

THE
CONTEMPORARY
REVIEW.

VOLUME CXXVIII.

JULY—DECEMBER, 1925.

LONDON :
THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW COMPANY LIMITED,
12, CURSITOR STREET, E.C.4.
1925.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME CXXVIII.

JULY, 1925.

	PAGE
The Budget Insurance Scheme. By Captain Wedgwood Benn, D.S.O., D.F.C., M.P. ...	1
Under-Cultivation and the Remedy. By the Right Hon. Noel Buxton, M.P. ...	9
The German-Polish Frontier. By Professor Hans Delbrück ...	18
The Authority of the House of Commons. By the Right Hon. Hilton Young, D.S.O., D.S.C., M.P. ...	23
The French African Empire. By Professor Charles Sarolea ...	33
Some Indian Problems. By W. A. J. Archbold ...	41
The "Hyphenates" and American Foreign Policy. By Clarence Walworth Alvord ...	48
The Mosul Question. By F. W. Chardin ...	57
Ferdinand Lassalle: The "Tragic Comedian." By A. W. G. Randall ...	64
Russia and Japan. By S. K.-H. ...	73
Our Vanishing Vikings. By A. G. Cowie ...	79
Signposts of Fiction. By Austin Harrison ...	82
William Tindale. By Atherton Mercer, Litt.D. ...	90
Nationalising the Lake District. By W. T. Palmer ...	97
Foreign Affairs. By George Glasgow ...	101
Literary Supplement:—Reviews of Books ...	117

AUGUST, 1925.

The Pact of Security. By the Right Hon. H. A. L. Fisher, M.P. ...	137
The Truth about Morocco. By Beckles Willson ...	146
The Opium Question: I—The Hague Convention in the Light of the Geneva Conferences. By Sir W. J. Collins, K.C.V.O. ...	155
II—A New Opium Policy. By C. F. Andrews ...	163
Twin Books on Two Policies. By Algernon Cecil ...	170
The Anti-Christian Movement in China. By Professor Ivan D. Ross ...	179
The Break-up of Islam. By the Rev. A. M. Chirgwin ...	187
Adramyttium. By Professor Rendel Harris ...	194
South America and the Royal Visit. By Percy Cross Standing ...	203
The Other Italy. By Ida Koritchoner ...	210
The Church and the Criminal. By Guy S. Dashwood ...	217
The World's Children. By Eglantyne Jebb ...	225
Some Plays of Pirandello. By Bernard Causton ...	229
Foreign Affairs. By George Glasgow ...	237
Literary Supplement:—Reviews of Books ...	253

SEPTEMBER, 1925.

The Session and the Parties. By Harold Spender ...	273
The Problem of the Unemployed. By the Right Hon. T. J. Macnamara ...	281
America and Fundamentalism. By S. K. Ratcliffe ...	288
The Church Union Movement in Scotland. By the Rev. Dr. J. Wilson Harper ...	296
Greece Since the June "Revolution." By Dr. William Miller ...	305
Transjordan To-day. By H. Charles Woods ...	313
The Balance of Power in the Balkans. By J. Walter Collins ...	322
International Aspects of the U.S. Immigration Law of 1924. By Kiyo Sue Inui ...	327
Is China Making Progress? By Dr. Wilfred Grenfell ...	334
Giacomo Boni: Poet of Archaeology. By Professor Dott. Giovanni Pioli ...	341
Peace and the Status Quo. By Roth Williams ...	350
Monsieur of France and His Two Wives. By Etta Elwes ...	359
The Timid Hare. By Douglas Gordon ...	366
Foreign Affairs. By George Glasgow ...	373
Literary Supplement:—	
The Verger's Tale. By J. E. G. de Montmorency ...	389
Reviews of Books ...	394

Printed by The Garden City Press Ltd., Letchworth, and published for
The Contemporary Review Co. Ltd., by British Periodicals Ltd.,
12, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.4.

69552

INDEX.

OCTOBER, 1925.

	PAGE
Conflicting Tendencies in the Church of England. I, Evangelical, by the Rt. Rev. E. A. Knox (formerly Bishop of Manchester); II, Anglo-Catholic, by the Rev. Professor Goudge, D.D.; and III, Modernist, by the Rev. Henry D. A. Major, D.D. ...	409
The Reformation of Politics. By J. A. Hobson ...	430
The Situation in Morocco. By Sir Charles Hobhouse ...	437
Ireland: After the Storm. By Hugh A. Law ...	446
The Liberal Party: What Sort of Future? By a Member of the Last Parliament ...	453
Italy in the Levant. By Anthony Dell ...	460
New Zealand's Coming Election. By Constance Clyde ...	467
The Fallacies of Current Cancer-Research. By Herbert Snow, M.D. ...	473
The Next Step in Educational Reform. By T. Edmund Harvey ...	481
Dante as a Political Thinker. By Ambrose Parsons ...	489
Feminist Philosophers and the International Labour Office. By A. Helen Ward ...	495
A Plea for James II. By Professor W. E. Brown ...	501
Foreign Affairs. By George Glasgow ...	509
Literary Supplement:—Reviews of Books ...	525

NOVEMBER, 1925.

The New Land Reform Proposals. I—By the Rt. Hon. F. D. Acland. II—By Harold Spender, LL.D. ...	545
Lord Grey and the Peace of Europe. By Sir Charles Mallet ...	559
The Sixth Assembly. By H. Wilson Harris ...	567
The Paris Press and French Public Opinion. By Beckles Willson ...	574
Turkey under the Nationalists. By H. Charles Woods ...	584
The Combative Instinct and the Abolition of War. By A. T. Cadoux, D.D. ...	592
Canada and British Immigration. By Mrs. H. A. L. Fisher ...	601
The Management of Industry. By Oliver Sheldon ...	606
A Central European Federation. By Dr. Heinrich Kanner ...	614
Alexander Pushkin. By C. Nabokoff ...	621
The Cinema in Education: Some Psychological Considerations. By Barbara Low ...	628
The Stockholm Conference on Life and Work. By Constance Smith ...	636
The Achilles of Journalism. By William Hill ...	641
Foreign Affairs. By George Glasgow ...	645
Literary Supplement:—Reviews of Books ...	661

DECEMBER, 1925.

What Liberalism Stands for. By Professor Gilbert Murray ...	681
Industry and Economics. By Sir Hugh Bell, Bart., C.B. ...	698
Empire Trade and Empire Settlement. By Professor Ramsay Muir ...	706
The New Germany. By Dudley Heathcote ...	715
France's Peril. By Sisley Huddleston ...	724
The Self-Giving of God. By the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, D.D. ...	733
Freeing the Slaves. By John H. Harris ...	743
Recent Progress in Tropical Development. By W. R. Dunlop ...	751
Shakespeare's Susanna. By the Rev. T. A. Gurney ...	758
Geneva and the World's Children. By Mrs. Percy Alden, M.D. ...	766
Good King Wenceslaus. By H. C. Watts ...	773
Foreign Affairs. By George Glasgow ...	777
Literary Supplement:—Reviews of Books ...	793

THE BUDGET INSURANCE SCHEME.

THE simplest way in which to approach the Government's new contributory pensions scheme is that adopted in the Bill itself, namely, to begin with a statement of the benefits conferred, examining afterwards the sources from which the money is to be drawn.

First, there is the provision for existing widows and orphans, which is as follows:

For the widow of an insured man dying before January 4th, 1926: if there is at least one child of the marriage or of any former marriage of either parent, under 14, pension of 10s. with additional allowances of 5s. for the eldest child under 14, plus 3s. for each other child, ceasing in each case at 14. The widow's pension ceases six months after the youngest child attains the age of 14, or on re-marriage if sooner. Re-marriage does not affect the continuance of the children's allowances. If the widow dies, the allowances become orphans' pensions as below. If there are no children, no pension is payable.

For the orphans of an insured widower or insured widow dying before January 4th, 1926: orphans' pension for each child under 14—7s. 6d. for the eldest child; 6s. for each other child; ceasing in each case at 14.

The conditions are, in general, that the man's occupation must have been insurable, or excepted, and that the widow or orphans, as the case may be, should have resided in Great Britain for two years immediately prior to the beginning of the scheme.

Next we come to the case of those widowed and orphaned after the initiation of the scheme, and first there is the case of the widow of the insured man who was over 70 at January 4th, 1926. The widow, if she has children under 14, receives the same assistance as that set out above for existing widows; and, if there are no such children, receives nothing. If the insured man is a widower and leaves orphans, they are provided for as are existing orphans.

Finally, there is the normal future provision, which is as follows:

For the widow of an insured man under 70 at January 4th, 1926, and dying thereafter: widow's pension of 10s., whether or not there are children, ceasing at 70, or on re-marriage before 70, and followed at 70 by pension of 10s. a week under the Old Age Pension Acts, without the necessity of satisfying the tests imposed by those Acts as to means, residence, and nationality. To this is added additional allowances for any children under 14, of 5s. a week for the eldest and 3s. for each other child, ceasing in each case at 14. Remarriage of widow does not affect continuance of children's allowances. If the widow dies, the allowances become orphan's pensions.

For the orphans of an insured widower or widow under 70 at January 4th, 1926, and dying thereafter: orphans' pension for each child under 14, at 7s. 6d. for the eldest, and 6s. for each other child, ceasing in each case at 14.

So much for the widows' pensions and orphans' allowances. There are two further benefits in the Bill.

The first is the provision of pensions for those between the ages of 65 and 70, which is provided for as follows:

Insured man between 65 and 70 at January 2nd, 1928: 10s. for life—until 70 under the new Bill, and thereafter under the Old Age Pension Acts without having to satisfy the tests imposed by those Acts as to means, residence, and nationality.* For his wife, 10s. a week if and when she is 65—until 70 under the new Bill and thereafter under the Old Age Pension Acts. If she is already 70, 10s. a week under these Acts. If the man dies, the wife's pension becomes widow's pension if she is still under 70, and ceases on remarriage under 70.

For the insured man attaining the age of 65 after January 2nd, 1928, the benefits are the same as above, but the wife's pension does not accrue until the husband is entitled.

Insured women (single, married, or widow) between 65 and 70 at January 2nd, 1928: pension of 10s. a week for life—until 70 under the Bill, and thereafter under the Old Age Pension Acts.

Insured women attaining the age of 65 after January 2nd, 1928, benefits as above.

Generally speaking, the conditions covering these pensions are five years' health insurance, and the payment of 104 contributions.

Lastly, under the Government Bill there is the abolition of the means limit in the case of the old age pensioner over 70, as follows:

Insured man over 70 on July 2nd, 1926, or attaining 70 between July 2nd, 1926, and January 2nd, 1928: 10s. a week for life under the Old Age Pension Acts, without having to satisfy the tests imposed by those Acts as to means, residence, and nationality.* For his wife or widow, 10s. a week for life under the Old Age Pension Acts if and when she is 70.

Insured woman, single, married, or widow, over 70 on July 2nd, 1926, or attaining 70 between July 2nd, 1926, and January 2nd, 1928: 10s. a week for life under the Old Age Pensions Acts.

* * *

Before passing to an examination of the sources of supply for these benefits, it may be appropriate to mention some of the criticisms of the benefits themselves. It may be observed in passing that while the contributors receive assured pensions at an earlier age, part of the cost is set off by the fact that they fall out of both health and unemployment benefit at the same age. The Actuary calculates that between the ages of 65 and 70 there are 250,000

* The removal of these tests applies in every case under this section.

persons insured against unemployment. Their annual contributions would amount to £330,000 and their benefits to £2,400,000. As regards Health Insurance, the number insured between 65 and 70 years of age is 355,000, who, in the course of a year, would receive in sickness and disablement benefits £1,800,000 and pay in contributions £250,000. It will be observed therefore that in the aggregate, persons between these ages constitute a nett charge under the two existing systems of £3,620,000 per annum. It is estimated that the expenditure in pensions to and in respect of such persons under the new Bill would be £12,400,000. So that, although the whole of the pension is not a new benefit, a very substantial new benefit is, in fact, conferred.

Criticisms of the scale of benefit have been plentiful and obviously easy to frame, for £1 is always better than 10s. Postponing the question of the amount which might be made available for the scheme, and examining the distribution of the allowed amount between the beneficiaries, certain hardships do in fact emerge. There is the case of the wife of the incapacitated man, and of the women whose husbands have been separated from them or divorced. Curiously enough, the claim of this class was urged with great force in 1923 by the Conservative Government spokesman, Sir William Joynson Hicks.

Then again, there is the question as to whether 14 should be the age at which orphans should cease to receive their allowances. The fixing of the age of 14 is contrary to the prevalent desire for the raising of the school age from 14 to 15 or 16. A good deal of criticism has also been levelled at the payment to every widow of whatever age of 10s. a week for life. The danger of competition from young childless widows in the labour market has been urged by Dr. Marion Phillips, among others, against this particular benefit. In general the scales have been criticised as being lower than the allowances usually granted by Boards of Guardians, and it is clear that where a widow is compelled to seek Poor Law relief, or a need pension as the dependent of a service man, the pension under the new scheme will be of no value to her, as the amount of it will be discounted from any additional help which is being given. Where, instead of going to the Poor Law, the widow supplements her pension by work, there is, of course, always the danger already referred to that the existence of these resources may form an adverse element in determining wages.

* * *

We may now examine the sources of revenue from which the pensions are to be or could be provided. There is the State con-

4 THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

tribution; there are the additional stamps to be collected on the health cards from employers and employed; there is the saving on the existing health insurance contributions, due to the transference of the beneficiary from the health benefits to the new insurance benefits at the age of 65; and there is the saving on State contributions to the unemployment insurance fund, due to the fact that the benefits under that scheme also will cease at 65. These are specific sources. In a more general sense, there is the taxable capacity of the country. Under this head, it is often argued that the reduction in super-tax, amounting in a full year to £10,000,000, was not justified in view of the demand for State assistance to the new pension scheme. A further argument that has great force, mainly from the fact that it was first employed by Mr. Churchill himself, is as follows:

In consequence of the war, the State has assumed a very heavy burden for war pensions. This charge, however, owing to the fact that pensioners die, and that their dependent children grow up, is constantly diminishing, and the Chancellor's plea was that the Exchequer, instead of putting off the burden, should retain it, but on behalf of the peace casualties in the place of war casualties. The figures given by the Actuary in reference to the decline referred to are as follows:

Year.	Estimated expenditure on War Pensions. Million £	Year.	Estimated expenditure on War Pensions. Million £
1925/6	67.0	1935/6	42.7
1926/7	63.5	1936/7	41.5
1927/8	59.3	1940/1	37.2
1928/9	56.6	1945/6	32.0
1929/30	54.1	1946/7	30.9
1930/1	51.6	1950/1	26.8
1931/2	49.2	1955/6	21.4
1932/3	47.0	1956/7	20.3
1933/4	45.3	1960/1	15.7
1934/5	44.0	1965/6	10.1

* * *

So much for the possible sources of supply. As to expenditure, Sir Alfred Watson gives very interesting tables showing the total cost of this class of State assistance for the next forty years. Two of his tables may conveniently be combined in the following:

Year.	Cost of Old Age Pensions under existing Acts. Million £	Cost under new scheme of Widows' and Orphans' Pensions and Old Age Pensions at 65. Million £	Additional cost of the abolition of insured persons in the case of the means limit for Pensions at 70. Million £
1925/6	27.0	2.7	—
1926/7	29.0	11.4	1.7
1927/8	29.7	15.0	2.7
1928/9	30.4	25.6	3.2
1929/30	31.1	27.8	3.3
1930/1	31.8	29.6	3.6
1931/2	32.6	31.3	3.8
1932/3	33.4	33.2	4.0
1933/4	34.2	34.9	4.3
1934/5	35.0	36.4	4.6
1935/6	35.9	38.4	4.7
1940/1	40.9	46.6	5.4
1945/6	46.4	52.3	6.2
1950/1	51.1	56.0	6.9
1955/6	54.4	57.7	7.2
1960/1	55.8	59.1	7.4
1965/6	56.8	60.8	7.6

It will be observed that the aggregate in forty years' time is £125,000,000.

Under the Government's scheme the contributions rise from £4.5 millions in 1925 to £42.7 millions in 1965; and the nett expenditure of the State (not the actual contributions proposed to be made by the Exchequer but the liability which falls to be met) varies from an actual surplus in 1925 to a liability in 1965 of £23 millions. This, however, is not the whole story. It was clearly stated by Mr. Churchill that in the end even the pensions under the 1908 Act would be met by the contributions. This will be achieved by a series of decennial increases in the contributions, the effect of which is stated by Sir Alfred Watson to be that

"the contributions payable for entrants at 16 in the year 1926, inclusive of the decennial increases, in addition to providing for the new benefits to the age of 70 will provide for about 20 per cent. of the old age pensions to which they, and in the case of men, their wives and widows, will be entitled. For entrants at 16 in the year 1936, 55 per cent. of the old age pensions will be similarly purchased. For entrants in the year 1946 over 80 per cent. of the old age pensions will be brought on to the contributory basis; while in the case of persons who enter into insurance in the year 1956 and afterwards, the whole cost of the old age pensions will be provided by the contribution."

To sum up. The cost is to be met at first largely and in the end wholly by contribution.

* * *

The discussion at the present moment of the issue between contribution and non-contribution is, however, largely academic. Differences of opinion have not in the past necessarily pursued the lines of Party distinction. Pensions and insurance are only a part of social assistance. Elementary education is *ejusdem generis* and it is non-contributory. The last Liberal Government made health insurance, which is only partly a matter of cash benefit, contributory; and old age pensions, which are a pure distribution of money, non-contributory. It is also interesting to observe that in those remote days the Conservative Party was unwilling to divide officially against the old age pensions scheme, but did officially divide the House of Commons against the contributory scheme of health insurance—although not necessarily on account of its contributory character.

The Labour Party has fathered and extended the contributory unemployment insurance scheme, and has never proposed the abolition of the contributory basis for health insurance, though some of its members, it is true, spoke against this when the scheme was first before the House of Commons. Even this view was not unanimously held, and Sir Kingsley Wood made a most effective quotation from a speech delivered by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald on July 6th, 1911, in which he said:

"Only the other day I looked up an article I wrote fifteen years ago on this subject, in which I discussed the problem of a contributory *v.* non-contributory scheme, and I was delighted to find that I was of the same opinion as I am now—that a contributory scheme is the soundest and best scheme from the economic point of view, and those of us who are consistent Socialists are bound to support it as opposed to a non-contributory scheme. . . . I have said I am in favour of a contributory scheme; that means I am in favour of insurance. To talk of State insurance without contributions is to talk nonsense. The very word insurance implies contributions—not a gift, not a grant, nor a dole, but a contribution proportionate to the risk which is covered by the insurance."

The issue, then, for the moment is not really concerned with the root principle of contribution or non-contribution, but merely with the question of what proportion of the expenditure should be borne by the State. Mr. Neville Chamberlain, in his speech on the Bill, spoke of the real hope inspired in insured persons by the knowledge that their efforts would be liberally supplemented by others. This is surely an argument for a larger State contribution; and, in fact, the argument from hope is much stronger than the argument from despair. And he it noted all the technical necessities of a contributory system, such as the need for defining clearly the beneficiaries, a basis of direct payment and so on, exist

whether the State assumes the whole of the new burden or not, or the scheme is founded on a stamped Health Insurance card.

* * *

When we consider the incidence of the contributions, the objections become much more real. Widowhood and orphanhood are not an industrial risk. So far as they are directly connected with industry, they are already covered by the Workmen's Compensation Act. They are, in fact, a general social risk and there is no justification for putting nearly the whole burden upon those engaged in industry, particularly at a time when trade is bad and when four of our largest industries have to meet the sharpest blasts of foreign competition. No one has urged this point of view more strongly than Sir Robert Horne.

Mr. Runciman, in pleading that the State should assume the whole of the burden, gave the example of

"a shipyard which spent on national insurance in 1915 £1,500 and turned out six ships a year, in 1924 spent on national insurance £4,200 and turned out only three ships a year, and thus had to provide £1,400 for national insurance alone for each ship instead of £250. Mr. Churchill's scheme would throw a further charge on that yard for national insurance of £1,100 a year, or £379 per ship on their present output."

That this case is a strong one has been fully realised and both Sir Douglas Hogg and Mr. Neville Chamberlain have attempted to meet it. Sir Douglas Hogg went to the length of quoting in pence the amount of relief to the rates which the Bill represented in three of the largest towns. Mr. Chamberlain, without committing himself to figures which may prove a boomerang later, catalogued general considerations on the other side to the advantage of the employer. The first was improvement in the temper of the workers due to the removal of the chief cause of their anxiety. The second was the reduction of unemployment due to pensioning off the older folk. As Mr. Chamberlain had stated, there were 350,000 men and 50,000 women over the age of 65 still working and earning wages. His third point was relief of rates, which he assumed in the aggregate to amount to £3,000,000 to rise ultimately to £7,000,000 yearly. He also pleaded the de-rating of machinery as a relief to the manufacturing classes. But despite these arguments, he was forced to admit, what is patent, that the burden of the new contributions will fall upon the industries at once, whereas the benefits he described will not accrue until a later stage.

That these arguments were really inadequate was felt by the Chancellor who, speaking on the Second Reading of the Finance

Bill, asked the House to trust the Government to do something more to lighten the load. He pointed out that the new stamps would not be required until January 1st next, and said:

"We have at this moment resources of help and power in reserve which, at the proper time and before this Session ends, will be moved forward to take their place in the general struggle we are waging against social disorganisation and the uncertainty of the workers' position. The key position turns upon the acceleration of the end of the deficiency period. At present, employers are paying 10d. and 11,000,000 workers are paying 9d. a week out of their wages. When the deficiency period is ended, the relief both to employers and workers will be extended to almost exactly the equivalent of the burdens which would be imposed by the new scheme. My Rt. Hon. Friend, the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs, advised us to increase the State contribution to the new pension scheme in the early years while this unemployment continues. I am sure that that would not be a thrifty bargain for the Exchequer. It is much better that any aid which we can give should be applied to what is a temporary adverse condition rather than incorporated in expenditure which will continue to run for a greater period. I shall ask the House to extend to us their confidence in this matter."

We can only await the full development of this plan, but if the Government's scheme is to drive insured persons off the live register by tightening up the regulations, it is clear that, far from lightening the burden on industry, it will increase it, because the workers will be transferred from what, although raised from industry, is a central fund, to the purely local fund of the Poor Law, involving an increase in rates, which form already the heaviest burden on production. If, on the other hand, the Government's scheme is to grant money on account of the insurance fund deficiency, or to improve the terms, as has been suggested by Sir Alfred Mond, on which money is at present lent, then it is hard to see the end of the matter, for no one can foretell the date at which the deficiency will terminate.

In any case, the vital question is left open, whether the burden of old age, widowhood and orphanhood is to be assumed in a large measure by the State (which, of course, will levy its contributions from the taxpayer according to their capacity to pay), or is, as Mr. Churchill has plainly stated (the Actuary dotting his i's and crossing his t's), to be shifted in the course of the next sixty years wholly on to the shoulders of the producers.

WEDGWOOD BENN.

UNDER-CULTIVATION AND THE REMEDY.

THE various reports issued under Governmental authority on the state of the agricultural industry show the increasing importance attached to agriculture in the life of the State. We shall never revert to the *laissez-faire* attitude of pre-war days. It is now recognised by all Parties that the Government of the day must take a hand in the development of an industry so vital to the welfare of the country. Opinions as to the causes of the decline of agriculture are as varied as the numerous reports that have been issued. But all are agreed, although with varying degrees of emphasis, in attributing a large share to the undercultivation of the land. Other causes, such as bad business methods, especially in marketing farm produce, are important. But unless we first excel in production, it would be useless to give all our attention to devising better methods of distribution. Indeed, the first step in solving the question of distribution has to be taken by the producer; he must know how to produce from the soil standardised saleable articles; the two processes are rigidly interdependent.

There are two aspects to be considered. British farming can first be viewed as a whole and compared with that of other countries, and secondly, the average British farmer can be judged in comparison with the best of his *confrères*. Looked at collectively, British agriculture is falling short of the standard of cultivation set by many other countries, particularly Denmark, Holland, and Germany, as is shown in the Report of the Agricultural Tribunal of Investigation. The level of production of food from the soil, and the production of cattle over a period of years, show greater increase in these countries, while in England cereals show an alarming decline. Of course, where the increase is greater, it does not necessarily show greater aptitude in farming, and as British farming had already reached a certain level, we have to allow for the law of diminishing return. We have also to recognise that the British are still the best breeders, produce more of certain crops per acre, and use perhaps better agricultural machinery. But judged by the standard of food production Britain lags behind owing to her low proportion of arable land.

In Germany two-thirds of the agricultural land is tilled, while in Britain only a third is under the plough. In fairness to the British farmer it should be said that this superiority is not entirely attributable to better methods of German production, the high standard of which is partly due to the artificial stimulus of protection. But subject to this reservation, the comparison is quite justified; the German farmer, for example, devotes more space

to crops like potatoes, and an acre under potatoes is worth ten times as much food as good pasture; large areas are given to the cultivation of sugar beet, and an acre of sugar beet is worth one and a half times in food an acre of potatoes. It should be noted that Germany surpasses Britain not only in cereal production but in those commodities in the production of which we are supposed to be most proficient, namely, milk and meat.

Turning to the second aspect, namely, the standard attained by individual farmers, I cannot do better than quote from Sir Daniel Hall's fascinating book, "A Pilgrimage of British Farming," which is based on a tour of personal investigation extending over three years throughout England and Wales. He points out that in every district he visited he found "good and bad farmers close together, men who are earning good incomes one side of the hedge, and on the other men who are always in difficulty, who in many cases are only kept going through the tolerance of their landlords. Nothing is more surprising than the way bad farming exists alongside good." Other agricultural authorities have made similar strictures on our pre-war farming. In 1912, Lord Ernle refers to the "thousands of acres of tillage and grasslands that are comparatively wasted, underfarmed and undermanned. Countries whose climate is severer than our own, and in which poorer soils are cultivated, produce far more than ourselves."

A mass of evidence collected by the Rural Land Inquiry showed undercultivation in all parts of Britain, attributable to lack of skill and efficiency in the farmer. He lacked knowledge, and the scientific equipment to apply this knowledge to a highly skilled trade. He also lacked capital. But some of the chief stumbling blocks arose out of the system of tenure. A considerable difference was found in the output of lands held under good and indifferent landlords. In a country where the bulk of the farmers are tenants, the part played by the landlord cannot be over-emphasised. A good tenant expects not only reasonable security of tenure from the landlord, but also efficient capital equipment and a keen interest in the development of the farm. Insecurity of tenure before the War was a bigger factor in causing undercultivation than it is now. Various measures have been placed on the Statute Book since then which make it very unprofitable to give notice to a tenant except on the grounds of bad husbandry. But although security has been increased we are still familiar with farmers who, for example, need liquid manure tanks but have no incentive to build them, and others who prefer to leave England and farm in the Dominions in order to get conditions which encourage outlay. But the main defect of the landlord system as practised in England still remains untouched. One of the most marked features

in British farming to-day is the increasing deterioration of equipment. The landlord takes no interest in the progressive development of his farms. His position contrasts vividly with that of the German landlord. The latter has not abdicated his function and become a mere rent receiver. He does not hold land merely as an investment, but for the purpose of carrying on the business of an agriculturist. Sir Thomas Middleton says in this connection:

"Capital must be freely available for developing his estate. In times of depression when money is difficult to raise, the reputation of a landowner as a business man may secure him an advance when otherwise he would fail. The estate of a German, unlike the home farm of most English landowners, is managed on business principles. Its function is to maintain the commercial credit of the owner, and its credit depends mainly on the balance sheet, not upon the number of prizes collected at local live stock shows. The ordinary German landowner must closely follow the business of producing food, his sons and his managers receive a good technical education, and it is from his well-managed estates that improvements spread among the peasant cultivators of the country."

Lord Bledisloe, in an address to the British Association, similarly charged the British landowner with falling short of his duties:

"The history of agriculture in the United Kingdom for the last seventy years does not redound to the credit either of landowners or of statesmen. The landowners who should have given a lead to the country failed to do so, largely because they have not as a class been trained for their proper profession, and because in a greater or less degree they have regarded the land as an amenity, but never as a great national problem for the solution of which they were themselves responsible. They are prone to treat their properties as playgrounds, or as instruments for the enhancement of their social position."

"The British landowner, if he farms at all, being untrained to the task, often farms indifferently, and generally at a loss. If he produces live-stock of special merit it is largely for the foreign and not the home market. Often his farming operations are based upon his ambition to gain public distinction by excelling as a professional exhibitor of prize stock at the leading agricultural shows, without any effort on his part to make such stock a medium for the improvement of the ordinary commercial stock of the country, or even of his own locality."

Such was the state of things before 1914. The war called the country to a perception of the function of agriculture, viz., to produce the maximum of supplies with the highest possible standard of living for those engaged in it. It was to the owner, where he controlled the farmer, that the State in its emergency might have naturally turned. But although when the War broke out the bulk of our farmers were tenants, the unimportance of the landlord was such that it was not to him that the State looked for the improvement of the land in his possession. A new element

was introduced, namely, the County Agricultural Committees, representing all three agricultural interests, Landowner, Farmer and Farm-worker, as well as representatives of the county holding a more impartial brief for the community. The standard of farming had to be raised to a higher level of production, not only in regard to ploughing up grassland but also to improving cultivation and husbandry so as to increase the food supply. It would not be strictly relevant to describe the activities of the Committees so far as they affected the cutting up of grassland for cereal crops. Much land that came under the plough for this abnormal war-time utility was not suited for the purpose, and in many cases crops were grown at enormously unprofitable cost. But putting this aspect of the Committee's work on one side, we find much activity of a character that would equally benefit the country if pursued in normal times. We were faced even under the stressful conditions of the War with the prevalence of negligent farming. Negligence in war is proof of more widespread negligence in peace.

The Committees were authorised by Regulation 2M of D.O.R.A. (a) to enter upon and take possession of land which was not being so cultivated as to increase the food supply of the country; the decision to terminate the tenancy being first taken by the Ministry of Agriculture; (b) to serve notice on the occupier of any land requiring him to cultivate the land in a particular manner. The power to enter on badly cultivated lands was exercised in 45 out of the 49 counties in England and Wales, the number of separate cases of entry being approximately 800, comprising an area of 52,000 acres. Some of the lands were let to new tenants, the Committee receiving the rent. In other cases they farmed the land at the Ministry's expense, either putting in a paid manager or securing the honorary services of a farmer member of the Committee living in the district. In this way direct farming of some 37,000 acres was carried on for four years by the Committees. Some cases may be quoted:

- (1) The tenant of a farm of 150 acres in Worcestershire was served with Cultivation Orders which he ignored. An independent report showed that the greater part of the arable land had not been ploughed for a considerable period, and that the grassland, which was poor, needed manuring. The tenancy was determined in Feb., 1920.
- (2) In Northamptonshire the tenancy of a farm of 242 acres was determined about the same time. In this case the pasture land was badly grazed, and not one of the four hay stacks had even a layer of straw to protect it. The 1919 crop had not been threshed, and the arable land generally was in a deplorable condition. The fences and ditches were also in a bad state. The occupier required the notice to be referred to arbitration, and the arbitrator found that the farm had not been cultivated according to the rules of good husbandry; the appeal therefore failed.

Turning now to the method of orders to cultivate, as it was

employed during the War, the main use of the powers to serve notices with regard to the cultivation of the land was to enforce the breaking up of a very large area of pasture in 1917 and 1918, and the growing of corn on lands so broken. Substantial penalties were enforced for non-compliance, and proceedings were taken in over 600 cases, mostly in 1918. Apart from the enforcement of these powers confirmed by Regulation 2M, Executive Committees had a great many other duties, for example, the destruction of pheasants, rabbits and rooks, the working of Government tractors and horse ploughing schemes, the provision of agricultural credit, and the supply of soldier labour, the provision of artificial manures, seed potatoes and other requirements.

More instructive lessons can, however, be derived from the exercise of the powers used after the Armistice by the Executive Committees. Their energies were then devoted to levelling up and improving the general standard of farming in their respective counties. Until January, 1921, when the Agriculture Act, 1920, came into force, the Committees retained all the powers that were exercisable by them during the War under D.O.R.A., but after the Armistice Cultivation Orders were served only in cases where rules of good husbandry were not being observed, or where in other respects land was being neglected. There is no record in Whitehall of the number of Cultivation Orders served at this period, but they numbered many thousands. It is regrettable that they remain buried in the archives of County Council offices.

Some interesting cases where legal proceedings were taken may be cited:

- (1) A notice to plough six acres of land was served on a farmer in Worcestershire in August, 1919, but no action had been taken by him up to February, 1920. It was shown that the land had lain derelict since the 1918 harvest, and about £80 worth of food was lost to the nation. The defaulter was prosecuted and fined £10 and £2 2s. costs.
- (2) An owner of land in Somerset was prosecuted for failing to comply with a Cultivation Order served in June, 1919, requiring the land to be ploughed and cleaned by September 2nd. The defendant's solicitor pleaded guilty on behalf of his client, but urged in extenuation of the offence that the land was purchased with the object of selling it again, not with the intention of cultivating it, and that delay had occurred in finding purchasers suitable to his client. The bench imposed a fine of £25 and £10 10s. costs.
- (3) An occupier of a field of 23 acres in Kent was prosecuted for failure to comply with a Cultivation Order. The field contained a large quantity of thistles, brambles, gorse and anthills, which the occupier was instructed to remove and destroy. The thistles were dealt with, but very little action was taken to remove the other rubbish which encumbered a large proportion of the field. The defendant was fined £20 and £5 5s. costs and has been served with a further order to carry out the work.

The experience of the County Committees was the basis of a permanent policy for the future as expressed in the Agriculture Act of 1920. The evidence they had collected impressed the Government of the day with the need of permanent powers for keeping up a good standard of husbandry. The Committee were to be retained as permanent machinery in the industry. It was through their services that the Government decided that cultivation could best be controlled. The powers conferred on the Committees were very wide, and nothing proves so completely the existence of bad farming as the terms of this Act. The powers as to the enforcement of cultivation were set out under different heads.

1. Good husbandry.
2. Improvement of existing methods of cultivation.
3. Necessary works of maintenance.
4. Destruction of weeds.
5. Grossly mismanaged estates.
6. Extermination of rabbits.

In an explanatory memorandum issued by the Ministry of Agriculture to County Councils there are given illuminating examples of the cases in which it may be desirable for the Committees to serve notices for the enforcement of good husbandry:

(a) foulness of the land, whether arable or grass, and prevalence of weeds; (b) repeated growth of white straw crops without proper measures to restore fertility; (c) excessive sale of hay, straw and root crops without suitable and adequate return of manurial value; (d) land left uncultivated or uncropped for too long a period; (e) neglect to keep open ditches and drains and to keep water meadows properly irrigated and in order; (f) neglect to keep in proper order hedges and other fences; (g) neglect to keep down scrub, gorse, bracken, anthills and molehills; (h) neglect to harrowing and rolling grass land; (i) failure to maintain a good state of fertility of grassland by proper stocking or otherwise; (j) general neglect in cultivation or in the securing of the crops.

For the improvement of existing methods, the Committee were instructed to issue notices for such purposes as (1) Maintaining or increasing food production by a suitable system of manuring; (2) Use of basic slag or other fertilisers on grasslands of the type on which such fertilisers are known to act beneficially so that the full feeding value of the land may be attained; (3) Use of lime, ground chalk or ground limestone in cases where the necessity is indicated by the prevalence of finger and toe, sorrel, corn marigold, etc., or other evidence of undue acidity in the soil; (4) To require the occupier of any market garden, fruit plantation, orchard or nursery ground to grub up and burn decayed or seriously diseased trees or bushes, and adopt spraying or other methods to keep in check diseases and pests which might become a menace to other fruit trees.

The destruction of weeds was also provided for; a power which the Committees still retain.

Necessary works of maintenance include the cleaning of drains,

embankments and ditches, the proper repair of fences, stone walls, gates and hedges, and repairs to buildings. The Committees were empowered in the case of a tenancy to vary the form of contract so as to secure to the landlord a fair payment in respect of the benefit derived by the enforcement of their orders.

As to grossly mismanaged estates, provision was made for enabling the Ministry to appoint a receiver and manager of any estate or part of an estate that is being so grossly mismanaged as to prejudice materially the production of food thereon.

Such a system, adopted as part of our permanent régime, would have created a gradual revolution. Agriculture, becoming a public concern, would be taken seriously by public opinion. The subordination of farming to sport would have been reprobated. The habit of regarding the countryside as an appanage to the golf course (providing it with pleasing scenery) would have ceased to provide *Punch* with material for pleasantries. No longer would the crops of turnips bordering on our woods have worn in late autumn a whitish colour, due to the desire to find plenty of rabbits when the coverts were shot, and the national loss would have ceased which is often, owing to that desire, represented by a reduction of rent, for fields near a wood, of 10s. an acre.

But the Agriculture Act was no sooner placed on the Statute Book than it was repealed. It scarcely functioned. The State would no longer bear the heavy burden of subsidising landlord, tenant and farm-worker involved in the guaranteed prices of cereals and claims for compensation for interference. Along with the subsidy control was swept away—unquestionably to the farmer's great relief, and England drifted back to the old conditions of haphazard husbandry. The Act, however, had clearly established the need for machinery, and we have to consider under what conditions it would be practicable and profitable to exercise control of cultivation.

The difficulties of supervising cultivation under a system of private ownership had proved insuperable, and I venture to put forward the contention that the problem would be infinitely easier of solution if agricultural land were controlled by a public authority as the Crown lands are controlled to-day. I am not concerned with making out a case for general nationalisation. This would rest on many other factors besides those to which I have alluded already. Nor would it be relevant to describe how the land could be nationalised. The proposition I wish to lay down is that given a system of tenancy, control can best be exercised when the State is the landlord.

Under a system of tenancy combined with private ownership of land, it is impossible for the State to embark on a great construc-

tive policy without gratuitously benefiting the pockets of the landlord. That is one of the main objections to control under present conditions. A second main objection lies in the fact that without public ownership the benefits of security can only be gained by a high degree of legal fixity. But this would impede the control of husbandry; whereas tenure under a public body gives the tenant sufficient security to encourage his enterprises even though legal fixity is less rigid.

There are other numerous disabilities. To control the standard of cultivation is practically impossible with private ownership. Interference gives rise to claims for compensation and to a situation which can only be solved by public acquisition. Even if a farmer gets notice to quit he has little difficulty at present in finding a farm on another property where again he may let down the land before he can be dealt with. If all land were controlled, as the Crown lands are now, he would be effectively squeezed out. A good landlord may control his tenants, and yet they may be victimised by the neighbouring farmer who is on another property. The seed of injurious weeds blows across, and neglect to clean the ditches may cause the neighbouring land to get waterlogged.

In many other ways there is loss through private ownership. One of our main needs is the readjustment of farm boundaries and revision of the size of holdings. With an increasing number of private owners the evil is perpetuated. There is undesirable variation in systems of land tenure, which no conceivable control without ownership could affect. Equipment is, of course, gravely neglected, through the poverty or incompetence of private owners and land agents; drainage could for the first time be efficiently dealt with; the housing question and that of water supply would be solved with greater ease; the problem of credit could be dealt with by the State because improved rent would go to the Treasury; the vital necessity of co-operative methods and of organised purchase and sale could be brought to the notice of farmers, as it is not now, and pressure could be brought to bear, which would be both inexpensive and profitable; the work of afforestation would be immensely simplified; land could be secured for the development of the small holding movement; the expense involved in a system of tithe, land-tax and copyhold would be avoided.

Perhaps the greatest gain would be in the sphere of administration. Great economies would result from unified and efficient agency. Few functions are more incompetently discharged than that of land agency, traditionally allotted to the nearest relative of the landlord who has failed to find a career. The work of the land tax and tithe rent charge would be eliminated—a whole branch of the Ministry of Agriculture thus disappearing. Income Tax under Schedule A is collected at great expense, and could in

future be collected by deduction at the source. The whole problem of repayment of income tax to owners in consideration of necessary expenditure would be removed, as would also the great cost of conveyancing.

Estate management is now conducted under the chaotic conditions afforded by scattered properties which prevent adequate supervision of farming and estate work. The economy available may be gauged by that effected through the placing of the Crown lands under an efficient firm of agents in 1907. Immense simplification would result in the concentration of work under the Ministry responsible for agricultural lands. The county unit would be with advantage entrusted with a share in the management. Competent land agents would be selected and might if desired for an indefinite time be employed in place of an official agency system. The present scheme of agricultural education would be multiplied in efficiency through its association with the landowning authority, and an immense encouragement would be given to the profession of land agency. A stimulus would accrue to agricultural propaganda of every kind. At present only a small fraction of farmers are touched by our agricultural education systems. The county land agent would become an officer of the highest importance, securing intimate relationship between the administration of land and the provision of technical advice.

The powers of the County Committees of which, as we have seen, they made such good use in difficult circumstances, could be revived under a simpler and more co-ordinated system, so as to ensure the active co-operation and goodwill of the county interests with the activities of the County Land Agent and his subordinates. It was the hope of calling out such county activity that induced me to circulate to County Committees during my term of office a memorandum suggesting what activities they could well undertake under the present system, in addition to the powers which they still retain, viz. (1) to deal with injurious weeds, and (2) to grant on the application of a landlord a certificate in cases where a tenant is not cultivating his holding. Much might be done under present conditions, but the pace will be far too slow till pressure can be applied, as the county agent now applies it, in the case of the county small holdings. Such a scheme is not based on political theories or ideals, but on the need for efficiency. So far from constituting an attack on property, it would be welcomed by many owners. Meanwhile we are wasting our resources and allowing an artificial decrease of our rural population—that most vital element in our social order.

NOEL BUXTON.

THE GERMAN-POLISH FRONTIER.

IN the June number of THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, Mr. Wilson Harris examines the question of the German-Polish frontier, a problem of the utmost importance not only for Germany and Poland but for international policy in general. The article is distinguished by a tendency towards strict impartiality, but there are some material errors in it which are bound seriously to affect the author's judgment. Perhaps I may be permitted at the outset to state that it is a well-known fact in Germany as well as in Poland how, in the pre-war period, I constantly opposed in my magazine, *Preussische Jahrbücher*, Prussia's Polish policy, which I stigmatised as wrong and inhuman. For this reason I was much attacked in Germany, and even prosecuted by the Government. The *Preussische Jahrbücher* was nicknamed the *Polische Jahrbücher*. Thus the Poles can hardly tax me with national prejudice when they now find me condemning their policy in the same way as, in the past, I used to condemn the policy adopted by Prussia.

Mr. Harris writes: "That the Corridor is predominantly Polish no one has ever doubted. German ethnographical maps demonstrate that as clearly as any others. The Vistula has always been Poland's great highway to the sea, and Poles have been settled for centuries along its channel." This is a fundamental error. I need only refer to the "Völkerkarte," in Andre's "Allgemeine Handatlas," to the "Karte der Länder und Völker Europa's," edited by Dietrich Schäfer, Professor of History at the Berlin University (published by Dietrich Reimer), and to the map of West Prussia and Posen, edited by Albrecht Penck, Professor of Geography at the Berlin University. They clearly show that both banks of the Vistula, from Thorn down to the Baltic, are predominantly inhabited by Germans, and that the district predominantly inhabited by Poles is situated on the thinly populated sandy hills that accompany the course of the Vistula at some distance on the left bank. According to German statistics, the province of West Prussia and the district of Bromberg, i.e., the area from which the corridor was taken, had, before the war, a population consisting of 1,500,000 Germans and 1,000,000 Poles. The Poles maintained that the population was to a much greater extent in their favour, and at Versailles they succeeded in getting the whole left bank of the Vistula allotted to them, "as being indisputably Polish," while for the right bank, as well as for the southern part of East Prussia (the so-called Masurenland), a plebiscite was ordered. The result of this plebiscite was that 93 per cent. in the West Prussian, and 98 per cent. in the East

Prussian district voted in favour of Germany. On this result being announced at the meeting of the Supreme Council at Paris, a smile full of diplomatic amiability is said to have passed over the British Delegate's face. There was a plebiscite in Upper Silesia too, and 50 per cent. of the votes were cast in favour of Germany. Nevertheless, by means of a "mean fraud," as Lloyd George called it, the most valuable part of the country, the natural unity of which was destroyed, was handed over to Poland. In the Corridor itself a plebiscite was not risked. There is little doubt that not only the Germans, but also a considerable part of the Poles living in the three districts concerned, would have voted in favour of Germany.

How has the mixture of races in the disputed area come about? Mr. Wilson Harris writes: "Mr. H. J. Paton has pointed out 'Germany had first annexed and then assiduously colonised Posen.'" Obviously this statement is meant to apply not only to Posen, but to West Prussia as well. This conception of the historical course of events is not correct. West Prussia on the left bank of the Vistula was originally a semi-independent Polish-Cassubian dukedom which, after the extinction of the Ducal House (1295), was for a time disputed property between the Margrave of Brandenburg and the King of Poland, until it fell to the Teutonic Knights to whom the Margrave had sold his claims. The King of Poland, Casimir the Great, in a peace brought about by mediation of the Church, renounced his rights and for a century and a half the country was in the possession of the Teutonic Order. But it is quite erroneous to assume that the district was colonised by Germans only subsequent to this annexation. Without exception all the towns, Thorn, Culm, Danzig, etc., had been German from the date of their foundation, and the advance of the German element in the Slavonic area was by no means a consequence of German conquest, but a natural process which took place more or less independently of political rule in the areas concerned, no matter whether they were German or Polish. It is the simple result of the fact that in those days German civilisation was superior to Polish civilisation. The Slavonic Dukes of Silesia, Pomerania, and Mecklenburg drew German settlers into their countries, which were thus Germanised. Not only in the district belonging to the Teutonic Knights but in Poland too, towns were founded with German colonists; even Cracow, the capital, had adopted Magdeburg law; so had Lemberg (Lwow) where the same King Casimir who had ceded the Pomerellen district to the Teutonic Knights settled German citizens. In a similar manner the Poles, in those times as well as later, extended their nationality in the east over Ruthenian, White Russian, and

Lithuanian areas. After the Pomerellen district for a century and a half had been under the rule of the Teutonic Knights, it passed in 1466 to Poland, and then again, in 1772, for 150 years to Germany. Frederick the Great at once constructed a canal connecting the district of the Vistula with that of the Oder, and drew German colonists into the country, thereby strengthening the German elements already settled there. During the period from 1861 to 1890 the Polish element under Prussian rule actually increased more rapidly than the German, as was shown by the statistician Böckh in the *Preussische Jahrbücher* (September, 1894); and when the Prussian Government thereupon started a very expensive colonisation by peasants, its action had practically no effect whatever. The small losses inflicted on the Poles in the country were more than made good in the towns.

Thus Mr. Harris' deductions are based on two errors—in the first place, that the Corridor has been "indisputably Polish in population," and secondly that the German element in this area has been nothing but an increase brought about by political rule. The district, by the nature of things, is rather a district containing a mixed population, and whether from an historical point of view it has belonged longer to Germany or to Poland, is a debatable point. According to Tacitus the whole country between the Rhine and the Vistula was Germanic in ancient times. During the migration period of the German tribes the Germans left the district between the Elbe and the Vistula, and it was occupied by Slavonic races. Whether this happened by conquest or by peaceful immigration is not recorded. From about 1300 the district was German for three centuries and Polish for three centuries. In this calculation the question has not been taken into consideration to what extent the Cassubians who inhabit the lower part of the Corridor near the Baltic may be accounted for as Poles. They talk a Slavonic dialect, but it seems doubtful how far they actually feel like Poles. It would have been easy to find this out by a plebiscite in 1920. Why was it not done? This extremely important point is passed over in silence by Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris thinks that the terms of the Armistice involved granting the Poles access to the sea. This is a question of interpretation. Mr. Harris thinks that it was never seriously contended that that access meant "anything but territorial access." I venture to disagree with him. The words have been chosen in such a way that they may mean access through foreign (German) territory guaranteed by international law. So the newly created Czecho-Slovak State has got no access to the sea, but an internationally guaranteed connection with the harbour of Hamburg, an arrangement which works quite satisfactorily. It would have

been quite possible, even if the Corridor had remained German, to do the same for the Poles at Danzig. As a matter of fact this has actually been done. It is not the Corridor which gives Poland access to the sea, for it leads to no port. The access to the sea consists in the rights granted to Poland in the harbour of Danzig. Therefore, even in this respect, the creation of the Corridor was illogical. The Poles have had recourse to the desperate expedient of building a new harbour near Gdingen, on Cassubian territory, not far from Danzig. Danzig was to be checkmated by a Polish Counter-Danzig. But the plan collapsed before it came to be executed. Large sums were actually voted, and a beginning was made with the construction of quays. To-day, owing to the lack of funds, the work has come to an end, and people have perhaps begun to realise that a harbour needs not only quays and warehouses but a body of merchants as well.

Nature, geography, and history have denied Poland, in the same way as Switzerland or Czecho-Slovakia, the privilege of possessing a sea shore. Poland has to fulfil other economic tasks as an agent between Western Europe and the East. She is situated between two seas, the Baltic and the Black Sea, without touching either. But by reasonable agreements with Rumania on the one hand, and Germany on the other, Poland would be quite capable of satisfying her economic needs.

Mr. Harris does not fail to see that the creation of the Corridor was very much open to dispute, but he thinks that, by the migration of Germans from Polish territory and of Poles from German territory, the minority problem is growing less acute. Unfortunately this is not the case. The Germans do not voluntarily emigrate from Poland but are expelled by the Poles in the most brutal manner.

I have referred to the fact that I always opposed, on account of its inhumanity, the policy adopted by Prussia towards Poland since 1886. My opposition was not entirely unsuccessful. Bethmann-Hollweg saw the mistakes of such a policy, and began to alter it. But what Poland is doing to the Germans to-day is something fundamentally different from the former Prussian policy. Prussia tried to fight the Poles in a national sense, advancing, at the same time, their cultural standard by an excellent system of education, and furthering their interests from an economic point of view. The whole district, which had gone to rack and ruin under Polish rule, became prosperous under Prussian rule. The Polish Republic pursues a totally different policy. It tries to ruin its German subjects economically, or to expel them. German schools and hospitals are either closed or turned into Polish institutions, and by such means the Poles have succeeded in driving

some 900,000 Germans beyond the Polish frontiers. Of the two million Germans allotted to Poland by the Treaty of Versailles, little more than half are left. The German people is all the less likely to forget these brutalities since, after all, it was due to German troops that Poland was liberated from Russian domination. The Polish Republic numbers 27 million inhabitants of whom little more than 17 millions are Poles. All minorities, be they Ruthenians, White Russians, Lithuanians, Jews, or Germans are being oppressed by the Poles in the same manner. The system adopted by the government is so terrible that, according to reports published by the press at this very moment, the Minister, Thugutt, declared in public that his conscience did not allow him to have anything more to do with it, and that he tendered his resignation. I believe that, sooner or later, a serious crisis is sure to develop in Poland, and the question of the Corridor will then be raised once more. The Polish Press likes to declare that, as a matter of fact, it will not be possible to preserve the Corridor, but that the difficulty could be brought to an end by uniting Danzig and East Prussia with Poland. The German Government might accept this proposal on condition that the question be decided by plebiscite.

According to Polish calculations there are living at the present time, after the emigration of so many Germans, 81 per cent. of Poles in the Corridor. All the same Germany might risk a plebiscite since the city of Danzig, which is exclusively German, would participate, and a large number of the Cassubians would vote in favour of Germany. But one further step should be taken. A plebiscite in a district constituted so arbitrarily as the Corridor would have no sense. Logically such a principle can only be applied to districts which form an ethnological, economic, or geographical unit. One could not possibly allow every single village to choose the State to which it would wish to belong. The Corridor is a monstrosity in itself. The only sensible idea would be to unite East and West Prussia. Then the uniform area ought to be allowed, in agreement with the principles of modern International Law, to decide by plebiscite whether it wishes to belong to Germany or Poland. If, as is to be assumed in such a case, a large number of Cassubians and even of Poles should cast their votes for Germany, there would only remain a small number of Poles who would be compelled to return to the German State against their will. As to the access to the sea, this could, by an international agreement, be guaranteed to Poland at Danzig, in much the same way as is done to-day, and Poland's rights might even be extended, by similar agreements, to Stettin and Königsberg.

HANS DELBRÜCK.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

A DISTINGUISHED lawyer with a very English mind said of that very English institution, the common law, that it was not a skeleton, but a living body; it was like a coral reef that was still growing, and the judges were the coral insects. The same may be said of an institution which is no less English, our Constitution. That, too, is not a dead skeleton: it is living coral, that is still being built up by ministers, members of parliament, and law courts, civil servants, newspapers, and, indeed, by the whole British nation. Those insects are adding to it and altering it day by day. The daily change is small, as it is in a coral reef. But in the course of ten years the change is perceptible, and in the course of a hundred it is conspicuous. Changes which are still in course of accomplishment are much more difficult justly to distinguish than those which are over. When one is travelling by train, it is easier to see the distant landscape than that which is flashing by close at hand. But it is the present changes that are the more interesting, because their course can still be modified. There are some particularly interesting changes that are now taking place, slowly but surely, in the House of Commons. They have two aspects. The first is that of the functions of the House, its powers and capacities; the second is that of the composition of the House, what sort of body it is, and what sort of body it is becoming.

In order the better to understand the changes that are taking place in the functions, powers, and capacities of the House, we should consider what those functions, powers, and capacities are, according to the accepted theory of our constitution. During the Victorian age, when the power of the House was at its zenith, the theory was formulated that parliament was sovereign, and that parliament was omniscient. That theory is expressed in the works of Anson, Dicey, and Maitland, and in a recent work of Professor Pollard there is an informing account of its historical origin. I imagine that constitutional lawyers would not hesitate to accept the theory still as a principle of our constitution at the present time.

What does the theory mean? It does not of course mean that parliament is omnipotent. Parliament cannot bid the sun and moon to stand still. By saying that parliament is sovereign and omniscient it is meant that, in the sphere of legislation, parliament alone is master. Parliament alone has authority to make laws: and in making laws its authority is not subject to that of any other person or body of persons. In that it differs from the

parliament of a country which has a written constitution. The parliament of the United States is bound by the constitution of the United States, which is a written document. If it passes a law which is not in harmony with the provisions of that constitution, the law is pronounced to be bad by the Supreme Court of the United States, and it has no force. The authority of our parliament knows no such limitations. No court of law can pronounce upon the legality of any of its acts. It is not even bound by its own previous decisions. It can repeal any Act as fast as it can make it. There is no subject about which it cannot legislate, and no legislation which it cannot pass about a subject. It is sovereign and omniscient. That is the theory, still accepted and repeated as a principle of our constitutional law. It is a theory with which it becomes increasingly difficult to reconcile the facts of everyday life in public affairs. There is a change taking place in the functions, powers, and capacities of parliament. Session by session an increasing share in the functions of legislation is passing to bodies other than parliament, and session by session parliament is ceasing to be our sole legislature. If that be so, then parliament is no longer either sovereign or omniscient, and for the true seat of those qualities we must look to some group of bodies, which no doubt includes parliament as by far its most important member, but does not any longer consist of parliament alone.

The change is chiefly due to the growth of our industrial system, and to the increase which has accompanied that growth in the number and variety of the legislative functions which the State is expected to perform. As our social organisation has increased in complexity, so has the sphere of legislation been extended. Legislation is now expected to concern itself with wide provinces of human activity, into which, a hundred years ago, nobody would have dreamed of its entering. So great now is the volume of legislative business that parliament has no longer time to perform it all. So great is its complexity and variety, so special in many cases is the knowledge required for its transaction, that parliament would not have the capacity to perform it if it had the time. The result is that, in order effectively to deal with the great and ever increasing volume of legislative business, parliament is obliged to share some of its powers with others. In some cases it does so voluntarily: in others it does so involuntarily. Voluntary delegations are frequent.

There is a growing practice of delegating legislative power to the executive, to be exercised by Order in Council. Detailed enactments are required, for example, to deal with some special matter, such as import licenses, or the regulation of pilots. Par-

liament has not time to attend to the matter. It gives the Ministry concerned power to make laws about it, in the form of orders. It dislikes doing so; a proposal to leave a matter to be regulated by Orders in Council is always unpopular in the House; but it often finds it impossible to avoid. There are many other devices by which parliament voluntarily delegates legislative powers. It delegates them in ever increasing measure to a whole host of local authorities, special and general, whose legislative activities are now even more incessant and multifarious than those of parliament itself. It delegates other powers, and powers which are undoubtedly legislative, to such bodies as Trade Boards, which have power to make what are, in effect, laws regulating the conditions of particular industries. Space would fail to enumerate the special bodies, such for instance as the Railway and Canal Commission with its power over railway rates, which have been instituted from time to time to relieve parliament of some particular legislative function. Their name is legion.

It is no doubt true that each and all of these authorities derives its powers, in theory, from parliament, and that, in theory, parliament could in the case of any one of them recall those powers. In theory, that is true: but it is quite untrue in practice. In practice, parliament could not recall all the powers which it has delegated, without bringing the business of government to a standstill. It could reverse a decision here or there, or recall this or that delegated power, so long as it took care not to interfere on any but the most exceptional occasion. Were it to seek to resume its powers and to reassert its authority in any general manner, not having the time or the knowledge needed for the work, it would plunge the country into confusion. In fact it does not do so, and it knows that it could not do so. What does this mean, in fact, but that these delegates of parliament do possess independent legislative power, and that their dependence on parliament is but a polite fiction? Whatever the theory may be, in fact they share in the sovereignty of parliament and qualify its omniscience. Parliament may not admit it: but it is none the less a fact.

Such is the manner in which parliament is voluntarily parting with a part of its legislative functions. Let us glance at the process by which another part of that authority is passing involuntarily out of its hands. The chief region of legislative activity in which this is taking place is that of the conditions of labour, including hours and wages. Consider the way in which these matters are now controlled. The mining industry may serve as an example. What is the process of making a law about miners' hours and wages? A crisis arises in the industry. The representatives of the miners meet the representatives of the coal owners,

in what may fairly be called the parliament of the industry. They debate the issues, and probably they disagree. The opposing views are supported by strike or lockout. The Executive steps in as conciliator, and brings the parties together again. Once more the parliament of the industry meets. There is further debate and negotiation: remedies are discussed and formulated. At last an agreed solution is found for the difficulties. Probably a law is needed to carry it out. A Minister introduces a bill, explaining that it is an agreed compromise which must not be varied, at the risk of spilling the whole of the fat into the fire again. A miner's member and a representative of the coalowners confirm this menace on behalf of the two parties to the dispute. The House of Commons talks for a little to vindicate its dignity, and then accepts the measure. What else can it do? It has no knowledge of the negotiations which have led up to the settlement. It has little knowledge of the subject as a whole. It knows that, if it tried to vary the settlement, its variation would be rejected by the industry, with a malison upon its meddlesomeness. In fact, it has not the knowledge or the authority necessary in order to enable it effectively to legislate upon the subject. So it does what it is told. Is it not clear that, in such a process, the theory that it is the House of Commons which is legislating is little more than a fiction? In fact it is the parliament of the industry which has legislated, and thus shared in the substance of sovereignty, if not in the legal form of it.

Another conspicuous instance comes to mind, of frequent occurrence, in which parliament involuntarily shares its legislative powers with outside bodies. It is in matters of taxation. What happens when a new tax is to be imposed upon some interest, or an old one is to be reduced, or its incidents are to be altered? The Chancellor of the Exchequer meets the representatives of the interests affected, and discusses the matter with them. They debate the matter, discuss expedients, and make a plan. If a tax is to be imposed, they settle its basis. If one is to be reduced, the Chancellor exacts conditions, it may be, to ensure that the public shall profit by the reduction. When all has been arranged, the Chancellor announces the result of his negotiations to the House of Commons. Great as is the jealousy with which the House is wont to guard its control of taxation, it is difficult for it to interfere with such an arrangement as this. It has not had cognisance of the negotiations which led up to the arrangement. It hesitates to interfere with a carefully prepared and balanced plan, which probably embodies a compromise between conflicting interests. It is ten to one that it dares not to interfere, and ratifies the plan with its formal assent. Is it not clear that, although the House

has formally assented, it is the representatives of the interests concerned and the Executive in consultation that have actually made the law?

It would be easy to give other instances in which laws are made outside the House of Commons, and the House, for lack of the necessary knowledge or authority, has little option but to accept them. Sometimes, indeed, these outside laws never come before parliament at all. Such are some of the most important of the standing industrial agreements, which govern the conditions of particular industries. Mention in particular may be made of the agreements between wage-earners and employers governing conditions in the cotton trade and in the boot and shoe trade. They derive no authority from the Imperial Parliament. They have been enacted by the parliaments of the industries concerned; but none the less are they in substance laws that govern the doings of hundreds of thousands of men and women: and they are better obeyed than a good many laws which have behind them all the authority of the three estates of the realm.

Whether or not this outside legislation has received the formal assent of parliament makes indeed little practical difference to its force and authority. It derives its force, not from parliament but from the representatives of the interests concerned gathered in their associations. We may indeed see in this involuntary transfer of some of the power and authority of parliament to other bodies an instance of the unfailing vitality of the representative principle in human affairs. These outside associations, trade unions, associations of employers, associations of special interests of all sorts, have power to displace the authority of parliament in regard to matters which specifically affect them, because in regard to those matters they are more directly representative of the interests concerned than is the miscellaneous assembly of the House of Commons.

The growth in the development of our social organisation which accompanies our progress in democracy brings with it an ever increasing number of these associations representing special interests. The House of Commons is thus confronted with an ever increasing number of rivals for legislative power. It is true that the activity of each such body is confined to its own special area of affairs. But they so increase in number that the sum of their activities now covers all but the whole social life of the nation. There are few subjects of legislation in which parliament does not find itself confronted with some representative association, better informed than itself, and eager to filch from it the power to make laws for that subject. Were the present process by which power is being transferred from parliament to these representative bodies

to be indefinitely continued, parliament in the long run would lose all power of initiating legislation. Its functions would become confined to co-ordinating the measures of the outside bodies, to formal ratification of those which it approved, and to the exercise of a veto, in the cases in which it had authority and influence enough to exercise it. We are no doubt still a long way from that state of affairs; but that would be the end of the journey which parliament is now making. To summarise these changes which are going on in the functions, powers, and capacities of parliament, we may describe them as a gradual decentralisation of legislative power. It is getting split up and scattered amongst various outside bodies, some of which have parliamentary authority for the exercise of legislative functions, and some of which have not. The old bottle of a centralised legislature is bursting under the influence of the new wine of industrial legislation, and its bits are being scattered far and wide.

The second aspect of change in the House of Commons is that of change in the composition of the House, in the sort of body that it is. In order the better to understand that change, let me refer to the classical theory of the true relations between a member of parliament and his constituents. It was best expressed by Edmund Burke, in his celebrated speech on the declaration of the poll at Bristol, in 1774. His colleague had said something which Burke thought too subservient towards his constituents. Burke seized the occasion to protest against the idea that a member of parliament was to be the mere mouthpiece of his constituency. He said :—

“ Authoritative instructions, mandates issued, which the member is bound blindly and implicitly to obey, to vote, and to argue for . . . these are things utterly unknown to the laws of this land, and which arise from a fundamental mistake of the whole order and tenour of our constitution. Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests, which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, against other agents and advocates. But Parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole, not local purposes, not local prejudices, ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole.”

Succeeding generations have accepted those noble words as a definition of the true principles governing the relations between a member and his constituents. The relation may be summarised in the phrase that a member is a representative, and not a delegate. He is to have a mind of his own for the consideration of questions as they arise: he is not to be a mere mouthpiece to repeat, like a gramophone, the mandates of his masters.

Such is the theory. But if we consider the House of Commons

as it is at present constituted, we shall perceive that session by session the theory is being riddled by facts that are inconsistent with it. Session by session the number of members increases who are the servants, agents, or officials of some association which represents a special interest. Formally, they represent a constituency. Actually, they represent their association. The association gives them hard and fast instructions. They are its delegates in the fullest sense of the word. Their relations with their associations could not be better described than in the words of Burke, when he described what the position of a member of parliament ought not to be: they receive “ authoritative instructions, mandates issued which the member is bound blindly and implicitly to obey, to vote, and to argue for.” In 1925 we must say that that is a state of affairs no longer “ utterly unknown to the laws of this land.” Of the associations which thus have their mandates and agents in parliament, the most numerous are the Trade Unions: but they are by no means the only ones. Associations of employers also have their members. There are the Co-operative Associations; and there are the great political organisations, such as the temperance societies, and so on, which are now seldom without special members committed to their interests. We may, I think, estimate, that about a third of the members of the House are connected nowadays more or less closely with some association representing special interests, and are bound by obligations to that association as well as, if not in preference to, their constituencies.

No doubt these associations differ in the degree of subservience which they exact from their members. Some allow more latitude than others do to their representatives in the House to think for themselves and to direct their own course of action. No doubt also the representatives of the associations include men of courage and independence, who are by no means content to act as the mere mouthpieces of their associations. The system of delegates, in short, is by no means firmly established yet. But it is certain that the relations between these members and their associations must have a constant tendency to make them less and less representatives, after the pattern of Burke's ideal, and more and more delegates, after the pattern of the gramophone.

A careful student of the debates of the House of Commons (if such still exist) will find in their changing character strong evidence of this change from representation to delegation in the composition of the House. When the House was composed of independent representatives, it used to debate. Speeches were related to each other. Member answered member. There was a comparison of ideas and a clash of intelligences. Truth was ham-

mered out by argument. Measures were beaten into shape by blows upon the anvil of spontaneous controversy. Every member was free to treat the subject from the widest view of public interest. All that has changed. The change again could not be better described than in the words of Burke. Parliament is ceasing to be a deliberative assembly of one nation with one interest, that of the whole. It is becoming a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests, which interest each must maintain as an agent and advocate against other agents and advocates. The daily reports of the House of Commons now in the twentieth century show that such advocates cannot seek truth in debate. They are bound by instructions. Their speeches must express the formulated policy of their organisations. So there is no debate nowadays. There is little meeting of minds. Speeches have little relation to each other. The measure under consideration gains little from the discussion. The House does not deliberate about it: its members merely register in public the mandates which they have received. It is not a debate amongst representatives: it is a series of demonstrations by delegates.

There are no doubt still at times lively debates in the House, in which there is a spontaneous clash of argument. It is rare, but sometimes it does happen. When it does happen, often it is because the subject of the debate is of so little importance that the delegates have not been troubled with mandates on the subject. The most spontaneous debate that I remember in the House was on a Rats and Mice Bill. It arose because somebody with a memory of his youth moved to exclude dormice from the murderous provisions of the bill. Here was a subject, for once, that every member was free to have and to express his own opinion about. Such an exception does but illustrate the tendency for true debating to decay.

The change which I have been describing in the composition of the House is leading to a curious anomaly in our representative institutions. We are getting two systems of representation superposed the one upon the other. Legally our representative system is representation by geographical areas, the constituencies. Actually it is coming to be representation by special economic and social interests organised into associations. The process by which the one system is ousting the other is a curious one. It will surely puzzle the student of our history in days to come. "Here," he will say, "were the inhabitants of East Barsetshire, who had the right to elect a member to represent their interests as Barsetshire men. But instead of doing so they used to elect an official of the Sackbut-players' Union, or of the Association of Master-pawnbrokers, although they must have been well aware that it was not

their interests as Barsetshire men that those worthies would represent, but the interest of the sackbut players or of the pawnbrokers. Why were they so disinterested? Barsetshire may have been peculiarly rich in sackbut players or in pawnbrokers. But certainly the interests of the eastern end of that county were by no means identical with those of the occupations in question." The answer to our historian's question is not an easy one to give. It must, I think, be sought in a comparison between the characters of the two groups, the trade union of sackbut players, for instance, and the constituency. As a group the trade union is homogeneous. All its members have the same interest in politics. The constituency is utterly heterogeneous. The political will of the closely knit trade union is therefore much stronger than that of the loosely organised constituency; its political consciousness is a great deal more awake; it has a great deal more character and personality. The rise of the political association at the expense of the geographical constituency is thus but another case of the survival of the fittest. The stronger and the more alert group squeezes the weaker to the wall.

In snatching representation from the constituencies, the organisations are greatly aided by the growing expensiveness of being a member of parliament. Of late it has grown rapidly, and in two ways. The increase of the electorate has increased the running expenses and the cost of elections also: and the greater frequency of general elections formidably adds to the burden. In comparison with these increases, the relief afforded by a salary of £400 a year is quite negligible. An election used to come about once every four years. Lately it has come once a year. An annual fine of anything from £700 to £1,700 is more than any but a few rich men can afford to pay out of their own resources for the privilege of serving the public and of neglecting their own affairs. Independent politicians of small private means are thus banished from politics in ever increasing number, and their place is taken by the agents and officials of powerful organisations that can afford to foot the bill.

It appears inevitable that both changes mentioned should contribute to diminish the influence of the House of Commons. The distribution and decentralisation of legislative functions directly reduce the power of the House. The change from representation to delegation indirectly reduces the authority with which that power is exercised. How could it be otherwise? The authority was based upon the position of the House as the assembly that represented the general interests of the nation as a whole. The more that its members are pledged to prefer particular interests to those of the nation, the more its authority must decline. Al-

ready the decline is perceptible. The House does not now exercise the unquestioned authority that it did in the middle of the last century. Whether that decline will continue, the future will show. If one indispensable organ of government declines in power, another must be strengthened to take its place and to do its work, or the vigour and efficiency of the whole constitution of the state must suffer. It is for the future to decide whether the decay in the power of the House of Commons is to be arrested, and it is to be restored to its former position; or whether some other organ of government is to be developed and strengthened to supplement its deficiencies, and if so what that other organ is to be. The worst thing of all will be if we allow the old to decline, and yet establish nothing new in its stead. When the old institutions of a State decay, and nothing arises to replace them, that State is indeed decadent. It is the glory of our constitution that it can grow and change to meet the growing and changing needs of the nation. But that capacity which it has for ready change makes it above all things necessary that we should watch with anxious care lest it should be suffered to undergo changes which are mere decay. National institutions, like buildings, must feel the hand of time. But, if the efficiency of government is to be maintained, we must be alert to make good the effects of wear and tear and, if need be, to build new structures to replace the old.

E. HILTON YOUNG.

THE FRENCH-AFRICAN EMPIRE.

I.

FOR the last thirty-two years I have had occasion to visit at various times, different parts of the French-African Empire, and to follow the successive stages of their development. As far back as 1892 I travelled in Morocco, Algeria, Tunis and in the Sahara. As recently as 1920 I had the honour of accompanying H.M. King Albert of Belgium on a state visit to West Africa. I thus was able to study on the spot the organisation of those black armies which accomplished such prowess in the world war and whose 400,000 disciplined units contributed in a real measure to the final victory.*

To the ordinary tourist as well as to the student of international politics, there are few countries more fascinating than the French Colonies of Northern Africa. They are ideal health resorts and holiday resorts. They are blessed with a wonderful winter climate. You are taken through every variety of landscape and scenery, from the picturesque ghettos of the coast cities, and from the rose gardens of Blidah, through the uplands of Kabylia down to the Biblical palm groves of Biskra. You are called upon to unravel the problems of twenty different races. You are constantly treading on historic ground and sometimes on hallowed ground. You explore the ruins of cities built 2,000 years ago by the Carthaginians and the Romans, where Scipio fought, where St. Augustine preached, and where tyrannical and greedy proconsuls speculated and speculated.

And we may add that there are few countries which are more easy of access than those North African colonies. A pleasant journey brings you, in a few days, from Marseilles to the first oasis of the Sahara. And not only is the journey quite comfortable, it has become absolutely safe. When I first went out, a trip to French Africa still contained in it some elements of adventure and danger. And when I visited Morocco in 1907 bandits were still attacking travellers on the very outskirts of Tangier. To-day the French automobile magnate, Monsieur Citroën, after several successful trial trips in his famous caterpillar cars, is attempting to arrange regular motoring tours across the desert, and these tours were to be inaugurated a few weeks ago by the King of the Belgians. The attempt was perhaps a little premature and the Algerian Government received timely notice that there was just a possibility of His Belgian Majesty being kidnapped by Beduin robbers. But even if a regular motor service may not

* This article gives the substance of an address delivered under the auspices of the British Broadcasting Company, and was broadcast to all British stations.

be established for lack of protection from marauders, at any rate a voyage by aeroplane from Paris to Timbuktu is likely to become, in a few years, a favourite honeymoon objective.

II.

The building up of the French African Empire was the culmination of that great colonial movement which probably will strike the historian of the future as the most startling political feature of the last quarter of the nineteenth century and also as the one most pregnant with unforeseen and tragic consequences. After the War of 1870, following the expansion of European trade and industry, there arose a sudden demand for new markets, which again led to a scramble for new territories and spheres of influence. In that scramble which in other nations was mainly prompted by economic motives, France had the additional incentive of finding in colonial enterprise some compensation for her national pride and some consolation for her military disasters. And she received the unexpected encouragement of Prince Bismarck, who saw in the conquest of North Africa a magnificent opportunity of draining and wasting French resources in sterile enterprises and of embroiling the French government with all its neighbours.

It is no exaggeration to assert that the imperialist fever took possession of every European country. Even the United States caught the contagion and went to Cuba and the Philippines. The explorations and expeditions of the 'eighties recall the voyages and discoveries of the Renaissance and of the Elizabethan age. The colonial ambitions of Europe embraced indiscriminately every part of both Asia and Africa. But whereas most European Powers joined in the partition of Asia and swooped down upon China as upon a quarry, it may be said that only two Powers, namely France and Great Britain, monopolised the partition of Africa, largely owing to Bismarck's Machiavellian encouragement to France and also owing to his deep seated opposition to colonial ventures and to his concentration on continental policy. Between them France and Britain divided the Black Continent, leaving it to King Leopold of Belgium to annex the deadly Congo swamps and the Equatorial Forest, which in the days of Livingstone and Stanley seemed to be the darkest part of dark Africa. France occupied the North, the West and the Centre. Great Britain appropriated the South and the East. The two countries started as determined opponents. They continued in friendly emulation. They ended in close co-operation.

III.

The French African possessions, including Morocco, Algeria

and Tunis in the North, the Sahara in the Centre, Senegambia and the French Congo in the West and Madagascar in the Indian Ocean, are indeed a marvellous achievement of imperial enterprise which ought once for all to dispose of the widespread error that the French have none of the qualities of an imperial colonising people. Two-thirds of those vast territories were occupied, pacified and organised in less than one generation. The achievement is all the more remarkable if we remember that this successful attempt to build up a colonial Empire had been preceded by two unsuccessful attempts. From the days of Henry of Navarre and of the Jesuit missionaries, long before Richelieu, France tried for more than two centuries to become a colonising power. And again and again she failed. Montcalm was defeated in Canada by Wolfe, Dupleix was defeated in India by Lord Clive. Even Napoleon had to surrender the vast expanse of Louisiana and to barter away this magnificent inheritance for a bag of dollars. Like Bismarck and Cobden and Gladstone, Napoleon was of the continental school, he never sympathised with the colonial school.

We thus have to keep in mind that the French colonial empire represents one of the oldest experiments in European colonisation and not as is generally supposed one of the most recent. For a short time the French Monarchy was mistress of the St. Lawrence and of the Mississippi valleys. As Mill, the historian of India, and as Lord Macaulay are both compelled to admit, Dupleix taught his British enemies how to organise native armies and how to govern India. He taught them the double secret that no native armies could withstand European discipline and that at the same time those same native armies could eventually be made into invaluable fighting instruments under European leadership. But notwithstanding the many men of genius whom French colonisation produced, notwithstanding whole legions of heroic Catholic missionaries, one dependency after another slipped from the grasp of France after a precarious possession. You can study the history of French Canada and of French Louisiana in the twelve fascinating volumes of Francis Parkman, the greatest of American historians. You can follow in Seeley's "Expansion of England" how the attempt of Great Britain to oust France from her overseas possessions was the main feature and gives the true interpretation of British history in the eighteenth century, and how it became the main cause and motive of a second Hundred Years' War, just as our latter nineteenth century imperialism became the main cause of an even more terrible world war.

And now once again, in our own generation, France has been trying to establish and to consolidate a colonial Empire. But this time she took care to enlist at the eleventh hour the good-

will and co-operation of her British rivals. And she was able to profit by her own former mistakes. The question arises whether, having thus started the experiment under more favourable auspices, France will be more successful in the twentieth century than she was in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries?

IV.

In speculating on the future of the French-African Empire it is important that we should carefully and clearly realise the distinct characteristics of French and British possessions and dependencies. The problem is not indeed a complicated one. It seems pretty obvious that in the partition of Africa France has secured the worse share, the lighter soil and the less profitable investment, although she has assumed by far the more difficult, the more costly and the more dangerous political and military task.

First, the populations of the French African territories are much more advanced in civilisation than those in the British territories. The ruling element in Morocco, Algeria and Tunis belongs to that gifted and tenacious Berber race which is substantially the same race as the aboriginal Iberian and Celtiberian population of Spain and Southern France, which gave such trouble to the Roman conquerors. It is the same race which was already the dominant factor in the days of the Arabs and which created the glories of the Alhambra of Granada and of the Mosque of Cordova.

In the second place, the French territories are much more thickly populated and much more settled. It is therefore correspondingly difficult for the French conquerors to dispossess or even to displace the native occupants. There are no vacant spaces in Northern Africa, there is no "terra nullius," not even the light soil of the Sahara, which is overrun by indomitable nomadic tribes such as the Touaregs. It is all the more difficult to displace the native population because France herself is not in a position to send her own colonists.

In the third place, the French African territories are much less productive and remunerative from an economic point of view. There is no diamond or gold in French Africa as there is in the Transvaal. There are no cotton plantations as in British East Africa or in the Sudan. Even the rubber or palm oil plantations of the French Congo are insignificant compared to the rich plantations of the Belgian Congo, which are to-day the enviable preserve of the companies founded by the late Lord Leverhulme and which represent a considerable proportion of the total exports.

Last, but not least, the French African populations are much more warlike and aggressive than any black population in British

Africa. They have proved their mettle both when fighting against France and for France. After the capture of Algiers in 1830, it took forty years and many arduous and costly military campaigns to subdue Algeria. It has taken twenty years to subdue Morocco. And now that Morocco has been subdued in regular war, guerilla warfare still continues and may be protracted indefinitely. Even Marshal Lyautey, a great soldier and a wonderful administrator, has not succeeded in pacifying the hill tribes of the Moroccan Atlas.

V.

There are four factors which are essential in modern colonisation: the initiative and daring of pioneers; the financial and military assistance of governments; the co-operation of private capital; and the presence of a large body of settlers. Remembering those conditions, the result of French colonisation can be summed up in one sentence: Whilst providing the pioneers and the assistance of the State, France fails to provide to-day even more lamentably than she has failed to provide in the past, the two other necessary requisites, namely, the commercial enterprise and the settlers. Therefore her ultimate success must appear extremely doubtful.

Since 1870 there has been a continuous stream of explorers and adventurers. From the late 'seventies down to 1914 the exploration of Africa and especially of the Sahara and the Niger country almost became a favourite and a subsidised form of national sport. Most of the French Generals who became famous in the World War first won their spurs in Africa—Joffre, Gallieni, Marchand, Gouraud, Mangin,* Lyautey. Those daring pioneers have been generously assisted by the French Government. Algeria, Morocco, Senegambia, French Nigeria, Madagascar, have been used by the Mother Country as the chosen training ground for the French army. Native troops have been disciplined. Military highways and railways have been built. Aviation routes have been established. Unfortunately, French capital has persistently refused to invest in African enterprise. Thousands of millions of French money have been lent to foreign governments. But French money has not fertilised the colonies. There have been no big French chartered companies such as the British Niger Company or the South African or the Rhodesian companies. French colonisation has belied the dictum that trade follows the flag. It is a peculiar feature of recent French history which has often been noted that whereas you will always find in France daring individuals who are prepared to risk their lives, the French peasant or French middle-class cannot be persuaded to risk their

* See General Mangin's recent interesting volume, *Coup d'Oeil sur l'Afrique Française*. (Plon, 1925.)

savings. The French citizen is passionately patriotic. But French capital, unlike British capital, knows no country. Thus it has happened that in Algeria and Tunis the rich deposits of phosphates have been originally exploited by British companies and that the internal trade in Morocco, Algeria and Tunis remains largely in the hands of Jews. Every French Mediterranean city—Tangier, Oran, Constantine, Tunis—contains its prosperous ghetto. It is highly probable that if mineral wealth were to be discovered to-morrow in the mountains of the Atlas, the shares of any companies which would be formed would be taken up by foreign investors just as the shares of the Suez Canal were allowed to be bought up by the British Government.

But the most unpromising feature of the French-African possessions is that they contain very few French settlers. It used to be said before the War that Germany had colonists, but had no colonies; that France had colonies, but no colonists; whilst Great Britain alone had both colonies and colonists. That epigram still remains true to-day. The French possessions are only dependencies, they are not real colonies. In Algeria there are more Spanish colonists in the province of Oran than there are Frenchmen and in Tunis there are more Italians. Indeed the economist Paul Leroy Beaulieu, the greatest French authority on colonial problems, described Tunis as an Italian colony administered by the French Government.

This colonial absenteeism of France is likely to persist in the future. For the population of the French mother country continues to diminish. Instead of French colonists migrating to French Africa, millions of foreigners are to-day filling the gaps created by the world war. Whereas the total foreign population of Great Britain is only 270,000, the alien population of France is to-day over 3,000,000. For every one alien in Great Britain, there are twelve aliens in France, or rather, if we take the exact proportion to the population, there are fourteen to one. Under such conditions how can France be expected to colonise her vast possessions? In this respect it must be very depressing for a patriotic Frenchman, and it raises a very perplexed problem for the scientist when we compare the present with the past. In the eighteenth century, under a so-called decadent French Monarchy, France with her 25,000,000 had a larger population than the combined population of Great Britain and Germany.

VI.

The conclusion of this summary examination of the French methods of colonisation is that any estimate of the results achieved must necessarily differ according to the point of view which we

are pleased to adopt. If colonisation means the settlement of our surplus population and the exploiting of the economic resources of a colony, then French colonisation may be said to have been an almost complete failure and hundreds of millions have been sunk in vain in the sands of the Sahara. In a total of more than fifty millions, the French number about three hundred thousand, i.e., about one-half per cent. We may add that no large fortunes are being made in French Africa. No large estates are being exploited by Frenchmen. The French colonies, instead of being an asset in a strict commercial sense, are a heavy fiscal and financial liability. The French colonies do not pay and cannot be made to pay. The results bear no proportion whatsoever to the enormous expenditure, to the magnificent effort and to the tragic political sacrifices. The results do not justify the controlling influence of the colonies in French foreign policy.

On the other hand, it has equally to be admitted that the French Metropolis has proved an admirable organiser and administrator and civiliser. The French have truly and literally taken up the white man's burden. Like the Romans they have been builders of roads and bridges. They have cleared forests. They have organised schools. They have established law and order. They have brought peace and prosperity. And last, but not least, they have earned on the whole the good-will of the subject populations. The great test of their administration came with the war. It might have been expected that French West Africa and French Northern Africa, which had been so recently pacified, might have taken advantage of the difficulties of the mother country and would have risen against her. But instead of drawing away troops from the mother country, the French-African possessions contributed half a million soldiers. And those African armies proved magnificently loyal and efficient. This military contribution must be looked upon as one of the most remarkable political triumphs which has ever been attained by any colonising power, after so brief a time and under such inauspicious conditions.

At the same time it must again be conceded that this political result, wonderful as it is, remains highly precarious and that the future of the French-African Empire must give cause for considerable anxiety to any statesman who is gifted with foresight. The French natives have been given equal political rights with French citizens. They send their own Members to the Central French Parliament. But it seems inevitable that the newly enfranchised Africans will some day want to make use of their rights to secure their autonomy. "Africa for the Africans" is already becoming the watchword of native politicians. The religious and nationalist movement in Egypt may soon find its counterpart in

Tunis, Algeria and Morocco. Read the French colonial press and you will find that agitators, subsidised from Moscow, are already busy in every dependency, rousing Islam, stirring up the natives against the French, and the French against the Italians. The future of the French African Empire could only be secured if a very much larger proportion of Frenchmen did settle on the land.

But such a settlement seems less and less likely. The third French Colonial Empire therefore seems to be ordained in the fulness of time to follow the vicissitudes of the two first. The French conquest of Africa, under the Republic, like the previous French conquest of North America under Louis XIII, of India under Louis XV, and of Louisiana under Napoleon, will only have been an interesting political and military experiment. It will have been infinitely costly in blood and treasure. It will have deflected the whole course of French foreign policy. And yet it will not be a permanent achievement. It will be an impressive object lesson illustrating the nemesis of Empire.

CHARLES SAROLEA.

SOME INDIAN PROBLEMS.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD in the days of the Public Services Commission once remarked to the writer that the difficulties of government in India largely arose from the fact that the civilisation of her peoples was advancing at so many different rates of progress. He was thinking of the Indians, of course, for though there are many different kinds of Englishmen and other Europeans in India they are, from the fact of their being strangers in a strange land perhaps, more united than they would be further west. Indeed, this easy social amalgamation often strikes visitors as being somewhat extraordinary. The bounds of the club have also been much enlarged of late years, necessarily owing to the waning numbers, and one will often notice men and women there of lower social station than used to be the case, and some whose colour shows that they are not of pure European descent. Where Indians have been admitted we usually—though not universally—find that they have adopted the sports and the habits of the west. And I need hardly say that in large cities like Calcutta and Bombay there is a very pleasant cosmopolitan society—English, however, in thought and ways—where English and Indians mix freely. They give each other dinners, very good dinners; and play bridge afterwards, very good bridge too, sometimes.

But when we have reckoned them all up, civilians and other officials, soldiers, merchants, planters, barristers and other professional men, men connected with theatres and racecourses, men who have retired, missionaries, men in the employ of native states, there are very few Englishmen in India. They form but a trifling minority as compared with the vast mass of the Indians. I suppose that leaving out of account the Hill Stations, Calcutta and Delhi are the only cities in which English influence is really of overwhelming importance, and in Calcutta it is certainly not what it was. The picture of the overbearing Englishman despising his cringing Aryan brother, which was always a gross exaggeration and generally pure fiction, has less relation than ever to reality nowadays, for the simple reason that Indians hold the posts which used to be in the hands of Englishmen. An old Commissioner told the writer the other day that he had recently visited the station where he was posted on first arriving in India. Then there were about twenty Englishmen; now there is one.

But I need hardly say that Englishmen, whether official or otherwise, occupy a very special position in India. This position they did not create, nor are they particularly fond of asserting it; it has been created for them to some extent by the circumstances of history, but much more certainly by the Indians themselves. The

fact of belonging to a small community which in a very real sense is ruling a very large one has its effect on the official. On the one hand it gives him a sense of grave responsibility, on the other it sometimes leads him to consider what he thinks as necessarily right, and to treat criticism with tolerant disregard. But there is something to be said for this attitude of mind because in a poor country which has to be cheaply governed, if your important man were to spend his time in logic-chopping and balancing probabilities, things would soon get into a pretty mess; especially in large districts where there are getting towards a thousand people to the square mile. The writer sat with a civil surgeon in an up-country hospital one morning and saw him perform two major operations and six cataracts beside doing a great deal of other medical, surgical and administrative work. He had to bustle; so has the collector.

Now one can easily see how hard it is for a man who is deciding very important questions, mostly without any help that is disinterested, to fix into his hurried and often over-burdened life new elements, elements which he really hardly understands. He has his day's work cut out for him from about seven in the morning till half-past four in the afternoon, often later, and he tends to get into a groove, a very good groove, but still a groove. Remember also that he has had a very strenuous youth and early manhood. There has been no pleasant loafing round London clubs, no bridge in chambers with clever men, no gossiping about things with frank careless fellows who quite unconsciously teach lessons of proportion and perspective. No, he is what the French call *un homme sérieux*. If he could make a few more jokes he would be all the better; but he can't, he is too busy. It is difficult I repeat to imagine such a man, excellent as he is, adapting himself to new surroundings. The old-fashioned Indian who comes and talks in a very respectful way he understands and likes and helps. And there is much that is kindly and beautiful, even if patriarchal, in the relations of such men with the Indians. They spend, always remember, much of their time in preventing the latter from, figuratively at least, tearing each other to pieces, and they are the only men to whom the ryot has to look for protection. In the India that we are now to see there may be some one to take the old-fashioned civilian's place, but I have not met him myself, nor after some inquiry have I found anyone who has. But the civilian does not regard the Indian educated in England as his equal. Nor in India is he his equal even now, in popular esteem, unless he happens to have got into the I.C.S. The loyalties and traditions of service are excellent things, but it will not do to keep on saying that one likes the old-fashioned kind of Indian, and yet to keep on hold-

ing up an English ideal of education and character. It always seems particularly hard that when an Indian has, however haltingly, taken all the steps which high authorities assure him are necessary before he can become a gentleman, he is blamed because he has turned himself into an incomplete one. The fault is after all ours to a very great extent.

For there is much in this matter, as well as in others, in which the Indian has ground for complaint. Why should he be practically obliged to pursue his studies in a foreign tongue? Why should he find it to his advantage to go to England in order to be called to the Bar, or to pursue other professional studies, and so lose touch with the people, the traditions, and the aspirations of his native land? It is we who have laid these burdens upon him and I hope that it will be Englishmen who will remove them. The absurdity of going to England to compete for the I.C.S. has been taken away but the young man is still forced to go there if he be successful. And the flow of young Indians who ought never to feel obliged to come to the English Universities still continues.

Englishmen at home are still very ignorant about India; but the idea is gaining ground that there are different kinds of Indians. Let us look at a few of those kinds, leaving out of account for the moment the question of religion, and dealing with the sadly small minority only who are even slightly educated. There are the old-fashioned up-country landowners, who live in semi-feudal state, have armed retainers, and are fond of horses and of sport of all kinds. Excellent men to go shooting with, if not blest with much education. Their ways are indeed not our ways, but they are often fine fellows; hospitable, generous and kindly. Not the sort of men to quarrel with if one were an Indian, but that is a different matter. Then there are the wealthy merchants in the cities, whom you will hardly ever see socially. The large and increasing class of Indian officials and professors will be much in evidence; there is no worthier class in the world, and they form in some ways the noblest result of our work in India. In the large cities, as has already been hinted, there is a wealthy leisured class, composed of those who have inherited large properties both in town and country. Such men are becoming slowly a power in political life, and the more they become interested in public affairs the better will it be for India. The only way to keep them out of mischief is to encourage them to take part in the business of the state.

We thus reach the class about which more has been written than about any other, but here again we must discriminate. The Bar in the large cities contains men of great ability and much public spirit; the Bar in the smaller centres has as its dregs some of the meanest wretches that can well be imagined. It would be difficult

to get lower, I have been assured, than a third rate Bihari pleader, who has his touts in the villages to obtain and to promote work for him; but the rather more highly placed rogue who blackmails a few landowners whose secrets he knows runs him very close. We must never forget, however, that the main part of the responsibility for the existence of the Vakil class lies at our own door. And our system of government has been such that the Bar, using the term for all classes of legal practitioners, supplies practically the only career for a man of ambition who does not go into government service. Things are getting a little better now, but the statement remains broadly true. The Vakils have their faults, and very bad ones sometimes, but they have for many years formed the only independent class in India. Now it is men of the pleader class who have offered the greatest obstacle to the government officials. The collector cannot stand them. This is very natural because they are mostly politicians and all the real strength, the fighting strength anyhow, of the various political parties is to be found in their ranks. The reader must not hastily argue from English analogies. In India there is practically no active party in favour of the British government at all. A great many men, most sensible men, are anxious that we should guard the frontiers; and a certain number of these same gentlemen, a small number I am afraid, would be glad to see us maintain internal order. But this is about the utmost limit to which the moderate really goes. Just before I left India a clever Bengali, high in Government service, said to me: "There are no men here who are real moderates at heart;" and I begin to think that he was right.

Such being the situation, there is obvious need of the greatest caution and foresight. Above all things, if we mean to lead the Indians on towards some form of self government we ought to take them into our confidence and associate them, unofficially as well as officially, with us in the great, the well-nigh impossible, task we have undertaken. Now it has always seemed to me that we have signally failed to adopt any such attitude, and especially with regard to the pleaders. It is of course difficult for one who occupied the position of head of an Indian College to judge, but I can only say that I formed that impression after much very pleasant intercourse with Indian gentlemen of the legal profession. I will go further and say that in discussion with pleaders one will find the most valuable criticism of our ways and works in India; indeed almost the only criticism that really counts because it is what we have to meet when it is translated into action on a larger field.

But it is time to state the real difficulty of the day, one which there is no hope of getting over if things continue as they are, and if any Englishmen remain in service in India. The conditions

under which Englishmen and Indians are employed in India are entirely different, and yet the two races are mixed up in the cadres of the various departments. The important point is that when there is a vacancy in a post, promotion to which depends upon the will of a superior officer, there will now usually be an Englishman and an Indian both technically qualified and one competing with the other. In the present political situation the pressure on the Indian minister, besides his own very natural and reasonable inclination, will be irresistible. The result is that the race question will be constantly raised, feelings will be embittered, and the Englishman or Indian as the case may be who is passed over will lose much of his future utility because he will become a moody, disappointed and discontented man. And the case is not better, remember, when the English head of a department passes over an Indian in favour of an Englishman. It is far worse when for reasons known to himself but incomprehensible to those below him he prefers an Indian to an English candidate. There is a certain type of Englishman, not necessarily a bad type otherwise, who thinks it absolutely impossible that an Indian should be as good as an Englishman. He is obviously very hard to convince especially where his own case is in point, though to do him justice he is equally bellicose on behalf of the supposed rights and wrongs of his fellow countrymen. Both sides think that other considerations, besides merit, are taken into account.

Now all this ought not to be. And especially it ought not to be in the India which the authors of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report assured us was to be the India of the future. The position of the Englishman in days to come is no longer that of a ruler, but rather that of one who advises his Indian colleagues as they try to do what Englishmen have done before them. Surely it ought to be easy to give a man a definite task or a succession of tasks, and in any case to decide on questions of promotion without bringing Englishmen and Indians into conflict.

Whether Englishmen will continue to serve under Indians is a question that is often raised. Personally I think that they would do so if their responsibility were exactly defined and their future assured. I do not take upon me to say it would be for India's good if they should so serve; that the future alone can decide. But it is a possible arrangement, even if it should revive some features of the eighteenth century or make India like what a well managed native state is at present. It is no use going a great way in the direction of self-government and then refusing to accept the consequences. India is a poor country and much of the efficiency which we consider essential she cannot afford; nor does she want it. There is a saying amongst lawyers about improving a man out

of his estate; and I am bound to say, if I may judge from the educational policy of the English in India, that there is considerable danger of that happening there. In any case if you give a people the right of self-government it is for them to say what grade of government they will have. I know that I shall be met by those who talk about our responsibility for the masses. We have done a good deal for them, but we have done far more in proportion for the middle classes. And Dacca and Delhi take a good deal of explanation; and when they are explained they still leave a feeling that there is something decidedly wrong in administration that has such colossal follies as its monuments. The ridiculous contrast too between the homes of the students and the palaces in which they are taught at Dacca and Allahabad suggests some doubts as to our inherited wisdom.

There is another and far greater racial difficulty, that which results from the divisions of the Indians themselves. This difficulty is really rather religious than racial, for a very large number of the Mohammedans come from families that were originally Hindu, and the number of people of Mogul descent is comparatively small; though this does not make matters any better. With this eternal difficulty must be taken an equally serious consideration, the position of the Native States. If we give self-government to British India we entirely alter their position; no one in his senses can think that Hyderabad will take orders from a self-governing British India. No, the Native States are not easy to manage now, but the result of any extensive scheme of self-government will be to turn them into independent kingdoms; that is, so far as the larger are concerned. They will become more powerful, while what is now British India will, with the important exception of the North-Western portion and Beluchistan, become infinitely weaker. It will have all its work cut out to maintain internal order; it may well be doubted whether it will even do that. The most probable, and we may add popular outcome, if things follow their natural course, will be a powerful Mahomedan combination in the north-west in alliance with Afghanistan, in answer to a development of the strength of Hyderabad in the south, and possibly Gwalior in the centre.

But we must, unless we wish to go back to the days of Clive, help India to save herself. And the only possible way of doing so seems to be the Federal way. A federal system supplies the only machinery which can at once create a powerful state, and yet can, as Lord Acton said, protect minorities and consecrate self-government. It is the only plan that would at once deliver India from her ancient ideal of union by way of conquest and provide for the combination of a large number of varying but united nations. The

Native States of India are so interwoven with British territory and so different from each other indeed that the problem which faces us is one of extreme difficulty. But these very conditions make it the more necessary for us to face it. If we do so we shall have a further satisfaction and a very powerful auxiliary. We shall be responding to a widely felt if somewhat vague aspiration which, though no part of the older Indian mentality, has certainly strengthened enormously in recent years.

The minority of the recent committee on the working of the Reform scheme, who represent apparently a good deal of what the majority think but do not like to say, have referred to a Royal Commission as one of the means by which the question of India's future constitution may be settled. It is sincerely to be hoped that that method will not be adopted. India is perfectly sick of Royal Commissions, she knows far too much about them for her to regard them with any other feeling than a mixture of annoyance and amusement. To her they mean too often a few English busybodies whom their friends wish to get rid of or perhaps reward in a way which costs them nothing, a tame Indian or two, and a couple of clever officials who are to do the work. It would be far better to ask the various states of India, including of course British India, to send representatives to a constituent assembly. Such a body would naturally work by Committees and would no doubt take time to complete its work. But when it had finished we should have something which would represent Indian opinion, and I venture to predict that if such an assembly is summoned the world will be astonished by the sense and moderation which it will display.

W. A. J. ARCHBOLD.

THE "HYPHENATES" AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY.

IS the foreign policy of the United States of America an inexplicable enigma? The answer is, of course, in the negative, even though the naïve explanation that satisfies simple minded Americans as well as the one proclaimed by omniscient Europeans must be rejected. The golden rule has not been conspicuously present; nor is there to be discovered in dollar diplomacy the motive for the recent hesitations, tergiversations, or repudiations that have been characteristic of the international mind of the English-speaking nation across the Atlantic. If there is any meaning in her acts since the outbreak of the World War, I imagine that it can be found by a search that is not too laborious and complicated. At least we can experiment. Let us try to unlock the secret chamber of the Department of State by employing a key that was welded in the fire of political strife, forged on the anvil of Republican party needs. Possibly the key will not be a perfect fit—it needs to be gilded and oiled in Wall Street—yet the analysis of the votes cast in the last two Presidential elections seems to open the doors so wide that even an historian is tempted to join the prophets and forecast the future.

Until the year 1914 Americans took only a very moderate or no interest in the international relations of their country. They were contented to let the direction of foreign policy follow the well-beaten track of tradition; they did not expect any deviation from established custom; they never dreamed of a repudiation of the immortal Washington's warning against entanglements in European rivalries, a warning later sanctified by the sagacious Jefferson. In their opinion the relations of America with the world had once for all been fixed. The belief in isolation was so deeply entrenched in the minds of all that no one anticipated that the country would be involved in the World War when it first broke out. President Wilson in his declaration of neutrality and Theodore Roosevelt in his subsequent affirmation of the same principle reacted to the American tradition just as directly and immediately as does the electric light to its current when the switch is turned.

The first months of the war did not alter conditions. Opinion in America, at least the part of it that had an impulse to partisanship, was divided on the European aspects of the war; and for the first time there was brought home to the heterogeneous mass called the American people a realisation of the divisions among them that were created by diverse national origins. The children of the Allies were confronted by those of Central Europe, and hotly were questions concerning the responsibility for the cataclysm and its

conduct argued wherever two or more were gathered together. Still the average citizen did not observe any evidence of a developing sentiment in favour of the participation of the nation in the European struggle. Here and there the voice of a prophet was heard, but he aroused little interest and less sympathy. When I recall to memory the universality of the belief in isolation held by my countrymen during 1914 and 1915 and the antagonisms separating them, I appreciate fully the political wisdom of President Wilson in waiting patiently for time to break down traditional convictions and in recognising the psychological moment when prejudices were so weakened that he could lead an apparently united nation into the conflict.

The Presidential campaign of 1916 was the first one fought, since the earliest years of the Republic, upon an issue involving a European policy. Yet in this case, as is usual, the issue was not clear cut. The Democratic managers conducted the campaign on the popular slogan: "He kept us out of war." But their Republican opponents, harassed by disagreements within their party, made no official *pronunciamento* on the vital subject that would alienate any section of public opinion. The candidate, Mr. Hughes, was cautioned to be most discreet in the expression of his sentiments on international affairs, and throughout the campaign he maintained his balance on the top rail.

A group of citizens, still relatively small, was beginning to demand boldly that the United States join the Allies. They found a spokesman in Theodore Roosevelt. The motives which had changed Roosevelt's opinion were complicated, a mixture of Wilsonphobia, political opportunism, war mania, and personal pride. Possibly historians will never be able to unravel the tangled threads of his soul; and it is unnecessary to undertake the task in this connection. It should be recalled to mind, however, that he had definitely laid aside his 1912 principles of progressivism and had become reconciled with the "Old Guard" leaders of the Republican party whom he had so recently anathematised. The reconciliation was still very superficial, it is true; but it was sufficiently real for Roosevelt to take the stump for Mr. Hughes and to make speeches that brought dismay to the party leaders. He berated the "Hyphenated" Americans, meaning in particular those who traced their descent to either the Central Powers or Ireland; and he emphatically declared that the country should pursue a more vigorous policy towards Germany. Mr. Roosevelt's speeches exercised a powerful influence upon the election. They were one of the forces that made Mr. Wilson President. The large vote for him piled up by communities of belligerent German-Americans and of pacifist citizens of Scandinavian origin was

decisive. Republican party leaders studied the election returns with care. The lessons they then learned they have not forgotten, as their recent successes prove.

In the following discussion care should be exercised not to confuse the meaning of the term "Hyphenates," as here ironically used, by limiting its application to the most recent immigrants from Europe, who form unassimilated groups of lately naturalised or unnaturalised foreigners congested in the cities and in the mining and manufacturing towns. These create a perplexing problem in Americanisation which time alone can solve; but, broadly speaking, their influence on public opinion is as yet negligible.

An American citizen is carefully defined in law. To attempt to frame a definition by employing terms external to the legal definition leads to absurdities of every kind. Law and custom have rested satisfied with a simple statement of identity: an American citizen is an American citizen. By conforming to the red tape of the procedure of naturalisation the miracle of changing a European into a true American was easily performed; and it has been performed with such regularity and rapidity that to-day the number of the descendants of the colonial families is reckoned at only forty-nine per cent. of the population. It is, therefore, an illusion to regard them as the only true type. Moreover, there is something absurd in hurling the word "Hyphenated" as a term of reproach against any section of Americans, for they all, with the exception of the Indians, are relatively recent arrivals from Europe or elsewhere. The Anglo-Americans are not less hyphenated than the others. Their racial origin still influences them, and many of their motives can be traced to forces of attraction or repulsion that date from the time their ancestors lived in the island of Great Britain. The "Hyphenates" of war-time propaganda, Germans, Scandinavians, and Irish, comprising fully forty per cent. of the population, are mostly descended from immigrants of the middle nineteenth century and have become thoroughly absorbed into the body politic.

A popular war-time story illustrates the present condition. An American sergeant at roll-call was stumbling through the list of queer names from Italy, Greece, Poland and elsewhere, when he came to the name of O'Flaherty. He stopped and with a sigh of relief exclaimed: "Thank God for one good old American name." These good old American names may sound alien in English ears, but the O'Flahertys, the Schneiders, the Ole Johnsons, and the Larsons form as integral a part of the American people as do the descendants of the Alfords from Somerset and the Heads from Kent. Like the latter they are body of their body, soul of their soul. So much is this true that the part of the nation that is to-

day most articulate in letters, science, and art is strongly impregnated by Rooseveltian Hyphenatism. The Puritan traditions of the older immigrants are yielding ground in every direction before the aggressive personality of later arrivals. The spirit, the soul—or whatever you wish to call it—of the nation is, and has been for almost a hundred years, undergoing a rapid transformation.

So strong was the tradition of America's isolation from European affairs that the proposal to declare war against Germany took the O'Flahertys, the Schneiders, the Johnsons, and the Larsons by surprise. They were not organised for an active opposition, even had it been possible to unite them, which is doubtful since in opinion they were divided. The last two were sentimental pacifists, the Schneiders were pro-German, sometimes very mildly, and all three were humble and docile soldiers in the predominant Republican party; while the Irish, less docile and more politically minded, were generally Democrats. Opportunity for opposition was scarcely given. The political machinery was under the control of the Hyphenates of Anglo-American breed, who wielded the governmental whip without mercy. By propaganda, by threats, and by violence, the feeble and disunited opposition was beaten down; the few who from principle did not submit and went to prison were a negligible number. America entered the war as a unit.

The years of the war were years of anguish and fear for the Republican party. The masterly manner in which President Wilson directed his campaign in 1916 and later administered the war energies of the nation won the respect of the tried political leaders opposed to him. Privately they did not call him a theorist, an idealist, nor did they think him spineless, terms to be made familiar by later propaganda. Instead of harbouring contempt, prominent Republicans were whispering to each other that Mr. Wilson was the most practical and the craftiest politician who had occupied the White House since the versatile Jefferson. They understood full well that his prestige was increasing and that consequently the Republican party was confronted by a crisis, which might result in an impotence comparable to that suffered by their opponents after the Civil War.

Some time in the summer of 1918, when it was apparent that the end of the European conflict was near, a few leaders met privately to formulate the future policy of the Republican party. As a piece of political strategy, the plan and execution of their campaign must be regarded as among the craftiest and most successful in the whole history of party government. They faced the facts squarely and drew their inferences with a clear under-

standing of the conditions confronting them. The all-embracing international idealism of Mr. Wilson left no room for a modified internationalism. Nothing short of the opposite gave any hope of victory. The President must be defeated to save the Republican party. A fervent appeal to nationalism in a war-sick nation, where half the population was bursting with suppressed emotions, seemed to hold out a promise of success. So it was decided upon. Thus the fate of the League of Nations Covenant in America was determined several months before the President sailed to Paris on the vessel of Universal Brotherhood.

As a preliminary of the campaign, there was negotiated a new and more solemn reconciliation between the Rooseveltian wing of the Republican party and the Old Guard. Mr. Roosevelt was accepted as the standard bearer. His great popularity in certain quarters seemed to augur a successful outcome for his candidature. Yet his leadership of the Progressives in 1912, his speeches about "Hyphenates" in 1916, his often voiced sentiments concerning the Germans, and later his demand for the utter crushing of the Central Powers, made many supporters of the Republican machine shake their heads at entrusting its fate to such a passionate and opinionated leader. In many ways his death brought relief to the Old Guard; it cleared the atmosphere. They had obtained from him what they wanted, a united party. So they readily lent assistance to the canonisation of their sometime enemy, sometime friend. St. Theodore exercised a power of attraction more potent than a live "Teddy," and at the same time did not endanger the skilfully contrived plan of campaign wherein the Hyphenates were to play an important rôle.

The question of joining the League of Nations apparently thrust an international issue squarely into the politics of the Republic. But the issue became so beclouded that no opinion on the vital subject was pronounced. The English people have been frequently informed by no less a personage than Mr. Harvey, when he was American Ambassador to the Court of St. James, that the large vote rolled up for Mr. Harding in 1920 must be interpreted as the popular rejection of the League of Nations. What inference may be drawn from the result of the election will be discussed later. For the moment it is not necessary to find in it anything more illuminating than the usual confused jumble of emotions that is manifest in Presidential elections.

Had the people been asked during 1919 or 1920 to vote "yes" or "no" on the question of joining the League, there is little doubt about what the result would have been. Sentimental altruism would have given an emphatic "yes." The Republican leaders were fully aware of the danger to their prestige, if Mr. Wilson's policy

were endorsed. The situation was made complicated for them, because many Republicans were intrigued by the League idea. To ordinary mortals this fact appeared to be a weak link in the party's armour; but the politicians, skilful at playing both ends against the middle, manipulated the situation so artfully as to increase their majority. The Republican idealists were generally loyal party followers and were easily persuaded by the assurances of men of the calibre of Taft, Root, and Hughes that the success of Mr. Harding would most easily bring to them their hearts' desire. They, particularly the new women voters, followed their shepherds like sheep.

The more the Republican leaders contemplated their real plan of campaign, the better they liked it. The ground seemed ripe for planting their seed. All the evils and petty discomforts suffered by the people during the war were being accredited to Mr. Wilson, and this wide-spread irritation was easily directed into political channels. But the pent-up indignation felt by two great sections of the population, the Americans of Irish and German descent, proved to be the source of greatest strength. Long endured suppression of opinion made reaction the more violent. Little need be said of the Irish desertion of the Democratic party, for it proved to be ephemeral in character. Their hatred of England and all friends of England explains their action. Mr. Wilson was pro-English and the League of Nations was an English device. Enough said.

The attitude of the German-Americans is of greater interest, for they have been, and what is most significant they still are, loyal members of the Republican party. That needs an explanation such as the usual account of American politics with its continued respect for war propaganda fails to present. The running fire of criticism of Mr. Wilson maintained by the Republicans, many of whom had opposed the declaration of war by their country, managed to hold the German-Americans within the traditional fold during the trying period of hostilities. When the Treaty of Versailles became known, much powder was added to the Republican arsenal. In the long drawn-out discussion in the Senate and the subsequent Presidential election, the Treaty itself, not frequently mentioned, was a most decisive element in determining opinions. The German-Americans were angered by the humiliation and financial oppression of their mother country. Wilson, they said, had betrayed Germany. The opposition of many Senators to the League was simply a reflection of their own and their constituents' disapproval of the dictated peace. The Democratic Senator from Missouri, Mr. Reed, and the Republican senators from Illinois and Wisconsin, Mr. McCormick and Mr.

La Follette, are fair examples of this phase of the opposition. As I look back from the short perspective of six years, the aspect of the tiresome and emotional debate that seems most significant is the two-fold success of the Republicans; they satisfied the wishes of the German-Americans by refusing to unite with the former Allies in imposing harsh measures upon Germany; and at the same time they did not alienate by this act the numerous anti-German Anglo-Americans.

From the European point of view the foreign policy of the United States since 1920 has appeared to cling stubbornly to traditional isolation relieved now and then by a half-hearted willingness to assist at European conferences. The latter occurrences have frequently been interpreted by unfriendly critics as being inspired by an anxiety to salvage what is possible of the nation's financial losses. Vacillation there has been, vacillation that recalls the Republicans' criticism of Mr. Wilson's policy as one of "wobble-wobble." This is very understandable. From the foregoing historical sketch it is evident that the dominant party is composed of two sections holding diametrically opposite views on the subject of international relations. The defection of either would bring disaster to the party. The Anglo-Americans, still somewhat blinded by war-time psychology, are financially, socially, and politically powerful. The German-Americans, also very powerful, are becoming each day more politically minded, more determined to influence their party's acts. Between these two the mind of the Secretary of State resembles that of the proverbial donkey and two bales of hay. He is forced to guide the international relations of the country along a line that will not rasp the sensibilities of either group.

Fortunately for those in control the war mind of the first group is being worn away by time and by the deeds of quondam allies. Republican orators had told their followers that Europe loved war, Europe was not prepared for peace, European conditions were hopeless, European diplomats, more skilful than Americans, were not pursuing idealistic ends. For innocent and sentimental America to be mixed up in the overseas turmoil could only bring disaster and expense. Since the Treaty of Peace, events seem to have justified these forebodings. Huge armies; many small wars; no effective effort to bring about disarmament. The invasion of the Ruhr by France was a godsend to Republican politicians. The wide-spread sympathy for France among the children of colonial families might at any time become a whirl-wind of emotion that would sweep across the country and destroy the barriers of hope behind which the children of Germany had taken refuge. That danger is now passing with the diminishing popu-

larity of the country that assisted the American colonies to gain independence.

To those who can read between the lines, the handwriting of the Rooseveltian "undesirable citizens" is becoming clearer. Will they in the end be the determining factor in the formation of their nation's foreign policy? Certainly they are already beginning to modify it. The Dawes plan, the name of which recalls to mind Chicago, a centre of German-American wealth and social prestige, was not altogether satisfying; yet its proposal of a loan to Germany was the first direct step in the rehabilitation of the country and as such was found acceptable. England and France hailed the re-entrance of the United States into European affairs. Did they recognise the new direction? What is the meaning of the persistent talk about the liquidation of the French debts? Does it indicate an increased assertiveness on the part of the population that entered the war unwillingly? So far as the demand for payment is an expression of the desire to control French military and foreign policy, their influence is unquestionably a factor.

The changes wrought by the recent election seem to forecast a more open recognition of the point of view of the non-Anglo-Americans. The section of the country which is the chief rival of the North-East Atlantic coast for control of the Republican party is formed by the states of the upper Mississippi Valley, that stretch from the Alleghenies to the Rockies. Here has always been the centre of insurgency. Here pacifism was strong in 1917; here arose the Nonpartisan League and its child, the Farmer-Labour party; here Mr. La Follette's influence is greatest; here is the seat of German-Americanism. This region of populous cities, huge farms, and rich mines must be held in check and will, therefore, be soothed by many favours during the Presidency of a Massachusetts Yankee. Already it wields the whip in directing the foreign policy. The West is in the saddle, at least by sufferance and in appearance.

By the fact of long service a man from the far North-West, Senator Borah of Idaho, is chairman of the Senate's Committee of Foreign Affairs, the powerful and to Europeans strange and misunderstood second Secretary of State in Washington. Mr. Borah's remarkable personality has won for him among all classes, especially the "Hyphenates" whom he knows well, a following that imparts to his will a force which the stubbornness of Mr. Coolidge will scarcely dare to resist. Newspapers report that Mr. Borah has already thrown down the gauntlet; but careful Cal has revealed no recklessness in picking it up. Instead of plunging into the arena he has been manoeuvring to placate the forces who look to his stalwart Senatorial antagonist. And well

he may, for he is under heavy obligations to them. During the campaign which made Mr. Coolidge President in his own right, there developed a dangerous crisis. All the German-American votes were apparently going to be cast for Mr. La Follette, the Progressive candidate. These disgruntled citizens must be convinced that the best interests of Germany were being served by the Republican party and that their desire for the speedy recovery of their mother-land would be most easily attained by the return of Mr. Coolidge. Men, most influential with the German-Americans and authorised to speak with authority for the Republican party, were sent throughout the land carrying a message of hope. On election day Mr. Coolidge received unexpected support in those sections of the country where Mr. La Follette was supposed to be invincible. Political debts must be paid; yet in doing so there is danger of offending antagonistic interests of weight. Notice the clever solution of the dilemma. Mr. Coolidge has selected for his new Secretary of State a man with an irreproachable war record and with a long professional and political experience in the state of Minnesota, seventy per cent. of whose citizens are of German or Scandinavian parentage. It would be difficult to discover another qualified candidate who represents so perfectly the two sections of the Republican party as does Mr. Frank Kellogg.

CLARENCE WALWORTH ALVORD.

THE MOSUL QUESTION.

WHAT THE INHABITANTS REALLY WANT.

WITHOUT in any way taking a partisan view in the matter of the deliberations of the Commission of the League of Nations at present reporting upon the thorny problem of the Mosul Vilayet, it may be profitable to consider some of the facets of the subject as they must appear to the various elements which make up the population of that interesting region. The total number of inhabitants of the Mosul District (including the Arbil, Sulaimania and Kirkuk areas) according to a recent census is given as follows:—

Sunni	...	...	519,713
Shi'ah	...	...	22,180
Jewish	...	...	14,835
Christian	...	...	55,470
Others	...	...	31,180 (mostly Yezidis).
Total			643,378

These figures are, of course, only approximate, as the difficulties of collecting statistics amongst tribal elements are, obviously, enormous. They serve, however, to indicate some idea of the proportions of the various divisions of the community as compared, numerically, one with another. It is inevitable that religion should be the basis of differentiation, for, in these lands, national cleavages still follow very largely religious lines: the Arabic word "milla" (Turkish "millet") denotes "nation" as well as "religious sect."

It may be taken for granted that the four minority subdivisions require only union with the state of 'Iraq, the Shi'ahs because of the great majority of their sect in the other two vilayets of Baghdad and Basra, the Christians, Jews and Yezidis (the so-called "Devil Worshipers") because they have every reason to expect a fairer deal from the 'Iraq Government under a British Mandate than from an entirely independent and unrepentant Turkish administration in Angora. But these classes account for less than 130,000 of the total, and it is among the large Sunni majority that the differences in the question of "self-determination" are bound to occur. It is here that some possibly enlightening remarks may be made without passing any judgment or taking sides. In passing it may be mentioned that King Feisul of 'Iraq is a Sunni, and that the royal entourage and upper classes of Baghdad are also, largely,

of that persuasion, but that the proportion of Shi'ahs to Sunnis in the two vilayets of Baghdad and Basra is 1,471,835 to 567,002—something like 2½ to 1.

There are, however, subdivisions other than those of religion which occur in the body politic of the Mosul area; they may be most conveniently indicated as (1) racial or linguistic; (2) tribal and settled; (3) social or class distinctions. These have quite as important a bearing on the aspirations of the people as the religious one mentioned above. Racially or linguistically, the area is divided as follows: (a) Arabs or Arabic speaking peoples, including Mosul Town and immediate environs on the east of the Tigris, most of the riverside cultivators and the great collection of nomad and semi-settled tribes in the desert steppes ranging from Mosul itself to the southern and western borders of the vilayet. (b) Kurds or Kurdish speaking peoples. These occupy the towns of Zakho, Amadia, Dohuk, Aqra, Rowanduz, Arbil (partially), Sulaimania and the whole mountain mass from the present provisional Turkish frontier in the north to the region of the Baghdad-Persia road in the south and as far as the Persian frontier in the east, approaching to some score of miles eastward of Mosul itself and owning a few tribes in the western desert also. The Kurds may be divided into nomads, semi-nomads and sedentary tribal elements, and form the largest racial division in the district. The Yezidis speak Kurdish, but as a result of their religion, their sympathies have no affinity with those of the Muslim Kurds whatsoever. (c) Turcomans or Turkish speaking peoples. These inhabit the towns of Kirkuk, Altun Keupru, a part of Arbil and a string of villages northward thence on the eastern bank of the Tigris as far as some thirty miles north-east of Mosul, also the small town of Tel Afar in the western desert. As compared with the Arabs or Kurds, their numbers are very small indeed. Their tongue is an old Turkish, and they are descended from settlements left behind by pre-Ottoman Turanian conquerors and have almost entirely identified themselves with the generality of the cultivators of the country. They are all settled. The number of real Ottoman Turks in the vilayet is microscopical. (d) Syriac or Chaldaic-speaking peoples. These are entirely Christian. They comprise the Nestorian Assyrians of the hills, the Jacobites, Chaldeans and Syrian Catholics of the plains and Mosul Town. The three latter sects speak Arabic universally, leaving their old national tongue for religious and purely domestic purposes. If the aspirations of the country follow a racial trend, which is open to doubt, little more need be said. The vast majority is non-Turanian, the Arabs and plain-dwellers are Semites, the Kurds are Aryans. Only the small minority of Turcomans can claim Turanian descent, a descent possibly purer

than that of the Anatolian or European Turks, who are a very mixed breed.

The great nomadic tribal federations desire only one thing, a complete lack of government: to them the golden age would dawn with the withdrawal of all central authority. They only wish to carry on their raids, counter-raids and blood feuds at will, to rob caravans or levy "akhawa" or protection fees on them, and to produce a most thorough anarchy. On the other hand, the semi-sedentary and settled tribes, cultivators and townspeople, in proportion as their interest in the soil or in trade increases, desire a government to protect them from the attacks of the nomads and to allow them to carry on their occupations in peace. As these people produce the vast majority of the products of the country other than livestock, it is conceivable that the opinions of these elements are most worthy of consideration. Although most of the Kurdish mountaineers apparently come under this heading, there are many of the more powerful tribes, mostly dwelling in villages, who would prefer the conditions desired by the nomads, conditions which have, in fact, more or less always existed.

Within the tribes, life is patriarchal. The Arab Sheikh or the Kurdish Agha leads his people as he wills, and what he says is echoed by his tribe. Questions of personal representative government do not trouble the common tribesman. Sheikhs and Aghas reside with their tribes and do not, as a rule, oppress them, although political questions are left entirely in their hands. The one object of each chief is to make and keep his tribe as strong as possible and as contented as circumstances allow, usually at the expense of neighbouring tribes. With the settled and cultivating villagers of the plains, however, especially in the case of the Muslims, the conditions are very different. Their villages with the arable land surrounding them, are mostly the property of "Ashab Mal," "owners of property," absentee landlords who reside in Mosul and the other towns and take a proportion of the produce as rent. The results of this system are deplorable. The landlord, in most cases, takes no interest in the welfare of his villagers and scarcely ever visits them except to extort a greater proportion of produce from his wretched tenants, so that, after a good harvest, they will often pass the winter on the verge of starvation. Much of this property has been grabbed in former days by the means of bribing corrupt Ottoman officials, and, until the end of the War, these same officials filled their pockets by assisting the landlord to squeeze his cultivators almost to death. An exception must, however, be made, and those cultivators who dwelt on "miri" lands, areas formerly personal property of the

late Sultan Abdul Hamid, were, although usually dwelling on poorer land, generally more fairly dealt with.

It is thus easy to see that the cultivators long for a just and strong government, an administration carried on without fear or favour, and it is also obvious that the generality of "ashab mal" would find a lax and dishonest administration much more to their profit. Unfortunately the fellah is not vocal, while the voice of his oppressor is heard from the housetops. The Christians, on the contrary, have kept possession of their land, and this is a direct result of their religion, not in spite of it. For, by becoming Uniates, i.e., attached to the Roman Church, the Chaldeans and Syrian Catholics secured powerful friends at Constantinople in the form of Papal representatives and those of Western Roman Catholic Powers. And so, when we compare the wretchedness of the Muslim villages with the obvious prosperity of those of the Christians, we must remember that these conditions are not solely due to the greater energy and enterprise of the latter. The greatest enemy of the Muslim villager is, as a rule, his Muslim landlord. Amongst the town-dwelling population the position is much the same. The rich landowner we have dealt with. His ally would be the usually corrupt "effendi" of the old official class, who would welcome nothing so much as the resurrection of a similar incompetency in which he might reasonably expect to return to some job with a view to filling his pockets by illegal methods. In short, what the effendi or clerkly class want is an administration which would absorb them all into official posts. The merchants, tradespeople, shop-keepers and artisans are in the same position as the cultivator. They benefit by security, justice, and an impartial administration, and care little or nothing for politics provided they can make money in peace and quietness. The remaining class to be dealt with is that of the Muslim religious fraternity, the 'Ulema, the Mullahs of the small Quranic schools and the Imams and officials of the various mosques. These people are doubtless in somewhat of a quandary, for it cannot but be nauseating to them that a Muslim land is under the surveillance of a Christian one. On the other hand, the action of the Angora authorities in abolishing the Caliphate has doubtless disturbed the majority of them immensely, and with more than a little truth they feel that the Angora Government is frankly atheistic, for a tendency of the nominally Muslim *intelligentsia* has been, for some time, to assume a rather superior attitude of agnosticism sprung of a veneer of Western thought. This is also rife in Egypt, Syria and 'Iraq as well as Turkey. By these people Islam is only used for political and nationalistic ends.

Thus we have tried to see how various elements in the country

are thinking. Of true, sturdy patriotism there is little, of real public spirit there is less. The two classes of the body politic may be generally classed as predatory and productive. The predatory class prefers a weak government or none at all, the productive class longs for a strong, impartial and just administration, and surely the latter is the class most to be considered. It is not suggested here that either the administrations of Baghdad or Angora possess any one of these qualities above the other. Both are Oriental and inexperienced, a certain amount of corruption exists in both, for it is obviously impossible in a few years to change the age-long outlook of two peoples. The government of Angora, under a strong dictator, is probably more united and knows its own mind more surely, but the government of 'Iraq has the advice and backing of a powerful friend who, for a time at least, is in the position to bring it up in the way it should go.

These are some of the problems into which the Commission of the League has been probing. The experience has doubtless proved a veritable labour of Hercules, so many and various are the interests concerned. It is, of course, extremely difficult for a commission such as this has been, no member of which is acquainted with the languages of the country, with the best will in the world, to arrive at even an approximation of the real wishes of the inhabitants, for the simple reason that the majority of the population have no real wishes, in a political sense, at all. It must be remembered that scarcely three per cent. of the population of Mosul Town itself can read or write. The proportion of literates among the Kurdish and Arab tribes must be some very small fraction of one per cent., comprised almost solely of the "mullahs," or scribes of chieftains. Until the fall of the Ottoman administration under the Committee of Union and Progress, these people were not even supposed to have a political mind, how, then, could they have developed one in the space of four or five years? True, several deputies from these regions sat in the former Turkish parliament at Constantinople, but the suffrages they received were almost an entirely personal matter and the circumstances of their elections would not often bear close examination. Needless to say, the deputies elected were, almost entirely, town-dwelling notables, or Ashab Mal.

A ludicrous illustration of this difficulty was provided by the recent electoral census in 'Iraq, when it was discovered that the reported electorate exceeded nine millions. As the total population of 'Iraq is known to approximate three millions, it was obvious that the tribal headmen must have swelled the figures of their followings three or four hundred per cent. Their object in doing this was, doubtless, the enhancement of their prestige,

but a deeper-lying reason is the tribal sheikh's dislike of the town effendi and his efforts after political domination. The sheikhs endeavoured to demonstrate what is doubtless the truth, namely, that the tribal portion of the population exceeds the settled portion, but the result of their efforts was merely a manifest absurdity. Former censuses were, doubtless, under-estimates, owing to the incorrigible habit of the tribal chiefs of reducing their numbers as much as possible, with a view to cheating the revenue. Obviously, then, representative government on these lines is, in the Western sense, an impossibility, for the majority of the population is in favour of anarchy, a mere lack of government, and this, of course, could not be allowed by any controlling or mandatory power. The riches and productive power of the country (except live stock) are entirely in the hands of the settled village cultivators, the trade and commerce in the hands of townspeople, and it is these classes who ought to have the largest voice in the destinies of the land. But to secure this while listening to the opinions of the vocal parties in the state, the Ashab Mal, Sheikhs, Aghas, Effendis and other persons whose whole thought is for their own personal interest, is a difficult and well-nigh impossible task.

Of course, the Commission has taken every precaution in its power. In every district meetings have been held, interviews granted and every effort made to ensure an opinion expressed as free from influence and intimidation as possible. The assessors for 'Iraq and Turkey are, presumably, persons who are thoroughly acquainted with the district and its peoples. To the competency of Mr. Jardine, the 'Iraq representative, the writer can testify by personal acquaintance, and these gentlemen have, doubtless, been able to assist the Commission with much information. In every district, representative inhabitants were called in to the Commission in private and were instructed to whisper "'Iraq" or "Turkey" to the Commissioners' ears alone. Even such safeguards as these, however, could not possibly ensure a real national opinion, for the assessors were in the position of counsel pleading a cause and, naturally, each one would put forward such witnesses as were likely to support his case. Any independent evidence given would be doubtless that of local notables, effendis, sheikhs, aghas and representatives of the vocal portion of the population, and these people would speak, the writer is convinced, from the point of view of personal interest very largely. In a country where, until recently, corruption was rife, and where, to-day, it is not unknown, the evidence of the paid witness and all the other products of the Oriental genius for chicanery, would have to be taken very much into consideration.

In a word, it is hoped that the Commissioners have really endeavoured to read between the lines, to carefully ascertain each witness's antecedents and to try and get at the mental reservation so often employed by Muslim witnesses before a tribunal composed of Christians. In this respect, it is perhaps somewhat unfortunate that the Commission did not include a Muslim member, if only for the League's own reputation. There are many Muslims of high character and attainments who could have taken a very useful part in the inquiry. As for the minority communities, the Christians and the Yezidis, it is to be hoped that very serious consideration has been given to the representations of these people. It would be a terrible thing for them, if, in the event of the Turks regaining control, these inoffensive, useful members of the community were to be turned out of their homes and driven, refugees, into other countries, as has happened to the Armenians and Greeks in Asia Minor. To the Yezidis such an event would be an unthinkable catastrophe, for they are so primitive and ignorant a people that they could scarcely be transplanted at all with any chance of survival as a race.

The Jew presents little or no problem at all for he is in a very small minority. Possibly he is indifferent to the course of events. Commercial and unwarlike, he is not regarded as a political force to be reckoned with, and with the amazing adaptability and power of survival of his race, his position would remain much the same as ever. Turkish massacres and oppression have always sprung from political fear of their Christian subjects, and not from a religious intolerance, although this sentiment, coupled with hatred and cupidity, has actuated their instruments of tyranny, the Kurds.

The fact that the Commissioners have postponed the presentation of their Report from the June meeting of the Council of the League to that of September, suggests that they are aware of the complexity and importance of their task. The delay, in some respects, is unfortunate, as this ancient land has been living on political tenterhooks for nearly seven years, and the effect cannot but be inimical to prosperity and security. The Commissioners have the sympathy and good wishes of all persons interested in this fascinating region, for the result of their work there may well stand as a monument to the great value of the League in international questions or as an evidence of its futility.

F. W. CHARDIN.

FERDINAND LASSALLE, THE "TRAGIC COMEDIAN."

FERDINAND LASSALLE, the centenary of whose birth fell on April 11th last, was not only the acknowledged founder of German Social Democracy, but one of the most fascinating figures in German nineteenth century history. He commands attention not only because of what he did and was, but also because of what he might have become and achieved. More than one notable writer has felt the attraction of his character and fate, of his character that *was* his fate—for the phrase associated with Hamlet springs inevitably to the mind as soon as we consider the contrast between the potentiality and the actuality of his life. The German novelist Spielhagen based his novel, *In Reih und Glied*, on Lassalle's career; on him the Comte de Vogüé modelled his hero in *Les Morts qui Parlent*; his fatal love-story was, of course, the inspiration of George Meredith's *Tragic Comedians*, whose introductory note well states the romantic, mysterious side of this man's nature, the side which places him, although a personage in sober social and political history, among the great figures of romance:

A Faust-like legend might spring from him: he had a devil. He was the leader of a host, the hope of a party, venerated by his followers, well hated by his enemies, respected by the intellectual chiefs of his time, in the pride of his manhood and his labours when he fell. And why this man should have come to his end through love, and the woman who loved him have laid her hand in the hand of the slayer, is the problem we have to study, nothing inventing, in the spirit and flesh of both. To ask if it was love is useless. Love may be celestial fire before it enters into the systems of mortals. It will then take the character of the place of its abode, and we have to look not so much for the pure thing as for the passion. . . . They are real creatures, exquisitely fantastical, strangely exposed to the world by a lurid catastrophe, who teach us that fiction, if it can imagine events and persons more agreeable to the taste it has educated, can read us no such furrowing lesson in life.

The beginnings of Ferdinand Lassalle foreshadowed a more than ordinary career. He was born at Breslau, of Jewish parents, his father being a prosperous silk merchant named Lassal—Ferdinand changed the spelling during an early stay in Paris; his mother was a woman devoted to, one may say doting on, a son whose brilliance she recognised and whose ambitions she encouraged. Of brilliance and ambitions there was no doubt, even when Ferdinand was a boy. Alexander von Humboldt called him a prodigy, a *Wunderkind*, and George Brandes, in his excellent character study published in 1877, wrote:

There was something of a Cæsar in this youth whom alarmed bourgeois were one day to regard as a Catilina. He was born for power, he bore the stamp of the ruler, and as he did not come into the world a prince or a nobleman, but the child of the middle-class, and of a disregarded race, he became a thinker, democrat and agitator, in order to attain in this way the element for which he was created.

Lassalle's father intended him for the silk trade, but he was bent on philosophy, and, proceeding to the universities of Breslau and Berlin, he succeeded brilliantly in the subject, his special attention being given to the fatalistic philosopher, Heraclitus, from whom Hegel traced descent, and to whom, in our day, the so-called prophet of the downfall of Western civilisation, Herr Oswald Spengler, looks back as to a master.

It was in furtherance of his study of Heraclitus that Lassalle went, in December, 1844, to Paris, where he met Heine. Here was another man who discerned genius in this youth of twenty, for he wrote to him: "I have found in no one so much passion and clearness of intellect united in action. You have good right to be audacious—we others only usurp this divine right, this heavenly privilege." On another occasion Heine spoke of him as "the Messiah of the nineteenth century," but the friendship between the two did not last long. The breach between them was caused—as was later the estrangement from Marx, and the long years of worry and diversion from his apparent brilliant destiny—by his championship of the Gräfin Sophie von Hatzfeldt. How Ferdinand came to espouse the cause of this woman, for whom he fought a legal battle for nine long years against all the forces her influential but worthless husband was able to bring against him, how he came to take up this fight which brought him nothing but imprisonment and social ostracism, is best told in his own words:

Intense admiration of the rarest intellectual qualities and the purest idealism filled me with unwavering interest in and devotion to the cause of the Countess Sophie von Hatzfeldt. Had this interest been capable of deepening, such a change would have resulted from my intense indignation at the indescribable horrors and despicable infamies to which this admirable and innocent woman was increasingly exposed from the year 1822, merely because she was purer, better and more highly intellectual than the soulless creatures from whom she was by an unjust and ironical fate descended. Often have you indulged before me in the old, old lament, how you were deprived of the joys of life, shipwrecked on the rock which threatens all of us, the baseness, the meanness, the perfidy of those vermin who constitute the great majority of our fellowmen. Others have suffered in like measure, aye and more than you. Yet though the terrible misfortunes and the innocence of others commands our respect, the sorrows of this

VOL. CXXVIII. 5

woman compel us to take off our hats to her. Ill-luck wedded her to a man who for twenty-two long years cruelly ill-treated her, but more than that not one among her relatives, of her two brothers secure in their social position, of all her relations by marriage and her cousins, not one of all these princes, lords and counts who—the proofs lie before me—shared my convictions as to the worthlessness of the Count and the unjust fate of his wife, not one of all these was to be found to defend her rights, to take up her cause effectively, not one but would have sacrificed her to his own profit, his own comfort.

Later, towards the end of his life, he looked back upon this remarkable episode and thus described it :

I saw embodied in this affair universal standpoints and principles. I said to myself that the Countess was a sacrifice of her class. I said to myself that such misdeeds, such an outrage on society in its moral depths, could only be hazarded without timidity by one in the insolent position of a prince and a millionaire. I did not conceal from myself the difficulty of the enterprise. I saw well how hard the task of clearing up this wrong, already old and become historical, would be; and how, if it came to a trial, my entire activity would exclusively be required—and thus a long interruption in my career be entailed—in order to carry the complicated business to an issue. I knew right well the difficulty of overcoming a false appearance; I did not conceal from myself what frightful antagonists rank, influence and wealth are, the fact that they alone can ever find alliances in the ranks of the bureaucracy, and the danger that I might myself run. I knew all this without being restrained by it. I resolved to oppose false appearance with truth, rank with right, the power of money with that of intellect. The obstacles, the sacrifice, the dangers did not frighten me; but had I known what unworthy and infamous slanders would be cast at me, how the purest motives would be twisted and perverted into their exact opposite, and what ready credence the most miserable lies would find; well, I hope my resolution would not have been changed, but it would have cost me a hard and painful struggle.

It has been accepted by most biographers that it was, as indicated in this quotation, Lassalle's innate sense of justice and his revolutionary enthusiasm which led him to undertake the Countess's defence. If, however, we analyse his psychology a little, we shall find that what spurred him on also was a kind of quixotry, a racial pride and belief in himself, which was a constant factor in his mentality, and was indeed to drive him ultimately to his death. The relations between Lassalle and the Countess were the subject of much scandalous speculation at the time and it is only since the war, by the publication of Herr Mayer's monumental edition of Lassalle's complete correspondence,* that the question has been finally cleared up and justice done both to

* *Lassalle's Nachgelassene Schriften und Briefe*. Six volumes. Edited by Gustav Mayer. (Stuttgart und Berlin. Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.)

Lassalle and to the woman whom he defended. It is now established that only on one occasion did Lassalle experience any passion for the Countess—it was when he was in prison in Cologne that the one unsatisfied cry of passion escaped him; it is also proved that, contrary to common belief, the Countess did not act spitefully to Lassalle after his fatal falling in love with Hélène von Dönniges, but on the contrary, cherished a grateful affection towards him and did her utmost after his death to see that justice was done to his memory.

Lassalle's quixotic defence of the Countess, then—whatever the precise motives that inspired it—fitted in well with his general revolt against the established social order. Before 1848, the year of revolution, he had joined the German Republican Party, in which he was to be associated with Marx and Engels. He was in particular charged with the organisation of the Party at Düsseldorf, then, as now, an important centre of the German working-class movement. When the Prussian Government dissolved the National Assembly he issued a call to arms and was arrested in consequence. His speech in his defence was a remarkable oratorical achievement and marked him out as one of the coming men in the working-class movement. He was sentenced to six months' imprisonment, while Marx went into exile, the physical break between them being symbolic of the intellectual and psychological rift which, in the years that followed, was to widen, with incalculable consequences for German Social Democracy, if not for the whole of German history.

The story of Lassalle's relations with Marx must be told in some detail.* The two first met in the autumn of 1848. Lassalle was only twenty-three, just released from prison, to which he had gone in connection with the so-called "casket affair"—the theft of a document he required in connection with his campaign on behalf of the Countess. The younger man looked up to Marx as the prophet of the German working-class movement, but also as a possible ally in his struggle against the Countess's husband. He tried to induce Marx to place his paper, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, at his disposal, but Marx refused. Heine had shown a similar coolness, and the first element of contempt for the young *poseur*—an attitude towards Lassalle which Marx was at no pains to hide in his correspondence with Engels—insidiously entered. Lassalle did not take the rebuff seriously. He entered enthusiastically into correspondence with Marx, who was living in exile, first in Soho and then in Haverstock Hill, exchanged views on con-

* All the necessary documents are given in Herr Mayer's 3rd volume, and the reader interested may also be referred to Professor Hermann Oncken's authoritative biography of Lassalle (new edition), Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.

tinental politics, supplied Marx with material for his journalistic work, and generally endeavoured to keep in being the working-class organisation in the Rhineland. But all the time the rift was widening. Lassalle was fundamentally anti-Austrian, and diagnosed the weaknesses of the Hapsburg régime with a penetration which we, looking back after the events of the last fifty, or particularly after the events of the past ten, years, can only call amazing. The difference of opinion on this point, which Marx expressed with his usual ruthless vigour, the almost contemptuous indifference he showed to the "academic" and "unpractical" work, that is, the Hegelian philosophical studies on which Lassalle was engaged, the readiness with which he listened to the complaints of other disgruntled exiles, that this man was a fop, a mere *poseur*, and that his infatuation for the Countess would bring ruin on the Communist party—all this eventually led to a breakdown in the friendship and collaboration between the two men, which a personal interview proved unable to restore. Professor Hermann Oncken admirably sums up the historical moral of this chapter in Lassalle's life when he says that "for the political emancipation of the German working class it was of no small significance that at the decisive moment its two future leaders should have been unable to arrive at any practical co-operation." Lassalle's brilliant intellect and command of the masses, united with Marx's prodigious industry and science, might have changed the whole character of the German working-class movement. A temperamental antagonism, a certain imperfection of sympathy, made this impossible. By such slender threads of human character does the fate of parties, if not of nations and continents, hang!

Lassalle's championship of the Countess ended in triumph in the year 1854. He was able to apply himself wholeheartedly to his philosophical, literary and political work. In 1857 he published his great work on Heraclitus; he also produced a tragedy, *Franz von Sickingen*, chiefly of interest for the autobiographical touches we can trace in his sketch of the hero. In 1859 he entered Berlin in disguise—having been banished from the capital ten years previously—and through von Humboldt's influence was allowed to remain. He became a lion of Society and kept open house in an elegant way far from pleasing to his communist colleagues. But all the time, despite his taste for wines and good cooking, he was prosecuting his political and social-revolutionary aims. In the year of his taking up residence again in Berlin he published a pamphlet entitled *The Italian War and the Mission of Prussia*, in which he expounded in masterly fashion his anti-Hapsburg ideas, anticipating Bismarck, and also, by implication, the outcome of the European War. Two years later he issued his greatest work, his *System*

der erworbenen Rechte (System of Acquired Rights), the philosophical foundation of his practical work as an agitator and organiser of the working-classes, an erudite and lengthy exposition of the thesis that acquired right has no sanctity in itself, but is subject to the will and conscience of the nation. In 1862 Lassalle entered upon an active campaign. The struggle for democracy had begun in Prussia and Lassalle was soon in conflict with the authorities for advancing a parallel between the French Revolution and the German Revolution of 1848, which he argued had, like the former, raised the Fourth Estate to a position of power. His experience before the courts, the oratorical success which attended him, and the attention called to his speeches when published as pamphlets launched him quite definitely on his career as an agitator. German working-class organisation had until then been dominated by the co-operative movement founded, after the model of English societies, by Schulze-Delitsch. It was essentially an economic and social movement; politically its influence was sporadic and unorganised. Lassalle came forward with the proposition that the Working Men's Associations should form Productive Associations, by which the worker should become his own producer, and that these associations should bring about the necessary State legislation by constituting the workers as a distinct political party. The letter in which Lassalle expounded this thesis with remarkable force and eloquence marks a red-letter day in the history of German Social Democracy. It opened a struggle between Schulze-Delitsch and Lassalle and their respective ideas, which ended in Lassalle's triumph on May 19th, 1863, when his theses, which he compared to Luther's, were adopted by an overwhelming majority, and the Universal German Workers' Association was founded.

Lassalle was now the acknowledged head of the democratic movement in Germany. He appeared to be fulfilling his destiny. Early in 1864 he toured the Rhineland, arousing immense enthusiasm, which the efforts of the authorities to suppress only succeeded in intensifying. His own description of it to the Countess Hatzfeldt, although displaying a characteristic touch of arrogant self-confidence, is not exaggerated: "I have never seen anything like it. The entire population indulged in indescribable jubilation. The impression made upon me was that such scenes must have attended the founding of new religions."

But already the tragi-comedy which was to end fatally had begun. In July, 1862, worn out in mind and body, Lassalle had retired to Rigi-Kaltbad in search of rest. He was tired of politics, as he confessed to the Countess Hatzfeldt; he wanted to devote himself to science and nature. He was not, however, apparently intending to cease his agitation. To his followers, at least, he was

merely recuperating in preparation for another struggle. But the siren through whom the ship of all their hopes was to be wrecked was close at hand. Earlier in the same year Lassalle and Hélène von Dönniges had met in Berlin. She was the daughter of a Bavarian diplomat, beautiful, coquettish, young and romantic. She had heard, as everybody had heard, of the exploits of the brilliant Jewish demagogue, of his fascination, his eloquence, his magic influence over the masses. Lassalle had heard of Hélène's extraordinary beauty, and when the two met it was the most remarkable instance of love at first sight history can record. The pen of Meredith does justice to the episode:—

Her hero stood up and stood looking at her fulgently. Their eyes engaged without wavering on either side. Brave eyes they seemed, each pair of them, for his were fastened on a comely girl, and she had strung herself to her gallantest to meet the crisis.

His friends quitted him at a motion of the elbows. He knelt on the sofa, leaning across it, with clasped hands.

"You are she! So, then, is a contradiction of me to be the commencement?"

"After the apparition of Hamlet's father the prince was mad," said Clothilde hastily, and she gazed for her hostess, a paroxysm of alarm succeeding her boldness.

"Why should we two wait to be introduced?" said he. "We know one another. I am Alvan. You are she of whom I heard from Kollin: who else? Lucretia the gold-haired; the gold-crested serpent, wise as her sire; Aurora breaking the clouds; in short, Clothilde!"

Her heart exulted to hear him speak her name. She laughed with a radiant face.

It was at their meeting at Rigi-Kaltbad that the actual engagement between the two took place. This is how Hélène conveyed her decision—and her words are an index to her character:—

"When I left you and your lips touched my hand for the last time, I said to myself that my decision for life should be taken before I left Weggis. *Eh bien, c'est fait*. And now know, you with your fine, magnificent intellect and your great but to me so pleasant vanity; how my decision runs. I wish to be and will be your wife. You said to me yesterday evening: 'Give me only a sensible and independent yes, *et je me charge du reste*.' Well, here is my yes—and now, *chargez-vous donc du reste*. Only I impose two very small conditions, and they are these. I will—only think, the child wills—that we shall do all that lies in our power (and in your power, my fine Satanic friend, there lies so very much) to attain our ends in a seemly and sensible way: in other words, you must come to us, and we will try to prepossess both my parents in your favour, and so win their consent. But if not, if they are and remain inexorable, even when we have done everything—*eh bien alors, tant pis*—then there is always Egypt."

Hélène's parents proved inexorable. It was unthinkable that their daughter should marry a demagogue who had been imprisoned

and involved in a very questionable affair with the Countess Hatzfeldt. In despair Hélène fled to Lassalle. He could have taken her off to Egypt, defied her parents. But racial pride, a kind of arrogant yet dignified belief in himself, which had more than once shown itself, was aroused. He took Hélène back to her parents; he would impress himself on them, win their consent. But it was in vain. Hélène's parents refused to receive him, while she was disconcerted at the apparent cooling in his affection for her. Under her parents' persuasion she wrote to Lassalle, saying that she had reconciled herself with a former *fiancé*, a young nobleman named Racowitz. Lassalle was roused to passionate anger. All his most influential friends, among them Richard Wagner and the well-known Catholic social reformer, Bishop Ketteler, were appealed to, to endeavour to mediate between him and Herr von Dönniges. It was useless, and realising his defeat Lassalle wrote Hélène a letter full of bitter imprecations:

"Have you not declared to me, even in your last letters, that you were nothing, nothing but my loving wife, and that no power on earth should stay your resolution? And now, after you have bound this true heart of mine to yourself so strongly, this heart which, when once it gives itself away, gives itself for ever; now, when the battle has scarcely begun, do you cast me off? Do you betray me? Do you destroy me? If so, you succeed in doing what else no fate can do; you will have crushed and shattered one of the hardest of men, who could withstand unflinchingly all outward storms. No, I can never survive such treachery. It will kill me inwardly and outwardly. It is not possible that you are so dishonourable, so shameless, so reckless of duty, so utterly unworthy and infamous. If you were, you would deserve of me the most deadly hatred. You would deserve the contempt of the world. . . . Helen, my fate is in your hands! But if you destroy me with this wicked treachery, from which I cannot recover, then may evil fall upon you, and my curse follow you to the grave! This is the curse of a true heart, of a heart that you wantonly break, and with which you have cruelly trifled. Yes, this curse of mine will surely strike you."

We seem to be in the presence, not of a common-place affair of a jilted lover, but of a tortured hero in some ancient drama. The play was rapidly approaching its climax. Lassalle—a life-long opponent of duelling—issued a challenge to Herr von Dönniges, who passed it on to Von Racowitz. The two met on the morning of August 21st. The weapon chosen was the pistol, which Lassalle—a poor shot—had, with that fatalistic pride which crops up again and again at all the critical moments of his career, refused to practise. "My star is in the ascendant still," he said, as he took aim. His shot was a few seconds after that of young Racowitz, which entered his abdomen. In three days he was dead, with the Countess Hatzfeldt weeping by his side.

So died, in his fortieth year, one of the great men of German nineteenth century history, a man to whose genius and political insight even Bismarck, who had earlier taken an interest in Lassalle's theories, bore witness:—

He was one of the most intellectual and gifted men with whom I have ever had intercourse, a man who was ambitious in high style, but who was by no means a Republican; he had very decided national and monarchical sympathies, and the idea which he strove to realise was the German Empire, and therein we had a point of contact. Lassalle was extremely ambitious, and it was perhaps a matter of doubt to him whether the German Empire would close with the Hohenzollern dynasty or the Lassalle dynasty; but he was monarchical through and through.

That is the view of impartial history. There is also the view of the Social Reformer, who looks on Lassalle as a guildsman before his time, the most brilliant exponent of Socialist doctrine the cause ever had. There is finally the view of the student of human nature, to whom Lassalle is a figure of remarkable appeal, one of the great examples of the inscrutable ways of fate, of the truth that what ultimately controls the destinies of nations is not the iron economic law, but simply human nature, with all its incalculable uncertainty of brilliant success or abject failure. Had Lassalle not been the character he was, had he not encountered Hélène von Dönniges, and so met his death—who can say what Germany's destiny might have been? "I could never have been brought down by the obstacles in my path," Lassalle remarked in a letter to his great friend, the musician, Hans von Bülow, "but a tile, falling on one's head from the roof, that is something one cannot guard against."* On which someone has made the only apt comment—"But supposing he did not want to guard against it."

A. W. G. RANDALL.

* Vol. 5, Gustav Mayer's edition of the "Nachgelassene Schriften."

RUSSIA AND JAPAN.

AT Peking, upon the twenty-first day of January, 1925, Mr. Karahan, the Soviet Ambassador, and Mr. Yoshizawa, the Japanese Minister, signed a Russian-Japanese Treaty. The negotiations of which this treaty is the long delayed fruition, have been broken off more than once during the last four years, and some sixty-nine meetings were held during the last stage before agreement was reached. Although it is an event of note that there has been a *rapprochement* between Russia, spiritual home of Communism, and Japan, a country in which the expression of what are there known as "Dangerous Thoughts" leads to instant imprisonment, it is an event whose full significance is apt to be ignored in a Europe obsessed by the post-war wrangling within its gates. In order to understand the place of this treaty in Far Eastern history it is necessary to inquire into the past, for only by so doing will it become plain that though methods and men may change the motives of foreign policies are often of a more enduring nature.

Since the seventeenth century, Russian policy in the Far East has resembled that of other foreign Powers in that its object has been place and position in China. But in one respect Russian policy has been unique, for whereas Great Britain, the U.S.A., France, Germany, Portugal, and latterly Japan, entered China from the sea, Russia came by land. The Powers who advanced upon China by the sea routes first established themselves in the south; Russia, whose military power was directed by a notable line of Empire builders, crept Eastward across the empty lands of Siberia until her advance was checked by the waters of the Pacific Ocean. She then turned right-handed and moved South until her shadow fell across Manchuria and the Kingdom of Korea. For many years the steadfast and solitary policy of Russia in the North-east of Asia hardly conflicted with the more complex designs of the other Powers to the south of the Yangtze Valley, but as Russia came south and her rivals moved north, the ragged edges of spheres of influence began to grate together. This phenomenon was first apparent during the closing years of the nineteenth century. It was a time when foreign policies in China rose to flood level; the final partition of a China already conveniently apportioned into spheres of influence was a matter of public discussion.

In 1895, the steady march of events was brusquely interrupted by a new player who suddenly stepped forward and took a hand in the game, for in this year Japan startled the Far East by making a successful war upon China. The foreign offices of Europe were at once convinced of two facts: firstly, that China was more helpless, and secondly, that Japan was much stronger than

had been supposed. To Russia, this second fact was particularly displeasing since it was evident that Japan's ambitions on the continent of Asia would, by reason of her geographical position, necessarily clash with those of Russia.

The Chinese-Japanese war was in fact largely fought by Japan in order to be able to counter Russian influence in Korea, and had Japan been allowed to reap the full harvest of her victory, Russian policy in the Far East would have been dealt a fatal blow. The tri-partite intervention of Russia, Germany and France, by which the victor was made to relinquish her gains in Manchuria, temporarily relegated Japan to a secondary position in the scramble for the good things of China. During the ensuing ten years Russia accelerated the development of her designs in North-east Asia. She forced the Chinese to grant her a lease of territory at the southern extremity of Manchuria, and here she built the fortress of Port Arthur and the commercial port of Dalny. These outposts were linked by rail to the Trans-Siberian system. The Boxer troubles of 1905 were employed by Russia as an excuse for the military occupation of the whole of Manchuria, whose three provinces, though lying north of the Great Wall, are indisputably Chinese. During the period 1895-1905, Russia worked steadily towards the absorption of the decadent Kingdom of Korea, in whose capital of Seoul the agents of Russia and Japan intrigued furiously against each other.

The Japanese observed these events with revengeful apprehension, and when Russia showed plainly that she had no intention of leaving Manchuria after the Boxer troubles, Japan felt that the hour had struck when she must bestir herself if the might of Russia was to be prevented from displaying itself along the whole length of the Asiatic coast from the Amur River to the Yellow Sea. The military success of Japan in the Russo-Japanese war revolutionised the Far Eastern political situation. Its most permanent and far-reaching effect was upon the mind of China, but with that we are not now directly concerned. Sufficient for present purposes to record that as a result of this war Japan succeeded to Russia's position in Manchuria and Korea.

From 1906-1917, Russia was dormant in the Far East whilst Japan busily exploited her gains. By 1911 Korea was Japanese territory. The murmurings of the coming storm in the West were audible and as Europe gathered into its armed camps and the United States of America remained politically aloof from two-thirds of the world, Japan established her domination in the Far East. Her alliance with Britain discounted interference from that quarter and Japan moved easily from strength to strength. Her ideas became grandiose and culminated in 1915 in the famous Twenty-One Demands to China. These outlined what amounted

to a Japanese protectorate over the major portion of China, and though the Powers were locked in an immense war they found time to protest against this resounding bang of the "Open Door."

The extravagance of these demands is explained by the fact that Japanese policy was entirely in the hands of her military party, who knew exactly what they wanted and expressed themselves with force and directness. Japan deemed it advisable to modify her demands, but those which extended her lease in Manchuria to the year 1986 were retained and acceded to under protest by China. When the Bolshevik revolution took place in 1917 it seemed as if Russia had ceased to count in the Far East and was not likely for many years to exert any influence in that part of the world.

In 1918, some Czecho-Slovaks were reported to be trekking through Siberia after having been released from Russian prison camps as a result of the treaty of Brest-Litovsk. In order to rescue these people who had announced their intention of joining the Allies, a joint expedition invaded Siberia from Vladivostok. The bulk of this force was supplied by Japan, the U.S.A. and Great Britain. The history of this campaign is largely that of a series of inter-Allied disputes, and Great Britain and the U.S.A. withdrew their troops as soon as the Czecho-Slovaks had been evacuated. Though the rescue of these wanderers had been the official reason for the expedition, the mind of the Japanese General Staff had worked on wider lines of thought. They believed that in the ruin of Russia there was opportunity to gain compensation for what had been abandoned from the Twenty-One Demands of 1915. They saw a chance of obtaining control over Eastern Siberia and with this purpose in mind they acted independently in two respects. First, they steadily pushed troops into Siberia until the Japanese force was ten times as numerous as it should have been according to the terms of an undertaking by which each Ally was to contribute 7,000 men. Second, when the Allies evacuated Vladivostok in 1920 the Japanese remained.

For two years, at a cost of a thousand lives and six hundred million yen in treasure, Japan persevered in Siberia; her efforts were in vain. By November, 1922, the failure of this scheme of expansion was becoming painfully apparent and Japan withdrew from the mainland. She retained a garrison in the Northern half of the island of Saghalien. The military party failed in its policy for a variety of reasons of which the chief were as follow. The U.S.A. continued to protest vigorously that Japan had no business to remain in Siberia; the expedition became most unpopular in Japan; the Bolsheviks in Siberia waxed in strength both militarily and politically. A tough struggle took place in Japan before the military party consented to abandon the gamble; it was

a struggle punctuated by some remarkable public wrangling between the Foreign Office and the General Staff.

Force having failed, diplomacy took the stage. Russo-Japanese negotiations began in 1921, with Japan on one side and the Far Eastern Republic on the other. At that time this state enjoyed a nominal independence from Moscow. Negotiations broke down, were renewed, broke down, and were again renewed. They began in Manchuria, they were transferred to Japan and thence to Peking. Although relatively small points such as the demand of Japan for an apology for the Nikolaevsk massacre were the ostensible causes of these ruptures, there was always in the background the bargaining in connection with the Northern half of Saghalien Island and its oil deposits. It was the massacre in 1920 of 700 Japanese at Nikolaevsk by Bolshevik partisans, whose leader was subsequently executed by the Bolsheviks for this crime, which caused the Japanese to occupy the northern half of this island.

As the conferences dragged slowly forward the position of Japan became less satisfactory. She was on the horns of a dilemma. The growing power of Russia in the Far East made an early agreement very desirable. The fact that Russia was isolated in the world made it likely that the sooner the agreement could be signed the better would be the price the Russians would pay for recognition. On the other hand, the bureaucracy in Japan is so fearful of "Dangerous Thoughts" that any contact with Russia was considered likely to lead to infection. Further, the Washington Conference, with its corollary of the abandonment of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, left the Japanese people with a feeling of isolation. Many Japanese feel that the conference was in some indefinable manner directed by the Anglo-Saxon peoples against Japan. With this unfortunate and mistaken impression prevalent in their country the Japanese Government were loath to take a step such as the recognition of Russia, which would be in sharp contrast to the policy of the other Powers. These several causes account for the great length of the negotiations just concluded.

In summary the important points in the Treaty are as follow:

1. With the exception of the Treaty of Portsmouth, which concluded the Russo-Japanese war, and which is the legal foundation of the Japanese position in Manchuria, all Russo-Japanese treaties are cancelled.
2. Diplomatic relations are restored and a Treaty of Commerce and Navigation on the usual lines will be concluded between the contracting parties.
3. Japan secures fifty per cent. of the prospecting and exploiting rights in the oil and coal fields of Northern Saghalien for a period of 40-50 years. (This is the really important clause from the Japanese point of view.)
4. Japan will withdraw her troops from Northern Saghalien by May, 1925.

5. Russo-Japanese debts will be the subject of negotiations.

With the preceding narrative of events as a basis it is permissible to advance certain conclusions. A few years ago it was the fashion to explain Japanese foreign policy by stating that Japan must have areas in which to dispose of her surplus population. This explanation ignored the easily ascertainable fact that the Japanese did not emigrate to the empty lands they already possessed, including the northern island of Japan itself. As a matter of fact the Japanese themselves never stressed this argument, and the late Mr. Hara, whilst Premier, publicly dismissed this theory as unsound. In the same speech he pointed out that Japan was solving her population question by industrialisation, and that her real problem arose from this process since nature had denied to Japan the essential bases of heavy industry, such as iron ore and other raw materials. It is in this local deficiency of raw products with which to feed her factories that is to be found the mainspring of Japanese foreign policy. Across a narrow strip of sea on the continent of Asia these essential materials abound, and it is in Manchuria, Eastern Mongolia and the Maritime Province of Siberia that Japan sees her economic future both from the commercial and the strategical point of view.

During the past thirty years she has made great efforts to obtain political and economic dominion in North-east Asia. Four times, in 1895, 1905, 1914, and 1918 her troops have embarked in Japan for the invasion of the mainland. Once, in 1915, on the occasion of the Twenty-one Demands, they were almost slipped from the leash. Three times, in 1895, 1915, and 1922, what has been gained has been substantially less than what was momentarily acquired, but always there has been progress, though in the last case it has taken four years of conference to obtain a fraction of what was once hoped for from the Siberian expedition.

Countering this policy of mainland expansion there have been the aspirations of two nations, the Chinese and the Russians. The former have up till now been negligible as a material force, though this will not be a true statement twenty, perhaps ten, years hence. Up till now the Chinese have merely provided the stake at issue between Russia and Japan. Even as these words are being written a telegram appears stating that the Chinese Government, such as it is, has protested against the clause in the Russo-Japanese agreement which recognises the validity of the Treaty of Portsmouth. There is much in the ambitions of both Russia and Japan to which Young China strongly objects; but for the moment China is impotent. The future Chinese State is still in its birth pangs. In the Russian-Japanese contest there have been three stages. It can be compared to a boxing match. The first round, in 1895, was won by Russia on points; in the second, in 1905, Russia

seemed to take the count, and her revolution made it look as if she had retired from the Eastern ring. But in 1918, she began to achieve a "come back" and a third round has taken place between the contestants. The recently signed Treaty concludes Round Three and honours are easy, with Russia looking a trifle the fresher of the two, and in as strong a position in China as she has ever been since 1890.

The Russian revival in the Far East has been remarkably rapid and complete, and whatever regrets the Soviet Government may have as to the outcome of its policies in Europe they have nothing to complain of in China. In pre-war days Russia was distinguished amongst the Powers by reason of her high handed dealings with China. With the advent of the Soviet a transformation took place in this respect. In the Russian-Chinese treaty of Nerchinsk which was signed in 1689, clause Three ran as follows: "Everything which has occurred hitherto is to be buried in eternal oblivion." This might have been the text with which Soviet Russia greeted China. Russian extra-territorial rights in China were voluntarily abandoned and an Ambassador was sent to Peking. He spends much time in reiterating to the Chinese that Russia is their only friend and that she will gladly assist them against the wicked imperialism of the Powers. There are many amongst the growing body of Chinese nationalists who lend a ready ear to these honeyed words. Japan views with alarm this assumption by Russia of the post of China's confidential friend, hence the Russo-Japanese Treaty and the imminent appointment of a Japanese Ambassador to Peking instead of a Minister. Hence, perhaps, some significant rumours in the Japanese press that Japan might be ready to consider some modification of her extra-territorial rights in China.

Of both Russia and Japan it may be said that though the men and the methods connected with their Far Eastern policies have changed during the last few years, the common motive is still to-day what it was in 1895, the economic control of North-east Asia. The Chinese have a saying: "Shoes for the same foot must be worn by different people." It may be that history will not repeat itself a fourth time and that in this vast area of untapped resources these two great Powers will solve their rivalries in a peaceful manner. Time will show what value is to be attached to the possibility of both Russia and Japan being thwarted by the self-assertion of a modern China. For the moment it is only possible to draw attention to the fact that the treaty just signed concludes the third round between Russia and Japan, and that the seconds, in the shape of the other Great Powers, are now distinctly further out of the Far Eastern ring than they have ever been before.

S. K.-H.

OUR VANISHING VIKINGS.

IN opening a discussion on the defects of the newspapers Mr. Strachey has strangely omitted to mention the most glaring of these, namely, that lack of sense of proportion which newspapers occasionally betray by minimising or even ignoring matters of importance while giving undue prominence to trivial topics.

For a striking instance of this kind he need not have gone farther back than the end of April last, when the House of Commons after discussion passed the resolution moved by Mr. Harrison, M.P., for Bodmin, that "This House views with grave concern the present state of the fishing industry of Great Britain, and that in the interests of the Navy, the Merchant Service and the food supply of this country this industry should receive every possible assistance from the Government."

Speaking on behalf of the Government the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries agreed with all this, and there can be no doubt of the Government's good intentions in this vital matter. For centuries past the rulers of this country have from time to time recognised the importance of the Fisheries and there is no reason to suppose that the present Government will fail in this respect. It is not Government, but public opinion and the man in the street that needs education on the point, consequently it is matter for regret that the Parliamentary resolution and debate referred to should merely have been reported without comment by the leading newspapers. It is the more deplorable because the Association of British Fisheries which, wisely guided, might have done so much to educate public opinion, is being dissolved—largely owing to its failure in this important respect—and most people are left the more dependent on newspapers for information about the Fisheries and Fishermen.

As the M.P. for Lowestoft and Chairman of the House of Commons Fisheries Committee, Mr. Rentoul observed in supporting the resolution above mentioned, no one familiar with the fishing industry would say the motion exaggerated the situation. On the contrary, it must be said that the resolution understates the case by failing to mention some important facts, e.g., that the depopulation of fishing villages which has more than once led to discussion in Parliament and to Government action in the shape of Committees and loans to fishermen, has contributed to that lack of work and that congestion of towns, and that housing difficulty so generally deplored, as well as to the impaired physical standard which the war revealed. While food prices are such as to compel Government action, vast quantities of wholesome food in the shape of fish are frequently wasted, and there is a widespread conviction

that, profitless as his work may too often be to the fisherman himself, the price of fish to the consumer in most towns is unreasonably high—for it is not generally known that the bulk of our fish supply means an expenditure of four tons of coal to catch one ton of fish.

When it is stated in a widely circulated popular journal, and nobody denies the statement, that one penny is all a fisherman gets for forty herrings for each of which the consumer pays twopence, housewives' complaints contribute to that unrest which is so prevalent and deplorable. But it is not only the housewife or consumer that is interested. The Fisheries are important not merely for the food they yield, the money made out of them, the employment they afford. They are absolutely vital to the existence of an Empire based on Sea Power. The man in the street fails to understand this. He has not learnt from Mahan or other authorities that a Feeding Fleet is necessary to a Fighting Fleet and that both demand a native maritime population to recruit from. He forgets or he has not noticed that Tyre and Sidon—fish towns—ancient Greece, modern Holland at the zenith of its strength at sea—and England herself attained maritime power by means of their fishermen. "The Spanish Armada was defeated by the English fishermen," said a royal admiral who understood the subject—Queen Victoria's second son, the Duke of Edinburgh, whose life was spent in the Navy, where as Admiral Superintendent of Naval Reserves he had exceptional opportunities of seeing the fishermen of our coasts, his high estimate of whose value as factors of maritime strength was subsequently justified by the part they played in the recent war with Germany.

"The sea sense which this country has always had was the greatest gift ever given to any Empire," said Sir Gerald Chadwyck-Healey at the annual meeting of the Royal National Mission to Deep Sea Fishermen on April 29th last, repeating what the present writer had said more than twenty years before.

It is certainly a priceless national asset to our particular Empire based as it is on Sea Power, which could not have been attained and cannot be retained without that sea spirit animating our fishermen. If all this were more generally realised the Fishing Industry need not to-day be in its present deplorable plight. Public opinion would have prevented that. The creation of enlightened public opinion is the primary need. That Government ought to help, the Government admits. The question is, what can Government do and what can the interests concerned do? This cannot be dealt with in the space to which the writer is at present limited. All that can be done is to point out that from more points of view than one the subject has an importance which yet remains to be generally understood.

Capital may regard the Fisheries from the point of view of the investor, or rather speculator. Labour may look to them for possible employment, and people in general may regard them as a source of food supply. Sportsmen they appeal to as the only remaining form of the chase by which modern man can live. Statesmen recognise in them not merely potential food and wealth recruits for other Sea Services, but virile stock whence urban communities may with advantage be replenished. But when the fishing communities of hereditary fishermen producing the virile stock are threatened with extermination or transformation into something quite different and more harmful than useful, which is the present situation, it is timely to remind the public that, Sea Kings as the Vikings often were, the word "Viking"—from the Norse *Vik* or *Wik*, a bay—merely meant a man who hailed from the seaside. Pagans, pirates, murderers, and robbers as the Vikings of old were, people considered highly respectable are proud to claim blood kinship with them. With more reason may they be proud of kinship with the Vikings of to-day who, while retaining the sea spirit and sea craft of the ancient monarchs of the Main, show many of the virtues and fewer of the vices of modern civilisation than most people.

Intellectually as well as morally and physically the average Viking of to-day is considerably above either Hodge, the typical labourer on the land, or even the average intelligent mechanic of the city. Perhaps it would not be claiming too much to say that to the Themistoclean axiom that to be master of the sea is to be master of the world, you might add that even to be born, brought up and live by the sea confers considerable advantage. "Breadth of mental horizon" was the term used by the late Lord Salisbury in referring to one of these, and when the German Emperor some years later was telling Germany that her future was on the water "breadth of mental horizon" was one of the rewards promised. Besides the advantage thus recognised of breadth of mental horizon, the sea yields a kind of wisdom as hard to define as poetry.

Although the modern Viking may not realise that he enjoys these advantages, he strongly objects to exchange his seaside home for a city slum; and who shall blame him? This or emigration is the fate of too many of our modern Vikings or inshore, coastal, hereditary fishermen. There are plenty of men to spare to people our Oversea Dominions. But these Vikings are not among them. Our Vikings are as necessary to the nation to-day as they have proved in the past, and if the nation is to survive it must find means to stop the process of extermination or transformation which has continued too long.

A. G. COWIE.

SIGN-POSTS OF FICTION.

PEOPLE often wonder about progress, so hard is it to see relatively, and we in particular think politically, being a commercial and practical race. One is apt to forget the tell-tale novel, owing to its popular misconception as a mere love story of entertainment. Yet no truer foot-rule can be found of the march of a civilisation, for the novelist is the recorder of his time. If anyone seriously desires to know whether and how we have changed since Queen Victoria mounted the throne, let him read *Pickwick* as foundation, taking then any novel by George Gissing and capping them with *Lummox*, by Fannie Hurst of America.

Dickens was, perhaps, the most popular writer of any time, so that men said: "We are the salt of the Earth"; Gissing probably the most unpopular of his time; the woman is the last word in fictional sensation. Not a century separates Dickens from *Lummox*, and yet these writers connect and give the measure of a century of civilisation difficult to grasp from any study of history. One lays down *Pickwick* with a gasp, the thing is too palpably an anachronism. In the new life of speed, the woman strikes the modern and errant note. A new force has arisen—woman. Half-way in between, Gissing reads like some solitary signpost, a pointer on the way. One divines his secret instantaneously. *Ida Starr* and *Lummox* are moderns and spring from the same heart.

Pickwick, of course, was a serial, a fantasia in chapters without construction or story, which might have run on for ten volumes—and did run on through all Dickens' works. It is essentially social history, and undoubtedly the most English book ever written, as *Don Quixote* is the most Spanish. It fixes a period immortally. We have to accept *Pickwick* as the live bone and marrow. To re-read Dickens to-day is instructive, for he is a chronicler, and no man ever judged more nicely the limits of his art-appeal. One notes with a start his a-feminism. One realises that in all his novels he held up women to derision and ridicule. The shrew is his constant type. All his wives are scolds, dolts and fools. He strips the sex relentlessly. All are butts and objects of satire. Even the superb Mrs. Gamp is a horrible and fiendish indictment. His love-women are dolls and nonentities. Did the women of his age relish this gallery of female portraits? (The men did, we know.) The answer is that they did. Women read Dickens avidly. They apparently failed to perceive the imperfections of their sex drawn with so sharp a point; or they lacked the sense of humour to take offence. In plain words, they knew no better.

We have to accept the logic of his enormous success, which was

immediate and lasting. His huge popularity was, without doubt, partly due to this masculinity of attitude in a land where women had no rights, which saw in women only the theme for perpetual and legitimate fun. Always his pity is reserved for man, at whose side the shrill, strident cackle of his women-folk stands out in discordant bathos. Yet his Hogarthian women were probably not more caricatures than are his types of men. They were probably true enough. At any rate, no protest was registered from any feminine quarter in his day or in ours. It is indisputable that the most popular writer in the English language only drew the foibles and weaknesses of women, all manner of types of whom he exposed to ribald laughter, and this in an age when the word "gentleman" had a real and national meaning.

Perhaps, nay, surely, this is the key to Dickens' greatness. His extravagance was good-tempered and always sincere; he was a Puritan with the Puritan's reformatory instincts, and in depicting the deformities of the women of his time he indicated the line and source of progress. Dickens really unlocked the England of that period. He was the first man to popularise the lower middle-classes, who saw in his portraits only the gay effervescence of the surface. For there was no psychology in Dickens, who wrote admittedly commercially with a genial eye on his public. The language of Bill Sykes is fantastic, and Nancy is but a mannequin to set off her man, like the Doras and Dollys and Emilys. Shakespeare's women were great renaissance ladies in comparison, but then Shakespeare has never been popular as Dickens was. In short, Dickens was the arch-interpreter of an apogee which was about to change, the spirit of which he understood as no other before or since; the gross insularity, the class homeliness, the inveterate vulgarity, good humour, good cheer and ugliness of life and thought of that period—he revelled in it all. He was at once the Music Hall that was to follow him and the Daily Newspaper which subsequently was to supersede him. No Dickens, no Dan Leno, one can say, no Dan Leno, no *Daily Mirror*. He featured a whole class, till then submerged; the rich and the real poor he left characteristically alone. All his novels are social propaganda. All his women are wholly uneducated, and he avoided sex like pitch. He never lampooned Mrs. Grundy.

Was this England? Without a doubt it was. The condition of England was his theme and inspiration, and his books have lived and will live for that reason. If Jingle is tiresome to-day and the Fat Boy seems tenuous fun, it is because we have passed on. Petrol has ousted the Wellers. Board-school education has dethroned Mr. Stiggins. Fagin is old-fashioned melodrama. The world of Dickens is "in office," and we do not find it quite so

funny as it appeared in caricature to our fathers. Mr. Charles Chaplin points the moral. Probably no single man ever exposed so much or so dazzlingly. Under his good-tempered stiletto, which the deeper it probed the more it excited laughter, the ponderous, insular ugliness of his age melted away. He was, though wholly unconsciously and quite unpolitically, the first constructive anarchist.

When Gissing began to write, the England that Dickens depicted had hardened into the wooden institutionalism of Victorian wealth, smug decorum and industrial success. It was utterly indecent to think socialistically or even to question the absolutism of things that seemed so dreadfully successful and shed such radiance. But, unlike Dickens, Gissing could not make concessions. He conscientiously set out to write about poverty and the lives of the submerged truthfully, in direct opposition to Dickens' method. He attempted to show the side of life omitted by Dickens—the side that did not laugh, and had got consciously tired of being laughed at. He knew the lower middle-class as well as Dickens, but he could not harlequinise or symbolise his types; hence his failure. He began life disastrously and he was nurtured on the Russians, on the school of veracity or realism. Moreover, he was a scholar. He lacked the Mark Tapley spirit, for though himself he could, and did, laugh at the comic side of life boisterously, he could not depict it in the spirit of a charade; he was too intellectually polished and missed the Puritan's fervour. He, probably, was not a "born" novelist, as his early efforts show. It took him years to write easily in novel form, and he despised the tinsel and pantaloony in which Dickens clothed his specimens to their own entire satisfaction. A fourpenny beef-steak in an eating-house to him meant four-pennyworth of bad meat, though he had excellent teeth. Dickens omitted the meat and focussed on some eccentricity in the fellow who served it. He always saw the clownery of life. Gissing always said that Dickens made him feel that he was "really necessary." Gissing's failure was simply due to his inability to caricature. His intellectual honesty was before his time. His faithful but drab portraits evoked small interest. He stood alone in his day in mortal combat with the national idiosyncrasy, rather pagan, physically and spiritually rebellious to all cant and to the common worship of hypocrisy. Yet though he lacked constructive enthusiasm, he wrote designedly as star-finder, and his message was undoubtedly a prime cause of his unpopularity. His true significance as novelist lies in that message—which may be defined as the freedom of women. This was his battle. He was the first novelist to plead for the better education of women, for a finer sex attitude, for a

wider sympathy towards them, and it was because this spirit so jarred and clashed against the tradition of Dickens that he remained in obscurity; Ruskin succeeded far better with *Sesame and Lilies*. Yet, like Blake, he put his walking-stick through the sky and died disconsolate.

To read Gissing to-day alongside of Dickens is to read the social history of England and catch its progress. Of the two, Gissing's people seem infinitely more real and are so. We sense the veracity of the man. We can see that he wrote deliberately as a reformer; whereas Dickens was a symbolist and, above all, an entertainer—the greater artist by far, yet for all that a merchant and perhaps the more astonishing a genius for that limitation. In Gissing we find a true picture of the lower middle-class at the end of Victorianism, weighed down and stifled by the terrific class-cleavage which divided England, deprived of opportunities, almost itself devoid of humour, held fast in the mesh of class and monied institutionalism. If Gissing missed the spirit of his time, it was because he was ahead of it. In fighting for women he incurred general opposition; in fighting for education he met with general indifference. Yet his books show the advance registered since the time of Dickens. His women are not quite so dollish and untaught, and already the signs and symptoms that ultimately were to lead to the sex-war which procured feminine suffrage are apparent. Out of the dreary and unlovely homes in Gissing's novels, there issued the women who were to fight policemen in the streets in the cause of suffrage. He makes us understand its origins and its necessity. He, too, laid bare a civilisation to those who could read the signs. Gissing was an intellectual analyst. He never holds women up to derision. He detested the Music Hall spirit; he loathed vulgarity. In all his writings sympathy for women is evident and a vast pity. It was in this respect that he stood in significant contrast to Dickens. It is in this sense that his books are to-day interesting. One reads them as one handles a gold snuff-box—there is no snuff in it; yet the essence remains quite clear and connective. Gissing is a modern—Dickens is not. I am not sure but that one cannot to-day get more laughter out of a book like *Denzil Quarrier* than out of the *Fat Boy*. We have got beneath the surface; that is the reason. The stifling gentility of Gissing's time is to-day droller than the mockery and one-sided melodrama of Dickens' eccentricity shop.

From *Pickwick* to *Lummox*, by Fannie Hurst, is a short jump historically, yet already we are in a new world. In *Lummox* we see the modern analytical method applied to America, and by a woman, who also is clearly a social reformer. Here, psychology is the key. In mordant, slashing phrases, the new woman

describes the life of a peasant charwoman who in the course of the whole book hardly speaks a hundred words. The writing is brilliant, febrile, sensational. Grammar is often discarded for effect, unrelieved realism is the note. Unlike Dickens, whose method was omission and whose weapon was laughter, the American aims at drama. She rips things open, tears at people's souls and squeezes them dry. The picture is uncouth. Her vividness of interpretation is almost disturbing. She writes, from the woman's standpoint, about daily drudgery and hard work, which is the lot of women—an angle entirely overlooked by Dickens, who only saw in women their inferiority which, by the way, was not their fault, and only dwelt upon their shortcomings. She reveals a side of life avoided by entertainment novelists, the side of unmitigated and unredeemed squalor. And yet she makes her charwoman beautiful and almost epic. She is the nether woman who does the useful work of life, who on her knees cleans the floors and sinks, and scrubs all day. She shows the immense goodness in human nature and its superb serenity in the foulest of conditions. This book, too, is propaganda, a chronicle, an arraignment. The story is purely episodic. The method resembles the picture-theatre. As a book it hits and goes on hitting and leaves the reader aghast. An immense power quivers from its pages. One re-reads some of the sentences; one lingers over a phrase. The book bleeds, so to speak. After *Pickwick* one reads *Lummox* with a sense of consternation.

A century has passed, that is all. The simpering, uneducated, civic-less, sex-slave woman of a hundred years ago is no more. The new woman is articulate, free and relative. Already she has become prophetic, symbolic, philosophical; and psychology comes natural to her. Her freed instincts, with her keen and subtle perceptions, enable her to probe deep down into human nature, and with her *flair* she is able to plumb and present conditions and emotions which in male hands would almost inevitably become coarse and offensive. How admirably etched in, for example, is the scene where *Lummox* "chars" in an immoral house! A man could not have written that so neatly. He would not have seen quite what the woman writer interprets. He could not have left the thing alone as she throws it off with a few aching impressions. And there is no caricature, no sentimentality, no concession. *Lummox* is a genuine creation. She lives. We can see her with her spatulate bare feet gripping the soil, and the rhythmic swing of her arms scrubbing the floors. We know what she thinks from what she does not and cannot say. We have a portrait as distinctive as Mrs. Gamp, shorn of all decorative artifice. There is no woman's portrait in English fiction which excels her as drama.

This is woman's work, not a hundred years after Dickens. Some people don't like it. The style is neo-American. It shrieks and jars, and is, perhaps, too unquiet to be accepted without protest. Yet it is extraordinarily effective, pungent and revelatory. Here we have the real poor and the drama of poverty; there is no padding and no moral. Scene follows scene, as in the film play. Almost a new technique appears, hard and lawless, which defies analysis. The points kick back, as it were. All the frippery of novel-writing is brushed aside. You cannot read the first page, a chapter in the middle, and then a few pages in the end and review the book, even anonymously, for there is no love story or plot or "working-up" business. *Lummox* is brutal life: frightfully exciting, fascinatingly swift. It gives, as the lady in the wine-shop said over her second glass of port, "the returns," in a way rarely attempted. To make a heroine out of an inarticulate charwoman is a feat which only a woman could have done. This is the new note in fiction—woman by woman. I fancy it is going to give a much required fillip to the novel.

Lummox shows the distance we have travelled since the days of Mrs. Nickleby. The authoress ignores her public and says, "Follow me," and so the libraries banned it. She writes about social conditions in a manner inconceived by Dickens, who always guarded his "city of the mind," and always made things pleasant, clear of all conventions and prohibitions. Dickens' soup-kitchen is school-boy stuff beside the swift attack of *Lummox* nursing the shivering monkey to sleep in the reeking underground cellar of a doss-house. Compare that scene with *Oliver Twist*! We are confronted with woman as she is; in her aspect as toiler and work-a-day servant of society—as fate: a conception and *motif* ignored by Dickens. She compels us to face the hideous slave-life embodied in the social mechanism, and to see the soul of tens of thousands of such women unable to escape from their environment. No man could have created her—he would not have seen the inherent greatness in this big, silent peasant woman of the soil; he could not have understood what there was to understand in her, any more than the poet in the book did, who seduced her. We get here a new spirit born of the new attitude that has crept into our civilisation. We sense a new force, the force of creative woman.

What Gissing desired so passionately has come to pass—educated woman is a reality. She has begun to write about her own sex, in the spirit of social veracity. She has broken through cant, tradition and the sex monopoly. Hitherto, women writers have followed the lines of hero-worship. In *Jane Eyre* we had our first stock fictional villain; George Eliot and Mrs. Humphry Ward

both glorified man, and most popular women writers specialise in types of manhood according to the tradition which Dickens exploited so valiantly. It is noteworthy that in all the very popular books women play purely a subordinate part—*Pickwick*, *Robinson Crusoe*, *Robert Elsmere*, *If Winter Comes*, etc. The same applies to Walter Scott and Byron. This is pre-eminently a man's country. The popularity of Kipling is due to his masculinity. Few novels or plays have ever succeeded in this country where woman assumes the stature of a hero in the sense of romance. This is the significance of *Lummox*, who is such a heroine, who redolently exudes her being from every page, claiming one's attention, enforcing her message, redeeming her sex.

The question arises, Will women strike out on their own? Will they unbar the minds of women? Will they take fiction into their own hands and give it a new direction? There is every indication that they will and are, in fact, doing so. They are to-day free to write, and what is more important, to think. It is no longer commercially safe to poke fun at women, as the passing of the old Music Hall attests, where over three-quarters of the audience were men, and drunkenness and "the old woman" were the stock jokes. Even the Pantomime "sisters" are dead. The Smoking Hall has become a theatre of varieties. It belonged to the closed sex period when men wore smoking-caps. How well I remember an old butler who never smoked a pipe without putting on a fez; he didn't think it decent to smoke bareheaded! Dickens would have loved Marie Lloyd. He would have been staggered by Dr. Marie Stopes. Sex is no longer a secret, the monopoly joke of the low-comedian, and Mrs. MacStinger has a vote. Whatever the modern press may have done to lower standards and deprave taste, it has, at any rate, opened many doors and killed the Kingdom of Beer. The *Pickwick Papers* appear morning and afternoon to-day, attuned to both sexes. We have got on famously since the age of *Little Dorrit*. Victorian "humbug" is dead.

The "fizz" of *Pickwick* has gone, gone because Mrs. Jellyby has become reminiscent, and the Dora of to-day shingled, sleeveless, stayless, is a social unit with a slave-bangle, probably contemplating standing for Parliament. The sadness of Gissing has gone because "the Pictures" have taken his place as records of domestic tragedies, and *Thyrza* is to-day a smart typist. His social lament has lost its substance. The England that in his time was closed to women exists no more, and love has ceased to be a mystery. England no longer drinks brandy, like a lord; the sexes have levelled up. In eighty years, what a change! A whole sex is emancipated; the spirit is freedom. We have passed through a complete metamorphosis in which the most striking advance

lies in man's attitude to and understanding of woman. And it is due, primarily, to education, for which Gissing so gallantly fought his lonely literary fight. The masculine monopoly out of which Dickens evolved his uproarious symbolism has given way to an infinitely higher and more human sex or social relationship, constituting an almost revolutionary progress in thought, in conditions and in society. Taught woman has pushed open the shutters and has become an entity, a personality and a sociologist. Will she become a law-giver, like all great creative artists?

The prospect of woman's work in these times is fascinating, for the rainbow is not her fancy and she is likely to inquire closer into human causes and promptings than man, the incurable idealist; for, despite the critics, it is in this direction that fiction seems destined to develop since the motives of human actions are to-day more interesting than their unexplained, and only too frequently unexplainable, effects, in which field woman is pre-eminently adapted to shine, being less deflectable and in her nature more impressionable. The answer is not easy. Humour is the native lethal weapon, and humour is not a feminine instinct and satire is not part of her armoury; nor is she vocal as sentimentalist, being so near and attached to earth. Gissing failed for want of these attributes. He could not slobber and he could not idealise. He lacked the qualities that go to the making of "Old Bill." I never saw a man look so miserable as Gissing at a Drury Lane Pantomime—there is a well known passage in Ruskin which gives the feeling—and so Gissing never attained to an auriferous old-age. That would seem woman's pen problem. She is deprived of the fascination of physical action and so in significance dims before the lustre of man's achievements on land and water. As creator, she is handicapped. The question of her creative social power would seem to depend, in this country at any rate, upon her ability to make us laugh or weep. Can she produce a Mrs. Pickwick? Failing which, can she evolve a counterpart to "poor Jo"?

AUSTIN HARRISON.

WILLIAM TINDALE.

MANKIND has a short memory for gratitude, but a long one for wrongs. We rarely forget, even if we forgive, an injury, but gratitude is something which easily slips out of memory into the *lethe* of life. What vast stores of gratitude we owe, for example, to the pioneers in every department of life—to the men who first “blazed the trail” in unexplored quarters of the earth which are now among the richest possessions of our Empire; to the scientists and inventors, the doctors, surgeons, artists and countless others! How great the debt which few of us ever think of paying! We accept as a matter of course the benefits these men have conferred upon humanity, we regard them as the accompanying privileges of the age in which we live, but very rarely pause to spare a thought of gratitude for those who first brought these benefits within the scope and practical utility of life.

It is therefore a welcome sign—possibly also in some cases with the hope that *lateat scintillula forsan*—that many newspapers and journals, not only in this country and in other parts of the Empire, but also in the United States of America, have thought it worth while to remind the English-speaking race throughout the world what it owes to one of the pioneers in the realm of literature, William Tindale, who four hundred years ago gave to the world the first translation into English of the New Testament from the original Greek. Attention is being directed to this anniversary or, as I should prefer to call it, this milestone on the highway of our national development, not merely—and in fact in some instances altogether apart—from any religious value such a translation may possess or because of its religious importance; but because of the influence the English New Testament of 1525 has exerted upon the language and literature of the English people. Whatever religious beliefs men may hold, whatever theories regarding the inspiration of the Bible, there are few scholars who do not admit that from the point of view of literary excellence—in beauty of imagery, in poetic diction and lofty conception, the Bible is unsurpassed by any literature in the possession of the English race. “The English Bible,” declared Macaulay, “is a book which, if everything else in our language should perish, would alone suffice to show the extent of its beauty and power,” or, to quote the words of Swift, “The translators of the Bible were masters of an English style much fitter for the work than any we see in our present writings—the which is owing to the simplicity that runs through the whole.”

William Tindale was born in 1484 in Gloucestershire and entered Oxford in 1508, graduating four years later and then proceeding

to Cambridge. There exists some difference of opinion as to the motives that prompted him to this latter step. Possibly the fame of Erasmus drew him thither with a desire more diligently to pursue the knowledge of Greek and so prepare himself, though unconsciously, for his great work in life. A group of remarkable men were then in residence at Cambridge including Cranmer, Latimer, Gardiner and Bilney, and with these Tindale found men of like thoughts with himself and men who in later years were condemned to the stake as heretics, a fate which befell Tindale at the little town of Filford, near Antwerp, in 1536. How long Tindale remained at Cambridge appears somewhat uncertain, but in 1521 we find him established as chaplain “to one Master Welch, a knight of Gloucestershire, and was there schoolmaster to his children and in good favour with his master.” Sir John Welch lived at the Manor House of Little Sodbury, which stands to-day as an authentic reminder of William Tindale and of the work which he commenced within its walls but was obliged to finish and print in Germany. The Gloucestershire squire was a man who

“kept a good ordinary commonly at his table, and there resorted unto him many times sundry abbots, deans, archdeacons with divers other doctors and great beneficed men; who then, together with Master Tindale sitting at the same table, did use many times to enter communication, and talk of learned men as of Luther and of Erasmus; also of divers other controversies and questions upon the Scripture. Then Master Tindale, as he was learned and well practised in God’s matters, so he spared not to show unto them simply and plainly his judgment in matters as he thought; and when they at any time did vary from Tindale in opinion and judgment, he would show them in the book, and lay plainly before them the open and manifest places of the Scriptures, to confute their errors and confirm his sayings. And thus continued they for a certain season, reasoning and contending together divers and sundry times, till at length they waxed weary and bare a secret grudge in their hearts against him.”

So runs the record of that time—a time of ignorance, superstition and hypocrisy when, it is said, 20,000 of the priests were unable to translate the Lord’s Prayer, and even in the reign of Edward VI many priests did not know who the author of that prayer was. Ignorance frequently tries to veil itself behind vehemence, and those whose ignorance had been exposed by Tindale were vehement and active against him, and he was cited before the Chancellor of the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol. He describes what took place as follows: “When I came before the Chancellor he threatened me grievously, and reviled me and rated me as though I had been a dog; and laid to my charge whereof there could be none accuser brought forth.” He seems to have escaped without any further penalty than the Chancellor’s abusive threats

and to have about this time began his work as a translator by rendering into English a book written in Latin by Erasmus, called *The Manual of a Christian Soldier* which, although never printed, seems to have been extensively lent to friends in the neighbourhood.

Having decided on the great task of translating the New Testament, Tindale, in 1523, went to London thinking that there he could obtain help in his great undertaking. Especially was he hopeful that Tunstal, Bishop of London, who had a reputation both as a scholar and for his liberality to scholars, would help him. His hopes, however, were doomed to disappointment and after a year in London he writes: "I understood at the last not only that there was no room in my Lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament but also that there was no place to do it in all England." In May, 1524, Tindale therefore, despairing of being able to complete his translation in his native country, went to Hamburg and then to Wittenberg, where he stayed until his New Testament was finished. Probably he saw much of Luther and was undoubtedly influenced by his writings, but the English scholar was not a mere imitator or translator of Luther's German New Testament. Tindale based his English version upon the Greek text of Erasmus issued in 1522, using also the latter's Latin version, the Vulgate, and also Luther's New Testament in German.

The question of Tindale's scholarship has frequently, and often heatedly, been debated. Those who wish to belittle his work maintain that he was ignorant of Hebrew, had a very imperfect knowledge of Greek, and was only familiar with Latin and German, and that therefore his New Testament was only a translation from the Vulgate and from Luther and not from the original Greek. As a refutation of this it will be sufficient to quote from one or two of his contemporaries. Sir Thomas More, whom no one would accuse of being biased in favour of Tindale, declares that "before he (Tindale) fell into these frenzies he was taken for one full prettily learned." His enemy Cochlaeus—also known as "the scourge of Luther"—speaks of Tindale as "a man learned and skillful in languages and eloquent." Schelhorn, in writing of him to Spalatin, declares that he knew seven languages—Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Spanish, English, French and Italian—"as a native," while Herman Buschius, the friend of Erasmus, in his "*Epistolae obscurorum virorum*," appears as the great champion of Tindale, whom he declares was "the greatest critic of the sixteenth century." Froude thus adds the weight of his testimony:

"Of the translation itself, although there have been many since revised and altered they are all substantially the same. The

peculiar genius which breathes through it, the mingled tenderness and majesty, the Saxon simplicity, the preternatural grandeur, unequalled and unapproached in the attempted improvements of modern scholars, are all here and bear the impress of the mind of one Man."

Tindale did his work so well and with such a high standard of scholarship that the keenest critics, the most learned classical scholars of the four hundred years that have elapsed since, have been unable to find much fault with it, and the English New Testament in 1925 remains, with but little alteration, the English New Testament of 1525, finished by Tindale at Wittenberg. The printing of it commenced at Cologne, but owing to an order from the Senate of that city prohibiting it from being printed—an order due to the opposition of Cochlaeus—it was finished at Worms, from which city six thousand printed copies were despatched to England. To its reception by the people, the opposition of the clergy to it, the public burning of many copies at St. Paul's, and of Tindale's subsequent arrest in Antwerp and martyrdom at Fildford in 1536, we need not devote attention—they are all well authenticated facts to the student of history.

We turn rather to the influence of Tindale's work upon the literature and character of the English people. The character of a nation is affected by its literature. Goethe declares that "the decline of literature indicates the decline of a nation—the two keep pace in their downward tendencies." But the converse is also equally true, that the advance of literature indicates a nation's advance, the purity and power of literature is reflected in the purity and power of the national character. Carlyle defines literature as "the fruit of thinking souls," and thinking souls usually produce noble thoughts and lofty ideals. But these, however lofty, cannot be fully appreciated in a foreign tongue. The more we receive from other nations' literature the greater is the need for our own literature in our own tongue.

Prior to the age of Tindale the English language was unformed and in a state of transition, and was regarded as not fit for any great literary undertaking but only fit for the commonplace. Tindale showed its great capacity and suitability as a vehicle of expression of the deepest and most sublime knowledge and truths known to mankind. It was the ability to read in their own tongue a book of such lofty conceptions and ideas that awoke the sleeping consciousness and half-formed knowledge of the people to a wider view of life and its purposes, and enabled them to take their full share in the great political and social movements of the period of the Renaissance. It taught freedom, both religious and civil, it gave a new and broader outlook upon life, it voiced emotions and yearnings which hitherto had been voiceless—in a word, it

united the English people into one nation with one aim and ambition and gave birth to the character of our race. Lytton declared that "a national literature is always the biography of its humanity," and in the national literature of England it is possible to read the biographical record of the growth, development and progress of the English race; and for this no small measure of merit is due to William Tindale's work, which first threw open the sealed doors of learning and literature through which the English nation passed to a fuller life.

Bernardin de St. Pierre has declared that "Literature is the daughter of Heaven who has descended upon earth to soften and charm all human life." Life without literature, if such a condition can be imagined in these days when books, magazines and newspapers are poured out from the printing presses in their thousands—it was recently publicly stated that the number of papers and periodicals issued in Great Britain was over eighty thousand—would be a very drab existence; and most of us would agree with Seneca that "Leisure without books is the death and burial of a man alive." To live without books or newspapers—though, according to popular report, some of our statesmen never read the latter—would make life to the majority of us unbearable. There is nothing so powerful as literature to "take a man out of himself," to make him forget his troubles and to inspire him with fresh hope and courage. These things are, of course, truisms, but truisms which we accept and have become so familiar with that we never think what the loss of the ordinary everyday common accessories of life would mean. According to Johnson, "a book should teach us either to enjoy life or endure it," and no small share both of enjoyment and endurance is due to the influence of literature, an influence which in its national and popular sense began with the work of Tindale.

The history of the growth and advance of literature is not, however, an orderly progressive one, marching in step with the advance of a nation, but, at times at any rate, quite independent of such advance. In the progressive days of Elizabeth, for example, there was an abundance of literary talent which developed and expanded side by side with the development and expansion of the nation. The period which gave Goethe and Schiller to the world, on the other hand, was a period when Germany as a nation was at a very low ebb. The development of literature while undoubtedly aided by a nation's development politically and socially is not dependent upon this and has often been manifested in spite of political and social conditions. In fact, Carlyle goes so far as to assert that "during a healthy, sound, progressive period of national existence there is no literature." During the last hundred

years of our own history the most remarkable and outstanding feature has been what, for want of a better definition, we may designate as the spread of intelligence. Beginning at the end of the eighteenth century, the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars had the effect of producing a popular mental awakening which in its train brought an immense amount of both literature and fiction, the difference between the two—if we accept G. K. Chesterton's definition—being that "literature is a luxury; fiction a necessity."

We are undoubtedly a reading nation, though possibly we could not be called a literary one with the same amount of confidence. We turn to reading as a relaxation from the daily toil and prefer enjoyment, not instruction, and so read the books that teach us to enjoy life rather than those that teach us fortitude. Someone has wittily declared that "Cooks, soldiers and authors must be judged by the effects they produce." We don't mind what sort of saucepans cooks use provided their dinners are good and to our taste and we—or the majority of us—care little about the personality of authors or their methods of working so long as what they write satisfies what we are pleased to call "our literary taste." Yet the personality of an author must be reflected in his book if that book is to become popular or achieve the object the author had in view. As Emerson says in his Essay upon Goethe, "Talent alone cannot make a writer. There must be a man behind the book." And it is the revealing of his feelings, emotions, his inner self, that grips the attention and wins the affection of the reader. 'Tis to be feared that few people realise this when they read a book that has become popular and great—the popular are not always great, nor the great always popular. We think little of "the man behind the book." We admire his cleverness, his treatment of the plot, his choice of words, but of the man himself, the real "ego," we think little.

Matthew Arnold has defined literature as "a criticism of life through the medium of language," and the really "popular" books in the best and highest meaning of the word—the books that *live*—are those which are true to life in all its varied phases, written by those who know what life means, its hardships and triumphs, its passions and emotions, its jealousies and its nobility; and who from their experience have poured out their hearts into their work. It is this, the personal touch and human atmosphere, that distinguishes "literature" from mere "writing," that Tindale so strongly brought out. "The man behind the book" spoke through his translation from his heart and therefore reached the hearts and fired the imaginations of his countrymen, and lit the spark which burns so strongly to-day although more than 400

years have elapsed since it was kindled. English writers prior to Tindale—with the one possible exception of Chaucer—though their writings were not deficient in cleverness, failed to reach their contemporaries. There is an air of scholarly aloofness about their works which repelled rather than attracted and which caused them to lack that gripping power and human touch that one feels in reading the works of many writers in the century succeeding Tindale.

Three years after the appearance of his New Testament translation, years spent probably in quiet retirement at Marburg, Tindale published his first book *The Parable of the Wicked Mammon*, which purported to be a comment upon the parable of the Unjust Steward, but which was in reality a presentment of the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith. This book, as Tindale anticipated, was received by the Church authorities with intense rage, and the Archbishop of Canterbury denounced it as containing "many detestable errors and damnable opinions." Tindale's reply was to issue his longest and most elaborate work, *The Obedience of a Christian Man*, which probably exerted more influence than any other book, except the Bible, upon the Reformation movement in England. This was followed in 1530 by his translation of the Pentateuch into English and by his *Practice of Prelates*, the latter well illustrating Tindale's ability as a controversialist. In his prologue to the book of Genesis he sets forth his views upon the study of the Scriptures and declares that,

"Though a man had a precious jewel and rich, yet if he wist not the value thereof, nor wherefore it served, he were neither the better nor richer of a straw. Even so though we read the Scripture, and babble of it never so much, yet if we know not the use of it, and wherefore it was given, and what is therein to be sought, it profiteth us nothing at all. It is not enough, therefore, to read and talk of it only, but we must also desire God, day and night instantly, to open our eyes, and to make us understand and feel wherefore the Scripture was given, that we may apply the medicine of Scripture, every man to his own sores; unless that we intend to be idle disputers and brawlers about vain words, ever gnawing upon the bitter bark without and never attaining to the sweet pith within."

These are sound words of wisdom and reveal the practical common sense of the author; and if the recalling to mind of Tindale and his work enables us to put them into practice the celebration of this centenary will not have been in vain either personally or from a national point of view. *Stat magni nominis umbra.*

ATHERTON MERCER.

NATIONALISING THE LAKE DISTRICT.

THE Lake Country is gradually passing into public possession. Two great lakes, Thirlmere and Haweswater, with great acreages of moor and mountain, are already the municipal possession of Manchester and theoretically under protection. In both cases birds and animals are well guarded and thousands of acres round Thirlmere are gradually being planted with conifers. Hardy larches have established their footing half-way up the screes of Helvellyn, and it seems possible that there will be a return to the great forest of old.

Manchester is munificent to birds, animals and trees. Its interest in human visitors is naturally less. Depopulation has been the policy throughout; even Armboth Hall, drowned out when the last lift was given to the Thirlmere surface, has been added to the mighty sheep-walk already belonging to West Head, the last remaining farm in the watershed. Manchester provides excellent facilities for "passing through" her Thirlmere properties; the roads are models of excellence, and the scenery lures the motorist on, either beyond the dam at Fisher Crag, or over Dunmail Raise to Grasmere. Then Manchester smiles, hoping that he will not make return to her jealously guarded watershed. If Haweswater is municipalised in the same way, much pleasure will be lost. Let us be absolutely fair: Manchester must protect its catchment area and reservoirs against the slightest misuse. The population, even of the last tiny farm among the hills, must gradually depart as the afforestation scheme is developed. The city encourages the use of the great lakeside roads at Thirlmere, but it does not interfere with ramblers and scramblers. Camping in a catchment area is foolish, so no one pitches a tent or halts a caravan. Public access to most parts of the hills is not barred, but there are high fences to protect the young trees against the nibbling sheep which are a trouble. There are few gaps or gates in that two or three strand wire-fence which borders the Thirlmere roads. The old rights of way are absolutely respected, but few new ones are cut. Manchester might do something in that line on Armboth Fells. In a few years the ascent of Launchy Ghyll will be arduous because the close-packed larches will present a shaggy, almost unconquerable fence.

The Haweswater "nationalisation" affects an enormous area in the East Fells. The trough we know as Mardale will be filled with eighty feet of water, and the road drowned out. As church and inn at the head of the mere are to be rebuilt, presumably there will be a refuge for travelling shepherds and storm-harried wanderers. At the "Nag's Head" at Wythburn there is a rule which prevents any visitor taking a bed. Mardale will probably accept the visitor

VOL. CXXVIII.

"for one night only," even at the time of the November hunt and shepherds' meet. The great hillsides, now bleak and bare, will be radiant in coniferous woods within twenty years, but only a few hardy wanderers will reach the place. Mosedale and Swindale, as well as Heltondale, are within the new catchment area purchased for water supply.

The Lake Country, however, is giving a lead to Britain in the true nationalisation of its beauty spots. The movement is very strong and seems to have the proper lasting power. It is not a mere passing fad, like many outdoor "cultured" theories. Practically every six months there is news that a few desirable acres here and there have been given or acquired by purchase. The public remembers the big gifts, but is surprised when a wee strip here and there is accidentally discovered during a walk. The nation seems to be represented as a buyer at practically every sale of likely ground for public ownership. During the past winter the rocky front of Scafell with the deep basin of Hallowstones was purchased, and in the spring a gift of fifteen valued acres at Jenkin Crag, near the head of Lake Windermere, was made.* The Roman Camp at Ambleside, with its frontage to the Brathay-Rothay stream and to the lake, was acquired about 1913, at the same time that Queen Adelaide's Hill and Millerground were purchased. The late Canon Rawnsley was always behind the local committees who tried to raise purchase funds. He had the great genius of organisation, enthusiasm and experience. To him the Lake Country owes practically every one of its national possessions.

The first great experiments in public purchase were the Brandlehow woods on Derwentwater, opposite Keswick (with access to the open Catbells beyond), and Gowbarrow Park, with Aira Force, next to Ullswater. Both estates have since been extended. A series of local efforts has almost redeemed the east shore of Derwentwater from private ownership. Right up to Barrow House and landing there are little patches of woodland and shingle proclaimed public, strong evidence of the desire to possess the nation's beauty spots as an inalienable right. Along Ullswater the nation is now in possession of a fine shore between Gowbarrow Park and the lake, and Stybarrow crag and bays has also been purchased. Much of the Lake Country remains within ancient entailed estates, and disposal is rather a difficult matter. Many of the patches conceded come to the public at nominal prices only. An acre in a commanding position in the Lake Country is almost as precious as land in a city. Its value can never fail; indeed there is steady appreciation in the cost of beauty spots as building sites.

* Later, Sir John S. Randles secured Crow Park and other properties outside Keswick, a valuable and beautiful estate on Derwentwater which is being added to the national holdings.

The nationalisation of the open Lake Country fells is a different matter. Legal rights may not be evident on these miles of undivided common, but they exist just the same. The dales farmer has, as part of his holding, the right to pasture a limited or unlimited number of sheep, cows and horses on the great stretches of upland grass. The manorial lord has the timber and mineral rights. Of late mining has not been a great success within the Lake Country. It is two generations at least since the last plumbago was raised from the shafts in Borrowdale. At Coniston there has been both lead and copper, just as there was at Newlands, but the veins are either exhausted or entirely lost. There are evidences of iron ore here and there, even the red kidney of hematite, but the workings in Ewer Gap and Eskdale have never been successful. It may be that the manorial owner hangs on to his rights in the hope that sooner or later a workable mass of mineral will be discovered beneath the grass. Under present conditions the hopes of prospective wealth are not taxed. We are told that a landowner may wish for the nationalisation of mountain and dale without being legally able to transfer the merest trifle of a boulder.

The nationalisation of the fells has, however, commenced. In the first years after the war Lord Leconfield dedicated the cone of Scafell Pike (3,210 feet), above the 3,000 feet contour, as a memorial to the men of the dales who had fallen in battle. The actual unveiling of the inscription was an impressive ceremony, more for its surroundings than for the brief speech made by Mr. Hamer. The mist had been rolling in billows all day, now hiding, now disclosing surprise glimpses of Scafell crags, of Great Gable, Kirk Fell and Bowfell. Then for half an hour the cloud was dense, sliding forward over grass, boulder and scree. As the inscription was publicly read, the great crags of Scafell began to peep through the mask, which shortly was cast aside, and the whole mountain looked proudly forth as though conscious of some great occasion.

In 1923 the Fell and Rock Climbing Club of the English Lake District became aware that a mountain estate next Sty Head could be purchased. The Club had been endeavouring to acquire some great rock or peak as a permanent memorial to members who fell in the Great War. The sheep farms of Seathwaite in Borrowdale and Rawhead in Wasdale had been sold at prices higher than the Club thought suitable to be raised by subscription from its members. The owner of the great manor which stretches across Sty Head found himself able to make a most generous quotation, and the Club issued an appeal to its members. There was never the slightest doubt as to results. The amount necessary was oversubscribed and the Club has the nucleus of a war memorial fund for future investment, possibly in mountain property. The title-

deeds of 3,000 acres of rock, grass, scree and tarn, were handed over to the National Trust in October, 1923. The ceremony was made part of the annual dinner of the Fell and Rock Club, with Dr. Arthur Wakefield, a native of the Lake Country but of international fame for his work in Labrador and on Mount Everest, as president over an enthusiastic gathering. The Club reserved the right to place some visible memorial, and this was unveiled on Whit Sunday, 1924. The day was wet and fairly windy, but climbers and dalesfolk mustered from all directions, and not a few of the general public braved the elements. A bronze slab showing a raised map of the mountains of the new national estate and recording the purpose and names, has been fixed to the highest rocks of Great Gable. The "Climbers' Park" covers over 3,000 acres, and is divided into two portions by the gap of Sty Head. No farm or fenced land comes into this mountain gift of mountain lovers. It is a memorial which can never be effaced by man.

Five square miles of country, even though it is practically desolate mountain, makes a mark on the map. It demands a continuation of the policy of peaceful annexation. What will the future bring forth? An Access to Mountains Bill keeps peeping out of the Parliamentary jungle; but in thirty years no one has been able to capture and bring it within the boundaries of statute law. The mountain-loving public does not wish to await the capture of this interesting fugitive. The Fell and Rock Club's gift has actually secured our national footing on the mountains, and prevented their annexation by water-consuming cities. It is obvious that great mountain areas can be purchased, and that the legal tangles of ancestral acres are not beyond solution.

A Lake Country which is over-ridden by City Councils is, and must be, practically discouraged as a pleasure resort. Crowds are impossible in a catchment area. A Lake Country which is a national possession is capable of development in the public interest. The parks already thrown open are greatly appreciated by natives and visitors. Their administration acts on the lines of a public trust trusting the public not to damage and mishandle national property. Here and there small pieces of the dedicated land can earn a few pounds from grazing and cultivation. On the fells no revenue is possible; the sheep rights are part and parcel of the farms in the dales, and are not separate property to be valued.

In all, the portions of the Lake Country dedicated to public use may approach ten thousand acres. The municipal-owned area is from fifteen to twenty times that area. Within this zone the wanderer and tourist must be subordinated to the question of pure water. In the national parks his interests are paramount.

W. T. PALMER.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

WHITSUNTIDE AND THE SECURITY PACT.

THE block has at last been loosened. It needed a holiday season and a heat wave to induce the diplomatists to move. The longer half of May was taken up with a competitive game of time-killing by the Foreign Office and the Quai d'Orsay. Then suddenly, during the hot Whitsuntide week-end, there began a series of events than which we have seen none more interesting or important since Mr. MacDonald's hey-day.

When M. Briand resigned from the French Prime Ministership on April 10th he left behind a draft French answer to the German security pact proposals. M. Briand was hardly satisfied with the Herriot draft, as few successors in office are satisfied with the work of their predecessors, and, therefore, set about re-writing it. In the meantime, the Ambassadors' Conference continued the congenial business of postponing its business. M. Briand in time finished his draft and sent it on May 13th to London, where it was received by the Foreign Office on the following day. That procedure is explained by the fact that the German proposals had been made separately in the four Allied capitals. While Mr. Chamberlain was content to make a statement in the House of Commons on March 24th accepting the German basis for negotiation, M. Herriot and, after him, M. Briand chose to answer Berlin separately in writing. That was a proper course for France to take in view of the method by which the German proposals had been made. True, however, to the usual French principle of creating a united Allied front—a principle which on the face of things was inconsistent with the sending of a separate French answer to Berlin—M. Briand obtained the consent of the British Government to read the French draft before it was sent to Berlin.

The draft came before the British Cabinet on May 19th, and the British Cabinet at once found itself in a pickle, as indeed, if Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Chamberlain had used their imagination, might have been foreseen. The Briand draft stated the maximum French case with an insouciance that took the Cabinet by surprise; that is to say, it proposed to accept the German proposal for a Western European pact on condition that the proposal was turned into something wholly different, namely, into a new kind of Geneva Protocol guaranteeing all the treaty frontiers of Germany, including those in the East, with the sanction of the entire military, naval, and air strength of the British Empire. It was understood that even Mr. Chamberlain's breath was taken away by the reading of that document. Now the British Cabinet had agreed to

read it before it went to Berlin; the whole world would know that the British Cabinet had read it; and the draft was ambiguously worded to suggest that, although in form it was a French note, in content it was an Allied Note.

What, therefore, was to be done? Clearly, in the first place, the Ambassadors' Conference must be again postponed, and it was postponed; and, secondly, M. Briand must be invited to "elucidate" some of the more startlingly clear points in his draft, and the elucidations were therefore asked for. Thereby a week's time was gained, during which the British Cabinet brooded, and the French Government, whose diplomatic staying power is well known, unconcernedly drew up the elucidations asked for by London. As a matter of politeness M. Briand explained at great length what he had intended to convey in his original draft. He might, so far as the substance of the elucidations was concerned, have simply underlined the draft and sent it back again to London.

On May 28th the Cabinet met and considered the "elucidations," euphemistically so-called, and decided that the beating about the bush had now been overworked as a diplomatic device. The Cabinet therefore took its courage in both hands and sent a renewed statement of British policy to Paris of so categorical a quality that M. Briand should understand it. That "elucidation" more correctly so-called, was the healthiest thing that had happened so far during 1925. Four months had elapsed since Germany proposed the pact. The proposal had meant one thing to its author and to the British Government, and a wholly different thing to the French Government. It is only fair to M. Briand's reputation for elasticity and common sense to recognise that his intransigence on this occasion—a trait which had been alien to him up to January, 1922—was due to his belief, whether well or badly founded, that Mr. Chamberlain, and through him the British Government, could be relied on to dance, if not to an all-French programme, at any rate to an all-French orchestra. That belief died hard in France, but was definitely weakened by the British Cabinet's action of May 28th.

M. Briand, on receiving the British communication, quickly recovered his form as an agile diplomatist, and acted in a manner wholly worthy of his reputation. The British communication this time had taken the form of "suggestions" to the French Government. Stripped of their sugar, they amounted to one single suggestion, namely, that the French Government should, in its answer to Berlin, accept the offer that had been made by Germany and supported by Great Britain, rather than an offer that had neither been made by the one nor could be supported by the other. To the probable surprise of Mr. Chamberlain, and to the open-eyed

interest of the British public, the whole French press broke out into an enthusiastic chorus of welcome to the British suggestions. What had happened was that M. Briand had invited representatives of the entire French press to meet him confidentially, and he explained to them the nature of the situation. He explained that the British Government, with no matter what Foreign Secretary, would never agree to any commitment which would enmesh Great Britain in the complicated series of treaties now in force between France, Poland and the Little Entente countries; that France therefore had to choose, on the one hand, between a peace pact which would guarantee the Franco-German and the Belgian-German frontiers, and on the other hand, a French lone-hand policy supported, for what the support might be worth, by military allies in Central Europe; that if France refused the exclusively Western pact, as offered, she would be exposed to the whole world as the Power responsible for the failure of the pact, French diplomacy would suffer badly in prestige, and the catchword about French militarism would be given a new lease of life abroad; the franc would suffer from the loss of British and American support, and France would be bereft of friends in face of the increasingly difficult and dangerous situation in Morocco; that, finally, the French Government, in view of these considerations, had decided to fall in with the British suggestions, and to agree to the divorce of the East from the West as a basis of negotiation. He appealed to the French press for its support in a national emergency.

The French press always rises to an appeal made on patriotic grounds, especially if made by the charming personality of M. Briand, and the world was informed from Paris that France and Great Britain were in perfect accord. That happened during the Whitsuntide week-end, and constituted the most important event since the German proposals were made. The French Government was no doubt helped towards its decision by the knowledge that the Belgian Government was unreservedly in favour of the pact, Belgium having no interest in Eastern alliances, but having a lively interest in a guarantee of her frontiers against a repetition of what happened in 1914.

It was not an accident that the Ambassadors' Conference that same week-end decided to send the long-delayed Allied Note to Berlin about disarmament and Cologne; for it was an open secret that the only reason why the Allies had delayed for four and a half months to explain to the German Government the detailed reasons why Cologne had not been evacuated on January 10th was that there had been no prospect of agreement between the French and British Governments about the security pact, and the

question of Cologne was in its essence a minor aspect of the general problem of security.

The first seven days of June were as full of important events as any seven consecutive days since the war. In addition to the French acceptance of the British suggestions, and the sending to Berlin of the Allied Disarmament Note (June 4th) there was the departure of Mr. Chamberlain for Geneva (June 6th), and his meeting there with M. Briand (June 7th) at which the final form of the French Note to Berlin was agreed to. In the eyes of the public on both sides of the Channel there was a confusion commensurate with the pace at which events were moving. Diplomatic history has a habit of repeating itself. After the first chorus of French agreement with Great Britain there came a second chorus, of which the burden was that the agreement had been reached on French terms. On June 1st it began to be given out semi-officially in Paris that the British memorandum of suggestions (May 28th) had conceded the principle that the demilitarised Rhine zone prescribed in Articles 42 to 44 of the Treaty of Versailles and destined to form the basis of the security pact should be unilateral; that is to say, that while acting as an absolute barrier against any German invasion of France, it should be subject to conditions which would allow France to cross Germany in case of trouble on the Eastern borders. An outcry arose in Great Britain, and the British diplomatists were silent, thinking no doubt to help M. Briand by their silence. Of course the British memorandum had said nothing of the kind. The British Government never committed itself to anything beyond the general principles, namely, that the German offer of a bilateral pact, applicable against either France or Germany, whichever became the aggressor, and confined to the Franco-German and Belgian-German frontiers, should be accepted, and that the details should be worked out in collaboration with German representatives.

Yet the misunderstanding was not entirely due to the exigencies of party politics in Paris, that is, to the need of silencing the Poincarists. It was at the same time due to some interpretative work on the part of French thinkers. British official circles succeeded in discouraging the detailed discussion of general principles so far as the British press was concerned, but who shall keep Frenchmen from details? A principle means nothing to a Frenchman except as translated into terms of what would happen in a given contingency. The question had apparently been asked of London whether a French acceptance of the British suggestions would make it impossible for France to carry out her treaty obligations to Poland, and the answer naturally was "Of course not." French opinion interpreted that assurance in its own way,

and argued that, if France could still honour her treaty obligations to Poland, then France would of course be allowed to cross the Rhine zone without waiting for League of Nations sanction. French deductive reasoning, however, took a false course from sound premises, and therein neatly illustrated Mr. Chamberlain's recently expounded hypothesis that logic is an unreliable guide in political philosophy. What had been implied of course from the British side was that there was no reason why French commitments to Poland should not be merged in the general commitments of the signatories of the League Covenant. The way in which the merging would be effected was naturally a subject for future discussion, but to those who are in the habit of thinking about these things there were two obvious lines of argument:

(1) That Poland is a member of the League, and therefore if she be attacked by either Germany or Russia, whether Germany or Russia be members of the League or not, Article 10 of the Covenant would automatically become operative: "The members of the League (it runs) undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League." The Franco-Polish Treaty of 1921 did no more than particularise a general and already existent obligation.

(2) That the particular French commitment is to guarantee the Polish frontiers. Now those frontiers were created by the Treaty of Versailles; if they were modified by that same Treaty—that is, through the operation of Article 19 of the Covenant, which is likewise Article 19 of the Treaty—both Poland and France would be part instruments in the modification, and clearly no issue could thereby arise on the score of the Franco-Polish Treaty.

There was some pleasant irony in the fact that the supporters of the pact could make the same argument to reassure British disquiet about the pact as to reassure French disquiet about the Polish commitment. The obvious argument for France was that the Polish treaty merely particularised the existing obligations of the Treaty. The argument for Great Britain was that the pact would merely particularise the general Covenant obligation and would moreover amend the obligation of Article 44 of the Treaty in a sense favourable to British opinion. This aspect of the case is perhaps worth looking at more closely. The British Government, and indeed the whole British Empire, is committed by the Covenant to defend the existing frontiers in Europe, subject to the modificatory potentiality of Article 19; and by Article 44 of the Treaty is committed to defend, unilaterally against German aggression, the demilitarised zone prescribed in Articles 42 and 43. It is true that the wording of Article 44 of the Treaty is that

a violation of the demilitarised zone is to be considered "a hostile act," but I believe the international jurists regard that formula as much more serious than "an unfriendly act" and as practically equivalent to *casus belli*. Now the proposed pact in the British view would (1) be concluded under the ægis of the League; (2) merely reaffirm the commitment of Article 10 of the Covenant (which safeguards the frontiers); but (3) would transform the unilateral obligation of Article 44 of the Treaty into a reciprocal obligation, whereby the British Government would defend Germany against a French crossing of the zone as much as France against a German crossing.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN GOES TO GENEVA.

Mr. Chamberlain left London for Geneva on June 6th, met M. Briand there on the following day, and without further ado they agreed on the final text of the French Note for Berlin. The chorus thereupon broke out again in the French press, to the effect that Mr. Chamberlain had mortgaged the British Army, Navy and Air Force for the help of France against Germany. One understood, however, from British official quarters that on the contrary M. Briand had agreed to the vague British formula. There were indeed many interests to induce France to accept. France was offered by Germany and by Great Britain a guarantee of her frontiers with Germany. That was all in France's favour, and important sections of British opinion doubted its wisdom from the British point of view. Next the franc was in difficulties, and it was a material consideration in Paris not to create the impression in London and in New York that French policy was the stumbling block. Then there was the increasing danger in Morocco, where France would be loth to find herself bereft of the moral support of friendly nations. Finally, there was the consideration that Germany offered no danger to France as a friend, but would be a formidable enemy. M. Briand therefore used his well-known commonsense when he plunged in favour of a French acceptance. While distorted accounts of the Briand-Chamberlain agreement came to London from Geneva and Paris—distorted with the usual French distortion—official quarters in London refused for twenty-four hours to correct the mistakes.

Contact with British official quarters is one of the best safeguards against cynicism. Those quarters are as charmingly green in matters of this kind as they were five years ago, and probably as they were fifty years ago. The number of times British diplomats have agreed on a mutual pact of secrecy with foreign diplomats who could as soon jump the moon as keep a secret is unbelievable. It happens every time with the old freshness, it is followed

every time by the same result—leakage abroad, uncomfortable silence at home; and it happens again the next time. After the whole world, therefore, had been informed that at the last moment Mr. Chamberlain had agreed with M. Briand that the pact should be unilateral in France's favour, and London had not denied it, out of a tender solicitude for M. Briand's domestic worries, British opinion became restive. The British diplomats had forgotten British opinion, and Mr. Baldwin therefore on June 10th had to make a statement in the House of Commons denying that any commitment of the kind had been made. In fairness to the British Government it must be remembered that the problem of bringing France and Germany to the same point at the same time is a six years' old problem, whereas the ultimate reasonableness of British opinion may with historical justification be counted on.

The initiative now shifted to Berlin. It depended on Berlin to counter the powerful Poincarist forces in Paris which looked for German "gaffe" to stultify the negotiations and thus to focus the responsibility on Germany. British diplomats therefore became anxious that the German Government should lose no time in making a strong demonstration of its determination to carry out the disarmament demands of the Allies, to seek admission to the League of Nations, to continue the loyal execution of the Dawes Plan, and generally to leave the would-be wreckers with no handle at their disposal. What the wreckers particularly counted on was the chance of making out a case against Germany on the score of non-fulfilment of the disarmament demands so as to thwart Germany's entry into the League this autumn, and thus to postpone the whole question of the pact for twelve months. That was the main reason why students of diplomacy regarded the Allied disarmament Note as a tactical blunder.

In advance of detailed negotiations between Germany, Belgium, France, Great Britain and possibly Italy, all that the British Government had undertaken was to discuss the German proposal for a mutual Western European pact. British official quarters, however, were not blind to the nature of French commitments to Poland and to Czechoslovakia, and while regarding the Covenant of the League as a full and sufficient instrument for the carrying out of these commitments, could hardly regard it as a perfect instrument. There was for instance the nightmare of Article 15 of the Covenant: "If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof other than the reports of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the members of the League reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice." What would happen in case of a German-Polish war

in which the League Council failed to establish the aggressor? That was perhaps, as seen ahead, the weakest point in the projected pact; but by the time Europe reaches such an impasse, no League, no pact will be worth the ink it was printed with, and we may as well dismiss the nightmare.

If the British Government in the event signs the pact, the 1914 situation will be stereotyped, and that is important enough for the moment. One question that will have to be answered is how far Dominion approval will be necessary. Before knowing the details of the proposed pact, Dominion opinion without exception was vaguely unsympathetic to the principle of it. Could Great Britain incur a limited liability, not shared by the Dominions? Could a pact be left open for voluntary adherence by the Dominions, on the model of the Anglo-German Commercial Treaty of last December? Or must Dominion approval and Dominion participation be fully obtained in advance? Those are questions whose solution will probably, by the establishment of a precedent, affect the British Empire for all future time. It is true that the Dominions signed the Treaty of Versailles as separate signatories, but they signed the same Treaty. For Great Britain to sign an obligation involving the future issue of peace or war without Dominion participation would inevitably weaken Empire unity. It may be pointed out that the Dominions are already committed by Article 44 of the Treaty of Versailles, and that the proposed pact is merely a reaffirmation, on better terms, of the obligation: but it might equally be argued that the Geneva Protocol was merely a reaffirmation and elaboration of the 1919 Covenant, and the Empire as a whole was none the less against it. One of the most interesting and important aspects of the pact problem is bound to be its effect on the relations of Great Britain with the Empire.

At the time when these notes were written (June 15th) it was understood that the dossier of the Pact discussions would be published.

THE ALLIED DISARMAMENT NOTE.

There was published on June 6th in the form of a British White Paper (Germany No. 2 (1925) Command 2429) and in the Allied and German capitals in corresponding forms, the text of the Allied communication to Berlin about Germany's failure to carry out fully the disarmament clauses of the Treaty of Versailles and the resultant Allied refusal to evacuate Cologne. The document consisted of the Allied Note and four annexes concerned with the details of Germany's defaults, in all an exceedingly bulky volume as heavy in matter as light in wisdom. The only hope of minimising its clumsiness lay in Berlin. If the German Government could

avoid being "drawn," could make a single-eyed effort to carry out the demands made, and at the same time hold fast to their own pacific proposals of January 30th, all might still be well. It was, however, deplorable that such a document should be shot at Berlin at a time when the supreme business of European diplomacy was to get on with the security pact. The French Poincarists hardly concealed their glee; and the British imprimatur was a puzzle. The most surprising thing in it was that it did, after all one had been led to understand to the contrary, include the report of the minute investigations of the Inter-Allied Commission of control, which had been spread over many years.

British diplomacy, it is fair to record, had fought against presenting this report to Berlin, and it was a British touch which was evident in those passages of the document which separated the most serious defaults from the full list, and which informed the German Government that Cologne would be evacuated as soon as the selected list of defaults had been seen to by Germany. Even Part 3, however, in which the selected list was given and the detailed demands formulated, was long and serious enough. It involved legislation on the part of the German Government, the text of which was to be approved by the Allied Military Commission of Control, and the execution of which the Commission was to supervise. It was already June, and one could understand the calculation of those European wreckers who first helped to postpone the Note for five months and then hoped that Germany would not be able to carry out the demands before the League Assembly met in the autumn. If the delay was astonishing, the particular time finally chosen for the event was still more astonishing. There was no reference in the Note to Germany's admirable peace initiative of January; the style of the Note was lacking in grace, and missed, as if deliberately, the opportunity of assuring Germany that the Allies wanted peace. It was, in short, a severe test for German pacifism and goodwill, and a proof of the second-rate quality of diplomatists on whom we are now dependent. Commonsense ought to have counselled them not to throw bombs in the middle of pacific discussions about peace pacts. The irony was that only Germany, by showing superior sense, could now save them from their provocative folly. On the other hand, just as British diplomacy had attempted to humanise the document in the collective making of it, so now British diplomacy was at pains to make it understood in Berlin that, although Cologne could not be evacuated before the demands were fulfilled, there is no reason why Germany should not join the League this autumn, even if by September the demands had

not been fully met, provided only that Germany had in the meantime shown goodwill and a reasonable measure of accomplishment in the execution.

The annexes to the Note may be thus summarised: Part 1 takes the military clauses one by one and states how far each clause has been complied with. Part 2 gives a list of 13 points under the military clauses upon which satisfaction has not yet been given. The points are as follows:

(i) Organisation of the police. (ii) Factories, depôts and workshops. Certain destructions, dispersions and transformations still required. (iii) Delivery of certain surplus war material. (iv) Organisation of the German Army as laid down by the Treaty. (v) Regulation of recruiting and military training. (vi) Import and export of war material. (vii) Possession of, traffic in, and illicit manufacture of war material. (viii) Forbidden zones. (ix) War requisitions. (x) Königsberg fortress. (xi) Fortifications and coast defences. (xii) Plans necessary to enable accurate files to be made up with regard to statistical returns respecting fortifications. (xiii) Delivery of documents relative to existing stocks of war material and the production of German factories during the war and after the armistice.

Part 3 contains a detailed list of the measures which must be taken by Germany before the military clauses of the Treaty of Versailles can be held to have been satisfactorily fulfilled. It is drawn up in two columns, one showing the present situation, the other the points which must be rectified:—

(i) Police. (Article 162 of the Treaty and the Boulogne Note of June, 1920.) The Police must remain a State and municipal organisation. Its effectives, which are now about 180,000, must be reduced to the 150,000 authorised by the Boulogne Note of 1920. The military character presented to-day by the Schutz-polizei must entirely disappear.

(ii) Factories, depôts and workshops. (Articles 168 and 169 of the Treaty.) Detailed lists are given of the factories, etc., where rectifications are required, and the Control Commission is generally left to indicate what precise measures must be taken. The lists are divided into the following categories: (a) Private factories other than authorised factories. (b) Former State factories. (c) Authorised factories. (The most important are Krupps, the Rheinmetall at Düsseldorf, the Dortmunder union and the W.A.S.A.G. at Reinsdorf.) (d) Military establishments. (e) Military workshops with units. (f) Police workshops.

(iii) Delivery of surplus war material. (Articles 167, 168, and 169 of the Treaty.) All existing material in excess of the scales laid down by the Control Commission must be surrendered, e.g.,

spare parts for small arms, Minenwerfer, machine guns, etc., blank cartridges.

(iv) Organisation of the German Army in accordance with the conditions laid down by the Treaty. (Articles 160, 161, 176, 178, 198 and 199 of the Treaty.) The Treaty lays down that the German Army shall be devoted exclusively to the maintenance of order within the territory and the control of the frontiers. Consequently, (a) The High Command. The German decree of August 11th, 1920 (which is still in force) had the effect of conferring the powers of a Commander-in-Chief upon the head of the Army directorate and of grouping the administrative services in a special organisation (*Heeresverwaltung*) under a Secretary of State directly responsible to the Minister for War. This has created an organ of executive command (in fact a Commander-in-Chief with a Great General Staff) contrary to Article 160 of the Treaty. The decree must therefore be abolished and fresh measures promulgated in its place after the approval of the Commission of Control. (b) General Staff. The *Heeresleitung* includes an organisation in many ways similar to the pre-war Great General Staff. This must be suppressed and the necessary measures after approval by the Commission of Control promulgated and put into force. (c) Military organisation of the railway system. The military organisation of the railway system to-day is constituted with a view to mobilisation on much the same lines as in 1914. In fact, the number of closed trucks prepared for military use is actually greater than in 1914, roughly 200,000 as against 160,000. This must be rectified and the organisation made to conform with the Treaty, which forbids all measures of mobilisation. (d) Arms and effectives. It has been proved that divisional staffs include in addition to their regular strength attached officers from units, and that supplementary cadres exist in units. This must be stopped by decree. So also must the co-operation of aeroplanes with the Army. (e) Services. The administrative personnel must be reduced to the authorised numbers. Reserve rations for the Reichswehr must be reduced to the scales laid down by the Control Commission. (f) Coast artillery school at Wilhelmshaven. This will be authorised provided that all army personnel are excluded from it.

(v) Recruiting and military training. (Articles 173, 174, 177 and 178 of the Treaty.) The following must be suppressed by legislation: (a) Short term enlistment with the Reichswehr. (b) The preparation of reserve cadres. (c) The military activities of associations.

(vi) Import and export of war material. (Articles 170 and 192 of the Treaty.) The German Government and the Control Com-

mission are already in negotiation for the settlement of this question.

(vii) Possession of, traffic in, and illicit manufacture of war material. (Articles 168 and 169 of the Treaty.) Legislation must be brought into harmony with the Treaty and put into force.

(viii) Forbidden zones. (Articles 115, 178, 180 and 195.) Legislation must be promulgated and put into force for the suppression of all forbidden zones.

(ix) War requisitions. (Article 178 of the Treaty.) Legislation must be brought into harmony with the Treaty and put into force.

(x) Königsberg fortress. (Articles 167, 169 and 196.) All the guns must be placed on fixed mountings, and their excess spare parts delivered or destroyed.

(xi) Fortifications and coast defences. (Articles 167, 169 and 196.) The guns must be placed on fixed mountings.

(xii) Delivery of the plans necessary for the compilation of accurate returns of fortifications. These must be delivered.

Annex II consists of a letter addressed by the Reparation Commission to the Ambassadors' Conference answering in the affirmative the question whether Germany is at the present moment faithfully fulfilling her reparation obligations as at present fixed.

THE AMERICAN DEBT "DRIVE."

In May the United States began a determined "drive" for the collection of debts. Senator Borah, Chairman of the United States Committee on Foreign Relations, wrote articles in the *London Observer* on the subject, Mr. Houghton dropped a broad hint to Europe in the course of a speech in London, press messages from America concentrated on the subject, and on May 17th it became known that the United States Government had circularised her European debtors to draw their attention to their unpaid debts to America. In the semi-official argument that accompanied the "drive" two new points were made: one, the attractive one, that American opinion was loth to encourage the war habit by letting off any belligerent from its debts to America; the other, that in the case of France America would not now insist on a 100 per cent. repayment. For the first time since 1914 Great Britain found herself "splendidly isolated." She was not affected directly by this American "drive." None the less, the Treasury had its weather eye well open. Great Britain is a creditor like America, but unlike America, she has received nothing from her debtors. She is also a debtor like the other European States, but, unlike those others, she pays. There is a straight issue between America as creditor and the Continental European States as debtors. Great Britain is both, and so far has got the worst of both worlds.

In what may be called official financial quarters here there is a tendency to be on guard against the possible re-emergence of a danger which first threatened at the beginning of this year, and which led to the famous *pari passu* formula being enunciated by official British quarters. It then arose out of a French suggestion that the French debt to the United States should be funded on more favourable terms than those accorded by the United States to Great Britain.

If the new American move leads to anything practical it will inevitably lead, so far as France and Italy are concerned, to a restatement of the British standpoint, which may be expressed in this way: It is no business of Great Britain whatever settlement is made between the United States on the one side and by France and Italy on the other. Our only affair is that we have funded our debt and are paying. If the United States were to penalise us for being the first to pay by giving other debtors preferential terms, then we should have our view on the matter, but we should keep it to ourselves. One stipulation, however, we have every right to make, and we make it, namely, that if any payment whatever is made to the United States by France, Italy, or any common debtor of Great Britain and the United States, payment shall be made to Great Britain *pari passu* with payment made to the United States. That is to say: (1) No payment shall ever be made, for instance by France to America, either of interest or of capital, unless at the same time a corresponding payment is made to Great Britain. (2) The payment made to Great Britain shall bear at least an equal proportionate relation to the debt as the payment made to the United States. (3) On no occasion shall the total sum paid to America exceed the total sum paid to Great Britain.

The ethics of this position simply are that Great Britain must not be made to suffer for having acted honestly and that France, having been dealt with patiently by Great Britain, must not grant priority treatment to a rival creditor.

THE BOOMERANG.

M. Caillaux showed no sign of perturbation in face of the American reminder. He had not returned to the subject of debts since he vaguely suggested earmarking a percentage of the Dawes annuities for repayment (see *CONTEMPORARY REVIEW*, June, page 783). In case the American reminder is repeated, it might be well for it to take account of some convincing French arguments in favour of a French repayment of debts. Last November, when the Morgan loan of 100,000,000 dollars was raised for France in New York, M. Clémentel, the French Finance Minister, wrote

part of the prospectus in the form of a letter of some 1,000 words, the burden of which was to prove the security of the loan by reason precisely of the flourishing financial and economic state of France. He gave tables showing that the excess of expenditure over revenue had been reduced from 23,759,000,000 francs in 1919 to 4,183,000,000 francs in 1924. He described the table as showing "in a striking way the progressive betterment of the budgetary situation." He also said: "The receipt by France of her share of these payments [i.e., the Dawes annuities] will enable the Government to accelerate the execution of its program of full financial rehabilitation and to proceed to the more rapid amortisation of the public debt." The adjective "more rapid" as applied to something which had not yet started to move was as easy of justification as the schoolboy's letter to his mother in which, starting from the premise that he knew nothing when he went to school, he now declared that he knew a hundred times as much.

M. Clémentel elaborated his points. "France has turned (he wrote) to the intensive development of her foreign trade. This effort has been most successful. . . . The recent development of France's export trade is in large measure due to the return to productivity of the great industrial centers devastated during the war. For example, the average monthly production of coal, exclusive to Alsace-Lorraine, which in 1919 had declined to 48.5 per cent. of the 1913 production, has reached during the first nine months of the current year 96 per cent. of the 1913 monthly average. The output of iron ore, excluding the important production of Alsace-Lorraine, has more than doubled since the conclusion of peace. Similar progress has been made in the finished steel, textile and chemical industries." As for the devastated regions, "of the area rendered unfit for cultivation as a result of war damage, which at the time of the Armistice covered 8,150,000 acres, all but 815,000 acres had been restored to productivity." Would that anything like such an achievement had been made in the reconstruction of the devastated provinces of British trade! "Great progress," ends M. Clémentel, "has been made in reconstruction, industrial productivity and foreign trade." The picture is so rosy that one almost begins to hope that France will pay the British debt.

CHINA AND THE POWERS.

At seven o'clock in the evening of June 11th a mob broke into the British Concession at Hankow armed with stones with which they attacked the police and members of the Municipal Council. That was the beginning of a climax which had been led up to for some time by anti-foreign, and particularly anti-British demon-

strations in China. There occurred a series of incidents which involved the killing and wounding of many people and in which British forces refrained from action till the very last moment. The British Chargé d'Affaires addressed a vigorous note of protest and warning to the Central Government in Peking. The seriousness of these events is that they jeopardise the movement for a better treatment of China by the Powers, which was started at the Washington Conference in 1921. China has for many years placed a strain on the patience and the sympathy of those Western Powers who are interested in her. She is a vast anarchic country which without the protection of the Powers would be at the mercy of the most aggressive neighbour who chose to make an inroad. For the last twenty-five years or so the chief Powers interested in China have protested their adhesion to certain progressive principles in relation to China, but it was not until the Washington Conference in 1921 that those principles were reduced to form and definitely subscribed by the Powers.

China had been led to expect great benefits from the Washington Conference, and Mr. Sze, the head of the Chinese Delegation, buoyantly started in by the well known ten demands of China, which were made by way of encouraging the Powers. The text of the ten demands need not be recalled, but they amounted to a demand that the Powers should on the one hand abandon all their rights and interests in China, and should allow China to go to perdition or to prosperity in her own way; but that, on the other hand, presumably to allow China a greater liberty in her progress the one way or the other, the Powers should undertake to protect her from all foreign aggression. Such a programme of course was hardly acceptable. None the less, Mr. Elihu Root drew up a series of resolutions—the well-known "Root Resolutions"—which, on November 21st, 1921, were formally signed by the United States, Belgium, the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands and Portugal. The resolutions were:

- (1) To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China.
- (2) To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself effective and stable government.
- (3) To use their influence for the purpose of effectually establishing and maintaining the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations and throughout the territory of China.
- (4) To refrain from taking advantage of the present conditions in order to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of the subjects or citizens of friendly States, and from countenancing action inimical to the security of such States.

On December 8th a further resolution, proposed by Sir Auck-

land Geddes, was adopted, stipulating "That the Powers attending this Conference (the eight Powers quoted above) declare it is their intention not to enter into any treaty, agreement, arrangement or understanding either with one another or individually or collectively with any Power or Powers which infringes or impairs the principles which have been declared by the resolution adopted on November 21st by this Committee."

Nor was that all. China was, in 1921, as bankrupt as usual, and the Powers, therefore, decided for her general encouragement to provide her with money. On February 6th, 1922, the eight Powers and China signed two treaties, the first embodying the Root Resolutions and the principle of "The open door," and the second making certain customs concessions. The Customs Treaty gave to China an immediately effective 5 per cent. customs tariff and provided for the convening of a special Conference to abolish the *likin* (the local internal customs duties), and to institute new customs duties which would represent, it was estimated, an increase of revenue to China of about twenty million pounds sterling a year. Although, therefore, the Chinese demand for complete tariff autonomy was refused, China was promised a substantial concession. A special customs conference was to meet within three months of the coming into force of the various treaties. Up to now, France has postponed her ratification and the conference therefore has never met. There is, however, reason to expect that France is about to ratify, and it is therefore anticipated that the customs conference can be arranged for the autumn of this year. When it meets, the opportunity will be taken by the Powers to point out to China that the disturbances and anti-foreign demonstrations which came to a head in June represent a violation of the Chinese undertakings at Washington, and that unless the Central Chinese Government can provide a convincing guarantee that such disorders shall stop, it will be impossible for the Powers to carry out the promises they made on their side.

June 15th, 1925.

GEORGE GLASGOW.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
1. REVIEWS	117
GENERAL LEE; SIR CHARLES NAPIER; EUROPE BEFORE THE WAR; FALSTAFF AND OTHERS; SIR JAMES FRAZER'S NEW VOLUME; ST. SAMSON OF DOL; THE YEAR BOOK SERIES.	
2. SHORTER REVIEWS: "Scientific Papers mainly on Electro-dynamics and Natural Radiation, including the substance of an Adams Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge"; "Christianity and the Roman Government: a Study in Imperial Administration"; "Modern Masters of Etching"; "A Short Review of Education in Leicestershire since the War"	133
3. NOTICES OF BOOKS: "Anecdotes of the late Samuel Johnson, LL.D., during the last Twenty Years of his Life"; "The Author's Book: being Notes for the Guidance of Authors in Dealing with Publishers"; "The Defence of the Child by French Novelists"; "Ihe-Nmuta Sunday School N'Asusu Ibo"	136

GENERAL LEE.*

General Maurice, in this masterly monograph on the achievements of General Lee, the famous General of the South in the American Civil War of 1861-1865, takes up such a judicial position and surveys the whole problem of the great campaigns that ended with the noble surrender at Appomattox in so thorough a fashion that the book must become a textbook in all military Academies. He criticises freely Lee's mistakes, and they were few but, perhaps, vital; he enters into Lee's mind and his personality in a fashion that has rarely been used in analysing the causes why fields are lost and won; he brings out the salient characteristics of the campaigns in a way that makes very complex movements understandable to the lay mind, and he makes clear, in so far as such mysteries can be made clear, the manifestations of genius that enabled Lee to win marvellous victories against tremendous odds, and almost to snatch triumph for the South by breaking the spirit and will for struggle of the North at a moment when the South was at the end of its resources. Had it not been for Lincoln and Grant the North would have come to terms.

The end was what it should have been. The South stood for separatism and for all that would sow the seeds of future wars.

* *Robert E. Lee: The Soldier.* By Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice. (Constable. 15s. net.)

Slavery was not the real issue though it precipitated the issue. The principle of slavery was waning in any event and would have died a natural death. The real issue was the unity of the States of the Union, and by some cursed spite Robert E. Lee thought it incumbent upon him to fight for state independence and to become the warrior of local as opposed to federal patriotism. It is not possible to regret that the South was defeated. Perhaps the fight had to be fought and the principle of national unity vindicated. If it had to be fought it was as well that it should have been so fought out that the issue could never arise again. It became certain that it would be fought out to the bitter end when Lee, on April 20th, 1861, resigned his commission in the army of the United States.

Why he resigned his commission it is almost impossible to understand. He did not believe in secession. Writing in January 1861, he declared that "Secession is nothing but revolution," and that if the Union were dissolved he would only draw his sword in defence of his native State of Virginia. He was then a man of fifty-four, and he was the most experienced soldier in the States with over thirty years of service. He was a highly trained military engineer, he knew a good deal of military administration, he had seen active service in very difficult country in the war of 1845 with Mexico, and there he established his reputation; he knew well many of the generals against whom he was destined to fight. He possessed vast ability, great moral and physical courage. He was a man with deep religious convictions who not only inspired confidence but love.

His reputation was such that on the outbreak of the Civil War he became the chief military adviser and organiser of the Confederate Government. His first business was to consider how the obvious superiority of the North to the South in general resources could be countered. His plans from the first, whether as to enlistment, to the organisation of a staff and to the order of battle, was for the first half of the war superior to those of the North. He worked loyally under President Davis, and Davis never wavered in his faith in him and gave him good subordinates, the chief of whom was the immortal "Stonewall" Jackson. Lee did not expect or wish to conquer the North. He believed that he could force the North to let the South stand out of the Union, and he very nearly succeeded. This limited objective made it possible to organise first a defensive campaign, in the next stage an offensive campaign which would threaten Washington and frighten the North, and in the last and, perhaps, most glorious phase of his fighting, to wage a defensive war that was endless and so tire out the patience of the North. Had it not been for

Grant's indifference to terrible losses the last phase might have been successful.

General Maurice describes in a most fascinating narrative these three phases. The defence of the Confederate capital, Richmond, is a brilliant instance of a defensive-offensive. Lee knew the mind of the Federal commanders and political leaders and outplayed them with ease. The combination of Lee and Jackson was ideal. Jackson, the ruthless Puritan, could respond as no other man could to the mind and the strategy of Lee. The famous Seven Days' Battle at the end of June, 1862, showed Lee as a superb strategist, but there were faults in tactics which robbed him of the full fruits of victory. Yet Richmond was not only saved, but the South was in full fighting trim and greater achievements were to follow. The story of the first offensive in Maryland in the autumn of 1862, though there were errors of judgment, is one of operations of genius in the face of uniform ill-fortune. The campaign is "a remarkable example of calculated boldness and of imaginative strategy," and at the end, after a campaign of terrible fierceness, Colonel Wolseley, who visited Lee's army, spoke of it in terms of enthusiasm. The defeat of Hooker near Chancellorsville in early May, 1863, was an achievement "which more than any other, displays Lee's faculty for calculated daring." But the death of "Stonewall" Jackson on the field was destined to neutralise this great victory. General Maurice writes, "the quaint prayer of the Confederate Chaplain, 'When in Thine inscrutable decree it was ordained that the Confederacy should fail, it became necessary for Thee to remove Thy servant Jackson' had in it little of exaggeration." None of Lee's commanders had the qualities of Jackson, and that stout but dilatory fighter Longstreet could not take his place. The failure of the second invasion of Maryland was, at any rate, partly due to the obstinacy of Longstreet before and during the terrible struggle of Gettysburg. The battle was lost on July 3rd, 1863, but Lee withdrew in good order into Virginia to begin the third phase of the great struggle. The story of the masterly defence against Grant makes the student think that the famous Federal General entirely under-estimated the capacity of his great opponent. Indeed, after the war, he is reported as having said: "I never ranked Lee so high as some others in the army. . . . Lee was of a slow, cautious nature, without imagination, or humour, always the same, with grave dignity." Grant had never known Lee, indeed, had only met him once when Lee had had to reprimand him for his slovenly appearance. The estimate was prejudiced and absurd. Even the bitter Longstreet declared that "on the defensive Lee was absolutely perfect." Lord Wolseley said of

him, "He was the ablest general, and to me seemed the greatest man I had ever conversed with, and yet I have had the privilege of meeting von Moltke and Prince Bismarck. . . . General Lee was one of the few men who ever seriously impressed and awed me with their natural and inherent greatness." Henderson, the British military historian, declares that, "the great counter-stroke at Manassas is sufficient in itself to make Lee's reputation as a tactician. Tried by this test alone, Lee stands out as one of the greatest soldiers of all times." Roosevelt declared that Lee "will undoubtedly rank as without any exception the greatest of all the great Captains that the English-speaking people have brought forth," and President Roosevelt had no sympathy with the Southern cause. Lee's chief fault was his failure to control Longstreet. Marlborough, Wellington, Grant would have been incapable of that error, but none of them would have been capable of Lee's greatest achievements. Napoleon, in 1796 and 1814, was the only man of his calibre. The lesson of Lee's achievement is being taken to heart to-day. He was the great master of trench warfare, and yet no one seemed to have studied his methods fully in their direct application to the Great War of 1914.

In the following pages I have suggested, more than once, that if the Allies of the Great War had studied more closely Lee's methods in 1864, they would have solved more easily many of the problems with which that war confronted them. While this book was in the press I learned that the French General Staff has come to a similar conclusion, and has begun in the present year for the first time the study of the history of the American Civil War at the *École de Guerre*.

So General Maurice writes in his preface. Lee has, in fact, become a classic in the study of the Art of War. He has long been a classic in his grave, noble, loving way, in the study of the Art of Life.

J. E. G. DE M.

SIR CHARLES NAPIER.*

Dr. Rice Holmes has been well advised to republish in its somewhat extended form his biography of Sir Charles Napier, originally issued as long ago as 1889 in a volume entitled *Four Famous Soldiers*. The revision is due to material that has since become available. Dr. Holmes received information from surviving officers who fought at the battle of Miani and, not least, from Sir Montagu McMurdo which has enabled him to amend the description of "the soldiers' battle" of February 17th, 1843. It was the common sense of the British soldiers which gave Napier

* *Sir Charles Napier*. By T. Rice Holmes. (Cambridge: at the University Press. 7s. 6d.)

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

the victory that made his reputation as a great commander after more than forty years' campaigning. It is worth while recalling McMurdo's account of the critical moment of the battle.

The officers fought like gallant gentlemen, but they—perhaps even their war-bred chief—did not at first comprehend the conditions of the fighting. "When the battle began," said Sir Montagu McMurdo, who leaped into the river-bed and there slew four Baluchis in single combat, "I was full of the idea that the bayonet could carry everything before it, and it seemed to me disgraceful that the men should recoil as they did. I advanced several times to the edge of the Fuleli [river-bed], and ordered and entreated them for God's sake to follow. But they knew what they were about and fought the battle quite right. They knew that they would be throwing away their lives to no purpose if they attempted to carry the position with the bayonet; and at last they got tired of hearing me tell them to advance. "Mr. McMurdo," some of them called out, "if you don't leave off we'll shoot you." Napier's foresight in placing Tew to hold the gap in the wall; the superiority of the British artillery and of the musket over the matchlock; the good sense of the British infantry; the timely order which Napier sent to Pattle; above all, disciplined combination prevailing over isolated valour—these were the chief factors in the victory. But neither generalship, nor courage, nor superior weapons would have availed if the Baluchis had formed, not a loose gathering of clans, but a compact host.

It was strange that this chance and this victory should at last have come to a man over sixty years of age, who had fought with Sir John Moore at Corunna and with Wellington at Busaco, and had nearly lost his life in each of those stern battles, who had eaten his heart out as a half-pay officer, who, in the early 'twenties, had done admirable civil work at Corfu and Cephalonia, who had dreamed of fighting with Byron for the independence of Greece, who as a civilian had tried to take an active political place in the new England of 1836, who played an extraordinarily interesting part as a soldier once more in quelling, with a touch of genius, social troubles in the North of England in 1839. Then, when near the age of fifty-nine, his great chance came. He accepted an offer for service in India and landed at Bombay on December 13th, 1841, a man approaching sixty with a career to make. And he made it.

He felt always the call of genius as a commander and time after time he had shown that genius. When he was given the command of Upper and Lower Sind the opportunity came. Dr. Holmes discusses, in the light of the hesitancy as to the righteousness of his decisions that were always stirring in the mind of a man who was both a Christian mystic and a soldier, the morality of the campaign that added Sind to the Indian Empire. Broadly, it would seem, Napier was justified, since the fight had to come

sooner or later, and Napier's conscience on the night after the battle acquitted him. Yet the Amirs of Sind, in matters of detail, had much right on their side and Outram frankly sided with these local tyrants. Napier hated bloodshed but he loved fighting, and above all he loved conquest. He was a commander who dealt with his conscience after the battle, at any rate, in some cases. When he was fighting he was fighting, and his name echoed through the places that mattered, among the fighting races of the North of Asia. They realised that he was their master. The Duke of Wellington fairly appraised his qualities when he said, "I have never known any instance of an officer who has shown in a higher degree that he possesses all the qualities and qualifications necessary to enable him to conduct great operations." Moreover, he was, within his rather despotic limits, a great civil administrator, and all that he did he did with the fear of God and the love of man written in his heart.

Yet Napier was a strange Christian. It is quite possible for a Christian trooper to swear, and he swore as well as any trooper in any army. It is quite possible for a Christian commander to be as hard as a rock. He was hard indeed when it was necessary. These things are quite consistent with Christian mysticism. But Napier's appreciation of his own great powers, his belief that he would make an ideal emperor controlling an empire greater than Napoleon or Alexander dreamed of, was, perhaps, hardly consistent with the humble Christian spirit. He was, indeed, nearer to Mohammed than to Charles Gordon or Robert Lee. But he was a very great man and Dr. Holmes paints him in all the colours of his greatness.

* * *

J. E. G. DE M.

EUROPE BEFORE THE WAR.*

In her book *The Neuroses of the Nations*, Miss Playne sets out to analyse the spiritual ailments of Europe in the generation before the war. In the present large and important volume she deals with Germany and France. A further volume is promised on England, and we can imagine her continuing her task till almost all the belligerents have been surveyed. Now that the passions and illusions of the great struggle are cooling and waning, we can see that our generation suffered from a grievous sickness of the soul. In these pages, richly illustrated with quotations from the press, the pamphlet, the poem, the drama and the novel, we find a complex of fear and ambition, anger and hate. Each nation invents an image of its neighbours behind which reality disappears. Perhaps the most striking part of the book

* *The Neuroses of the Nations*. (Allen & Unwin. 16s.)

is the General Introduction filling no less than fifty pages, and dealing in broad outline with nervous and mental deterioration. The study of mass-psychology is young, but it has already helped to interpret many phenomena both of national and international history.

Opening her survey of the nations with Germany, the author traces the neurosis to incidents and tradition in German history, describes German militarism as its chief fostering ground, and discourses at length on the Pan-German intoxication. Much of her material is familiar to readers of the literature of the great war, but much is new. Moreover, her purpose is scientific and descriptive, while that of the propagandists was purely polemical. Miss Playne declares with truth that the neurosis of Germany was louder and more boisterous in character than that of any other nation; but the second half of the volume reminds us that precisely the same neurotic phenomena were found in France. The chief value of this work is to be found in the extraordinary parallelism between the two great enemies, and it would be of the greatest value to both nations, fed as they have been with one-sided polemics, to learn from this volume the identity of their malady. The final chapter summarises and compares the group neuroses of the two countries. Though the story told by Miss Playne gives ground for discouragement and suggests the terrible power of atavistic and subconscious fears, she ends on a note of hope. "Ten years have passed and sanity is not yet regained in either of the two countries whose career we have been following. The recovery must needs be slow as the malady was long in developing. The soul of a man may perchance be permanently alienated, but in the soul of a nation there remains ground for recovery, and the recurring urge of the human race, in the long run, makes for health." This striking volume deserves wide notice for its learning, insight and impartiality, and should help the new generation to understand and resist the dangers and temptations which had a leading share in producing the greatest catastrophe in history.

* * *

G. P. G.

FALSTAFF AND OTHERS.*

Mr. J. B. Priestley has caught the comic spirit and has imprisoned it for a few hours in the pages of this delightful book. The reader and the writer must be in accord, for the comic spirit is elusive, and cannot be held in bondage for long. Like Ariel,

* *The English Comic Characters*. By J. B. Priestley. (The Bodley Head. 7s. 6d. net.)

it craves for freedom. This is partly the reason why this spirit materialised on the stage is often a failure. Something which appeals separately to each individual reader is lost when rendered by another type of mind in another form of art. This is not the case when we read the immortal character-studies of Shakespeare and other great writers. They stand apart and alone, mirrored from nature by genius. The Poins and the Pistols are but stalking-horses for the wit of their betters.

Mr. Priestley's study of Falstaff is a masterly piece of criticism, even though some may differ from him as to the identity of the Falstaff of "The Merry Wives" and the be-littling of the character of Henry V. Falstaff, before noon and after, may be two separate entities. But the *volte face* of the King is as natural as are all conversions, and "the little touch of Harry in the night" was as welcome to his soldiery as ever his comradeship had been to Falstaff.

Bully Bottom is near to the heart of the author of these studies. The one substantiality in this Dream of Dreams was Bottom's: yet he felt it was beyond expounding on his own part, so he left it to Peter Quince. But it was Bottom's dream nevertheless. He is of the immortals waking or dreaming, and may be met with among ordinary English folk now as ever. The highly respectable people lose much when they shut the door on themselves and so miss the comicalities of life outside, which season and leaven the whole lump.

The Comic Illyrians are a low, drunken and disreputable company, as Mr. Priestley points out; but they are brimming over with the fun of the undoing of Malvolio—alas, poor fool! tragedy and comedy blended—and they communicate their merriment and jollity at his expense with no mean hand. Maria is the instigator of the plot. Is she comic in herself, or only the cause of it in her circle? One wishes Mr. Priestley had devoted a chapter to feminine comic characters. Sir Toby, with his snatches, could quote Scripture to his purpose. "There dwelt a man in Babylon." And so the old rascal passes from our view but not from our memories, which are freeholds that can neither be bought nor sold. Of Sir Andrew Aguecheek, the author feels a thousand things might be said of him. We will just quote one, among many:

"There is somewhere at the back of all our minds a little of Sir Andrew Aguecheek. . . . Some of Sir Andrew's ingenuous remarks have the same effect, or should have the same effect, upon us as the sight of a monkey, which presents us with a parody of human life that is highly diverting, but that leaves us somewhat shame-faced: after seeing so many things done openly that we ourselves do in secret, we blush, partly for the monkey that it should make a public show of itself, and partly for ourselves who have so much that is better concealed."

We none of us like our own reflection; it is a shock to our sense of fitness; but the uses of the fool are manifold, and his cap often fits if we would but wear it.

From Shakespeare to Dickens may seem a long stride, but the eye and ear for the comic, with which is so often blended the tragic, is not confined to any one century or place. Egypt knew it, and Greece and Rome revelled in buffoonery. The two Wellers, Dick Swiveller, and Mr. Micawber are all treated by Mr. Priestley with the same insight and true criticism which he deals out to his Shakespearian characters. He approaches his subject without prejudice, and sets down naught in malice. He arrives at his conclusions by the only just way, ignoring the outward and finding the inward or spiritual, which after all is the real character. The huge paunch of Falstaff and the Aguecheek of Andrew may indicate certain attributes, they are the trappings and the suitings, but there is something beneath which passes show, and Mr. Priestley generally finds it. The study of "The Brothers Shandy" must be read to be appreciated, and if read must be appreciated. An excellent book, which in grave times will help us to feel that comedy is as real as tragedy and often finds the solution of tragedy if we will but let it.

S. DE M.

* * *

SIR JAMES FRAZER'S NEW VOLUME.*

This important work on tribal life and tribal religious beliefs is rapidly growing under Sir James Frazer's tireless and impartial hand. The first volume, published in 1913, deals with the belief in immortality and the worship of the dead among the aborigines of Australia, the Torres Straits islands, New Guinea and Melanesia; the second volume, published in 1922, extends the record to the Polynesians; the present volume carries it to the mixed races who dwell in the archipelagos scattered over the vast spaces of "the Western Pacific, to the east of the Philippines, to the south of Japan, and to the north and north-east of New Guinea and Melanesia," the Gilbert, the Marshall, the Caroline, the Pelew and the Ladrone Islands. "The dominant racial element appears to be the Polynesian, and that element is naturally most prominent in the Gilbert Islands, which are the nearest to Polynesia and form, as it were, a link between it and Micronesia." The other end of the long chain is formed by the Ladrone Islands which are in the proximity of the Philippines. One good authority thinks that the long chain of islands was originally populated

* *The Belief in Immortality and the Worship of the Dead.* By Sir James George Frazer. Vol. III; *The Belief among the Micronesians.* (Macmillan. 18s. net.)

from the Philippines, while others seek the starting place in the Moluccas Islands between New Guinea and Celebes. The original home Sir James provisionally identifies with the Malay Peninsula, and suggests from an infusion of black blood that "before the arrival of the Micronesian or Polynesian race the whole of the islands of the Pacific were inhabited by a dark people of the Melanesian, Papuan or Negrito type."

The conclusion is very interesting and will add a special value to the next volume, which will deal with the Indonesians and presumably with the pure Negritos of the Andaman Islands. The linking up of the scattered stock of the Negritos will form a step in the tracing out of the westward distribution of the black races. The question is of great importance since apparently no trace of the classificatory system of relationship is to be found among the pure Negritos and yet, as Sir James Frazer shows, the classificatory system is recognised in the Marshall group. It might be argued, if it is a fact that this strange system does not exist in any pure Negro or Negritic race, that there must have been a great dispersal in South-Eastern Asia before the classificatory system was adopted and that after its adoption there was a second dispersal which affected races that moved north-east and reached America, and a race that moved south-east and populated Australia. This, of course, turns on the question whether the classificatory system exists among the Negritic peoples and their pure descendants. But if it does not there must have been two dispersals, and as the Australian tribes came into the second dispersal it would seem as though some modification must be adopted of Sir James's very low view of the aborigines of Australia. The complexity and fullness of their tongue, their considerable capacity for art, and the substantial measure of intellectual ability in, at any rate, some leaders of the tribes, would seem to indicate not so much arrested or retarded development as a definite falling away from a higher stage of human life. However that may be, the existence of the classificatory system in the Marshall group should throw light upon a dispersal of peoples who had adopted a classificatory system of relationship. That system in America is associated with a people of a considerable intellectual virility.

The great variations in character and morals in these long extended chains of islands is, perhaps, not remarkable when the variations in type, or from type, are considered. High sexual morality is, or at any rate was, the strong feature of the Gilbert Islanders, a dark race rather Malayan than Polynesian in appearance, except in the case of Makin island. They identify the soul with the shadow, and believe that it survives the body and reaches, if the body has been tattooed, the happy land. The soul seeks

the fair-haired ancestors of the north through the agency of the Ancestress who, here as in so many places in South-Eastern Asia, seems to indicate a Matriarchy State far away in time. Samoa appears to have been an intermediate home. The Marshall Islanders have a low sexual morality. The operation of tattooing is associated with religious ideas and the islanders apparently believe in the survival of the soul. The Caroline islanders are a very mixed stock, but the evidence of the various islands seems to show that totemism and exogamy, with maternal descent of the totem are "characteristic features of Micronesian society." It should be attractive to compare this proposition with some of the Australian evidence. If the Marshall Islands' evidence is important this is not less so. Then again the legends as to the creation of things in the Mortlock Islands, part of the Caroline group, should be compared with the Australian legends, but the resemblance is remote and there are apparently no stories of the distribution of spirit children by the great Ancestress. The practical knowledge of the stars among these islanders shows a high degree of intelligence. "It is at once an art and a science in embryo." The account of the natives of Yap is extraordinarily attractive. The invisible soul is conceived of as "a faithful image of the body" and so remains after the death of the body. The conception is a logical one and practical logic is the note of these remarkable natives. Among the Pelew Islanders the high social position of women is a definite note and is considered not inconsistent with an amazingly low moral outlook. The worship of goddesses is fully consistent with the social organisation.

It is only possible in these brief indications of the scope of this remarkable book to invite readers and students to turn to the book itself. It opens up a wide and new outlook on the theory, or indeed the general scientific belief, that man originated in South-Eastern Asia. We see in the people of these islands the residue of some great migrations, and from the material put together with such remarkable, though habitual, lucidity by Sir James Frazer it is possible to frame some reasonable conjectures as to the nature and, perhaps, even as to the approximate epoch of the great dispersions.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

ST. SAMSON OF DOL.*

Canon Taylor, one of our foremost experts on Celtic questions and the author of a very learned work on the Celtic Christianity of Cornwall, has placed students of British history in his debt

* *The Life of St. Samson of Dol.* By Thomas Taylor. With a Frontispiece. (S.P.C.K. 5s. net.)

by this admirable translation of the early seventh century *Vita Samsonis*. This document and the *de Excidio* of Gildas, which belongs to the first half of the sixth century, form the only extant literature dealing directly with Britain if we exclude the document hidden in the heart of Nennius. Canon Taylor confidently places the date of the *Life of St. Samson of Dol* between 610 and 615, but he, very properly, sets forth the arguments against the early date adopted by M. R. Fawtier, the French scholar, who published a work on the subject in 1912. M. Fawtier has examined with great care the eight extant versions of the *Life* "and has traced them all, with one exception, to that adopted by the Benedictines in the *Acta Sanctorum Sancti Benedicti*, and by the Bollandists in their *Acta Sanctorum*." He has examined twenty manuscripts of this parent version which in the Metz manuscript belongs to the tenth and eleventh centuries. The one version that M. Fawtier has not been able to trace to this source he regards as "a much mishandled redaction of the original version." It seems, however, to have been written by a monk of Penetel early in the second half of the ninth century.

The date of the *Life* is a very important matter, and it is satisfactory to know that scholars of the rank of Professor Loth and the Abbé Duine entirely reject the doubt as to the contemporary authenticity of the document. Indeed, the arguments adduced by the eminent textual critic are wholly unconvincing. The writer of the prologue to the *Life* gives the sources of information. They "are a life of the Saint written by the deacon Henoc, a nephew of St. Samson, and handed down to his nephew, an old man of eighty; also various particulars communicated to him orally by the same old man and by the monks of Llantwit." M. Fawtier complains that the name of the old man is not given—an inventor would certainly have given it—and that the saint is called an abbat and not a bishop. He does not realise that the abbat-bishop—a bishop whose see is placed in the monastery of which he is abbat—was a common phenomenon in Wales and Cornwall. The Abbé Duine has shown that the *Life* has no traces of any literary composition subsequent to the end of the sixth century—a convincing argument in favour of the date 610-615 for the composition of the work. The author moreover does not quote from the Vulgate version of the Bible, and this fact is in favour of a very early origin. The word *theomachia* used in the *Life*, which Canon Taylor translates sorceress, is a Latin version of a phrase in the Acts of Apostles which is not retained in the Vulgate Latin translation. The author of the *Life* must have got it from some Latin version in use in the Breton Church before the Vulgate acquired a footing after the seventh century. There is thus prac-

tically no doubt that in the *Life of St. Samson of Dol* we have a document relating to Britain of the early seventh century.

What, then, does the *Life of St. Samson* tell us about Britain or South-West Britain at the opening of the seventh century when the Angles and Jutes had been in England for about a century and a half? We may perhaps make the comment on the earlier history that the Roman legions were never "withdrawn" from Britain. They departed on a fruitless errand of conquest at the bidding of a British Cæsar and never returned. Their departure and the Roman refusal to re-garrison Britain left the land at the mercy of what we may call the last wave of the Brythonic Celts, long settled in Germany. The pressure of these invaders has been differently estimated. They certainly did not depopulate and repopulate even Kent, but there can be little doubt that the Celts of Wessex withdrew into their Cornish fastnesses and there, being overcrowded or perhaps restless, many of them in successive waves of emigration, from, let us say, A.D. 460 to A.D. 600 or a little later, passed across the Channel, the "Southern Sea" to Armorica. Such numbers emigrated that this Gallic peninsula became known as Lesser Britain or Brittany. It was in the middle of this period of emigration that St. Samson passed over to a land that was becoming a Celticised peninsula with a highly organised Celtic population.

Samson was of Monmouthshire stock, but was born about A.D. 486, in Demetia, the part of Wales that is now Carmarthen, Cardigan and Pembroke, the region where the Goidelic peoples had settled in force. He was educated at the famous college of Llantwit, near Cowbridge, in Glamorganshire, and in this College of Illtutus acquired a great reputation for ability and godliness. He became a priest, and the text gives us a vivid picture of the jealousies and difficulties of this institution and of its wild environment where saintliness and devildom were ranged side by side. We get a picture of a heathen priestess and of devil worship, and also of the passion for religion that inspired the converted laity. The picture might be one of the African forest lands to-day. Historically the picture is very important, but in one vital point it differs from a Christian centre in heathen Africa. The monks were too often a guzzling, drunken lot of men, and in this respect it confirms the evil picture drawn by Gildas. Yet religion was not dead, and the bishops and earnest Christians inspired profound popular respect. The outstanding character of Samson pointed to him as a ruler of men and in due course he was consecrated as a bishop, and we see him passing south to Cornwall consecrating churches as he goes. We see him in the Hundred of Trigg in Cornwall stopping devil-worship and converting the

chief of the pagan tribe, who brings in his people for baptism. The old faith is still struggling with the new in the first quarter of the sixth century.

His work in Britain accomplished, he passes with very many monks to a similar work in Lesser Britain or Brittany, where he founds the Monastery of Dol and comes into close relation with King Childebert. Here we see the first link of Britain with the continent, many years before the days of Augustine and the Christianisation of the Kingdom of Kent in 597. To what age Saint Samson lived is unknown, but he was present at a Church Council in Paris after 556 and possibly as late as 573, but this is improbable if Samson was born about 485. He probably lived, at any rate, to see the Breton Church complete with the foundation of the Bishopric of St. Malo by St. Malo of Gwent in the seventh century.

The negative evidence of the *Life of St. Samson*, though it is not specially dwelt upon by Canon Taylor, is perhaps almost as important as the positive evidence. Had it been written in the ninth or tenth centuries it would have been full of the rumours of war between Celts and Danes. As it is, there is no whisper of the Saxons, no suggestion even of internecine or tribal war. The days of Nennius and his Romano-Britains are gone, the fears of Gildas are dissolved. The troubles of the future are not foreseen. Wales and the land west of Wessex are at peace. The foes are spiritual foes. The old heathenism was face to face with the new Christianity in a land untroubled by the sword. The saint embarks without difficulty, taking his Irish chariot and his books with him, and crosses the mouth of the Severn to Western Cornwall and drives through Cornwall to Fowey, passing on the way a tribe engaged in the peaceful occupation of performing a heathen mystery play in honour of a certain idol, a play performed time out of mind. Parr moor, near at hand, is haunted to this day by a dog-headed demon. This negative evidence is important as proving that in the first half of the sixth century there was no pressure westward from Wessex or even from the central areas of England. The automatic division of the island between Saxon and Celt had been long complete before St. Samson sailed from Fowey to the land of Brittany in the first quarter of the sixth century.

J. E. G. DE M.

THE YEAR BOOK SERIES.*

The Selden Society is making steady progress with the publication of a reliable and indeed final text, with English translation, of the year books of King Edward II. The first volume of this Year Book Series was edited from sundry manuscripts by the late Professor F. W. Maitland as long ago as 1903. A second and third volume from the same learned editor were issued in 1904 and 1905. A fourth volume by Professor Maitland was completed by Mr. G. J. Turner. Mr. Turner, and also Sir Paul Vinogradoff, have supplied further volumes and Mr. Turner has now in the press a volume dealing with the fourth year of Edward II. Dr. W. C. Bolland first contributed to the series in 1909 when he took up the editing of the *Eyre of Kent of 1313-14* in continuation and completion of the work of Professor Maitland and Mr. L. W. Vernon Harcourt. In 1914, Dr. Bolland, in his edition of *Select Bills in Eyre of 1292-1333*, threw a flood of light on an hitherto unsuspected equitable jurisdiction of the itinerant justices. During the past ten years Dr. Bolland has laboured continuously at the Year Books of Edward II, and the new volume now before us dealing with the year 1314-1315 is the sixth volume that he has edited unaided for the Selden Society of these important year books.

Apart altogether from the fact that Dr. Bolland, by an elaborate process of collation of manuscripts—there are eleven manuscripts of these particular year books—is producing an almost perfect Anglo-Norman text, these volumes provide authorities for the inner or social history of English life half a century or so before the Black Death, that are invaluable. We see here a great deal of the elaboration of legal procedure and realise that law cases afforded a good deal of excitement and some sense of uncertainty in days six centuries ago when, if life was simpler, law was certainly more complex than it is to-day. In one case we see an echo of the legal difficulties that followed the expulsion of the Knights Templars from England. "In May, 1312, the Pope granted all the Templars' possessions in England to the Order of St. John of Jerusalem in England and sent a letter to Edward II asking him to restore them to the Order of St. John." In the case reported in this year book the King had taken no notice of the papal request, but the Prior of the Order, acting on the assumption that the request had been granted, proceeded to nominate to the Bishop a parson for the Church of Rothley. Upon this the King brings in his own court a writ of *quare impedit* against the

* The Publications of the Selden Society. Volume XLI for the year 1924. *Year Book of Edward II. Vol. XVII. 8 Edward II. A.D. 1314-1315.* Edited for the Selden Society by William Craddock Bolland. (Quaritch, 11, Grafton Street, W. 52s. 6d.)

Prior. The Prior says that the Court should give him the opportunity to see the documents. But the Court had no mercy. The Prior should have sued for the documents earlier. The King won his suit. The case has a general interest well discussed by Dr. Bolland in the introduction to this learned volume. The King was frequently before his own courts in the early fourteenth century either as plaintiff or defendant. But how did the King appear? "A duly appointed attorney had practically full authority to bind his principal." Now every subject is bound to stand by the King and give him service, and therefore any subject could come into the Law Courts and take upon himself the conduct of any case to which the King was a party. The King stood in need of no specially appointed attorney and his representative was not bound by the rules that bound a specially appointed attorney of a subject. The King, therefore, by his representative had a specially privileged position. The Sergeants treated the King's representative with unusual suavity. "When they are contesting the King's right to say or plead some particular matter they say suavely that they do not think that the King would really wish to take such a course, and they give their reasons." It was a curious position, but Dr. Bolland's explanation seems to make clear some difficulties as to the growth of the procedure in later centuries when the King appeared before his own courts.

Another point discussed by Dr. Bolland is the denial of the validity of certain Statutes (included in the Statutes of the Realm) by early justices. Apparently the repudiation of what is known as the Statute of William Butler (20 Edward I) and other Statutes was on the ground that the Statute had never been sealed. The practice of sealing was as follows: "Statutes were sent from Parliament to the Chancery and there enrolled, and from thence copies certified under the Great Seal were sent to the Courts of the King's Bench, the Common Bench and the Exchequer with orders to these Courts to enroll them and give effect to them." Presumably the judges had the right to say that evidence of sealing must be produced. That seems reasonable in days when there was no printing and no notoriety secured by the press. But the Statutes in question were accepted by Coke centuries later. Time had healed the lack, if there had been a lack, of sealing.

We wonder what steps the Selden Society or the Law Schools of London, Oxford and Cambridge are taking to secure the upbuilding of a class of men and women who will be capable of carrying on the work of men such as Professor Maitland, Mr. Turner and Dr. Bolland. There are masses of work in the transcription and translation of mediæval legal reports still to be

done, and if this country were America steady efforts would be made to secure a continuity of specialists combining highly-trained legal knowledge with the special gifts needed to expand and read the rugged Anglo-Norman script. It is no doubt in the power of the Selden Society to urge the Inns of Court and the various schools of law to undertake the necessary training of specialists. There is little evidence that this is being done on any thorough scale. It is a task that should not be delayed.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

It has been not only an act of piety but of great scientific value to publish the late Samuel Bruce McLaren's *Scientific Papers mainly on Electro-dynamics and Natural Radiation, including the substance of an Adams Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge*.^{*} The papers have been prepared for publication by Professor Hassé, of the University of Bristol, Professor Havelock, of Armstrong College, Professor J. W. Nicholson, of Oxford, and Professor Larmor, of Cambridge. McLaren had been awarded an Adams Prize for his essay on the Theory of Radiation in 1913. Sir Joseph Larmor says in his preface that this essay was not in a form ready for immediate publication and its final adaptation, with a digest of McLaren's previous publications on related topics, was proceeding when the Great War involved "a higher call of duty." McLaren was born on August 16th, 1876, at Yedo, in Japan. When he was about five, his father went to Melbourne as Principal of a Presbyterian college. The boy at the Scotch College, Melbourne, and at the University of Melbourne made a great mark. In 1897 he came to England, secured a Major Scholarship at Trinity in 1899, was third Wrangler in 1899, and, taking the second part of the Mathematical Tripos in his third year, was placed in the second division of the first class. In 1904 he became lecturer in mathematics at Bristol, passed to a similar post in the University of Birmingham in 1906, and became Professor of Mathematics at Reading in 1913, the year when he won the Adams Prize. As Secretary of the "A" Section of the British Association he revisited Australia in 1914. He joined up on his return to England and on August 13th, 1916, he was wounded while trying to save a dump of ammunition which had caught fire, and died on August 16th. He was a most lovable, fearless person, a powerful athletic man, and as tender as he was powerful. He was a profound thinker. Professor Nicholson says that "the subjects which absorbed his attention most completely were always those of a really fundamental nature." In his published papers he discussed the emission and absorption of energy by electrons and extended Lorentz' theory of complete radiation to all wave-lengths. "The radiation is regarded as an external field superposed on the other forces which act on the electrons," and is treated "as a small, disturbing force which gradually takes the electron out of the orbit it would follow under the internal forces alone. When this is ensured, we can use the theory of varied motion, the displacement due to radiation being small during the time of des-

^{*} Cambridge University Press. (8s. 6d. net.)

cribing a free path, small in comparison with length of path and with any wave-length under consideration." This was McLaren's key method in all his investigations. He was prepared to accept atomism for matter but not for radiation. In his second paper he assumes the undulatory theory of light but not the formulæ of classical dynamics. He shows that the classical dynamics cannot supply a complete kinetic theory of induced magnetism. He was a believer in the physical reality of the fourth dimension. Professor Nicholson states that he "undoubtedly anticipated Einstein and Abraham in their suggestion of a variable velocity of light, with the consequent expressions for the energy and momentum of the gravitational field, and put forward, in his last paper, a suggestion, perhaps of great value, as to the nature of the magneton and of the elementary positive charge." It was a lamentable thing that a man of his superb gifts could not have been found suitable work during the War. But he had the highest sense of duty and was, "as an officer idolised by his men, and was conspicuous for personal bravery in an army where bravery is almost universal." But his loss is irreparable.

* * *

Dr. E. G. Hardy has republished the monograph entitled *Christianity and the Roman Government: a Study in Imperial Administration*.^{*} It first appeared in 1894 and was republished in 1906 with other essays on special points in Roman history. It is now reprinted separately with an introduction. As a study of Roman administration it is not concerned with religion as such, but with methods of dealing with various cults by the Roman Empire, and is "an attempt to find some common policy which, however modified by circumstances and environment, will serve to explain the diversified facts on record." There was certainly no exclusiveness about the Roman State religion and the widening of the Roman Pantheon was in accordance with the spiritual attitude of the people. But the authorities might feel it necessary to check alien religions under certain circumstances. Thus the worship of Bacchus had to be stopped in 186 B.C., in the days when the Punic wars had created great nervous tension. Again, the worship of Isis was occasionally interfered with. Again, repressive measures against the Jews were occasionally taken in Rome itself, though on the whole the Government tolerated a people who hated Rome and all polytheism. So long as Christians were regarded as a sect of the Jews they received the same measure of tolerance, but when Paul turned to the Gentiles a new problem arose and there was certainly a good deal to tolerate in Christianity, "but for more than thirty years after the death of the founder of the religion, the Government maintained a tolerant attitude. . . . There was nothing in the religion, *qua* religion, which called for intolerance, but as set in a municipal and imperial context, it involved potential dangers which called for potential treatment. But, just as this treatment might never have been applied in Rome but for exceptional circumstances, so it need not be repeated there or elsewhere except when urgent necessity called for it." Dr. Hardy puts the case from the point of view of a Roman administrator, and puts it in a perfectly judicial fashion. In fact, Christians were destined to persecute each other in a fashion that the broad tolerance of Imperial Rome never would have tolerated.

^{*} George Allen & Unwin. (5s. net.)

Number four of the very interesting series entitled *Modern Masters of Etching*^{*} deals with the work of M. J. L. Forain. The Introduction is from the pen of Mr. Malcolm C. Salaman. He tells us that it was not until 1908 that Jean Louis Forain, then fifty-six years of age, with a great reputation as a draughtsman, became a recognised master of etching, though he had worked with the needle as far back as 1873. His modern work shows a pure, sharp, cleanly bitten line, but one that is, for purposes of producing certain effects, often made extraordinarily tangled and complex. The result of his work is intensely human and full of a fresh point of view. The drawings reproduced here are remarkable always and sometimes approach great genius, as in "Le Retour de l'Enfant Prodigue." Some of the religious etchings are terrible, but the subject of "Le Christ dépouillé de ses vêtements" is a terrible theme. Again, "La Fraction Du Pain" has a solemnity that it would be hard to equal, a simplicity that is the veritable scene from Holy Writ. We mention these etchings, but those of modern life are no less vivid. M. Forain does not spare the frivolity or the sordidness of his own generation and that is a good sign both in art and morals.

* * *

Mr. W. A. Brockington has prepared *A Short Review of Education in Leicestershire since the War*,[†] which should be studied by those responsible for rural education throughout England and Wales and especially in those counties like Devonshire, where rural education and child-care is in a very backward state. Leicestershire has abolished the bad old tradition of "elementary" education and has divided the elementary schools into two grades with a dividing line at about the age of 11½ years, the senior grade forming what is practically a system of junior secondary schools. Physical and agricultural education are the subject of special attention, while the physical education is dovetailed into the work of the wholly admirable school medical service. The system of examination for transfer from the senior schools to the secondary schools is not fully competitive, and the intention is to do away with competition altogether and restore the qualifying system which had begun to work before the preposterous Geddes bowstring partially throttled local educational enthusiasts. The senior schools involve the decapitation of many small rural schools so as to bring the elder children together in efficient schools at convenient centres. It is perhaps as well, for the moment, that these are not strictly central schools as the great need in England is the formation of junior secondary schools everywhere. Very admirable provision is made for rural children coming considerable distances to school in the way of good meals, dry clothes and slippers. There is a large spirit of unselfishness among both managers of schools and teachers, and the Ideas Box, in which new local experience is rapidly made common property, is a most excellent invention. If the Leicestershire experiment is widely followed we shall hear no more of rural decadence and of school medical officers whose urgent demands are pigeon-holed by backward rural education committees.

^{*} "The Studio," 44, Leicester Square. (5s. net.)

[†] Education Committee of the Council of the County of Leicester. 1s.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

"Anecdotes of the late Samuel Johnson, LL.D., during the last Twenty Years of his Life,"* by Hesther Lynch Piozzi, and edited by S. C. Roberts, contains a great deal of interesting matter besides the actual text. Mr. Roberts has provided a well-made bibliography, notes and index on the text, and a long interesting Introduction. In it he deals with Mrs. Thrale, later Mrs. Piozzi, her friendship with Johnson, her writings, and the Streatham circle, the latter being particularly interesting. He has endeavoured in this Introduction "to summarise some of the evidence available for a proper judgment upon the relations between Johnson and the Streatham household," rather than to give fresh theories.

* * *

"The Author's Book: being Notes for the Guidance of Authors in Dealing with Publishers," issued by the Macmillan Company, is a little work of real use and interest not only to authors but to librarians as well. A short history of the Company, and of the work done in certain special departments, is followed by detailed directions and assistance for the author. He is told the correct method of preparing and submitting his manuscript, of legal considerations, of bindings, of proof-reading, besides dozens of other details. A certain number of these details should be unnecessary, since they imply that the ordinary American author never learnt composition at school. It may be so. The sections on proof-reading and the glossary of terms are particularly useful and well written.

* * *

Dr. C. S. Parker, of Columbia University, has written a somewhat curious book entitled, "The Defence of the Child by French Novelists,"† in which he traces the reflection in French literature of to-day of the movement to secure the rights of the child, that is to say, a healthy babyhood, protection from child-labour, home life, education, just guardianship. Dr. Parker discusses the non-literary influence of a sociological movement upon literature and considers, in turn, important problems relating to the child—health, work and daily life and environment in the social sphere, and discusses the work of those French novelists whom the successive problem has influenced or possibly inspired. In England we should look in vain for such a relationship between the novelist and specific problems of childhood, except in Dickens.

* * *

Here is a book that in one sense is a curiosity and in another is likely to be a vital force in West African life—the "Ihe-Nmuta Sunday School N'Asusu Ibo,"‡ being outlines of Sunday School lessons in the Ibo tongue. It is strange to think of this somewhat elemental race, not so long since in the throes of perpetual tribal wars, sitting down to the study of the New Testament in a series of lessons in their own tongue illustrating the Christian year. Changes are swiftly coming among the great African races, and those changes, while recognising the desirableness of maintaining the essential characteristics of native humanism and customary life at their best, and excluding economic exploitation, must be accompanied by the spirit of Christianity. A book such as this may do much to achieve this end.

* Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d. net.

† George Baxter Publishing Company, Menasha, Wisconsin, U.S.A. \$2.

‡ S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d. net.

THE PACT OF SECURITY.

THE proposed Pact of Security, however consonant it may be with the real needs of Europe, nowhere excites popular enthusiasm. In Britain the feeling with respect to it is, save in high political circles, negative or adverse. In France M. Painlevé, a high-minded and enlightened Liberal statesman, has with the aid of a falling franc and an acute lack of financial credit succeeded in getting his countrymen to face the fundamentally unpleasant prospect of a deal with the Germans. But though the proposal is immensely to the advantage of the French, they are not yet habituated to the kind of psychological somersault which is involved in a diplomatic combination and *entente* with their recent enemies. However insistently the mind may counsel the alliance, the heart tugs the other way. And since M. Painlevé's position is itself unstable, difficulties may yet arise on the French side which are so far undisclosed.

As for the Germans they are plainly in a state of intense perplexity. The first suggestion for a Pact came, as we all know, from Dr. Luther, the German Chancellor, and was at once very properly taken up by the British Foreign Secretary. One would imagine, therefore, that having originated the proposals, the Germans would use their best endeavours to put it through. It would not, however, be safe to reckon on this. One of the conditions insisted on by the Allies is the entry of Germany into the League of Nations. Now the League of Nations is for various reasons very unpopular in Germany. It decided against the German claims in the matter of Silesia and is widely suspected of being the machine of French and Polish policies. More important still is the sentiment in Germany that entry into the League will snap the cord with Russia. Surely, it is said, it would be unwise to do this? Hateful as is the Moscow Communist to the Prussian Junker, there is the feeling that behind the subversive Soviet propaganda, and beyond the temporary victory of the urban proletariat of Petrograd and Moscow, is the great peasant nation whose friendship and support were the essential conditions of the brilliant triumphs of the Bismarckian epoch. Deep down in the hearts of the people is the feeling that the sun of Germany rises in the east. In the last few years there has been no more popular play in Berlin than "Die Entlassung" or "The Dismissal," a dramatic sermon on the fall of Bismarck. As the aged Prince is driven into exile, he warns his young and headstrong master that the abandonment of the Russian for the Austrian alliance will entail a war on two fronts. At that point the audience, convulsed with emotion, breaks into thunders of applause.

The German Nationalists may, therefore, be counted on as generally opposed to the entry into the League of Nations, which

is one of the conditions laid down by the French and British Governments, without which the the proposed Pact of Security cannot go through. Some weeks ago in the first flush of Hindenburg's victory, the fire-eaters might have been more indulgent to Dr. Luther's project, feeling that after so great a triumph over the Allied Press, it might be well and wise to make concessions to the foreigner. But now that it is found that the old general goes about in mufti and honours the Republican flag and intends to observe the Constitution of Weimar, and is by no means the fire-brand of Pan-German dreams, opinion has hardened, and Dr. Luther finds his Nationalist public more difficult to handle than was the case when the Pact was first launched upon the diplomatic waters. Not that the Pact is devoid of solid attractions for patriotic Germans. Every German wants to see the French out of the Ruhr and the British out of Cologne. The Pact implies evacuation. Every industrialist again is anxious to borrow at something less than fifteen per cent. The Pact promises improved credit. But the politicians are not unnaturally anxious to sell their adhesion to the Pact, which, season it how you may, will be distasteful to many, at the highest price, and some of them are already beginning to write prescriptions for the Government. The German People's Party, for instance, of which the Foreign Minister is the leader, has been putting forward its views, and though the Party would appear to be desirous of continuing its negotiations, its manifesto discloses an hiatus between the views which are likely to be acceptable in Paris and those which are at present popular in Germany, which can only be overcome by some expense of diplomatic skill. It is true that the German People's Party are willing to accept entry into the League, when the Ruhr and the sanction areas and all the first Rhineland zone have been evacuated, but they require certain decisions of the Council of the League to be annulled, especially so far as they contemplate a permanent local control body in the Rhineland. They demand that disputes arising out of the Treaty of Versailles with regard to the administration of the Rhineland should be referred to arbitration "in accordance with the German method," and insist that the Pact must not interfere in any way with the Rapallo agreement covering Germany's relations with Russia or with treaties concluded with any other Power. Moreover, Germany is to have entire freedom to make such treaties as she pleases on the eastern side and "does not accept decision as to their maintenance and guarantees from outside."

Since the greater part of the Berlin Press accepts the principles laid down in this manifesto, we may assume that the German Government will endeavour to pursue the negotiations with some regard to their demands. It will be seen that the principles are:

- (1) The liberation of the Rhineland with no sanctions, no permanent body of control and all questions to be referred to arbitration.
- (2) Complete diplomatic freedom for Germany in the east.
- (3) Preservation of the Russian Agreement, and
- (4) Entry into the League of Nations conditional on the evacuation of the Ruhr, the sanction areas and Cologne.

To the extreme Nationalists the whole idea of the Pact, recognising as it does the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, is fundamentally repulsive.

It is for these reasons premature to assume that the Security Pact will go through. In the end France and Germany may fail to see eye to eye. In any case a good deal of delicate and difficult negotiation still lies before the Foreign Offices of the three principal nations concerned, and the play of forces brought to bear on the negotiating countries is so complex (for tariff questions and questions of credit are mingled with the problems of strategy and national honour) that it is impossible to predict with confidence a favourable conclusion. In any one of the three countries a popular agitation skilfully led might bring the whole structure to the ground.

At first sight there appears to be something grotesque and paradoxical in a Pact of Security signed by France, Germany and Great Britain. How, it may be asked, is the interest of Great Britain, consisting now, as always, in the avoidance of Continental wars, to be served by entrance into such a combination? Our destiny lies beyond the seas. We have no concern with the Continent except to prevent any conflagration which may break out abroad spreading into our own quarters. And yet under the Pact, if Germany, after refusing arbitration, attacks France, we are bound to defend France; and conversely, if France under the same conditions invades Germany, we are equally committed to a Continental war. Now an alliance of Britain with France against Germany is quite intelligible; so, too, is alliance of Britain with Germany against France. Under either of these two hypotheses we take a side and frame our plans in collaboration with our ally. In our military and naval departments all is simple. The General Staffs consult together and concert measures. In the first instance, the strategical mind of the country is concentrated upon the defence of France against Germany; in the second instance, upon the defence of Germany against France. But if we are allied both with Germany and with France the psychology of the alliance becomes far more complex and its administration far more embarrassing. We are allied at once with the strongest and with the weakest of the great Continental Powers; with France, which is armed to the teeth, and with Germany, which, whatever may be her successes in evading her obligations under the Treaty of Versailles, is still to a large extent disarmed. Our business

will be to side with the aggressor, whoever the aggressor may be, and the one thing which seems to be certain is that if France and Germany are ever hereafter drawn into a conflict we shall be engaged upon one side or the other.

Surely, it will be said, this is a very gratuitous and unpopular commitment? The country hates the very idea of war. Its aversion for Continental entanglements is one of the deepest of its political sentiments. We are islanders. We have never really been, since the end of the French wars in the fifteenth century, other than insular at heart. And the horrors and hardships of the late war have deepened the isolationist feeling of the country. The Pact then cannot, and will not be, popular, for nothing will be easier than to represent it as an unnecessary risk and an indefinite obligation. Lord Beaverbrook and Lord Rothermere are wise in their generation. In the Pact they descry an object of popular aversion sufficiently serious to wound, if not to kill, a Government. And a brisk artillery of leading articles is directed by these two noblemen and their henchmen against the instrument. How, then, does it come about that when on June 24th Mr. Chamberlain gave an account of his proposed Security Pact in the House of Commons he met with so large a measure of preliminary approval?

First, it was, I think, generally recognised that we are no longer free to choose between a policy of pure isolation and a certain partnership in the conduct of European affairs. The development of the air arm alone has made us very much less secure than we were twenty years ago. We are now liable to molestation from the air as we have never been exposed to attack from the sea since the days of Napoleon. But apart from this, and apart from the strong likelihood that, Pact or no Pact, we should eventually be drawn into any serious Continental war which may hereafter break out, we are already subjected to positive engagements. We have, for instance, signed the Covenant of the League of Nations. That contains several distinct obligations. And though the language in which some of these obligations are couched may be capable, and is capable, of different interpretations, nobody will doubt but that, taken in their entirety, they do constitute a very large and substantive obligation to co-operate, if necessary by the employment of force, in the preservation of peace throughout the world. Nor can the repudiation of the Covenant be regarded as practical politics. All parties are solemnly pledged to observe it. We cannot renounce it because America has declined to take her seat upon the Council or because the Pact is found to involve us in troublesome contingencies. The loss of honour before the world would be too great. Besides, statesmen of all parties are pledged to the hilt to defend the League, which is now supported

by a great body of public opinion in the country. Then again we have obligations under other clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. Articles 42-44 of that Treaty read as follows:

Article 42. Germany is forbidden to maintain or construct any fortifications either on the left bank of the Rhine or on the right bank to the west of a line drawn fifty kilometres to the east of the Rhine.

Article 43. In the area defined above the maintenance and assembly of armed forces either permanently or temporarily, and military manœuvres of any kind, as well as the upkeep of all permanent works for mobilisation, are in the same way forbidden.

Article 44. In case Germany violates in any manner whatever the provisions of Articles 42 and 43, she shall be regarded as committing a hostile act against the Powers signatory of the present Treaty, and as calculated to disturb the peace of the world.

These clauses mean, that if Germany violates the provision for neutralisation of the Rhineland she commits a hostile act against Great Britain. Nothing can be clearer or more explicit.

It is vain then to assume that we are free as matters now stand. We are not free, we are, on the contrary, bound and implicated. Moreover, there is no party in the State which has yet dared to say that we should seriously abstain from Continental commitments. The Labour Party, which opposes the Pact, applauds the Protocol, which the Conservatives attack on the ground that it makes our commitments too onerous. The serious political argument of responsible statesmen is not directed against commitments as such, but against the particular form which commitments assume.

A third reason for approving the general idea of the Pact is that it seems to offer a better guarantee of European appeasement than any proposal which has been put forward since the Peace of Versailles. The Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance and its sequel the Protocol did not find favour with the House of Commons because, rightly or wrongly, each of these instruments was thought to commit us to military operations in the east of Europe in certain eventualities, and the Government of the day was unwilling to "sustain the defence of such an engagement before the bar of public opinion. The proposed Security Pact is not so ambitious. Its merit lies in the severance of the Eastern and Western problems. Under Mr. Chamberlain's proposal we undertake no obligations with reference to Poland or Roumania or Czecho-Slovakia to which we have not already subscribed in the Covenant of the League of Nations. Our guarantee is limited to the eastern frontier of France and Belgium, the disturbance of which—apart from the general evils which it would bring in its train—would be a distinct source of national danger to Britain. Moreover, such a Pact seems to offer the only hope of bringing Europe back to the peace mind.

It is the plain fact that unless Britain be willing to take some

risks for European peace, another war upon the Continent is inevitable. It is inevitable, because France will not withdraw, and cannot reasonably be expected to withdraw, from her positions on the Rhine without some compensating security, and so long as the French remain on German soil there is, however much it may be disguised by diplomatic inventions, a state of war between France and Germany which may, and indeed must, eventually break out with overt hostilities. The Pact offers a way out of the *impasse*. It has the enormous advantage of bringing France and Germany together, of carrying with it a free acceptance by Germany of her new western frontier, and of procuring the admission of Germany into the League of Nations and her assumption of the responsibilities which such membership involves. These are immense benefits, benefits great enough to warrant strenuous diplomatic exertions on the part of all the Powers concerned to frame an agreement on these lines.

It is clear, however, that if we are to assume far-reaching obligations under the Security Pact we must know what these obligations are. To what are we in fact committing ourselves? Some parts of the joint memorandum submitted by the French and British Governments are not very clear. It is not, for instance, laid down how far the principle of arbitration is to be carried, under the Rhineland agreement. Are all disputes arising out of the interpretation and execution of the Treaty of Versailles to be referred to arbitration or are they excluded? If they are excluded, then the cause of peace is only advanced by the agreement in so far as France and Germany (for Germany *ex hypothesi* is admitted to the League) realise their respective obligations under the Covenant of the League of Nations. For most of the burning questions of Europe arise directly out of the Treaty of Versailles. Will the French evacuate Mainz when the time comes? Will the plebiscite in the Saar Valley be held under fair conditions in 1935? And who is to be the judge of whether the Treaties are being fulfilled? Are the French to be the judges? Or the Allies? Or the League? As Mr. Lloyd George pertinently remarked in the debate on June 24th:

"We ought to know before we sign this document whether France or Germany—it does not matter which, because they are both in this Pact—is to be allowed to pull the trigger without our having a say at all in the matter, and whether all we have to do is to rush in with our armies and navies and money and the blood of our people. We ought to know."

No doubt the British Parliament will always in the last resort be technically free to decide whether or no it should go to war. The danger is that its freedom may be compromised in advance by engagements and understandings, which, at the decisive

moment and in the stress and strain of a great international crisis, it is bound to honour.

Another difficulty which is very real relates to the preservation of the *status quo*. France, which has a system of Peace Treaties, agreeable to her mind save in the one particular of the Rhine frontier, is anxious that no jot or tittle of the Peace Settlement should be altered. The French Note of June 16th (to which Mr. Chamberlain has assented) makes this explicit:

"The search for the guarantees of security which the world demands cannot involve any modification of the Peace Treaties. The arguments to be concluded ought not, therefore, either to imply a revision of these treaties or to result in practice in the modification of the conditions laid down for the application of certain of their clauses."

Now there is a widespread feeling in Britain and in other countries that the Peace Treaties will, at some time or other, need revision, and if it were to be understood by this engagement that Britain was to bind herself for all time to maintain the *status quo* in Europe, however acute the grievances resulting from its maintenance in certain parts of the Continent might disclose themselves to be, then undoubtedly the Pact would be exposed to serious objection. I do not, however, understand that this is the view of the Foreign Secretary. Here are his words:

"No one serves the cause of peace by suggesting that you should *now*" (the italics are mine) "tear up the Treaty of 1919 or attempt to re-write it. No one serves the cause of peace by suggesting that Article 19, or for the matter of that Article 18, was intended for application *at this time*, or ought to be or could be met if they were appealed to *at this time* by anything but refusal on the part of those concerned to alter the Treaty basis under the Articles. The Treaties must be the basis of every future scheme of arbitration. The revision of the Treaties, if there is to be revision, must be by friendly negotiation and agreement between those immediately concerned or by recourse to Article 19 and the intervention of the League."

It will be seen that Mr. Chamberlain does not exclude the idea of future revision by friendly agreement and negotiation, but points out that it would not serve the cause of peace to incorporate into the present agreement any provision for the re-casting of the Peace Treaties. This is good sense, provided that no words are used in the agreement which may hereafter be pointed to by our French allies as slamming the door against revision through negotiation at a future date. To raise the whole question of the Peace Treaties now would throw Europe into confusion; and the Foreign Secretary is probably right in thinking that Europe has not yet reached the atmosphere of composure in which so delicate a task as the revision of frontiers by negotiation could be undertaken with any prospect of success. On the other hand, we have

to remember that the Treaties were made, of necessity, with extreme rapidity and under tremendous political pressure, and that if some minor readjustments could be effected peaceably before very long, grave trouble might be averted hereafter. While, therefore, we ought not to open the door for revision, we certainly ought not to close it. Our policy is, and must be, the appeasement of Europe, and we equally frustrate our ends either by proclaiming revision from the house tops or by banning it with bell, book and candle to the end of time.

I have spoken of the possibility of minor readjustments—but there is one major question (it was lightly touched in the course of the debate on June 24th by Mr. MacDonald) with respect to which it would be well if the Allies were to cultivate an open mind. I allude to the position of Austria. There are, of course, immense difficulties in the way of gratifying the wishes of that party in Austria which desires re-incorporation in the German Reich. There is the acute hostility of Italy, there are the lively apprehensions of France. It would be impossible to make any move in that direction without the concurrence of these two Powers. There are many good judges, however, who hold, first, that this small Catholic Republic would be happier and more prosperous inside the Reich than outside it; and, secondly, that so far from fortifying the elements in Germany dangerous to peace, Austria would be a useful make-weight against them.

It has been charged against the British Government that they have not insisted upon a conference on disarmament as an integral part of the contemplated agreement. In this respect the Security Pact proposals of Mr. Chamberlain are disadvantageously contrasted with the Protocol, which, it will be remembered, was only to come into force upon a general scheme of disarmament being agreed on by a special Conference to be summoned by the Council of the League. Surely, it is said, Mr. Chamberlain might have used his tremendous bargaining advantage in obtaining some concession from the French with respect to his armaments and submarines? If Britain is to undertake the immense responsibility of guaranteeing France against attack she certainly is entitled to the advantage of a reduction in her air estimates? Mr. MacDonald took the point about disarmament very strongly:

"Surely the right hon. gentleman could have made a disarmament agreement an essential part of this Treaty. He has made one thing an essential part of bringing the Treaty into operation, namely, that Germany must enter into the League of Nations. I suggest that France, Germany and the whole lot of them must consider a disarmament Pact. Unless disarmament is allied to security, the right hon. gentleman can have his Pact as soon as he likes, but the measles of a policy of insecurity will break out again and again as soon as he has satisfied one side."

To these criticisms the Foreign Secretary replied that he did not mean for a moment to set aside the idea of an International Conference upon disarmament, but that, seeing that this country and the United States had already reduced their land forces to the minimum, it was rather for some other country to take the initiative in summoning an International Conference or in inviting the League of Nations to do it. The Pact would, in any case, be a preliminary to such a Conference. In any case, the withdrawal of Russia from the comity of nations makes it very difficult to carry through an agreed limitation of land armaments on the Continent at the present moment. It is, therefore, probably wise not to complicate the present negotiation, which must in any case be difficult, by insistence on disarmament as a precedent condition of Britain's adherence to the Pact. If the Pact goes through, our influence should be sufficient to secure for the whole question renewed consideration, either at Washington or at Geneva, or both places.

The conclusion to which I am impelled is that Europe will be advantaged by the conclusion of this Pact for security but that we are by no means sure of obtaining it, or, failing a specific arrangement for referring all disputes, whatever be their nature, to arbitration, effectually guaranteed by its terms against a future war. I believe, however, that it will, if signed, be a distinct step towards peace and disarmament, that the population of France will experience an immense sentiment of relief at the conclusion of a Pact under which Germany, of her own free will, consents to the loss of Alsace-Lorraine and to the assumption of the responsibilities attaching to membership of the League of Nations; and that, as French fears abate, the Chauvin forces in French politics will lose influence, and the more sober and temperate mind of a country of peace-loving peasants and artisans exercise an increasing measure of control over the direction of policy. In Germany also the conclusion of the Pact would mean a defeat of the Pan-Germans and a re-entry of the country into the fellowship of western nations.

It is urged that the French General Staff will demand military conversations. But how is it possible at the one and the same time to have military conversations with France on one hypothesis and with Germany on the other? A pact with either France or Germany would undoubtedly entail carefully-thought-out military plans and close military association. A pact with both simultaneously can have no such result. Its meaning would be that in certain emergencies, never, let us hope, likely to arise, the weight of Great Britain would be thrown into the scale. The war has shown the world how great that weight can be, and how little it can be measured even by the most extreme preparation to which Parliament is likely to assent in time of peace.

H. A. L. FISHER.

THE TRUTH ABOUT MOROCCO.

WITH so many subject races seething in discontent and ungratefully rejecting the religious and political canons and boundaries of their present rulers, the lesson which Morocco has recently been furnishing the world was, perhaps, superfluous. We have seen it all so often before. Nowadays, it is not the difficulties of colonial conquest, or even of colonial administration which trouble us, but of colonial retention.

The importance of the Moroccan issue lies less in itself than in its implications. The future of French hegemony in North Africa is at stake. For a century, roughly speaking, France has been exploiting Algeria, Tunis for half a century, and Morocco for a quarter of a century. One perceives, therefore, a progression by regularly marked stages, but without any corresponding advance in method such as has been imposed by circumstances upon us. As long as the hundreds of Arab and Berber tribes could be played off against each other, and each movement of revolt or aggrandisement nipped in the bud, there was nothing to interfere seriously with the government of each country and its material development. France has, from the standpoint of European civilisation, already wrought much good in Morocco. She has improved its agriculture and its finances; she has built railways and roads, and developed generally the country's resources. All this has been done chiefly at the expense of Morocco itself and of foreign capital. Although the country is suited to white colonists, such colonisation has not been undertaken largely or with any marked success, although some 450,000 hectares of land, formerly held by the natives, have been officially transferred to intending settlers. But Morocco, it must be remembered, lacks any natural fuel and is forced to import its coal and petrol, whose cost to the consumer is fantastically high. It also exposes the country to the risk of a fuel famine if its ports were to be blockaded. To minimise this disadvantage water-power is being exploited, and various concessions have lately been granted to certain capitalists to electrify industry and supply electric lighting. In this connection it may be mentioned that financial power in Morocco tends to concentrate in a comparatively few hands, and that these are rather international than French in character. The leading financial institution in the Protectorate is the Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, which has numerous industrial and commercial ramifications and is closely affiliated to the Morocco State Bank, which issues the currency. It may be added that the railways are largely controlled by these banks, as well as the milling, brewing, and numerous other industries.

On the whole Morocco has been offering foreign investors a satisfactory return on their capital, but the systematic penetration of the country by the colonist and civilian has been retarded by a sense of political insecurity. For Morocco differs from Algeria and Tunis. By the Convention of 1912, France in assuming a Protectorate acknowledged Spain's historic interest and geographical contiguity by formally recognising a Spanish zone. As long as Spain was able to control the tribes and suppress the periodical revolts in this northern zone all would go well in the south. But always the danger has been that amongst the Berbers of the Riff region some leader of real capacity would arise, who would be able to unite the factious tribes, compose their jealousies, and precipitate a general Moorish war. Having successfully thrown off the yoke of the Spaniard, such a leader would naturally be tempted to carry the flame of revolt into the French sphere.

No man understood this peril more clearly than the veteran Marshal Lyautey, Resident-General at Fez. But in view of the military resources and dispositions of Spain, the leader of such a native revolt would not only have to possess a capacity for leadership, but he must have access to European arms and methods and also to European counsels. The circumstances of the Great War actually produced such a leader. Although descended from chieftain stock, the father of Abdel Krim was a functionary in the Spanish service at Melilla. He followed in his father's footsteps and obtained official employment. During the Great War, in which Spain was a neutral, Abdel Krim came under German influence, and was actually in the pay of the German Embassy at Madrid. He also became profitably engaged in contraband trade. Here, then, was a Berber patriot far more dangerously equipped than such of his predecessors in rebellion as Abdel Kader or Raisuli. He was well acquainted with the secrets of Spanish military organisation; he knew the weaknesses of the army, and he also knew precisely in what quarter he might obtain practical sympathy and assistance in the shape of rifles, machine guns, and ammunition. He duly raised the standard of revolt; he led forth the tribes of the Riff, and, in the end, beat the Spanish forces despatched against him, beat them repeatedly and under humiliating circumstances, succeeding in expelling them from several considerable tracts of territory nominally held by them in northern Morocco. Many Spanish prisoners also were taken, nearly a thousand of whom Abdel Krim still keeps as ransom—besides large quantities of the material of war. All this accomplished, the Riff leader made himself dictator, established the Riff sultanate with his capital at Ajdir, and proceeded to consolidate his position.

Had the French in the south been prudent, this surely was the time to attempt the propitiation of Abdel Krim. For on February 25th last the Riff leader announced:

"Our struggle is exclusively national. Our only enemy is Spain. In the matter of peace it will come when Spain wishes it to come. Above all things we wish Spain to be at peace with us and that she become, if possible, our friend and ally.

"All the Spanish soldiers in Morocco, from the Atlantic to the eastern frontier, should be sent to Ceuta, Melilla or to Spain. The only thing that can satisfy us will be to see Spain abandon completely her protectorate. This we demand in the name of the Moroccan nation, since the Spanish Protectorate has not brought, nor can ever bring, anything but misery and desolation to our people."

As to his relations with France, he thus expressed himself:

"We wish the Riff and nothing more. With France I only wish peace. I consider France as the Queen of Islam. . . . Although the Sultan has not responded to my appeal, I have shown my desire of an understanding with France and I do not doubt that they will find a formula which I can accept."

It is, nevertheless, a fact that Abdel Krim's overtures to Fez were treated with contumely and that the Resident-General, who could have arranged terms with the victorious leader and, perhaps, undermined his influence, elected to treat him as a potential and probable enemy. Marshal Lyautey himself admits that he "was fully informed of all that has happened since January, 1924, and perceived that Abdel Krim, in view of the Spanish smash-up, would attack us, that his attack would be sudden and brusque, and that it would be an affair of propaganda amongst the tribes of the country affected." For these reasons, as far back as May of last year, the Marshal began to prepare for the expected incursion of the Riffs. He strengthened his frontier defences by constructing a chain of posts north of the river Wergha, which flows east and west, following the Spanish frontier line. He armed and instructed his tribesmen, deployed his regular troops, and awaited the irruption with confidence.

But in these simple preparations for war and the confidence which he expressed to his Government, the Marshal did not sufficiently consider the changed conditions under which warfare with the Riff leader would be waged. It was not now a question of a few tribes, but of all northern Morocco. By his victories over the Spanish, Abdel Krim had won enormous prestige, not confined to Morocco alone. His exploits and the cause he proclaimed had attracted attention in Europe, where he was now able to command friends, money, and credit on a considerable scale. Rifles, cannon, aeroplanes, motor transport, all the munitions of war, were already pouring into the Riff. European adven-

turers flocked to his standard. A propaganda in his favour was inaugurated in Europe. A noisy international party, inspired by Moscow, proclaimed that he was only battling for the freedom of his people from a foreign yoke. He himself, within his own territory, began to preach a holy war. Those tribes whom his eloquent, patriotic appeals failed to move he promptly terrorised by those bloody methods which the Arabs admire and understand. In a few months he had disposed his force of 10,000 trained men and a large body of tribesmen throughout the wild, hilly country which was to be the scene of his operations against the French. Abdel Krim swooped down upon the French outposts and captured them.

Now to repel such an enemy on such a *terrain* it became obvious that the French commander needed resources of men and material on a far bigger scale than had previously sufficed. So far from assuming the offensive it was all he could do to maintain the defensive. He found that the friendly tribes whom he had armed and whom he had relied on, were already going over to Abdel Krim. He found his own troops unsteady, gifted with a fatal facility for surrender. Whereupon the Marshal appealed to the Minister of War in Paris for fresh regiments and war material in abundance. Here an unpleasant surprise awaited him.

In pre-war France, when colonial conquest and colonial expansion were popular, troops and money would have been forthcoming promptly. But the situation at home, like the situation in Morocco, also was changed. The Great War had intervened. The people were weary of fighting; they were impatient of further taxation; the Ruhr adventure had utterly disillusioned them; they only wanted peace. As long as native troops, Algerian, Tunisian, Senegambian, Annamite, and Moorish, could be recruited and employed the French at home had no objection to Morocco's furnishing the means to pay them. But what the Resident-General asked for was an army of trained French soldiers (the experiment of a Foreign Legion had by no means been a success), he wanted the regiments now in barracks in France; he wanted guns and aeroplanes and tanks; transports and hospitals; and he found to his chagrin that there was small disposition at home to accord him anything of the kind. For one thing, a Socialist Government was in office, pledged to oppose all military projects; while a small but vehement political section was actually preaching the evacuation of all Morocco. The country generally was apathetic. When the Herriot Ministry fell and was succeeded by M. Painlevé and his friends the situation was not much brighter. The new Cabinet was faced by the need for the intensest economy. The Budget would not balance, and it only wanted this Morocco

adventure for it to topple over incontinently on the side of bankruptcy. The anti-war faction grew more insistent and threatening. The propaganda of the Communists was already infecting the troops on the spot. The Communist leaders, Cachin, Renaud Jean, and Doriot, discoursed almost daily in the Chamber or in their organ, *Humanité*, on the probity and patriotism of Abdel Krim and the incapacity and iniquity of Marshal Lyautey, who was charged with having initiated the war by his precautionary passage of the Wergha. Amongst the Socialists there were many who demanded an immediate peace with the Riff.

No wonder that M. Painlevé was at his wits' end. He saw the delicate arrangement with the Socialists—known as the *Cartel des Gauches*—by which he was enabled to command a majority in the Chamber, dissolving before his eyes. To make matters worse, news came of further reverses in the field. He was told by his Foreign Minister, M. Briand, that the Moroccan affair was having the worst possible effect on foreign opinion. His Minister of Finance, M. Caillaux, also informed him that Morocco was having the worst possible effect on French credit. The franc was descending with a velocity which uncomfortably recalled the early vicissitudes of the mark.

At this critical juncture, at the very moment, indeed, when he was summoned to meet a hostile motion in the Chamber, a happy idea presented itself to the harassed Premier. Few people were aware that Marshal Lyautey had been adroitly pulling various strings in Paris. He had been launching, though circumspectly and by deputy, a counter-propaganda of his own amongst the Socialist deputies and the Paris press. To his nephew, in Paris, he now dictated a letter defending his military measures, exposing the current situation in detail, explaining his pressing needs, urging activity upon his friends and animadverting upon the shameful behaviour of the Spanish. This letter, in its way a very interesting document to English students of Colonial government, as revealing the shifts to which a desperate pro-consul can be reduced by tepidity and opposition at home, never reached the nephew of the gallant Marshal. It has even been hinted that it was never intended to reach him. In any case, it turned up in the morning's mail of the Communist deputy, M. Doriot, who promptly read it to a shocked legislature. At first, it was denounced as a forgery, but this could not be sustained; it was obviously authentic. The letter had been stolen in transit, and M. Doriot was haled before a magistrate for receiving stolen property. The Marshal's secretary at Fez, who had posted the letter, was dismissed for the uncomplimentary references to the Spanish army it contained. The next day an official communiqué announced

that the secretary, M. Vatin-Perignon, had been promoted to a higher post in the Moroccan civil service.

But this is to anticipate. In the mind of the French Premier no doubt of the genuineness of the letter entered for a moment. Its effect upon public opinion would be disturbing. Instantly, he turned the incident to his advantage. Following one sensation with another he asked the House to suspend its judgment: there were far too many letters, reports, and rumours in circulation: he would examine the whole Moroccan business on the spot. He would not waste another moment: he would fly to Morocco. He would be absent four days. It was a dramatic *démarche*, well calculated to divert public opinion and arrest popular judgment. "Soldiers," commented the *Times*, "may smile at the idea that a civilian Prime Minister, even though he is also Minister for War, can form a judgment of much value upon an exceedingly difficult military problem with the information picked up in a hurried survey of the scene of operations." But M. Painlevé understands his countrymen. And, after all, did not Mr. Churchill once fly to Antwerp?

The French Premier, then, on June 10th last, flew to Morocco and returned, not in four days, yet with remarkable celerity. But the local situation during the ensuing weeks did not improve. The French reverses, disguised as only French official communiqués can be, persisted. Further tribes, hitherto friendly, became disaffected. Nevertheless, the trip succeeded in focussing universal attention upon Morocco. The truth began slowly to permeate the mind of the French masses, even those most opposed to war, that the Moroccan campaign involved consequences fatal to French dominion in Africa. It was not an affair of Imperialism, of "capitalistic exploitation," but a real war for racial ascendancy. At the present moment it is inconvenient, onerous, disagreeable, tragic; but the implications of the success of Abdel Krim are too plain to be ignored. Should he reach Fez one might as well say farewell to the Protectorate, and the political status of the French elsewhere in the midst of an Arab population would be profoundly affected. When, therefore, Mr. Painlevé again faced the Chamber, albeit there was much grumbling and the Socialists abstained from voting, yet, on July 9th, the Moroccan credits for a three months' campaign were finally agreed to.

Meanwhile, it being manifest that upon Spain's co-operation all chances of victory depend, negotiations were opened up at Madrid. The Spanish apparently agree that the projected French offensive, if it ever occurs, may be waged within their zone. They also agree to share measures to suppress the contraband trade in armaments. But whether they are likely to afford any armed

assistance to the French is another matter. The Marquis de Estrelle has his own plan of campaign, and he may not welcome a diversion for the sake of the security of the French zone. The Madrid negotiations, which began in the most cordial spirit, were rather clouded by certain regrettable incidents occurring in the international zone of Tangier, indicating an inveterate national divergence between the French and Spanish which may affect the whole situation. This neutral status of Tangier is, it may here be remarked, highly unsatisfactory. It has only been in force since June 1st and already gives rise to anxiety for the immediate future. No provision having been made for its local defence and the enforcement of law and order, there are not enough police to quell the disturbances which naturally arise between the Moorish partisans of one side or the other in the surrounding conflict. Spain has proposed to land a force of 500 Spanish Civil Guards. But the French and ourselves, the third party to the neutral arrangement, have decided that such action would be in itself provocative. Whereupon the Spanish Directory invited the two other Powers to furnish the required troops. Clearly, something must be done; but under no circumstances should Britain consent to be drawn, however indirectly, into armed participation in the conflict in which Spain, France, and the Riff are engaged. Her only interest in Tangier is to ensure the safety of the entrance to the Mediterranean for her fleets. Those on the spot are certain that the ultimate success of Abdel Krim and his control of Tangier would not really jeopardise our interests.

The feeling that Marshal Lyautey is, by reason of his age and civil duties, unequal to fresh military responsibilities, has resulted in the appointment of a new French commander-in-chief in Morocco. It was rumoured that the appointment would be offered to General Weygand, perhaps the ablest general on the active list; it was actually offered to General Guillaumat, who promptly refused it; it fell to General Naulin, of whom few outside the army have ever even heard. On July 18th* the new commander set out for Rabat. He has been promised sufficient troops, munitions and material to enable him to meet the Riffs and their allies and defeat them. If he merely forces back the Riffs into the Spanish zone the problem will be left as it was before. It is, however, much more probable that his show of force will induce the Riff chieftain to consent to a peace which will confirm the autonomy of the new Sultanate at Spain's expense. If such a peace is concluded Abdel Krim will retire with his military organisation, his national pretensions, his prestige intact. After his recent pro-

* Two days previously Marshal Pétain flew to Morocco at the request of the Government, and remained.

nouncements on the subject of the Sultan, of French foreigners and infidels and the rights of the Moors to all Morocco, after his solemn promises to the tribes fighting under his banner, the prospect of a free Morocco being restricted to the Riff does not appear convincing.

If war à outrance is decided upon the issue must be settled by the end of the present fighting season. Otherwise the Riff leader will so have consolidated his military and political position that it will require two hundred thousand men and twenty milliards of francs to dislodge him. He will, moreover, have laid the foundations of a Moorish alliance which will not rest until the whole country is as free of the foreigner as the Hedjaz or the Arabian Sultanates. The truth is, as astute minds in France have already perceived, the French are playing a losing game in Morocco. If, thanks to their civilising efforts, the country is not what it was five-and-twenty years ago, neither, in another sense, are the Moroccans the same people. They have not been drawn into the orbit of democracy for nothing. The national impulse given by Abdel Krim is not permanently to be resisted.

France may succeed in averting the present Riff peril. Aided by Spain she may even succeed in conquering the Riffs. But in spite of all her labour and benevolent intentions she is dealing with a difficult people, intelligent and inveterately recalcitrant. In the long run she will only succeed as we succeeded when we conquered Egypt, when we spent British lives and treasure in conquering Mesopotamia. For a few brief years there may be peace: but the lessons which France has been teaching of equality and nationalism coincide too closely with the aspirations of Abdel Krim. In the French zone the first form the revolt will take will be a denial of man-power. Not enough has been said of the resentment Moroccans feel at their country's being made a reservoir for France's fighting material and their countrymen being the instrument by which France has inflicted humiliation upon a beaten European foe. It has, however, played a prominent part in Abdel Krim's propaganda and it is not likely to be overlooked by his German well-wishers.

While we are everywhere escaping from unnecessary Colonial commitments, France has of late years been increasing hers from a mistaken notion of national prestige or some mistaken idea of future material advantage. There is also her need for man-power. Conscription may be very well in Algeria, which is now an integral part of France and sends her deputies to Paris; it may even answer in Senegal and Senegambia, where the blacks may be driven like cattle; but it is too much to expect that the Berbers and Arabs will continue to fight against their fellow-Moors at the

behest of a Sultan at Fez, whom they know is a simple puppet in the hands of the French Resident-General.

It is a common experience of the traveller to hear the example of Britain quoted, to hear a French patriot say, "You English can afford to talk! Look at your Empire: You have got Canada and Australia and India and Egypt and South Africa, this, that, and the other place. We must perforce take what we can." To which one can reply, "You mistake, my dear sir. We have not 'got' the nations and principalities you name; it is they who have 'got' us. Erase the idea of 'possession' from your mind. Our Dominions, Colonies, and Dependencies have, it is true, received our institutions, our laws, our capital and the pick of our population; but there is not a single colony, much less a dominion, where an Englishman is free to act, where we must not constantly consult their wishes and prejudices, where they may not discriminate against us, where they are not increasing our Imperial risk and making our international relations more difficult. We do not 'possess' other countries where British influence is as great and our commercial profits are higher. We do not possess, for example, Argentina, where we yet have five hundred million pounds invested. And, moreover —"

But it is difficult to explain the mystery of the British Empire to a Frenchman. One may only say that if we held such a country as Morocco on the same terms as the French hold it, we would at least be under no illusions as to the permanence of our tenure. The British people have learnt to be stern realists in these post-War days.

BECKLES WILLSON.

THE OPIUM QUESTION:

I.

THE HAGUE CONVENTION IN THE LIGHT OF THE GENEVA CONFERENCES.

IN THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW for March, 1912, I described the work of the first International Opium Conference held at the Hague in 1911-12 and the provisions of the Opium Convention of 1912 which was the outcome of that Conference. In THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW for July, 1923, under the title of "The Opium Convention and the League of Nations," I related the progress made in securing adhesions to and ratifications of that Convention as the result of the second and third International Opium Conferences, held at the Hague in 1913 and 1914, and the transfer, after the War, of the supervision of the execution of the Opium Convention to the League of Nations.

Two further Opium Conferences were held at Geneva under the auspices of the League of Nations last winter, and it may be well to inquire what results have attended those Conferences, and how far the agreement, convention and protocols with which they concluded their labours are calculated to achieve that progressive suppression of the abuse of opium, morphia, and cocaine and similar drugs of addiction which it was the aim of the Hague Convention to secure. It was never very clear why *two* Conferences were summoned at Geneva, the one to deal with Chapter II of the Hague Convention, *i.e.*, measures to be taken for the "suppression" of opium "prepared" for smoking; the other to deal with Chapter III of the Hague Convention, *i.e.*, the control of traffic in dangerous drugs. The explanation may perhaps be found in the distinction—more official than physiological—sometimes insisted upon between the effects of the inhalation of opium when smoked, on the one hand, and the effects of the ingestion or injection of it or its preparations on the other. This rather illogical division of the agenda necessitated the reference of the important American proposals in regard to the production of opium, whether for smoking, eating or medicinal purposes, to a Joint Committee of the two Conferences, but with inconclusive results.

The able president of the second conference, M. Zahle, in his final speech on February 19th, 1925, said unhesitatingly that this "had been the most difficult Conference in the history of the League of Nations. No League Conference had ever lasted so long." Representatives of forty-one States were in session for nearly seventy days, and before the close two delegations—those of the United States and of China—withdrew from the proceedings. M. Zahle made no claim to complete success; on the contrary he recog-

nised that the Conference leaves behind it "questions which will not be solved for years, possibly even decades." He maintained, however, (1) that the Conference "had greatly strengthened the Hague Convention of thirteen years ago," and (2) that "where the Hague Convention adjourned without leaving behind it either organisation or permanent machinery, this present Conference is but the opening step in a movement which will accelerate from day to day and from month to month." With perfect candour the President admitted that "if manufacture and transit (of drugs) have been well cared for the same cannot be claimed for production. The American principle for a limitation of production to medical and scientific purposes, though accepted as a principle by both the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium and the Assembly, has not been included in the Convention as a contractual obligation;" and "Similarly, only a limited progress can be claimed as regards the smoking of opium in certain Pacific countries."

Let us proceed to inquire how far the claims made on behalf of the recent Conferences can be substantiated, and to what extent constructive progress in the national and international control of the traffic in opium and other drugs of addiction has been achieved or expedited. In the first place, let me say that although I was a British Delegate at each of the three Hague Conferences and took part in drafting the Convention of 1912, no pride of sponsorship precludes me from recognising the difficulties which M. Zahle and his colleagues courageously encountered at Geneva. As to the allegation that the Hague Conference in 1912 adjourned without setting up machinery or organisation, I may say that our instructions from the Foreign Office specifically excluded even discussion of "the advisability of an international commission to be entrusted with the carrying out of any international agreement concluded," and all the Powers represented at the Conference had previously accepted this, among other conditions, laid down by His Majesty's Government.* Moreover, there was not, of course, in existence in 1912 any such organ for international co-operation as the League of Nations, although in our report, dated October 1st, 1914, of the third Conference, Mr. (now Sir William) Max Muller and I foreshadowed international co-operation on this humanitarian subject when peace should be re-established, recalling the example set by the Congress of Vienna in the abolition of the slave trade for such co-operation.†

Inasmuch as only twelve Powers were represented at the first Hague Conference and signed the Convention, while the evil to

* See Instructions to the British Delegates to the International Opium Conference [Cd. 6605] 1913. Miscellaneous No. 3.

† Correspondence respecting the third International Opium Conference [Cd. 7813], 1915.

be attacked was found to be world-wide, it was clear that the first step to be taken was to endeavour to secure the signature of the Convention by all the Powers not represented at the Hague. After that would follow ratification, and then passing and bringing into operation the legislation which was implicit in the Convention. The duty of supervising the execution of these effectuating provisions was entrusted to, and courteously undertaken by, the Government of the Netherlands. So effectively were these duties discharged that at the close of the second Hague Opium Conference in July, 1913, thirty-four out of about forty-six Powers had signed the Convention, while eight had ratified it or were about to do so. Further, by the same machinery, at the close of the third Hague Opium Conference, held shortly before the outbreak of war, forty-one out of forty-six Powers had signed, eleven had ratified and fourteen were about to do so. In order further to expedite progress it was then and there resolved to institute a Special Protocol for signature by such Powers as were willing to put the Convention into force without awaiting its ratification by other Powers.

The intervention of the Great War paralysed the progress of international co-operation between 1914 and 1918, although experience gained during the war had indicated even greater need for better control of the traffic in narcotics, and had induced this and other countries to put into operation certain emergency regulations against the alarming growth of the abuse of these drugs. On October 24th, 1918, when there appeared some prospect of the cessation of hostilities, I put a question in the House of Commons to Lord Robert Cecil as to the position, at that time, of ratification and enforcement of the Convention and of the Special Protocol of 1914, and was informed that "His Majesty's Government are still considering the question of putting into force some or all of the articles of the International Opium Convention without waiting for its ratification by all the signatory Powers." On March 19th, 1919, a reply was given in the House that "His Majesty's Government hope to be able to bring the question of international co-operation in the control of drugs before the Peace Conference, with a view to the adoption of a resolution binding the Powers represented at the Conference to the speedy enactment and enforcement of the laws, regulations and measures contemplated by the Opium Convention of 1912 for the purpose of confining to medical and legitimate purposes the manufacture, sale and use of opium, morphine and cocaine and similar noxious and habit-forming drugs. Such a resolution to be made binding on the enemy Powers."

This was accomplished by the Treaty of Versailles and the

other treaties which followed it while by Article 23 (c) of the Covenant of the League of Nations the supervision of the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs was entrusted to the League. Moreover, by article 295 of the Treaty it was provided that

"those of the High Contracting Parties who have not yet signed, or who have signed but not yet ratified, the Opium Convention signed at the Hague on January 23rd, 1912, agree to bring the said Convention into force, and for this purpose to enact the necessary legislation without delay and in any case within a period of twelve months from the coming into force of the present treaty. Furthermore, they agree that ratification of the present treaty should in the case of Powers which have not yet ratified the Opium Convention be deemed in all respects equivalent to the ratification of that Convention and to signature of the Special Protocol which was opened at the Hague in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the Third Opium Conference in 1914 for bringing the said Convention into force."

It would thus appear that by the Peace Treaties, or otherwise, some forty Powers have, since 1920, been pledged to put the Opium Convention of 1912 into force, without waiting for other Powers, and to enact the necessary legislation without delay.*

In February 1921, the Council of the League of Nations entered on its duties in regard to the Opium Convention by appointing an Advisory Committee which collected much valuable information, and in June of that year the Council adopted a resolution recording "the general desire to reduce and restrict the cultivation and production of opium to strictly medicinal and scientific purposes," and instructing its Committee to determine the average requirements for such purposes in different countries. This resolution gave rise in the Assembly of the League to a lively discussion, when protests were made on behalf of India, and it was accordingly amended by the substitution of "legitimate" for "strictly medicinal and scientific" purposes, it being contended that the practice of eating raw opium is "not illegitimate under the Convention."

Nevertheless in January, 1923, a Joint sub-Committee of the Health and Opium Committees of the League of Nations reported that "the medical use should be considered the only legitimate use and that all non-medical use should be recognised as an abuse, and also that, in the opinion of doctors, the use of opium as a stimulant could not be considered legitimate even in tropical countries."† The estimate of six hundred milligrams of opium per head per

* See The International Opium Conference of 1912, and subsequent relative papers. Treaty Series No. 17 [Cmd. 1520] 1921, pp. 268-9.

† Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium. Report of the Council on the Work of the Committee. C. 37. M. 91. 1923. XI.

annum was put forward tentatively as the legitimate requirement; subsequently, this was reduced to 450 or 400 milligrams.

Now the chief difficulties encountered by the Geneva Conferences centred around (1) the limitation of production of opium to legitimate requirements, and whether "legitimate" covered other than medical and scientific purposes, and (2) the rate at which, and the date from which, the suppression of the use of "prepared" opium for smoking—to which all the contracting parties were pledged—should take effect. The principles enunciated by the American delegates were: "(1) That if the purposes of the Hague Opium Convention are to be achieved according to its spirit and true intent it must be recognised that the use of opium products for other than medicinal and scientific purposes is an abuse and not legitimate; (2) That in order to prevent the abuse of these drugs it is necessary to exercise the control of the production of raw opium in such a manner that there will be no surplus available for non-medicinal and non-scientific purposes." The president, M. Zahle, in his final speech said: "No voice was raised, and indeed, I believe no voice can be raised against the justice of the principles enunciated by the American delegation." He claimed that "The producing countries realise that in total they are providing far more drugs than the world needs," and he spoke severely of a "small coterie of people willing to poison their fellows for profit." But the American principles were not included in the Convention or the agreement signed at Geneva, and their non-inclusion led to the withdrawal of the powerful delegation from the United States and the consequent non-signature of the new instruments by America.

As regards smoking or "prepared" opium, by Chapter II of the Hague Convention of 1912, all the contracting Powers had pledged themselves to bring about the gradual and effective suppression of its manufacture and use and the prohibition of its import and export either immediately or as soon as possible. Nevertheless, the Protocol drafted by the first Conference at Geneva last February postpones the suppression of smoking opium to a period not more than fifteen years from a date when a commission of the League shall have decided that the export of the raw drug from producing countries no longer constitutes a serious obstacle to the reduction of consumption of prepared opium in consuming countries. The new formula thus substituted for that of the Hague Convention is naïvely introduced by an assurance that the undersigned seven Powers are "anxious to ensure the complete and final execution of the obligations, and to strengthen the undertakings assumed by them under Article VI of the Hague Convention of 1912."

Great Britain by the Dangerous Drugs Acts of 1920 and 1923 gave legislative effect to the provisions of the Hague Convention as regards the Mother Country. Major Baird, in introducing the Bill on June 10th, 1920, said: "This Bill gives effect to the International Opium Convention signed at the Hague on January 23rd, 1912. The purpose of the Convention was to bring under control throughout the world the traffic in opium and cocaine and the preparations derived from them, and to restrict their use to medical and other legitimate purposes."* He added: "We believe that the only effective control can come from international co-operation." By the Acts of 1920 and 1923 severe restrictions are placed on the production, possession, sale, import or export of raw opium. The manufacture, sale, possession, smoking, import or export of "prepared opium" are forbidden; and the manufacture of and traffic in dangerous drugs are controlled and regulated. By the Act of 1923 the penalties for offences under the Act of 1920 were increased and any person found guilty on indictment is now liable to a penalty not exceeding £1,000 or to penal servitude not exceeding ten years, or both.

When we were about to sign the Hague Convention we received instructions from the Foreign Office to attach to our signatures, and did attach, the following declaration: "The articles of the present convention, if ratified by His Britannic Majesty's Government, shall apply to the Government of British India, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong Kong, and Wei-hai-Wei in every respect in the same way as they shall apply to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland." The question has been repeatedly asked whether the policy of the Government in India and the Far East has been such as to apply the Hague Convention there "in every respect in the same way" as the Dangerous Drugs Acts of 1920 and 1923 have applied it in Great Britain. It has been officially claimed that the practice of the Government of India rigidly "conforms to, and in many respects goes beyond, the requirements of the Hague Convention," while nevertheless it is based upon and justified by the findings of the Royal Commission of 1895.†

Now that Commission found that in India opium "is the universal household remedy," that "it is extensively administered to infants," that it is a remedy in fever, a prophylactic against malaria, a specific against fatigue; and that "in the present circumstances the revenue derived from opium is indispensable for carrying on with efficiency the Government of India." Moreover the Commission did not recommend the discontinuance of

* Parliamentary Debates, June 10, 1920. Col. 714.

† *The Truth about Indian Opium*, 1922, pp. 2, 8, 31.

"the export trade in Bengal opium from Calcutta to China and elsewhere, which would inflict a very heavy loss of public revenue on the Government and people of India."

It will be remembered that in 1906 Mr. John Morley, when Secretary of State for India, asserted in the House of Commons that the findings of the Royal Commission of 1895 had "somehow or other failed to satisfy public opinion in this country, and to ease the consciences of those who had taken up the matter;"* and the Indo-Chinese trade, condemned by the House of Commons as "morally indefensible," was terminated in 1917. The more recent declarations of the position of the Indian Government† include the contention that opium smoking is "essentially a social vice," "a form of social indulgence among the disreputable classes," and "a vicious habit." It is also asserted that "the effects of consumption of opium in Europe and America are hardly less disastrous than those of morphia and cocaine," and that "cocaine and morphia used for other than medical purposes invariably takes the form of a dangerous vice." Moreover since 1894 the Government of India has accepted the view that "the consumption of opium was harmful to the people of the Burman race;" they aspire to confine the use of the drug in India "within the narrowest possible limits," and entertain the hope "of confining the world production of opium to legitimate purposes."

Now the world production of opium has been estimated at not less than 2,500 tons a year, while the world requirement for legitimate medical purposes has been variously computed at from five to 125 tons a year. There can be no reasonable doubt that the production of opium, morphia and cocaine is appallingly in excess of any conceivable legitimate use, and it is idle to suppose that without limitation of production of these drugs there is any prospect of restricting, still less of suppressing, the world-wide abuse of them.

The distinction drawn by the Indian Government between smoking and eating opium to the detriment of the former is not supported by pharmacologists. Thus Prof. Dixon, F.R.S., holds that smoking is "by far the least objectionable way of taking opium, because the amount of alkaloid taken is so small, because a strong craving is not formed, and because 'cure' is relatively easy."‡ The export trade in Indian opium, much of which is destined to be used for smoking, has been adversely criticised. Some thousands of chests, of 140 lbs. apiece, are annually exported by the Indian Government to Singapore, Hong Kong, Batavia, Bangkok, as well as to Saigon, Macao and Bushire, and the

* Parliamentary Debates, May 30, 1906. Col. 508.

† *The Truth about Indian Opium*, 1922.

‡ Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine. Vol. XVIII, p. 252.

revenue derived from this trade in 1924 was Rs. 28,870,398. The acreage under poppy cultivation in India both in the Native States and in British India has increased during the last three years. Another significant feature is that the Government revenue of Brunei, the Federated Malay States and the Straits Settlements, to the extent of eighteen, seventeen and forty-five per cent. respectively, is derived from opium.

It has been alleged that while Indian opium has ceased to be imported into China, British-made morphia has found its way in enormous quantities to China and the Far East. In 1914 504,020 ounces, or fourteen tons, of British morphia were exported. Since the Dangerous Drugs Acts came into operation the exports of British morphia have been greatly reduced, and in 1924 amounted to 88,871 ounces, of which more than 9,000 ounces went to China and Japan. When it is recalled that the pharmacopœial dose of morphia is from one-eighth to half a grain, it may well be questioned whether there is not ample margin for other than legitimate medical usage.

It was maintained by M. Zahle that by the new Convention signed at Geneva, Chapter III of the Hague Convention, dealing with international trade in dangerous drugs, is "provided with the mechanism for its realisation." The keystone of this control, is, it is claimed, a Central Board of eight experts. "Obligations as intricate and complicated as the drug question itself have been accepted by the Signatory Powers to make all this mechanism effective." The Board is to receive statistical and other information annually from the contracting parties as to supplies, manufacture, stocks and consumption of opium and cocaine and their preparations, and is to watch the course of international trade. It may ask for an explanation of and call attention to illicit or excessive traffic and make recommendations as to limitation of traffic, while a Government not disposed to act on the recommendation may invoke the Council of the League. This Convention is not to come into force until it has been ratified by ten Powers, including seven of the States in respect of which the Central Board is to be appointed.* One ominous fact that emerged in the course of discussion was that some of the largest opium-producing countries are the least willing, or the least able, to exercise restriction on the amount of production. Whether the new and complicated machinery now devised will serve, as M. Zahle hoped, to initiate a "movement which will accelerate from day to day and from month to month," or, on the other hand, provide innumerable opportunities for procrastination and diplomatic *démarches* on the part of those who would prefer to go slow,

* According to a reply in the House of Commons on June 17th last, the Foreign Office had no information that any ratifications had been deposited.

remains to be seen. If all the contracting parties were to carry out their pledges by enacting and enforcing legislation on the lines of the Dangerous Drugs Acts of Great Britain of 1920 and 1923 there might be some hope of securing the objects of the Hague Convention, which the British Government declared to be "to bring under control throughout the world the traffic in Opium and Cocaine and the preparations derived from them, and to restrict their use to medical and other legitimate purposes."

WILLIAM J. COLLINS.

II.

A NEW OPIUM POLICY.

IN the Imperial Assembly at Delhi on March 12th and 13th, 1925, during a debate on the Opium Question, Sir Basil Blackett, the Finance Minister, held out the hope that if the Local Governments agreed, the Imperial Government might be willing to hold an inquiry by a Representative Committee into the Opium Policy, in order to see if any changes might be necessary. Sir Basil Blackett himself frankly took his stand on the Royal Opium Commission of 1893-95. He spoke of it in the terms of highest praise, as if it were the final word on the subject. At the same time he warmly congratulated Dr. S. K. Datta—who might be called, on this one question, the leader of the Opposition—for his well-reasoned argument in favour of an inquiry. The debate took the form of a vote of confidence, and the Government of India was defeated by sixty-two votes to fifty. The non-official Indian members were singularly united and the vote itself was impressive, as it included almost every Indian non-official present. It came also at a time when there was a wide cleavage among non-officials on other subjects.

What is the new Opium Policy, to which the leaders of Indian thought are looking forward? To answer this question, it is necessary to consider the course of the World Conference at Geneva, and to note their extreme dissatisfaction over the actions taken by the Government of India. They objected, first of all, to the fact that though opium had been declared a "Transferred Subject," in which the people's choice should prevail, the delegate to Geneva had been appointed by the Executive power and not by the Legislative Assembly. They also strongly objected to the delegate chosen to represent India. For the last person whom the Indian leaders would have wished to go to Geneva was Mr. John Campbell, and they said so bluntly at the Assembly. For some years past he had shown reactionary tendencies, and had consistently obstructed the American proposals throughout. The

Indian leaders believed in these American proposals, on the whole. They wished to join hands with America in carrying through a world reform, and they were entirely opposed to Mr. Campbell's policy of obstruction. This may be seen at a glance from the statement signed by Mahatma Gandhi and Rabindranath Tagore—the two greatest names in India to-day and both of them keenly sensitive for the honour of their country on this question. The fears expressed concerning Mr. Campbell proved true. His attitude at Geneva was more obstructionist than ever. When at last he was withdrawn and the whole case left in the far abler hands of Lord Cecil, even then the shadow of the India Office was not entirely lifted. The British Cabinet Minister was led into blunders by his advisers, which were of the gravest character. He had no information about the changes of thought that were taking place in India itself, and he did not realise fully the unrepresentative character of the India Office.

It will not be out of place, at this point, to refer to one of these blunders, because it will show how backward the India Office is, not only in its policy, but in its information. Lord Cecil, at a time when he was anxious to be entirely conciliatory towards America, quoted some figures from an India Office publication called *The Truth about Indian Opium*. He stated that in America the opium consumption per head was thirty-six grains per annum, which was in excess of the Indian consumption. This was only one of the inaccuracies in that singularly misnamed pamphlet. Now it happened that, as Chairman of the Foreign Relations' Committee of the House of Representatives, the Hon. Stephen Porter had himself inquired into that very scandal. He had proved up to the hilt its untruth, and had shown that the American consumption was eight grains, and not thirty-six grains at all. Thus America came well within the League of Nations index figure, and was not an excessive consumer, as the India Office pamphlet had made out. The evidence of this had been published a year ago, and yet this libel on America continued its circulation from the India Office. When Lord Cecil had all unconsciously repeated the charge against America, thinking it to be the truth, Mr. Porter got up and rebutted with indignation the false statement which the British delegate had uttered about his country. No one could have been more startled and distressed than Viscount Cecil. His apologies were profuse; but the incident left a bad impression.

This story is worth repeating, because one of the most serious complaints against the Government of India and the India Office, not in this matter only, but in almost every subject of reform, is this, that they are continually behind the times. They move for-

ward too slowly to keep pace with the current of the age. As for their conscientiousness, no one can call it in question. No administration in the world is harder worked. As Mr. Ramsay MacDonald said once at Simla, a Ministry of Archangels could not avoid blundering in a position such as theirs. The really able people at the top, who carry on the work, are few in number; the retrenchment by the Inchcape Committee has made their work harder still, for it depleted their staff in certain offices. They are all egregiously overworked, overworn, overtired, and worried to death. The problems of 320,000,000 people are so vast, the routine work is so heavy, that no one among them has really the leisure needed to get to the bottom of any single problem, studying it by itself thoroughly and radically. All that can be done is to keep the administrative machine in some state of regular motion. Therefore, with every good will in the world, things get into arrears. Humanitarian questions—such as prison reform, the Andaman Convict Station, police tyranny, peasant indebtedness, forced labour, women's work in mines, the doping of factory babies, and a hundred other subjects—are all of them so terribly long overdue, that the situation becomes almost desperate. Only some painfully direct action, such as passive resistance, or else some sudden pressure from the outside world, like the Geneva Conference, can thoroughly shake the Government out of its routine habit of mind, to face a new world that is thinking new thoughts. Lord Curzon was perhaps the keenest intellectual worker and the hardest driver at making the pace that India had known in modern times; but even he broke down under the strain of a giant's labour, and made blunders, in consequence of overwork, which could not be repaired.

Opium had been for many generations in India one of those questions that had fallen hopelessly into arrears. All that concerned the Central Government, encumbered by its heavy military budgets, was the opium revenue; and this was easily and steadily obtained. But the British Parliament vote on the China traffic in 1892 and the Royal Commission of 1893-95 disturbed this *laissez faire* attitude. The China opium trade, which had been declared "morally indefensible" in the House of Commons, had to go. It was not, however, till revenue had been taken out of it for nearly twenty additional years that it came at last to be abandoned. Meanwhile, a second line of defence had been built up, and an opium trade was carried on with the five million Chinese outside China, which seemed likely to prove almost as profitable as the old China trade itself.

But the Hague Convention came, and this export trade of India fell under another searching scrutiny. It was seen clearly that

if opium smoking was bad in China, it was bad out of China also. But there were many interested powers at the Convention, each with its own interests to consider. Therefore the terms of the Opium Articles, on the point of export trade from India, were rendered intentionally vague. Then the war came, and for the time being no one thought about the treaty which had just been signed. The trade went on just as before. But Article VII, in spite of its limiting clauses, was a difficult one to explain away altogether. It read as follows:

"The Contracting Powers shall prohibit the import and export of prepared opium. Those Powers, however, which are not yet ready to prohibit immediately the export of prepared opium shall prohibit it as soon as possible."

The Government of India had been the chief exporter of opium for smoking to the Far East. When the war was over, the Article proved embarrassing. For the Hague Convention was taken up into the League of Nations and the whole discussion of opium was re-established, after the Peace Treaty at Versailles, on a world scale. America had entered into the struggle with her own experiences in the Philippines of total prohibition. She was inspired with moral idealism in the person of Bishop Brent, who had been Bishop in those islands. In the Plenary Conference at Geneva, the American Delegate went straight to the point and bluntly charged Great Britain with breaking the Hague Convention for financial reasons. Lord Cecil declared that such a charge was "very wounding—very wounding indeed." But it was never withdrawn by America.

The official reply offered by the Government of India has been unsatisfactory. One explanation has been that opium exported from India is not "prepared" till it gets to Singapore. Another is that India's trade is covered by the words "as soon as possible" in Article VII. Another is, that Singapore, Macao, and other places certificate this opium as "legitimately" needed, and therefore India is not to blame. A fourth explanation is that the War prevented the last steps in the Opium Articles' ratification at the Hague.

Dr. S. K. Datta, Pundit M. M. Malaviya and Pundit Motilal Nehru have openly expressed in the Assembly that they are dissatisfied with these lame explanations. They would willingly forfeit the revenue that is obtained out of this disreputable traffic. Indeed, it is possible to go still further and suppose that the Indian Government itself would be glad to get rid of it. But the Singapore Government has been running its administration very largely on its opium monopoly for forty years and it is a difficult thing to surrender.

Here, then, we come at last to a new and definitely formulated export opium policy, put forward publicly by Indian leaders, and voted for by practically the whole body of Indian non-official members of the Imperial Legislative Assembly. They would abolish the export trade in opium, where Indian opium is sent out for smoking purposes, and thus come into line with the clear demand of the Hague Convention and also of the Geneva Conference. The loss of revenue would be willingly and gladly accepted in view of the moral obligation to mankind.

A proposal, no less significant, has also been made with regard to India's internal consumption. Here the Indian leaders agree with the Indian Government that a Dangerous Drugs Act for India would be impracticable. India is a land of small, scattered, and remote villages, often with no medical aid immediately near. It would not be possible, therefore, to obtain a medical prescription in every case where opium was urgently needed as a specific remedy. Therefore it would be impossible to try to limit the use of opium to medical prescription alone, and to make any other use penal. But Indian leaders suggest that the League of Nations' index figure of 600 milligrams per head per annum should be taken as a working basis. In Indian weights and measures, this works out at a consumption of six seers (i.e., twelve pounds avoirdupois) per 10,000 persons. Their proposal, put very briefly, is this, that as soon as possible all districts in British India and Burma should reduce their consumption (if it is not already reduced) to six seers for each 10,000 of their population.

When we have regard to the ease with which opium may be obtained at the opium shops, it is clear that Indian villagers as a whole are remarkably free from opium addiction. In the vast majority of the villages throughout the country, the consumption is well within the League of Nations' index figure of six seers per 10,000 people. Four of the largest provinces—Bengal, Behar and Orissa, the United Provinces and Madras—with a population of over 170,000,000 souls, have an average consumption which is under eight seers for each 10,000 people. The whole of British India and Burma has only the average consumption of twelve seers for each 10,000 of its population. If the Indian States were added, it is likely that the figure would be higher, but it is only possible to deal with British India in classified statistics. Therefore the new proposal of the Indian leaders, namely, to reduce the consumption in every district to the League of Nations' index figure of six seers per 10,000 people, is not likely to prove so difficult as at first sight may appear. It might be called the policy of progressive limitation; and if the Government of India were to accept it as the Government policy, it would mean

the gradual rationing of all the opium shops down to the minimum amount. Indeed, it has also been suggested that, as education on the subject advanced among the villagers, the practice of selling opium in a medicinal form, such as Dover's Powders, might be introduced both at Government dispensaries, and, in more remote places, at the village Post Office—just as quinine is sold at present. A certain check would have to be kept upon the amount which might be purchased at one time and also upon the stock that might be held. Everything would be done, according to this reform policy, to convert the present irrational eating of crude opium into a more rational and scientific use, without the legal insistence on a medical prescription. At the same time, in districts where opium addiction had been prevalent, registration of addicts, together with a more drastic form of prohibition, might have to be adopted.

While this new rationing might be actually in progress and this new education having its effect in the schools, a definite attempt would be made to reduce consumption in those areas where it is now clearly excessive. Such an attempt to remove an age-long opium abuse has recently been made in Assam with remarkable success. By means of voluntary effort, combined with Government rationing of shops, the consumption has already been reduced by nearly half. But even now its index figure of fifty-two seers per 10,000 people is hugely excessive. Yet the tide of popular enthusiasm for reform has by no means reached its limit and the people themselves are determined entirely to remove the curse. The Government also have been taking action as they have never done before. This has been one of the startling results of Mahatma Gandhi's personal influence. For the whole reform movement took its rise from his visit in 1921.

Excess in consumption over other parts of India may be briefly explained as follows:

(1) There is an increasing demand for opium in the new industrial centres, where the old religious sanctions of village life have been broken down. The consumption rate for Calcutta is 144, and for Rangoon 108 per 10,000 people. Though the presence of a Chinese immigrant population accounts for some of this excess, new habits of addiction are beginning to appear among the mill and factory hands. In Bombay, where there is no Chinese problem, the consumption is forty-three per 10,000, and many other industrial towns show as high a figure. The doping of babies by their mothers with opium also accounts for much of this new evil in the cities.

(2) There is evidently a long entrenched opium habit in Rajputana, which has had its effect on the neighbouring parts of British India. We cannot get accurate figures for Rajputana here, because the consumption in the Indian States is not tabulated as in British

India. But Ajmere is a small portion of the British territory in Rajputana itself. The Ajmere area has a consumption of fifty-two per 10,000. This may give us an indication of the consumption that is going on in the adjoining States. From all that I have heard, at first hand, it appears that the opium habit has led to great demoralisation. Malwa is a state in Rajputana which actually cultivates opium. Malwa opium is even now being smuggled into Assam, where I am working at the Opium problem as a member of the Assam Congress Inquiry Committee.

(3) There are certain areas of excessive consumption in the borders of Rajputana itself. These are found in Gujerat, in Sind, and in the lower and central parts of the Punjab. The consumption rate is between thirty and fifty for each 10,000 people.

(4) Two strange areas of excessive consumption appear on the East Coast. One is in Orissa, at Puri and Balasore. The other is in the Godavari district. It is not unlikely that the opium habit here was brought back from Burma and Malaya by the large number of emigrants who go across the Bay of Bengal.

(5) An illegitimate practice is to be found in Burma, by which opium is allowed to the Chinese labourers, but prohibited to the Burmese. The Chinese smoke opium: and this exception in their case is so contrary to the Hague Convention and the League of Nations, that it ought to be stopped. Its result has been quite disastrous, as may be seen from the district of Mergui, where the consumption is 147 per 10,000, owing to the presence of the Chinese in the mines. The Burmese, who wish to smoke, purchase their opium secretly from the Chinese or other races.

In concluding this article, I would wish to add that it is my own great wish and hope that this purely humanitarian subject of Opium Reform may become a common meeting ground for Congress workers and Government officials. But for this to happen, the Government of India must be prepared to leave definitely its own old, outworn policy behind, and accept the new policy of the reformers. Since opium has been declared a transferred subject, the people's policy ought to carry weight and the Government should give it a fair trial.

C. F. ANDREWS.

TWIN BOOKS ON TWO POLICIES.*

THE nearly simultaneous appearance of two highly authoritative books upon the foreign policies of Castlereagh and Canning celebrates very appropriately the centenary of the death of the former, which has just gone by, and of the latter, which is rapidly approaching. The authors of these studies are both admirably equipped for their task. Each of them enjoys a long intimacy with his subject, each has produced one or more preliminary monographs before bringing out his larger work, each can claim the high credentials of an important university appointment, each has lived through a period in many respects similar to that which Castlereagh and Canning adorned, and each can boast a certain amount of practical acquaintance with the problems both of diplomacy and war. The only advantage that authors, otherwise so fortunately situated, might be suspected of lacking is leisure. Partly, no doubt, from the very austerity of their subjects, but partly, too, one may guess, from the exacting demands of busy lives, they fail, if they fail at all, in giving to the treatment of their subjects that indefinable sense of spacious days and spacious ways, which the old literary historians regarded as an essential feature of their business, but which their successors, tormented by the angels of meticulous accuracy, exhaustive documentation, and anatomical exactitude, can hardly be expected to regard as of equal consequence. "Don't be afraid of letting the bones show," is said to have been the bold advice of one teacher of history to his pupils; and in these two books the bones are made to show in a manner that is sure to be a great convenience to the student, but may be less to the taste of the general reader, who needs, as a rule, to be helped upon his journey by the free use of allusion, digression, generalisation, and even, it may be, now and again, by purple patches and by flowers of style.

This growth of asceticism in the writing of history—this constant paring of the flesh and baring to the bone—is a danger not to be neglected, threatening as it does, at a time when the study of the past, important anyway, is peculiarly important as a corrective to the influence upon a half-educated electorate of tendentious journalism and ingenious head-lines, to leave the ordinary citizen at the mercy of men, not only indisposed to view events *sub specie æternitatis*, but actually indifferent to the proved wisdom of the previous century. If, for example, the admirable analysis of European diplomacy in the years of the Vienna Congress that Professor Webster contributed to the *Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy*, had been written, not only a little

* *The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, 1815-1822*, by C. K. Webster. *The Foreign Policy of Canning, 1822-1827*, by Harold Temperley. (G. Bell & Sons.)

earlier but with somewhat less austerity, it is permissible to think that it would not have been wholly without influence upon the Peace of Versailles. The desire to please should be as much part of a historian's philosophy as the desire to probe; and the richest work will come from those who seek to satisfy, not only the stern canons of research, but the delicate palate of the lover of *belles lettres*. Clio, as Mr. Trevelyan, to the great honour of his University, has reminded us, is a muse; and it is not on record that any muse has ever shown a disposition to be a monk.

It is equally true and equally to the point to remind ourselves that, if Clio has shown no leanings to a convent, she has flirted time out of mind with moral philosophy. We may damn her for a blue-stocking or belaud her as Hypatia, as we please, but, beyond all doubt, she has an eye for ethics and her soul is "souly." When Lord Morley spoke of "those noble moralities that are the life-blood of style and of greater things than style can ever be," he discovered the secret of the wide powers and influence of much of the best historical writing of his own time. The historians of the nineteenth century were alive with the energy of great causes and eloquent under the pressure of an ever-present sense of right and wrong. We have been afraid of their partialities and have lost their fires. Yet Passion is the condition precedent of all truly humane writing—the key that unlocks the closed chambers of the Past, the cordial that sets the blood coursing in full flow through dead men's bones. Froude is the better exponent of the spirit of the English Reformation that he was a Protestant, Macaulay of the temper of the English Revolution that he was a Whig. Only in this matter Clio, as befits a philosopher, needs to be more man than woman. "Her passions," observes Mrs. Browning, of Madame Mohl, "have her thoughts inside them, instead of her thoughts her passions. That's the common distinction between women and men!" It is the distinction also between the false historian and the true. Passion playing within the bounds of honest thought sets the student free from that dull detachment which is the proper temper of physical research, but alien to the study of the relations of man with man, and so gives rein to his conscience, vigour to his judgment, mobility to his style.

How lively, how humane the analysis even of so documentary an affair as diplomacy can be made, has been shown by the two-volume essay in which Seeley examined the growth of British Policy; and it is the memory of that brilliant piece of work, teeming at every turn with suggestion and generalisation, that provokes comparison between the Cambridge School as it has come to be under the heavy hand of Acton, and the Cambridge School as it promised to be under his predecessor's guidance. Not,

indeed, that Acton himself eschewed either gossip or morality! Only that the immense stress that he laid upon thorough and exhaustive study of the sources and the commentators has tended to obscure the truth that if the detection of facts is a science, the presentation of facts is an art.

If there is a criticism to be passed upon the work of Professor Webster and Mr. Temperley, in certain respects so evidently deserving of the highest praise, it is, then, that their technical attainment in the former direction is markedly superior to what they have accomplished in the latter. Abundantly provided as their period is with event and incident, with memorable figures and momentous issues, the tense, throbbing movement of the times seems to elude the grasp of both writers alike. Partly, this is due, no doubt, to the fact that the two books are studies, not precisely of Castlereagh's or Canning's foreign policy, nor yet of Castlereagh or Canning as Foreign Ministers, but of their diplomacy in certain eventful years, and those years, as it happens in Castlereagh's case, not the most eventful. But, besides this, the documents, somehow, are never quite welded into a drania. The authors are a shade too ascetic for the staging and the pageantry of the scene. The story dissolves in sections methodically arranged. But Life—the life of men in societies, of which History has to tell the tale—is a sparkling, rushing stream of circumstance, tossing up ideas and speculations at every turn, tempting the bather now to dive deep and now to sport upon the surface of the current. We talk of 'human' documents as of something rare and strange; no document in the hands of one like Maitland, who could keep reading between the lines, is ever anything else.

There are signs, indeed, that neither Professor Webster nor Mr. Temperley is quite so austere as at first sight he seems. Nature is not altogether to be expelled either with fork or parchment, and both our authors fall now and again into the temptation of telling us human things about their heroes, of which the exact bearing upon foreign policy is not obvious except on the basis of a wide and humane and discursive historical philosophy. It is interesting, for example, to know that Castlereagh was fond of flowers; it is important to have a full, detailed account of his death; and it is curious to learn that a stranger, happening to catch sight of Canning as he drove away from his last audience with the King at Windsor, saw death in the Minister's looks, and that a doctor, suddenly summoned to the Privy Council Board, exclaimed when he caught sight of him: "Who is that individual with such a fine eye, who is so near his end?" But these things are the marks of the chronicler and the playwright, and not of those who do not lift their eyes above despatch and treaty. As

such many of us, students, so to say, in the street, will welcome them; and had they been more numerous and more dexterously welded into the body of the narrative, these two volumes would have been all aglow with life. For, as things are, the studies, monuments though they be of industry and scholarship, move a little stiffly to their ends. Yet those ends are reached, even though others may, perhaps, grind anew the corn which better men than they have reaped and garnered.

Castlereagh and Canning are the fathers of the two great schools of British diplomacy, but they were sons of the same spiritual mother, both of them of Irish stock, both of them in love with England and all that England stood for in their time. There is a world of similarity in their careers, and a world of difference; and so it is also in their policies. It is as easy to compare as to contrast their work. Their minds seem to meet only to part, to part only to meet again. They furnish a text for him who would preach upon the continuity of British Policy and a target to him who would point out its inconsequence. To have made up one's mind upon their respective merits is to have matriculated in a diplomatic education.

These are their points of likeness. They were born within a year of one another; they were Irishmen with English blood; they were both touched by the liberal influences of the first phase of the French Revolution, and both fell back into a strong Conservatism untroubled by any thought of Parliamentary reform; they came in turn under the influence—the fascination—of Pitt; alike, they hoped, they pressed, but all in vain, for that measure of Catholic emancipation which, in the hour of its opportunity, would have righted all the wrongs of Ireland. Alike they developed, Fortune giving to each in turn his chance, a dominant interest in foreign affairs; alike they left their mark, destined to grow plainer and not less faint, upon the policy of their country. Nor was this all they had in common. For they wrestled, both of them, with the problems of a Europe, distracted like our own by noble dreams as well as by the hard realities of war; they believed, both of them, that British Policy must hold firm by treaty rights and stand free of constitution-mongers, republican or royal; and they died, both of them, suddenly, tragically, each at his post, with, as it seems to us at any rate, their work not yet accomplished and no one near at hand equipped to take it over.

The differences, however, between the two men are even more marked and more remarkable than their similarities, opening as they do the way to wider considerations. Castlereagh, not by birth alone, but by virtue of instincts and feelings, for which, indeed, Tradition provides the easiest soil for growth but sometimes

all in vain, was made and moulded for a gentleman. Canning, though he had the graces of an Eton education and obtained by virtue of it, coupled as it was in his case with brilliant gifts of intellect, a rapid entry into the society of the great world, never to the end of his days shook off the look of a *parvenu*. Some part of this disadvantage he owed no doubt to aristocratic prejudice, but much to qualities which to this day are damaging. Newman says in his famous character of a gentleman that this type is marked by a sensitive dislike of giving pain to others. Canning had no such delicacy. His squibs and sarcasms were pitiless, intended to give pain and successful in doing so. But he had another bad quality, which men resent no less. He was an *arriviste*—an *arriviste* naked and unashamed. He set, quite justly, the highest value on his abilities, and he fixed, himself, the price at which the country could have them. In 1809 he refused to serve in the same Cabinet with Castlereagh, though Castlereagh's strategy at the War Office was much better conceived than that of his predecessors and was ultimately and triumphantly vindicated by Wellington in Spain. Again, in 1812, he refused to take the Foreign Office, which Castlereagh magnanimously offered to resign in his favour, unless he were given also the leadership in the Commons. In 1827—the last year of his life—it was still the same. He must either be Prime Minister, or else have a Prime Minister subservient to himself; if not, he threatened to split, as, in fact, he did ultimately split, the party he belonged to. On this last occasion, indeed, there was a latent nobility in his conduct, in so far as his unswerving advocacy of Catholic Emancipation was responsible for alienating the sympathies of his colleagues. But, if he had been a great gentleman or, for the matter of that, a great patriot, he would never have bargained for the Premiership, and still less for a puppet of a Premier with himself nearby to pull the strings. The truth was that his motives were seldom pure, and that, perhaps subconsciously, his colleagues knew it and distrusted him accordingly. No other hypothesis really explains Wellington's unfairness to him in the crisis of 1827. The question for the Duke was how the King's Government could best be carried on, but the question for Canning was whether or not he was to have the place, or, at the least, the power to which his abilities were entitled. The King gratified his ambition; the nation signified its assent; and Providence, having granted him his heart's desire, changed his crown of roses, before it had had time to fade, into a funeral wreath.

Castlereagh lived and worked upon another plane. His talents, far less brilliant in appearance, were rendered far more effective by the transparent fineness of his character. He never enjoyed

such a moment of popularity with the crowd as was Canning's in 1827; and his strong action in dealing with sedition, or the appearance of it, caused him to be execrated by poets and publicists. But he possessed in increasing measure, both at home and abroad, the confidence of all who knew him; and it speaks volumes for the moral worth and solid judgment which lay behind his clumsy tongue that it was said of him that he never spoke in public without gaining a friend, nor Canning, for all his classic periods, without making an enemy. Nothing is so persuasive to Englishmen as a wise and honest man painfully struggling to express himself; and no man, perhaps, ever gave better proof of what such an one can achieve than Castlereagh. He had to deal with an England exhausted and exasperated by war, a Europe devastated, and a France that had gloried in all that we think shameful and for twenty years assailed, with every accompaniment of meanness and cruelty, the peace and prosperity of her neighbours—that had done this, and, not content with this, had shown herself ready on the morrow of European deliverance to receive back with open arms and flying colours, as if he were a hero and a benefactor, the author of her offences and the tyrant of his times. Castlereagh dealt with this situation better than any man knew how to deal with a state of affairs similar, yet not really so provocative, a century later. Backed by Wellington, aided by Alexander, countenanced by Metternich, he insisted upon a *beau geste* and treated France with a generosity such as she has never shown to others. Needless to say he had, and has, his critics, of whom Mr. Temperley is or has been* one. But, thanks to his sagacity, France, after some back-slidings, has learnt to take that place in Europe which any increase in her weakness must have left vacant.

It is something of a misfortune that Professor Webster's book does not cover the years 1814 and 1815 when, first at Chaumont, then at Vienna, then at Paris, Castlereagh laid the foundations of his great scheme of lasting peace and conciliation. Their outline has indeed been admirably traced by the same hand in the *Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy*; but it is much to ask a modern reader to turn back to pages not instantly accessible. Here it must suffice to say that the keystone of Castlereagh's edifice was a Quadruple Alliance of the four victorious Powers for the maintenance of the Vienna settlement. The Alliance was directed primarily against any revival of the French peril, but, though Castlereagh would incur no obligations beyond the maintenance of the boundaries fixed by treaty, this Concert of the Greater Powers was designed to meet in conference at stated intervals for the discussion of such questions of European interest as might arise. There was a great good sense in this. Statesmen

* In his former book on Canning.

had got to know one another during the Napoleonic War, and frequent meetings made for better understandings. But Castlereagh did not immediately perceive all the implications of his scheme. The cause of the long war lay in part in hostility to Napoleon, but in part also in the antagonism between the Ancien Régime and the Revolution. Monarchy and Democracy were felt increasingly to be forms of civilisation as well as forms of government; and in the period between 1815 and 1850 the rulers of Europe were, of necessity, quite as much occupied with problems of philosophy as with questions of geography. Castlereagh, the Minister of an insular State and of a State, moreover, that was at that fortunate stage in its development when no one element of the Constitution had the advantage of the other, may be easily excused for failing to appreciate fully how interdependent countries are, how essential is a community of institutions to the development of a full civilisation—and excused all the more readily that his cosmopolitanism was in advance of that of his colleagues and much in advance of that of his country. Democracies will never live at ease with Aristocracies near at hand, nor Aristocracies feel safe with Democracies knocking or waiting at the door. But Castlereagh took his stand upon the doctrine that Europe had no right to interfere with the domestic affairs of its various members, an exception to the rule being, however, recognised by him in regard to any restoration of Napoleon by France.

This may have been a thoroughly sound decision, given all the circumstances to be taken into account, but it was undoubtedly a decision which caused Great Britain to lose weight in counsel. The despotic Powers debated none the less for it the troubled situation in the Bourbon Monarchies of France, Spain and Naples, whose unstable thrones seemed a constant menace to them; and England neither stood in with them nor yet stood altogether out. Professor Webster is of opinion that matters were again shaping not unfavourably for Castlereagh's system at the time of his death in 1822. It may be so, but Professor Alison Phillips's view that the system had been tried and found wanting is probably the juster estimate. Nationality—in the sense of a free constitution—could not fairly be regarded as an indifferent issue internationally; and Castlereagh's scheme made no real provision for dealing with it. Each successive Congress—Laibach, Troppau and, after Castlereagh's death, Verona—was, therefore, in the nature of a tide receding and left Britain somewhat higher and drier than it had been before.

It was, at any rate, the partial, if not the total collapse of Castlereagh's hopes of international co-operation that enabled Canning to give a new orientation to British Policy without any apparent loss of continuity. Taking exactly Castlereagh's point—that

Great Britain could not interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states—and basing his policy in fact upon Castlereagh's now famous confidential state-paper of May 5th, 1820, Canning did not merely leave his predecessor's international machinery to fall into disrepair but set to work vigorously to destroy it. He took up again the unhappy idea of a balance of power, consecrated it in a magniloquent phrase, spoke with undisguised contempt of the Conference-system as "Areopagus and the like of that," and bade every nation look to its own affairs and not at all upon the affairs of others. So much indeed did he believe in international competition that, as Mr. Temperley brings out, he had no particular wish to see others adopt free institutions for fear that it might give them an advantage in the race for strength. His policy, thus, reflects the competitive view of international relationships, just as Castlereagh's reflects the co-operative view. But to call it a view is too little. It implies a philosophy and more than a philosophy—a religion. Though Canning would have done lip service to the idea of peace, he was not prepared, whereas Castlereagh was prepared, to work in the only spirit calculated to eliminate war—to work, not in antagonism but as if all nations, by virtue of a common civilisation, were born to be members one of another. He remained content with that popular appeal to national sentiment which Palmerston, his pupil in foreign affairs, worked up into something like a science. But the New World that he called into existence to redress the balance of the Old has, with a noble irony that he never dreamed of, responded to and regenerated his appeal. "Peace," said Mr. Houghton, voicing the other day the thought of the great nation that he represents at the Court of St. James, "must be based upon the assumption of good faith by all who participate in it. . . . Peace can come only as the result of mutual and hopeful endeavour. Peace is an adventure in faith."* One might add one word more; Peace is the prospect of true civilisation.

So great then, and so much alive are the issues raised by these two remarkable books. Neither volume is complete without the other; and together they form a fine example of contemporary historical scholarship, full of knowledge, of research, of information not to be elsewhere obtained and of political experience conveniently arranged and yielding a rich harvest of reflection. If there are anywhere slips, these—the base coin of the critic—nowhere strike the casual eye. Professor Webster is perhaps mistaken in adopting the common statement that every ruler of Europe except the Pope, the Sultan, and the King of England signed the Holy Alliance, and certainly in error if he intends to imply† that

* Pilgrims' Dinner, May 4th, 1925.

† The implication lies in the use (on p. 59) of the words "at a later date" in regard to Switzerland.

they did so forthwith. Koch and Martens, the obvious authorities, guard their general statements on the subject carefully. "La plupart des Etats Chrétiens, ou peut-être tous, à l'exception de la Grande Bretagne, ont successivement accédé à ce traité," says the former. The course taken by Spain is, in particular, obscure. Professor Altamira in the *Cambridge Modern History* declares that "Spain . . . was not invited to join the Holy Alliance," and Hubbard tells us that Ferdinand's apologists in Spain pretended that he had refused to belong to it on the ground that any close pact with anti-Catholic Sovereigns was heretical. If, therefore, he was ever formally associated with the Powers of the Holy Alliance, his admission to their company apparently involved a change of heart on his side as well as on theirs.

Another small point in which not only Professor Webster, but Mr. Temperley also lays himself open to criticism is the use of the term Tsar or Czar to designate the Russian Emperor. No doubt the title is consecrated by popular habit. But in an exact treatise on diplomacy the practice must be reckoned an inexactitude; and an English diplomatist has, before now, drawn attention to the error involved. After the time of Peter the Great the correct style of the Russian sovereign was Emperor (*imperator*) of all the Russias; and the very fact that in due course he called himself also "Tsar of Poland," emphasises the distinction between the one title and the other. For "Tsar," whatever its original link with "Caesar," is, in Russian usage, nearer akin to "lord" or "king." But these are trifles illustrating by their very triviality the painstaking, careful quality of the work in general. For the rest one might say that Professor Webster is possessed of a sound, workmanlike style which does not slip or stumble. Mr. Temperley's writing is more embarrassed by quotation and also more ambitious of effect. Here and there he indulges in quaint freaks of diction—"the Court of the Czar-Mother" (p. 344), for instance, and "steps awash with blood" (p. 351). But these, again, are trifles, and lighter than the last.

In sum, work so thorough, so important, and so well-considered is deserving of great praise on the part of a reviewer, certain of full and grateful recognition at the hands of all close students of the period, and alive with claims to the attention of politicians. To say more may be to expect overmuch. But one cannot close these two remarkable, diligent studies of Castlereagh and Canning without at least expressing a hope that they may be read also by that larger public now at last awakened to the fact that Foreign Policy may, for better or worse, plough as great furrows across their lives as any questions of interior concern.

ALGERNON CECIL.

THE ANTI-CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT IN CHINA.

ON Christmas Day and Boxing Day, 1924, in Canton, Changsha, Wuchang and other cities in South and Central China, there occurred an outbreak of anti-Christian agitation. This outbreak was a preconceived movement, organised mostly by students and labour politicians, and it took the form of demonstrations in which street processions, public speeches, and distribution of anti-Christian literature were the leading features. What took place in Canton was described as follows in the *North China Herald* of January 3rd:

"Canton, Dec. 26.

"The anti-Christian movement was started here with the Canton University as the centre. Taking advantage of the Christmas holidays, a demonstration was staged on a large scale on the 24th, 25th and 26th. Those participants in the demonstration who paraded in the streets yesterday assaulted Chinese Christian missionaries and gave them a drubbing. The movement here is thus assuming a serious aspect, savouring of Bolshevism."—Eastern News Agency.

"Canton, Dec. 26.

"The anti-Christian Organisation in Canton held a demonstration at the Kuangtung University auditorium on Christmas Day, when Mr. Liao Chung-hoi, an ex-governor of Canton and now chief of the Labour Department of the Kuomintang (Republican Party), and Mr. Chau Lu, the President of the University, were among the speakers. After this mass-meeting, six other anti-Christian meetings were held in the populous parts of the city. It is reported that a Committee consisting of seven Chinese Bolsheviks has been appointed to take charge of this campaign."—Reuter's Pacific Service.

A week later the same paper has a report (this time from a missionary source) of some of the doings in Hunan:

"Within the past few weeks this (anti-foreign) feeling has taken an anti-Christian turn. Thus, on December 22nd, one of our Hunan correspondents reports that a student strike has 'turned into bitter anti-Christian and anti-foreign propaganda; handbills are sent all over the province and telegrams to all Christian schools. Some of the printed matter is a bitter attack on all Christian education as imperialistic and urges that all Christian schools ought to be closed.'

"The same correspondent, writing on Dec. 30th, reports that students have come from Changsha and persuaded the Siangtan boys to strike on the same plea. Bibles are torn up and scattered over the school grounds, and the students try to bolster up their cause with wholly untrue assertions that their foreign teachers go about their work armed with revolvers."

It is a startling fact that, at the present stage of missionary operations in China, this movement should be launched, aiming

a direct attack upon the Christian faith. The fact that, by a pre-concerted plan, Christmas Day should be chosen for the occasion of simultaneous demonstrations in centres as far apart as Canton and Wuchang, shows that there is a deliberate and well-organised agency behind the movement. To the newspaper reader at home who is not in close touch with Chinese affairs, the report of this apparently sudden and unexpected outbreak must have caused some perplexity. But to the observer in China who is able to study the currents of feeling, this Christmas Day demonstration, sudden as it was, was neither unexpected nor surprising; for it appears as a symptom of a process which has been going on for some years.

China has always been anti-Christian. A quarter of a century ago, when her system of education was suddenly revolutionised, it was western science and not western religion that her students clamoured for. Since then the rationalist press and all kinds of anti-Christian propaganda have always found a fruitful seed-plot in China's schools and colleges. In 1920, when the World's Student Christian Conference was held in Peking, an outburst of anti-Christian sentiment showed itself in the capital which took a similar form to the recent demonstration in Canton. Such outbursts are certain to take place from time to time with increasing frequency and seriousness, until educated Christian influence becomes sufficiently strong to permeate the student masses of China. When the facts are thus set in their true perspective, they are neither startling nor discouraging. But there is another fact which needs to be understood by the side of these before the true inwardness of events becomes apparent. This is, that the anti-Christian agitation is only part of a much more general anti-foreign movement. Christianity is assailed in China, not because the Chinese are a naturally irreligious race, nor because they are enemies to truth and morality, but because it appears to them as a foreign religion. This current of anti-foreign feeling has been increasing in intensity during the last few years, and, besides the anti-Christian movement, it is giving rise to a series of movements which are certain to end in serious international complications.

China has always been anti-foreign. From the very commencement of her intercourse with other nations, her officials and people have failed to realise that it is to their own advantage to throw open their ports to foreign trade and to allow foreigners to reside in their cities. In the beginning, all foreigners were looked upon as barbarians, and the Chinese did not realise that there was anything to be gained by intercourse with them. It is unfortunately, true to say that China has been entered by force. Since she

would not listen to the voice of reason, she was made to listen to the thunder of cannon. All treaties, trading rights, and concession areas have been wrung from her at the point of the sword. It could not have been otherwise. But the fact is regrettable, and it leads to consequences which have still to be faced. For the wars of 1840-2 and 1856-8 left a bitter feeling of resentment in the hearts of the Chinese. This feeling led occasionally to murders and outrages committed upon foreigners, and came to a climax in the horrors of the Boxer year. The looting of Peking by the Allies in 1900 and the infliction of a huge indemnity taught China another sharp lesson and cowed her into submission. But the feeling of resentment still rankled under the surface, and quite recent events have proved that it is still rankling. In 1917 the anti-Japanese Boycott Movement broke out in the provinces of the Yangtse Valley. This boycott was inaugurated and led by students. It was an attempt to destroy Japan's trade with China in revenge for the "Twenty-One Demands" which had been presented by Japan to China in the preceding year. Ever since 1917, the date on which China acceded to the "Twenty-One Demands," June 7 has been kept annually as China's day of "National Disgrace." It is celebrated by the students with a holiday from school, on which they organise street processions, deliver anti-foreign speeches, and sometimes break into shops which are supposed to be selling Japanese-manufactured goods, and destroy their stock.

Last summer, a group of Chinese Members of Parliament in Peking formed a "People's Foreign Relations Society." The object of this society is to procure the abolition of the so-called "Unequal Treaties" which have been made with foreign Powers, and the return of all ports and settlements on Chinese soil which are at present in the hands of foreigners. This society spread very rapidly, and soon had branch associations in all leading centres. Each branch association is composed of various units, representing the merchants, students, lawyers, small shopkeepers, and so forth. From time to time these bodies meet together and send telegrams to the Central Government, urging the abolition of treaties with Western Powers, or the restoration of ports like Dalny, Wei-hai-Wei and Hongkong, the refusal to pay the French portion of the Boxer Indemnity in gold francs, or some such burning question. In November, the National Teachers' Council met in Kaifeng, Honan, to discuss the whole aspect and future of Chinese education. A great deal of their attention was concentrated upon the existence of foreign schools in China. Resolutions were passed requesting the Government to take steps which, if carried out, would naturally lead to the

closing down of all missionary schools in China, and the boycotting of any scholar or educational institution of which a foreigner may be in charge. Finally, it is necessary to make mention of the activities of the Kuomintang, or Republican Party, and of the undoubtedly Bolsheviki influence that is working behind it. The leader of the Kuomintang till the time of his death was Sun Yat Sen, formerly Christian and patriot, but latterly a waver of the red flag. His latest pronouncements of policy were violently and bitterly anti-foreign. He stood for a type of student, not very uncommon in China, who owes his education, his position, his safety, to the foreigner, and yet who hates his benefactors with a deadly and unrelenting hatred.

What then are the charges which are brought against the Christian Church and religion in present-day China? The answer is found in a thirty-page pamphlet in Chinese, which was printed last year in Shanghai, and which has had a big circulation in large cities like Wuchang and Changsha during the recent agitation. The pamphlet is entitled *The Anti-Christian Movement*. It opens by summarising the causes and aims of that movement. A translation of its leading heads will show the nature of its subject matter.

We intend to oppose religion for the following reasons:

(1) We want to encourage progress in education. Religion is conservative and bound to the past; religious doctrines are fixed and do not permit of doubt, and those who venture to differ from them are persecuted.

(2) We want to encourage friendship between races. But religion emphasises racial distinctions and narrow points of view, and increases national jealousies and enmities. (Witness the Crusades and the Thirty Years' War.)

(3) We want to encourage the advance of science. Religion claims to be divinely inspired, and thereby encourages superstition. (For instance, in a certain college in Shanghai, it is still thought that men were created by God, and not produced by evolution.)

(4) We want to encourage self-reliance. Religion teaches prayer, contrition, and the need of dependence.

(5) We want to encourage the development of human nature. But religion teaches to despise the flesh, and makes the labourers willing to endure bitterness, which is destructive of life.

We want in particular to oppose Christianity for the following reasons:

(1) Because it is the basic point for an attack upon religion.

(2) Christianity teaches doctrines like the creation of the world by God and the immortality of the soul. We can confute such doctrines by the nebular hypothesis, the theory of evolution, psychological and biological science. To talk of sins and their forgiveness is not only false but encourages evil-doing.

Altruism and self-sacrifice are not peculiar to Christianity, and many of its sayings are quite impossible to carry out. (Such as turning the other cheek, and giving up your cloak, etc.)

(3) Christianity is the forerunner of the imperialistic policy which is now invading China. Missionary activity has led to the exaction of indemnities and the partitioning of our territory. Missionary propaganda is an attempt to destroy the spirit of independence of the Chinese people.

We especially want to oppose the Christian Church for the following reasons:

(1) Because, under a false name, it joins itself with the official classes and panders to the wealthy.

(2) To gain adherents, it uses material inducements and empty promises of future happiness.

(3) The pastors and church-members all get their rice from their profession of religion. Their words contradict themselves and their conduct is false.

(4) The pastors rely upon being backed by the imperialistic Powers. They intimidate the officials, interfere wrongly in disputes, protect criminals, support lawsuits. Sometimes they smuggle arms for bandits, and help to prolong civil discords. (This was so at Tsaoyang.)

(5) They use money to buy the services of both male and female church-members. Sometimes they interfere in marriages and produce disaster. (In a church school in Chentgu, a girl student was driven to suicide by this sort of thing.)

(6) In China, the result of 400 years of Christian propaganda has been only to persuade a few country-folk to exchange their idols for God, and to teach them to worship a foreigner. Besides this, they have accomplished no good.

We young students of China must oppose the Christian schools for the following reasons:

(1) CONTROL: Scholars are not allowed either freedom of action or freedom of thought.

(2) INTIMIDATION: Small scholars are told, "If you do not believe in God, the devil will come and get hold of you."

(3) COMPULSION: Those who do not accept religion are compelled to attend worship, and also to study the Bible.

(4) CRUELTY: Those who do not attend worship are refused leave, and are also starved.

(5) CONSERVATISM: Text-books, teaching methods, rules, are all out of date.

(6) PREVENTION OF PATRIOTISM: Commonly, China is insulted, patriotic movements are forbidden. This kind of thing is very common.

(7) HINDRANCE OF INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT: The Bible is used and strict methods are used, to make the scholars submit to authority, to cultivate habits which are not natural and altogether contrary to proper educational methods.

To sum up: we oppose Christianity by every principle which embraces truth and freedom, by the principles which encourage

a spirit of reform and oppose imperialistic aggression,—by these we oppose Christianity and Christian education.

The main part of the pamphlet consists of four essays, written by different writers. The first is entitled, *Religious Propaganda and Imperialistic Policy*; the second is, *Christianity in China*; the third, *The Present Condition of the Christian Church*; and the fourth, *What is the thing called Jesus?* The first three essays amplify most of the points raised in the introductory summary translated above. Of the fact that agents of religion have always preceded the invasion of an imperialistic military power, instances range from the conquest of South America by Spain in the sixteenth century and the first settling of Virginia by the Puritans down to the earliest visits of missionaries to the South Sea Islands and the colonisation of Australia. It is carefully explained how, in modern times, with the development of new industrial conditions, Christianity has become a useful tool in the hands of the capitalists for keeping down the labouring classes and persuading them to submit with resignation to the hardships and injustices of their lot. Writers from Voltaire and Rousseau down to more modern schools of atheism are invoked to show that Christianity has been proved radically unsound by the findings of the latest science and philosophy. All these facts, and many more, are applied to China, and it is shown that in China, as elsewhere, Christianity threatens to become the instrument of imperialistic aggression, capitalist injustice, and unscientific obscurantism. The fourth essay, as might be expected from its title, contains a good deal of irreverent, and even obscene, discussion of the life of Jesus, in which He is shown to be beneath the level of some of China's own heroes, and even the Cross is scoffed at and given a lewd interpretation.

It were waste of time to undertake the refutation of this kind of irrational tirade. The main part of it rests upon a perverted reading of history, and the rest is deliberate falsehood. The type of mind which produces this kind of propaganda is one that feeds upon lies. Any kind of lie is good enough, if it serves the immediate purpose. Thus, in the third essay, America, the father of republics, is reckoned among the imperialistic nations. It is the same mentality as that which was displayed by the students in a school in Hsiantau, who went on strike and declared that their teachers had come into the classrooms with loaded revolvers to shoot them. The whole production is an example of how an unscrupulous partisan, out to make good a poor case, will snatch at any falsehood which seems to serve his purpose. Such stuff as this cannot and does not represent the best mind of educated China.

It is more profitable to inquire into the cause which, just at the present juncture, is bringing to the surface of Chinese student life all this seething eruption of discontent. A recent writer in the *North China Herald* of Shanghai offers three explanations of the present outbreak. The first of these he states as follows: "The commonest (cause) is also the most ancient. From time immemorial, when the mandarins' misgovernment was beginning to make them intolerable to the people, they adroitly directed popular wrath against the foreigner. The Young China mandarins have made such a mess of the country and its finances as can hardly be equalled; they know they are a failure, they know they are found out, and they seek a scapegoat." The second suggested explanation is, that it is a consequence of the recent growth of Christianity in China. One hundred years of mission-work have not been without their fruits. The Christian Church in China is a power to be reckoned with, and her influence is becoming strong in many spheres of life. The anti-Christian movement is a reaction against the onward sweep of Christianity. It is an attempt to stem the tide. If there is any weight in this point of view, the movement must be looked upon as an indication of success already being won, and not of threatened defeat. The third explanation is "the influence of Bolshevism, which, as we know through many sources, is doing all it can to stir up trouble all over Asia. Its agents have been welcomed in Canton, they are free to act in Peking, and there can be little doubt that they are working everywhere. They are the sworn foes of Christianity, and it would not be surprising if they combined their attacks on the Western Powers with propaganda against the faith for which they stand."

To these a fourth suggestion may be added. The campaign against the Christian schools is undoubtedly due in large part to a consciousness of inferiority. China has not yet succeeded in co-ordinating her educational system, and in setting up efficient and well managed schools and colleges in her vast territory. Here and there, it is true, exist model schools which in teaching and management are all that they should be, and even surpass many schools of the same type in the West. But these schools are mostly the results of private enterprise. The government schools, as a rule, are sadly lacking in discipline, reach a low standard of education, and are hampered by continual lack of funds. The mission schools, on the other hand, while they are far from perfect in the estimation of experts, do at least excel in those very features where the government schools are found to fail. Students are kept under rules, a fair standard of educational attainment is reached, salaries are regularly paid and buildings kept in repair.

Consequently, the mission schools stand as condemning witness in the midst of China to the present inefficiency of her education; and the jealousy of her teachers and students finds vent in the excesses which have been referred to.

However it may be, the missionary in China needs to walk warily, especially if he is engaged in educational work. It is, unfortunately, impossible for him to claim that the conduct of his own country towards China has been free from reproach in the past. He knows that it has not been so iniquitous as the bulk of the students imagine. At a time when national feeling runs so high, and national honour is so sensitive, an untactful word, even if it be a blunt statement of true fact, may do more mischief than good. On the other hand, there is a magnificent opportunity for showing the power of Christianity to bridge gulfs of inter-racial hatred, for displaying a spirit of love and charity which can overcome national prejudices, and for building up a substructure of fellowship and brotherhood which shall form a foundation for the mingling of East and West in the Kingdom of God.

Wuchang.

IVAN D. ROSS.

THE BREAK-UP OF ISLAM.

A FEW months before the world was staggered by the shock of the European War, a company of English friends stepped on to the platform of the railway station at Damascus to find that it was not possible for them to travel beyond a certain point, and that any attempt to venture into the prohibited area would be punished by instant death. On inquiring the reason they were informed that the birthplace of Mohammed was so sacred that no Christians could be permitted to defile it by their presence.

To-day all such inhibitions have vanished. Damascus, the oldest city in the world, has its fleets of motors, linking it up with all the important centres of Transjordan. The journey to Bagdad, which formerly took several weeks by camel caravan, may now be accomplished in nineteen hours by the daily running of motors, and in less time still by the regular air service. Even the Sahara has been crossed by automobiles, and a railway is now under construction. Persia is busy building motor roads, and Abyssinia's capital is a railway terminus, while on the city-walls of Damascus, built to exclude all alien influences, there stands to-day a wireless receiving apparatus, gathering in the news and thought-ferments of all the world—doing, that is, the very thing the walls were intended to prevent. Islam is accessible as never before.*

A change of a subtle but significant kind has come over the Moslem world since 1914, and Islam is passing through a crisis as important for its very existence as the period of the Crusades; but whereas the Crusades, with their repeated attacks from without, made Islam a more compact and self-conscious unit, forces have been at work during recent days which appear to be disintegrating the Moslem world from within. If this should prove to be the case it will be a fact of the first importance for both the political and religious world. The attitude and temper of Mohammedanism are matters of world moment, because in the three Continents of the Old World there are more Moslems than there are followers of any other faith. It is a peculiarly important matter for the British Empire because half the Mohammedans in the world live under the protection of the British flag, and indeed there are more Moslems than Christians within the Empire. When it is recalled that Islam is a political and social as well as a religious structure, these figures assume a new importance.

The Moslem world, which in pre-war days was a closely-woven whole, knit firmly together by many bonds and responding without hesitation to the cry of Pan-Islam, reeled under the shattering impact of the War. Fissiparous nationalisms, clamant race-

* *The Moslem World in Revolution*, by W. W. Cash.

movements, and Bolshevik ferments, have worked as solvents in the blood of Pan-Islamic unity. Mustapha Kemal as the symbol of Turkish nationalism, Zaghoul Pasha as the spear-point of the emerging national consciousness of Egypt, the King of the Hedjaz the rallying centre of so many Arabian aspirations, and the Ali Brothers, the leaders and spokesmen of a great section of the flaming spirit of New India—these are the potent leaders of the nationalisms which have rent for good and all the once seamless fabric of Pan-Islam.

What the Moslem world is experiencing is strangely parallel with the throes suffered by mediæval Europe when emergent nationalisms shattered for ever the structure of the Holy Roman Empire. The great word Self-Determination, which President Wilson broadcasted from Versailles across the hamlets and cities of the world, was caught up and repeated in Arabic and Hindustani, in Turkish and Hausa, and men began to speak of Swaraj for India, Home Rule for Arabia, and Egypt for the Egyptians. A decade ago a Moslem did not think of his country except as part of the Islamic world. A question as to their nationality put to the Arabs and Turks, the Egyptians and Syrians, the Somalis and Berbers who crowded the streets of Cairo, would have elicited from them all the answer that they were Mussulmans (Moslems), and only in response to much questioning would they have thought of naming the country from which they came. A Moslem's allegiance to his faith was given unquestioned priority to all else. But to-day, he is a nationalist first and a Moslem second. For the first time in its history India has seen a Hindu-Moslem alliance, while Egypt has witnessed that incredible achievement—a union of Moslems and Copts, with a flag on which the Christian Cross and the Moslem Crescent both find a place. Short-lived as these alliances must necessarily be, the fact that they have been made is a sufficient indication of the strength and fervour of the nationalistic spirit of which they were the outward expression. The sense of an intense patriotism has driven divisive wedges into the solidarity of Islam. The Egyptian sheik, for example, is beginning to ask why he should any longer look to Mecca as the centre of his faith; Cairo, with its El Azhar University, is in his eyes adequate to all the demands of the Faithful. While in Arabia Hussein gave to the nationalist movement a motto which everywhere was blazoned on its banners: "Before we were Christians, before we were Moslems, we were Arabs; and it is as Arabs that we will build up our native land again."

Perhaps the clearest indication of the new spirit which is emerging in Islam is the abolition of the Kaliphate by Turkey. Not only were the echoes of the explosion of that bomb heard through-

out the length and breadth of the Moslem world, but its effects will be felt for decades to come. Islam, for the first time in fourteen centuries, is under the necessity of seeking some new core for its national and international life. The Young Turks who set up the Angora Republican Government were actuated by the desire to lift Turkish culture to the level of the West. What the cost of this policy might be to Islam they neither cared nor paused to inquire. By the abolition of the Sultanate they had destroyed political Islam, and they next proceeded to attack the Kaliph—the visible religious head of the Moslem world, one in whom resided the specifically religious functions exercised by the Prophet. The abolition of the Kaliphate not merely meant the disestablishment and disendowment of Mohammedanism, and the deliberate abdication by Turkey of the position of acknowledged religious leadership in the Islamic world, but it was the signal for letting loose a flood of anti-Mohammedan propaganda. Orthodox Moslems, of course, did not readily acquiesce in this abolition of the Kaliphate, and movements were at once set on foot for setting up a Kaliph in India or Egypt or Arabia, and Hussein, King of the Hedjaz, who was already guardian of the Holy Places—Mecca and Medina—was proclaimed Kaliph in the spring of 1924. In spite, however, of these orthodox attempts to repair the damage done, it cannot be doubted that the voluntary abolition of the Kaliphate by the Turks has dealt a blow at the whole fabric of Islam, from which it is doubtful if she can ever recover.

Political movements are, however, not the only causes of this vast change. The intellectual and psychological elements in the situation may quite conceivably have been the most powerful formative influences. There has emerged in the Moslem world a new mentality. The typical Moslem of pre-war days was an incarnation of complacent self-assurance; his very bearing showed that he thanked God daily that he was not as other men, especially these Christians. He closed all the avenues of his mind against everything that was non-Islamic. Indeed the Moslem was the most unapproachable man on earth. He confidently believed his to be the only true faith, and he maintained an attitude of haughty contempt for all who professed any other. In his fanatical bigotry he reserved his special contempt for Christians and the Christian's Saviour, and the attempt to make some impression upon the intransigence of the typical sheik, by a frontal attack, has been summed up as being "an attempt to induce the proudest man on earth to accept the message he detests from a people he despises." To-day that self-assurance, and arrogant assumption of superiority, is weakening, and a questioning attitude of mind is appearing. The Moslem is paying heed both to the existence of an outside

world and to its attitude towards him. In a word, he is in an inquiring mood and is willing to listen and even to learn. The Moslem is accessible for the first time in history.

This new orientation of Islam has given birth to the first faint beginnings of reform from within. The movements associated with the Mohammedan mosque at Woking in England, and with the Aligarh Moslem University of North India, are definitely liberal. The former attempts, by a kind of modernism, to accommodate Moslem and Christian ethics, and the latter aims at belittling the character of Christ and glorifying that of the Prophet. There is a curious parallel between these two movements, in their respective attitudes to Christianity and the Brahmo and Arya Samajes in the world of Hinduism.

Movements such as Scepticism and Feminism are beginning to stir the hitherto stagnant pool of Moslem thought. Sceptical books and papers, many of them of French origin, unknown in Islamic lands a few years ago, have an amazing circulation and are eagerly read. Some of these papers are edited by Moslems, and others, *mirabile dictu*, by women. Journals that are having a wide circulation are edited by Moslems who have accepted Christianity, or at least have strong Christian sympathies. In Cairo, the heart of orthodox Islam, there are over two hundred printing presses pouring out a voluminous literature. Nationalist newspapers are largely bought and read. French novels of the less reputable sort have a large circulation. A new book is published in Cairo, in the Arabic tongue, every day of the year, and many of these are interpretations of European, and especially French, political and scientific thought. In Beyrout, twenty-five book-shops are busily selling French books, particularly *risqué* novels with a sex interest. Damascus and Bagdad are reading books and papers with feverish interest, while the schools of a thousand Moslem centres are full to overflowing. Islam is clamouring for mental food and is ready to listen to anyone who has aught to teach. What effect this Western knowledge will have upon the springs of Moslem thought and life few stay to inquire. Christianity, of course, has nothing to fear from all this secularist propaganda; but Islam has not the same intellectual equipment for meeting it, and the inevitable result is that the new notions from the West are undermining the foundations of the whole fabric of Islam. Already there are ugly cracks in the structure, and unless it can be underpinned by the efforts of the faithful, collapse must ensue. In a word, those who are causing the disintegration of Islam to-day are largely they of its own household.

The Women's Movement has been one of the wonders of recent years in the Moslem world. All through Islam literacy among

women has made amazing strides, and it is beginning to be felt a disgrace that a woman should be unable to read or write. The better educated Moslem women are at last making their voice heard and their influence felt. In both Turkey and Egypt the minimum age for marriage has been fixed by law at sixteen for girls and eighteen for boys. The result thus baldly stated represents a very revolution in Moslem notions and practice, for boy and girl marriages have been the custom in Islamic lands from the days of the Prophet down to three years ago, and that custom is deeply embedded in the example of Mohammed himself, and in Moslem tradition. Women are beginning to exercise some freedom in the choice of husbands; they are attending lectures, concerts and public functions; women's, and even mixed, Clubs are being freely formed; considerable freedom in the use of the veil is being exercised; Western novels are being devoured at an amazing rate; girls are staying at school or college till eighteen or twenty years of age, and are increasingly refusing to be shut up in harems; while many are earning their living as teachers, journalists and clerks. No greater revolution in Islam could be conceived.

The necessity of adaptation to these amazing cultural strides would put a severe strain upon any religion, in particular upon one that is professedly incapable of development, since the last word in revelation has been said by the Prophet. It is not surprising to learn that Moslems are finding their faith inflexible and are beginning to complain that it is too static either to adapt itself to the new conditions, or to make effective contacts with the new thought-forms of the time. They are accordingly becoming uneasy in their minds and are inquiring into the adequacy of Mohammedanism, and questioning not only its elasticity but its authority and ethics. One Turkish newspaper has recently gone the length of saying, "No thinking Turk can be a Moslem to-day"; whilst other papers are openly affirming that the Turks made the gravest error of their history when, five centuries ago, they abandoned their own virile pagan faith for the paralysing cult of Islam. That act, they assert, put the Turk outside the stream of progress, kept him isolated for centuries from the best political thinking of the world, and in thrall to a faith that cannot stand scientific investigation. He has almost completely disowned Mohammedanism.

The change of attitude has not been by any means so complete in other parts of the Moslem world. But everywhere there is an unwonted openness of mind. Ferments as different as Secularism, Bolshevism, and Christianity are at work in every part of the Moslem world, and the pilgrimage to Mecca and the other holy places is growing numerically less every year. The heart is going out of Islam. When viewed in this setting the abolition of the Kaliphate and the disestablishment of Mohammedanism as the

religion of the Ottoman Empire becomes easily intelligible. These new adventures in the realm of thought and belief have been made increasingly possible by the removal of the dead hand of Turkey from a great part of the Islamic world. The Turk has always blighted every land and people he has ruled, but in no sphere has his sinister influence been more witheringly felt than in that of the spiritual. Prior to 1914 liberty of conscience simply did not exist within the Ottoman Empire. But much of that Empire has now passed, as mandated territory, into European control, and in those areas there is granted a liberty of conscience before unknown. Almost necessarily this has given rise to a demand for education, and masses of people previously impervious to all Western or Christian influences are now accessible through the printed page. All schools, including those conducted by Missionary Societies, report large increases in the number of Moslem pupils, both boys and girls. The eyes of the peoples of Islamic lands are being turned away from the things that sufficed them in the past to the achievements and pursuits of the West. Attempts are being made to adapt Christian, or at least Western, ethics to Moslem law; for instance, Turkey has promulgated a new monogamy enactment, and several Islamic lands are taking legislative steps towards the emancipation of women. The trade and commerce of Western countries are being studied; young Moslems in considerable numbers are travelling great distances to attend European Universities. It is reckoned that there are more Moslems proceeding every year to England and France for purposes of education and commerce than the annual number of the Mecca pilgrimage. Islam would seem to be drying up at its springs.

The accessibility of the Moslem is particularly marked in regard to religion. In many Moslem lands there is a quite astonishing desire to listen to the Christian Good News. Missionaries, in Egypt particularly, report wonderful and unsought openings for widespread evangelism. Nothing quite like it has been known before. There are 234,000,000 Moslems in the world, and four-fifths of these are now accessible to every method of missionary approach. Many thousands of miles of railways and motor roads have been built, bringing to hitherto unreached places some vital contact with the outside world. Along these new routes the Good News is being taken as Paul and Barnabas took it along the great roads the Romans built. Islam is no longer shut away from the rest of the world. Western civilisation is meeting it at a thousand points, and the disintegration of Islam has begun. The accepted standards and ideals are being brought under review, its dogmas questioned, and its sanctions undermined. The Moslem world is at the moment malleable and a score of influences and ferments

are working within its life. Before long it will harden again, and the moulds into which its new life are then cast will not be easily altered.

This new accessibility of the Moslem world calls for a fresh orientation of all men of goodwill, and particularly of Christian missionary forces. Hitherto there has been relative neglect of the Moslem world. Great tracts of Afghanistan, Arabia, Russian Turkestan, Bokhara, and parts of North Africa, are almost entirely unoccupied by any Christian forces. The sixty-nine millions of Moslem India are fully one-fifth of the total population of the land; it would be a fair allocation if one thousand out of the five thousand five hundred Christian missionaries in India were devoting their time to work among Moslems. As a matter of fact the number wholly engaged in this work is less than twenty. A little more than half of Bengal's teeming population is Moslem, yet the number of men devoting their whole time to the service of Moslems may be counted on the fingers of one hand, while in great Moslem centres like Delhi, Lucknow and Lahore there are none at all. The eight million Moslems of China have scarcely a single missionary giving his whole time to work amongst them, and Ujiji, where Stanley found Livingstone, is now a great Moslem city, almost entirely devoid of men equipped for an effective approach to Islam. The Missionary Societies of the great Free Churches south of the Tweed are particularly sinners in this respect. The London Missionary Society, with its wide-flung front, has not one single missionary set apart for this work, nor has the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, while the Baptist Missionary Society has only four missionaries devoting full time to the service of the Moslems.

Islam is no longer presenting a united front; it is open-doored to all kinds of influences; it is accessible as never before; and within its life forces are at work which are breaking down the intransigence of the past. Islam is to-day at the cross-roads and for the first time is ready to give heed to whatsoever guide can win her ear and heart. From the days of the Crusades the Christian approach to Islam has been controversial and unappreciative, not to say warlike. In future the approach must be understanding and constructive. Points of contact must be sought. The path of polemic, which has been found singularly barren, must be abandoned, and the rewarding way of fellowship followed. Writers in the vernacular, appreciative of Islamic culture, educationalists of constructive capacity, who will educate without denationalising, and missionaries who will place themselves alongside Moslems in self-forgetting service, are the prime need of Islam to-day. There is abundant evidence that such an approach would liberate unsuspected forces and make the way ready for the Moslem peoples to bring their loyalty, culture and zeal into the Kingdom of our God.

A. M. CHIRGWIN.

ADRAMYTTIUM.

GEOGRAPHY might well be found a dull subject without the aid of maps; with them, it is surely fascinating. We suspect it was one of the early discoveries of man (when he had ceased to be what kindly people call primitive) that delineation was the best form of description, and it is conceivable that the map was earlier than the text in the *Geography for Beginners*. Take, for example, the account in the Book of Genesis of the rivers of Paradise and the lands through which, or to which, they flow. It reads like a map, a four-square map, even if it was drawn first on a Babylonian cylinder; and it resembles, in one respect, a modern ethnographic map in which we find dots and circles and stippling and shading to show the existence or diffusion of peoples and natural products. For here is Havilah dotted for gold deposits, and stippled for beryls and jade. It must have been recognised very early in history, perhaps as soon as man began to study the world in which he found himself, that a Pocket Atlas was his primer of knowledge.

It is, however, when we pass from the descriptive maps to the historical that geography becomes romance. We arrange them in series and show them on a film. If there is a Providence to be proved and a Destiny to be conjectured, the historical atlas must be admitted as part of the evidence. Does chaos turn to cosmos, or cosmos to chaos? Whatever the answer, the *historical atlas* is companion to Volney's *Ruins of Empires*, or to Wells' *History of the World*. Suppose we are studying the subject of colonisation, and the ways by which man has sought larger or richer or safer places to dwell in. What a story the map will tell us of his wanderings, and even of his inner thoughts! Columbus and his followers will augment the map by the Indies, and suggest by their names for the islands and new countries that the Spaniards were a shipload of archangels, with church furniture and festivals on board; will drop a Vera Cruz here, a San Francisco there, a Santiago yonder. Here we see the stipplings of religion correspond with the dots for gold deposits and the circles of silver. The map begins to tell of spiritual history as formerly it did of natural; it is ethical and religious! Look at a map of New England and see how, from renowned Plymouth onward, the successive bands of settlers seeking freedom have marked the memory of the ports in the Old Country and the villages of East Anglia. Their boast that they were Englishmen still is on the atlas of their westward motions. No gold and silver stipplings this time!

The Mediterranean Sea, when viewed by the method of historical geography, becomes almost oracular. Turn to the middle of the atlas, and you will find a map of the Mediterranean, with Virgil's

hand on the margin: *Urbs antiqua fuit: Tyrii tenuere coloni*. He wants to say to you in verse that Carthage has come and gone; the *fuit* is almost in the same sense as *Troja fuit*, "was and is not." It was a vanished colony, but if we mark the Mediterranean by its colonies, we shall go further afield than Tyre and its dependencies, we shall have the "glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome." Homer and Virgil will both be colonials. Suppose we look at a colonial map of the Mediterranean at an earlier stage than either Greece or Rome can claim a place in! What shall we find, beyond the above-mentioned Tyre and Sidon? There is Crete, for instance, which is older than either, and Egypt, which is older than all. Was Crete itself a colony? We cannot yet say. The historical map that preceded the founding of Knossos cannot be turned yet, and Egypt has so much history of a legible character that we almost forget to ask whence it came; it was so very long ago. Was it a colony once, and did its people become colonisers? These are questions still unanswered for the majority of students.

Here we venture on a little incursion, on our own account, into the story of colonisation, with the object of showing one of the results of our use of a historical atlas, and also of throwing some light on the story of the early colonisation of the Mediterranean from an unexpected quarter. In the twenty-seventh chapter of the *Acts of the Apostles*, we have an account of the deportation of St. Paul from Cæsarea to Rome, and are told that the first part of the voyage was taken in a coasting ship belonging to Adramyttium: it may be said that almost all ships were coasters at that stage in the history of navigation. Well, this one is definitely said to be a coastwise trader. She was bound for the shores of Asia Minor. She, at all events, was not going to Rome for gain or with grain; and the Apostolic company, Paul, Luke, and Aristarchus, were transferred at Myra, in Lycia, to another ship—a great corn ship of Alexandria, which had been held back by westerly and north-westerly winds from her proper course. As for the ship of Adramyttium, she was not only coasting, but on the homeward track. It is evident from her register that she was of Adramyttium, and therefore for Adramyttium. In a week or two, after touching at Miletus, Smyrna, and Mitylene, she will sail up the gulf that leads to Adramyttium and drop her anchor in one of the well-known harbours of the ancient world. Its modern name, Edremit, has scarcely varied from the Greek form, and if it has thus persisted from the time, say, of Thucydides, we may ask whether, if we could go further back than the time when the Greeks had superposed a colony of their own on one which they found, it would show a similar persistence. For Adramyttium is no Greek name.

We return now to the *Acts of the Apostles*. Whatever may be said about the persistence of the name, the persistence of the editors of the Greek Testament is to be deplored; they print the word with a smooth breathing and, as we shall see, they have, in consequence, obscured its meaning. The Vulgate, however, tells us to read *navem Hadrumetinam*, a ship of Hadrumetum. It may be said, in passing, that as the earliest manuscripts had no signs by which to indicate whether a breathing was smooth or rough, there is nothing to prevent us from calling our ship a ship of Hadramyttium, if we see any reason for doing so. A parallel instance would be the *Alleluia* of the Western and Latin tradition, which defaces the Anglican hymn-books; where the Hebrew has the right of way against the Septuagint and its dependent Latin and tells us to say *Hallelujah*. The parallel is a suggestive one. Is it possible that when we restore the breathing, we may be on Semitic soil?

We look in the index to our Classical Atlas and we see, immediately preceding the reference to Adramyttium, an entry of certain tribes in South Arabia, whom the geographers call *Adramitæ*: this is certainly the same word as is involved in Adramyttium. Here we are on perfectly safe ground. These tribes can be no other than the people of *Hadramaut*, the spice-bearing area of Southern Arabia, from which the world obtained in ancient times (and does to some extent still) its supplies of frankincense and myrrh.*

Hadramaut, then, is the equivalent of Adramyttium, and Hadramaut has its first letter justified by Semitic philology. The name means "district of death," and was commonly understood by the Greeks as referring to the pestilential airs of the frankincense trees, before they had turned to sweetness.†

We can see, in another way, that the Semitic explanation is correct, by turning to the tenth chapter of Genesis where the writer is making a geographical atlas for his readers, and tells us (Gen. 10, 26) that "Joktan begat Hatsarmaveth"; this is the Hebrew equivalent of Hadramaut, a fact recognised by most modern Arabists and Arabian explorers. They do not, however, seem to have realised that the same name is involved in the word Hadramyttium.‡ However that may be, the matter has more significance

* Hence the account in the Gospel of Matthew of travellers who came to Jerusalem with gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh, need not be understood as referring to a Persian deputation. Justin Martyr has it more correctly, that they came from Arabia. Whence else should Seba and Saba offer gifts?

† Herodotus has a long story of how the incense trees are guarded by flying serpents, as the Arabians say; there seems to have been something like a conspiracy to keep foreigners out of Spiceland. Bent, in his *Southern Arabia*, observes that "the cunning old Sabæan [Frankincense] merchants, who liked to keep the monopoly of the drug, told wonderful stories of the phoenix which guarded the trees, of the insalubrity of the climate, and of the deadly vapours which came from them, when punctured for the gum. Needless to say, these were all inventions."

‡ Amongst orientalisks Olshausen is one of the first to have recognised the

than mere etymological identification, as we shall presently see. But first, let us notice how the Greek and Latin geographers describe the Hadramaut region. Strabo calls them *Chatramotitæ* in which the strong initial guttural and all the other consonants of Hadramaut are accurately represented; Pliny (H.N., VI, 36) in enumerating the tribes and districts of Southern Arabia, not only mentions *Chatramotitæ*, but has also a later reference to *Atramitæ*, who must be the same people; from which it is clear that he is compiling from more than one geographical source; indeed, he seems to say so a few lines further on when he corrects an Arabian distance, as commonly measured, from 770 miles to 440, according to the estimate of Juba.

Now let us turn from the etymological identification to a conclusion that follows from it. It will readily be admitted that migrating peoples are given to naming the new lands after the old ones from which they came. The settlers in Boston (Mass.) came, not from Holland, but from Boston in Lincolnshire; even without the adjective prefixed to New Amsterdam, we should have known that what is later called New York was a Dutch city. There is no need, surely, to multiply instances. It follows that the town of Hadramyttium is not originally a Greek colony (though it became one for a period), nor a Phœnician one, as was supposed by some scholars in the past, but a *bona-fide* South Arabian colony, formed by people who not only brought their goods into the Mediterranean area, but settled on its sea-board. Had it been merely a matter of selling spices, the trade-route from Central Arabia would have sufficed for transport, and the Phœnicians could have acted as middlemen and controlled the market; but Hadramyttium is not situated on a trade route, it is in a harbour. Its founders were colonists as well as traders, and, in view of the undoubted antiquity of their settlement, we are forced to the conclusion that *traders and navigators from the spice-kingsdoms of Arabia were among the first colonists of the Mediterranean*. By what means they transferred themselves is matter for conjecture. There may be several possible solutions;* but the point we wish to press is that the Sabæans or Minæans, or Hadramytenes, or whatever South Arabian clan may have represented the higher civilisation, were colonists and not merely traders. And to prove the existence of even one such harbour is to open a fresh page in ancient history, for it is in the highest degree improbable that these people founded only one colony in the Mediterranean, and that the one we have stumbled on.

equivalence of Adramyttium and Hatsarmaveth. See his article in *Rheinisches Museum* for 1853, p. 321 ff.

* cf. Hogarth, *History of Arabia*, p. 7. "The overland traffic down the 'Spice Road' has perhaps . . . been exaggerated by modern historians of ancient economics, who are apt to forget how good the evidence is for very early use of Red Sea ports connected by short desert roads with the middle valley of the Nile."

Let us see, then, if we can find further traces of South Arabian intercourse with the Mediterranean. We begin by asking if there are any remains of South Arabian products to the North of the Isthmus of Suez. One of the ways by which traders may be traced, in countries remote from their own, is by the coins which they have exchanged for commodities, or which they have accidentally left behind, such as gold coins of the Roman Empire, which turn up in South India, or the hoard of Roman bronze money found in Coventina's well, on the wall of Hadrian. And if we are asked, "What was the medium of exchange of the South Arabians?" we reply, "Cowrie shells."

The subject of the origin of money, in general, and of the place of the cowrie shell in the story of its evolution, has been much discussed by anthropologists in recent years. Even now, strings of cowrie shells are the currency over a great part of Africa, from Ashanti to Zanzibar. It has also been shown that this shell had a value before it passed into currency: it was a prophylactic, especially against the evil eye. Nor has it ceased to serve as such. One sees it still on the camel's neck in Egypt. It is also a charm for fertility and is worn by Eastern women and by African savages at the present time. The subject has been dealt with lucidly by Prof. Elliot Smith and by Mr. Wilfrid Jackson in his treatise on *Shells and Shell-culture*. When we see an Eastern woman with her forehead overhung with coins of gold, suggesting a conjunction of wealth and ornament, we may easily miss its real meaning. Replace the coins by cowries and they are no longer in the service of beauty, nor are they, primarily, to be counted as cash; they are charms which antedate charm, and secure a woman against women's disappointments and women's ills. One can still see them on the hair and on the person of savage women; especially they attach themselves to the girdle. In Central India the women who carry water have their locks enwreathed with them. We think we have made it clear that the problem of the place of the cowrie in the past and present of the race is not solved by simply calling it money. It is money to-day, but it is more than that; it is magic.

In that interesting book by Mr. Skertchley called *Dahomey as it is*, we find the following note on cowries as currency:

(p. 28). "The medium of exchange among the natives is the cowrie (*Cypræa*) which is imported into the country by the European merchants from Zanzibar. These are twisted on grass stems, in strings, and fifty strings make one 'head.' At the present time fifty cowries make a string in Whydah, only forty-six in Alladah and Abomey, while the cowries given by the King, which are strung by the Amazons, average only about forty to a string. Four heads of cowries are equal to a dollar (4s. 6d.) in Whydah and three heads in the interior."

It is indisputable, therefore, that the cowrie currency still obtains

in Africa, but the idea that European merchants are at the bottom of the business and have persuaded all black men to accept shell money, is, we think, fantastic. If it were true that Europeans in Zanzibar bank in shells, where is the Mint? The answer is that it is the Red Sea and Southern Arabia. The Mint is older than the money. We cannot be certain that cowries reached the west coast of Africa by the overland route; but we are sure that they were collected in the Red Sea or the Indian Ocean long before European traders discovered Zanzibar, or than they themselves as Europeans existed.

Here is a curious piece of evidence which Jackson brings forward from Perregaux with regard to the use of cowrie shells in the district to the north of Ashanti. "According to this observer," says Jackson, "in Koranza they were counted per thousand, and one hundred cowries were worth threepence. In Okwaon, on the contrary, they were reckoned thus:

35 cowries = 1 string (Obang)
 12×35 cowries, therefore 12 strings = 3d.
 50×35 cowries, therefore 50 strings (1,750 cowries) =
 1 head (Atramatiri).

In the plural, Atiri was used for 2—9, and Atramatiri for 10 or more heads. A game with cowries (obviously the same game as elsewhere in this region) was named Atramaton, *i.e.*, to throw cowries. These words are combinations with the word Atrama (? Atramat) which denotes cowries. They were so named, says Perregaux, in the Tshi language in Aquapim and Ashanti."*

The reader who has observed the various forms in which the name of Hadramaut appears in early writers will naturally suspect that in the Atrama(t) and Atramatiri of Northern Ashanti and the Tshi-speaking peoples, we have an actual survival of the coast-name of the district of Arabia from which the shells were exported. The parallel in mediæval language would be the description of a coin of Byzantium as a besant. Atrama(t) in Ashanti may be classed with Adramyttium in the Ægean. Whether this conclusion, with regard to the West Coast of Africa, can, or can not, be substantiated, time will show. Here, however, we offer it in elucidation of our assumption that if South Arabian civilisation put a colonising hand on at least one site in Asia Minor, other traces must exist of such a racial movement. Archæology as well as etymology will help us to find them.

Supposing, then, that we have established the existence of an early colony from South Arabia in the north-east angle of the Mediterranean, at a period before the Greek colonisation of the Levant, we cannot stop at this single discovery. If the traders from

* Jackson, *Shells*, pp. 156, 157.

Hadramaut went as far north as this harbour, which still bears their name, there must be other traces of their influence and activity. It is clear that the Minæan and Sabæan kingdoms of South Arabia were both powerful and enterprising. That part of the Arabian coast was affected by the monsoon, as our Indian Empire is affected, and its people turned it to good purpose by the cultivation of certain spices, which were of magical value in religion, and prized in domestic life. Trade in these carried those engaged in it north and east and west; north into Palestine, east into Persia and India, and west and north-west into Egypt and the Mediterranean. Knowing this, it is, as we have already said, in the highest degree improbable that one port only, a single harbour in the north-east angle of the Mediterranean, is all the proof that can be found to-day in support of the fact. So we go in search of further evidence.

Let us imagine a ship in those days sailing the Mediterranean, say, from some point such as the modern Port Said. If she is going to Adramyttium, she does not strike away to the north or north-west: like the vessel on which St. Paul embarked, she is a coaster. She works along the shores of Palestine and Syria, perhaps striking across to Cyprus, and then again along the coast line of Lycia and so around into the Ægean Sea. But stay! here is a Greek geographer who tells us that there is an island off the coast of Lycia, called Adramyttis. Is this another station or colony of South Arabian traders? It must be a colony, if it is really South Arabian, for it bears the name of the homeland. At first I am disposed to discredit Stephanus of Byzantium, and to suggest that he has said Lycia where he meant Lydia or Mysia; but Mr. A. B. Cook advises me that Stephanus is a very trustworthy geographer and that I ought not to be sceptical. In that case, we have found another South Arabian station. And when our hypothetical ship continues her journey north, she must pass the harbours of Ephesus and Smyrna. The latter place-name arrests our attention: it is the Greek word for myrrh; but it is certain that no such tropical or semi-tropical plant as the myrrh tree ever grew there. Then it must have been a "factory" (as the East India Company would have called it), where the myrrh and frankincense trade of the Mediterranean centred, and if so, we come to the conclusion that South Arabia once occupied, as a trading post, one of the most famous harbours and cities of the Levant. Our early map of the Mediterranean is acquiring an Arabic colour, telling us the history of remote times, in days before either Greek or Latin peoples had migrated into the Mediterranean area.

There is another direction in which we may find confirmation

of the statement of Stephanus of Byzantium with regard to the existence of an island named Adramyttis on the coast of Lycia. It will be remembered that one of the chief cities and ports in Lycia is Myra, the town where St. Paul and his friends left the coasting ship of Adramyttium and were transferred to the corn ship of Alexandria. Myra is known in Church history as the episcopal residence of St. Nicholas, who behaved so badly at the Nicene Council, and who has, in consequence, been accredited as a saint both by East and West—it pays to lose one's temper sometimes in ecclesiastical circles; and, after all, if there was a moral obligation to box Arius' ears, there was another open road to sanctity in the displacement of Poseidon of Myra, to whom sailors did reverence. As is well known to the antiquaries of the Church, Nicholas was transferred from Myra to Bari in Italy, where he is supposed still to reside, and legend says that the transference was made by the saint's navigation of the sea in a vessel of *myrrh*. In other words, the folk-lore explanation of the name Myra is that it means myrrh-town, nor is there any reason to suppose that folk-lore and philology are here at variance. This would mean that, as at the cataract of the Nile there is a town called Yeb (ivory) and an island called Elephantine, because this town is the entrepôt for the ivory traffic from the Sudan, so we can have early Levantine centres where the trade in myrrh and other associated spices is centred. The case would be similar to that of Smyrna, with a dialectical variation in the names, comparable with such Greek forms as *μικρός* and *σμικρός*. Only, Myra is nearer to the original Oriental form, which in Hebrew is *Mor*, and in Syriac and Arabic *Mur(r)*. If these parallels are correct, and the folk-lore with regard to Myra is archaic, we can then see the meaning of the island Adramyttis on the coast of Lycia. The island is the real "factory" of the importers, for whose wares the city on the mainland is the distributing centre; and we are now able to see more clearly that it was a "factory" of the South Arabians and not, as might at first be supposed, of the Phœnicians.

Suppose now that our trading ship, instead of coasting northwards had gone westward, as the Phœnician ships did at a later date. She will pass the coast of Libya and the great sandbanks, and then turn north, and if she rounds the corner she will come to Tunis ("this Tunis, Sir, was Carthage"); but on the coast before Carthage there is an older harbour, one said by the geography books to be a Phœnician colony of a very early date. Look at its name; it is Hadrumetum, clearly a variant form of Hadramyttium. Can we doubt, then, that here we have another South Arabian colony? Suppose we go ashore. The French have been excavating here; they find remains of prehistoric buildings, and among the relics which they have exhumed are perforated shells,

evidently meant to be strung together. These especially excite our interest. Of what sort are they? We may be certain that, if it was really an Arabian colony, the shell must be our old friend, the cowrie; and conversely.

Looking back, now, along the shore line of the sea that we have traversed, we recall a fact which we find in Pliny (V. 6), that amongst the tribes that occupy Libya, to the west of Alexandria, there are the Adyrmachidæ. Pliny locates them, and leaves them. But a very slight correction of this ungainly word gives us Adry-mattidæ. These are evidently the same people as those whose early movements we are following, and the fact leads us to the supposition that the South Arabians may actually have colonised Libya. Should this prove to be correct, it would explain why the people of Adramyttium had on their coins (in days, of course, when the colony had become a Greek one) the figure of a horse. The suggestion of a primitive horse-breeding community is attractive; only, we must not identify the horse on the coin as of Arabian origin, for Professor Ridgeway has shown that the supposed Arab horse is a myth. There is hardly a trace of him in history, it seems, before the Christian era. Professor Ridgeway shows reason to believe that the early horse-breeders and horse-exporters into Europe were the Libyans. If so, we find in the fact a connecting link, and suggest that the trade in horses was one which the Arabian settlers in Libya engaged in, and that it was carried on between Mysia and Libya.

Here, for the moment, we leave the matter; having proved, we hope, from this consideration of the geographical names which time and the early geographers have preserved, that South Arabian colonies once existed in the Mediterranean.

RENDEL HARRIS.

SOUTH AMERICA AND THE ROYAL VISIT.

SPEAKING at a public function in London, on February 2nd last, in celebration of the centenary of the first treaty between Great Britain and the Argentine Republic, Mr. Austen Chamberlain took occasion to say:

"The treaty which we are celebrating—the first ever signed by Argentina—has resulted in an unbroken and fruitful friendship between the two countries for a hundred years, and it is a happy indication of the continuity of our British life that there should be present at this gathering two grandsons of the man [Sir Woodbine Parish] who signed that treaty for Britain, and that their interest in the Argentine should have become almost a permanent incident of Anglo-Argentine relations. Our association with Argentina dates from the very birth of that Republic, and the recognition which my great predecessor Canning accorded to the Republic, and the defence which he offered for it, has become proverbial in our political language. Our two countries have been singularly complementary, one to the other. . . . Every step in the development of the Argentine has been forwarded by British interests in that country, and has resulted in British advantage derived from Argentine prosperity and the development of Argentine trade. Canning said he had called a New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old. Canning's humble successor sometimes wishes he too could find a new world whose aid he might invoke to-day to redress the existing one."

This happily-inspired address by the Foreign Secretary served the dual purpose of reaffirming great Britain's old-time friendship with Argentina, and of emphasising the pleasure evoked in this country by the cordial invitation to the Prince of Wales to visit the Republic at the close of his tour of our African possessions. It is probable that that invitation originated in President Alvear's visit to England in 1922, and that it should be made to synchronise with the hundredth anniversary of the two countries' treaty friendship is surely one of the happiest omens. It has since been supplemented by urgent invitations from two other South American countries, Chile and Uruguay. Fortunately, it has been found practicable for the Heir-apparent so to extend the itinerary of his tour as to include all three republics, though his visit to Chile must necessarily be a brief one.

As a matter of historical fact, it was as far back as May 25th, 1810—three centuries after the initial appearance of Spanish pioneers in this region—that a convention assembled at Buenos Aires declared for freedom from the yoke of Spain. On July 9th, 1816, the Republic of "Rio de la Plata" was proclaimed, followed by successive defeats of the waning Spanish power in the battles of Chacabuco, the Maipú, and Ayacucho. And on January 23rd, 1825, the "Argentine Confederation" was formally constituted,

and was immediately recognised by the Government of Great Britain.

It is generally admitted that the Treaty of Buenos Aires—"the first diplomatic instrument of its kind endorsed by a European government and any of the modern Latin American Republics"—was in the main the work of two men, George Canning and Sir Woodbine Parish. The first-named statesman had already held office under Pitt, had been Foreign Minister in the Portland Cabinet, and had fought a duel with Castlereagh (Lord Londonderry). Oddly enough, the suicide of his old enemy, Castlereagh, called him back to the Foreign Office in 1822, and the "forty years' peace" was not quite a decade old when he brought about the treaty with Argentina.* The actual signatory to that instrument on the part of Great Britain was Sir Woodbine Parish. He was the first diplomatic representative of this country accredited to Buenos Aires, and his name survives as one of the most eminent Englishmen engaged in the recognition and development of the South American countries. Yet the immediate sequel was a serious British commercial crisis, primarily due to the popular clamour for South American speculation. For "during the revolutionary war, which had lasted fourteen years, the capital of those countries was completely exhausted. The unworked mines were filled with water. They were accessible to English speculation, but they were worked exclusively with English capital. The South American mining companies were conduits through which a rapid stream of gold flowed from this country."

The Prince of Wales will doubtless be delighted with the stately and beautiful city of Buenos Aires. It is an odd reflection that, in 1806-7, the Argentine capital was the scene of two attacks by the British, then at war with Spain as the ally of Napoleon. The place was, in fact, occupied by a naval and military force commanded by Admiral Sir Home Popham and General Beresford; but on July 10th, 1806, Beresford was compelled to surrender, though Admiral Popham sent home a million dollars in specie and it was announced that these Spanish colonies were "open to British commerce." This proved a somewhat premature announcement.

A further expedition from England (which, incidentally, stormed and temporarily held Montevideo, to be referred to presently) was entrusted to the utterly incompetent General Whitelocke. His instructions were to recapture Buenos Aires, and his 12,000 troops included several crack battalions; but the affair culminated in unmitigated disaster. Just a twelvemonth after Beresford's capi-

* See Mr. Harold Temperley's recent and exhaustive work, *The Foreign Policy of Canning*.

tulation, Whitelocke half-heartedly attempted to storm the town, and was beaten back in blood. The inhabitants took part against the common foe, and Whitelocke surrendered after considerable losses. He was, however, allowed to quit the country with his remaining troops, plus the prisoners taken in Beresford's previous fiasco. They were accordingly conveyed across the La Plata to Montevideo, which was also evacuated, and returned home. Whitelocke was of due course court-martialled, and was sentenced to be cashiered as "wholly unfit and unworthy of serving His Majesty King George III in any military capacity whatsoever."

The Buenos Aires of to-day is the second Latin city of the world, with a population of upwards of two millions,* and contains the world's largest wool-market. Built upon American lines, it boasts its zoological and botanical gardens (in Palermo Park), a splendid racecourse and jockey club, fine arts and national museums, opera-house, etc. Its principal suburbs include: "Hurlingham," the British residential quarter—where the Prince, if the time-table permits, will be able to indulge his taste for polo; Tigre, the centre for yachting and rowing clubs; and Belgrano, which has an English church and college, cricket and tennis clubs.

In the course of the London celebration, whereat Mr. Chamberlain made the speech quoted at the beginning of this article, the Argentine Minister to England (Don José Evaristo Uriburu) stated that the amount of British capital invested in his country had increased from £2,000,000 in 1824 to upwards of £600,000,000 to-day! To this I may add that, a century ago, the Argentine's foreign trade amounted to £2,253,524 per annum, whereof Great Britain's share was £1,146,190. To-day, the Republic's total imports and exports—which exceed those of the other nine South American countries put together—represent some £380,000,000 annually, of which Britain claims no less than £110,000,000!

Argentina exports enormous quantities of wheat, maize, and other cereals, frozen and chilled beef and mutton, hides, etc. Naturally, the War proved terribly destructive to German commerce in this quarter, though the ubiquitous Teuton is already raising his head again. The Argentine Government and people—who in 1891-2 passed through a commercial crisis of such gravity that banks and many business houses were compelled to liquidate—have never forgotten the Award of King Edward VII, in 1902, which averted the threatened disaster of an armed conflict between Argentina and Chile. That act by "Edward the Peacemaker" doubtless was not without its effect upon Argentine policy and statesmanship during the world-war.

The second invitation to the Prince of Wales emanated from

* Actually, 2,310,441 in 1925, making it the sixth city of the world.

Señor José Cerrato, President of Uruguay—the smallest of the South American Powers, having an area not much in excess of 72,000 square miles. The royal visitor should be hardly less pleased with the aspect, climate, and surroundings of Montevideo than with those of Buenos Aires. This handsome city, at once the metropolis and principal port of the Republic, is finely situated on the northern bank of the La Plata estuary, and has a population of over half-a-million. It is also the chief centre of railway enterprise and, consequently, the headquarters of commerce. Its attractions include an English hospital and a King Edward VII sanatorium, while two charming seaside resorts, Pocitos and Playa Ramirez, are only four miles distant.

Great Britain appears to be the third most important customer of Uruguay, both as regards import and export trade. The United States and France are her biggest customers, though a very large commerce is carried on with her neighbours, Argentina and Brazil. Livestock constitutes the country's principal source of wealth, and it is calculated that at least ninety per cent. of her exports is derived from cattle, sheep, and their products—canned meat, wool, sheepskins, hides, and so forth.*

The same British expedition of 1806-7 against Spanish America, which ultimately failed in reducing Buenos Aires, also attacked Montevideo. That port, after being ineffectively bombarded by Sir H. Popham's squadron, was attacked and stormed by Sir David Auchmuty on February 2nd, 1807, when 6,000 Spanish were decimated and driven out. General Crauford—afterwards the leader of Wellington's famous "Light Division" in the Peninsular campaigns—also went to Montevideo; but, in the general confusion that ensued, the country was evacuated, as we have seen, chiefly thanks to the pusillanimous Whitelocke.

It has to be borne in mind that, after the Spanish power in the Latin continent had been conquered, Uruguay remained a part of the Argentine Confederation much against her will. She was constantly at war both with Argentine and Brazil, until in 1828 Great Britain's good offices procured for her a "free and independent" status. This, however, long proved but an equivocal description. The new Republic was constantly attacked, and between 1843 and 1852 it withstood a *nine years' siege* by the forces of the Dictator of Buenos Aires, Juan de Rosas, and of General Oribe, who claimed a dictatorship of Uruguay from 1835 onwards. None other than Garibaldi assisted in the city's defence.

Seeing that this period of high-handedness included what may be characterised as the last act of armed intervention by European

* The latest figures obtainable show Uruguay as possessing 6,830,000 head of cattle to 1,400,000 of population, and Argentina 25,844,800 cattle to 8,000,000 population.

Powers in Latin American affairs, a few words must be devoted to it. For two years the Dictator Rosas succeeded in closing the mighty rivers Uruguay and Paraná, not only to trade from other South American countries, but to world-commerce generally—and this albeit numerous British and French firms were doing lucrative business along those waterways. England and France accordingly notified Rosas that his embargo must cease, and in reply he bade them do their worst. The Dictator's "fleet," commanded by Don Guillermo Brown, an Irish adventurer, was quickly disposed of by a Franco-British squadron under Rear-Admiral Inglefield, in September, 1845. Meanwhile, Rosas had placed a formidable obstruction—a boom consisting of two dozen hulks chained together by an iron cable—across the Paraná at Punto Obligado, one hundred miles from its mouth, and supported by four heavily-armed batteries on shore.

The Franco-British attack on this obstruction was delivered on November 20th, 1845, by the "Gorgon" and "Firebrand," paddle-steamers and lesser units, and by the (French) paddle-steamer "Fulton," "San Martin," and smaller craft. A hot engagement ensued, in which certain fire-rafts employed by the enemy proved a dismal failure. Victory for the Allies was rendered possible by the following act of gallantry, as described by Commander Hamilton Currey:

"Captain Hope [afterwards Admiral Sir James Hope] asked and obtained permission to attempt to cut the chain with which the hulks were bound together. The log of the *Dolphin* brig states curtly: 'Sent cutter at 11.50 with the *Gorgon's* armourer to assist Captain Hope in *Firebrand's* boat to cut the chains across the river, which was accomplished.' Hope, with his armourers, attacked the boom in three boats. Regardless of a perfect storm of shot and shell, grape and canister, from every gun that would bear, these men sat on the deck of one of the hulks chipping away with cold chisel and hammer, and we may imagine the length of time such an operation took. Three other boats severed the riding-cable of the craft on the deck of which Hope and his armourers were at work. At last the perilous business was accomplished and, the chain binding the hulks together being severed and the riding-cable gone, the released vessel floated rapidly down-stream amid the cheers of the French and English tars. Perhaps the most remarkable thing in the whole affair was that none was hit; the more so as the enemy had proved themselves excellent shots when dealing with the ships, as their battered condition attested when the fight was done."

Landing-parties then stormed the shore batteries and spiked their guns, and a free waterway was established once more. Rosas fled to Europe in 1852, but for years thereafter Uruguay was devastated by the partisan struggles of the "Blancos" and the "Colorados"—a kind of nineteenth-century version of the Mon-

tagus and Capulets. Finally, order was evolved out of chaos by the strength and initiative of Juan Cuestas, who was twice President of Uruguay (1897-1903). The admirable part played by the Republic throughout the world-war is well within living memory, and Uruguay very properly became one of the Associated Powers that were signatory to the Treaty of Versailles.

Turning now to the last of the three countries which the Prince is visiting, however briefly, it is one that has engaged the sympathy and admiration of people of British race ever since the great Donald, Miller, and others from these islands assisted in its struggle for independence upwards of a century ago. It is a land that has happily been more exempt from revolutionary and reactionary outbreaks than others of that continent, and is correspondingly prosperous to-day. The two outstanding events in the history of modern Chile have been her struggle with the Peru-Bolivian Confederation in 1879-81, and the civil war of 1891. The former land and sea campaigns ended in the total victory of Chile and her acquisition of the rich nitrate territory whence so much of her revenue has since been derived. President Balmaceda's reckless expenditure, culminating in his declaration that the budget for 1890 must be deemed the budget for 1891, led to the loss of 10,000 lives in battle and the death of the President, to be succeeded by Admiral Montt. Since those deplorable events, Chile had not faced the spectre of revolution until last year, when President Arturo Alessandri felt compelled to leave for Europe, but was subsequently requested to return.

Santiago de Chile, the capital, is exquisitely situated on the Mapocho River at an altitude of 1,821 feet. The public gardens surrounding the Santa Lucia Hill overlook the city from a height of 500 feet. Like the majority of the Spanish-American race, the Chilean people are greatly addicted to gaiety, and, in addition to an up-to-date racecourse, Santiago possesses some twenty-five theatres and about fifty cinema and variety houses. Rather less than 120 miles from the metropolis we find Valparaiso, the Republic's second city and principal seaport. Its pleasure resort and racing headquarters is Viña del Mar, charmingly located on the coast some six miles from the port. A terrible calamity desolated Valparaiso and, in a lesser degree, other centres of population in 1906. In August of that year an earthquake practically demolished the city, 3,000 persons being killed, thousands injured, and 100,000 rendered homeless. This visitation was followed by a devastating fire—yet the enormous damage was practically made good during the ensuing year, when a new and attractive Valparaiso arose from the ashes of the old.

Thanks to her triumph in the war of 1879-80 Chile is the only

country producing nitrate in a natural state. These nitrate deposits in Tarapacá and Antofagasta are a source of enormous wealth, and in 1916 their export amounted to £23,000,000 of the country's total product of minerals (£34,000,000). British interests control about thirty-six per cent. of this output, coming easily next to Chile's forty per cent. Such quantities of nitrate were utilised in manufacturing explosives for belligerents in the War, that a production of 40,144,974 quintals in 1914 (the quintal is 101 English pounds) rose to 64,964,547 in 1916, and declined to 20,059,446 in 1919, the year after the struggle.

Chile is also one of the few Latin-American countries producing coal in any quantity, and this is building up another large industry. Again, Chilean wines are the best in the continent, and the annual yield is approaching 10,000,000 gallons. There are at least 5,000,000 acres of forest-timber in the country and nearly 100,000 acres suited to cattle-raising. Great Britain purchases a great deal of Chilean wheat, and, to such an extent is this country the Republic's biggest customer, that during the first post-war year, 1919, the exact official figures were, imports £6,381,624, exports £19,330,993.

Chile owns and administers a larger proportion of her railways than any South American State. Considerably more than half of the lines are state-owned, and all have been electrified. The historic *Robinson Crusoe* island of Juan de Fernandez has long been an important fishing centre, abounding in fine lobsters and crayfish especially.

It is understood that, on his necessarily brief visit to Chile, the Prince of Wales will cross and re-cross the Andes by train to Santiago, afterwards rejoining H.M.S. "Repulse" at Montevideo. This remarkable Andean railway from Valparaiso to Buenos Aires owed much to the initiative of President Pedro Montt (1906-10), who unfortunately died in office. In travelling upon it, the Prince will make practical acquaintance with one of the world's most remarkable engineering feats, and one which, moreover, at those high altitudes exacts not a little in the way of endurance from its passengers.

As Sir Philip Cunliffe-Lister remarked at the gathering referred to at the opening of this article, if anything be needed to knit Great Britain and South America more closely together, the visit of the Prince of Wales—the greatest ambassador of our diplomatic or commercial service—is surely the biggest step that could be taken. In Buenos Aires, in particular, His Royal Highness may rest assured of "a most enthusiastic welcome from the inhabitants of that great city, romantic capital of a land of immense, impressive pampas, of an opulent agricultural and cattle production, and of hospitable estancieros."

PERCY CROSS STANDING.

THE OTHER ITALY.

VERY few people remain insensible to emotion when they hear mention made of Italy. For the moment, maybe, it arouses some imaginary vision of Fascism which comprises more punctual train service mixed up somehow with revolting murders of Socialists, for both of which Mussolini is responsible. But on the whole "Italy" conjures up pleasurable emotions of remembrance or anticipation. It would be worth while considering for a moment with what that remembrance or anticipation is mainly concerned. What is it that Italy means to most of us who have either been there or intend going? This question is of particular significance to the English speaking world, for there is striking proof in most Italian cities that the majority of foreign visitors are English people or Americans. In the shops there is an attractive display of objects that might be designated as industrial art; little almanacs, bookmarks, hand-painted Christmas cards, souvenirs of all kinds—all with English inscriptions. "A present from Rome" may be seen side by side with "A merry Christmas," and though a great many Italians can speak French, far more frequently do we read "English Spoken" advertised than "On parle Français." Unfortunately, too, the Italian shopkeeper and man in the street generally has little judgment of an Englishman or an American other than that he is there to buy these things after or before looking at the many art treasures of the neighbourhood.

From natural pride in these treasures and the incomparably beautiful language, which the outside world so lavishly praises, the Italian unconsciously feels that all his habits, customs and institutions are there to be admired by the innocent foreigner, nor can one cavil at that, it being a result of the attitude of one's own people towards this temperamental, impulsive, credible race of human beings. But that is just the crux of the whole question, for what do we know of one another really? What do we know of the modern Italian? What is it that deeply moves him? What actually are his joys and sorrows, his hopes and sufferings, his work and play? Are we not usually quite content to shrug our shoulders a little contemptuously at the shoals of professional beggars (very much to the fore in Italy even in pre-war days) in complacent consideration of our own diligence as opposed to Italian traditional laziness, with no thought of the fundamental differences determined by political or economic development, historically surveyed? The Guide Books draw attention to the orange and lemon trees, to fertility worthy even of a name such as the "Shell of Gold"—but what Guide Book implies that within such

"shells of gold" may live human beings so poor that in spite of blue sky and sunshine their lot is comparable to the most notorious of our London slums?

It is a revelation indeed to travel through Italy with an eye not solely turned on art and natural scenery, nor, with all the sadness and disillusionment this will entail, is it finally a loss. Art and scenery exhilarate, broaden and develop; but human contact, the discovery of unexpected loveliness in others, the knowledge that others have discovered that same loveliness within ourselves is, let us boldly say it, worth a dozen wonderful churches and the glories of Rome and of Venice. Tell an Italian you have come to visit his country for her extraordinary treasures in art and scenery and you will call forth the conventional smile of gratified pride. He is ready and glad, too, to show you what he can. But tell him you have come this time not for his pictures and mountains but to meet him, to see modern Italian life, to know the Italian people, to learn to appreciate and understand them, and his face will express extreme astonishment which quickly, when he sees your earnestness, will turn to intense delight.

Let us turn the tables. Ask an Englishman who has travelled in Italy what impressions he has gleaned. He will rave to you of the country where the sun always shines, where orange trees grow, where the fertile soil produces almost unwittingly, where milk and honey flow—as indeed they do for the foreign traveller come to revel in beauty, warmth, art, and flowers. And if he tells you of the beggars, the dirt in the streets, the draggled children, it will be as half the country's charm, conducive to its picturesque attraction; it has made things interesting, he has felt observant, curious, sometimes a little sorry, and though he may have given a halfpenny to a beggar here and a street urchin there, he will have wished Italians would bestir themselves and get some solid work to do.

In reality things are vastly different. The country classed as "Italy," a new unity of some 70 years' standing only, comprises people as different from one another and as impatient of one another's failings as races entirely apart. They do not speak each other's language, do not know each other's habits, customs, conditions of living. Unless a Calabrian peasant has travelled through taking part in the World War, he has no inkling of what a city like Milan or Rome can be; he knows no postmen, no water pipes. Nay, we need not go so far afield. Within almost walking distance from the great city of Rome, there are men, women and children compelled to fetch each drop of water from a distance of some 15-30 minutes' walk. Water markets are a well-known feature, while the picturesqueness of the villages round Florence

and other parts would suffer were they deprived of the sight of women water carriers, bearing pitchers on their heads. Italians are not as a rule idle. The soil, where it is not infested with malaria, is cultivated to the last inch. There are no fields in which to wander, for they are too thickly planted and sown with a double or treble crop; cornfields under olive trees, or mulberries, from the branches of which a whole network of vine is carefully suspended and trained, are a common sight. Land labour is almost entirely done by hand, agricultural machines are very rare in Italy, especially in the south. The public squares of Florence, Siena, and other cities swarm on certain days with apparently idle men, gesticulating and talking; but they are transacting business there for whole districts round. The Naples streets at certain hours fill with idle men apparently loafing; but they are fishermen whose busy hours are while others sleep. The streets are always populated, women appear everlastingly gossiping and scolding their children, knitting, washing their clothes; but the street is the Italian woman's home. Her one dark airless waterless room, in which her family eat and sleep, does not suffice for a meeting place, a place for the work and play of the day time, so the home is transferred to the street, which in Italy, as to a great extent in France too, is not a means of communication and traffic merely, but a common meeting ground, a piece of welcome extra space which certainly in Italy contributes to the health of many of the inhabitants otherwise cooped up within dark walls without any outlet on to garden or field.

The deep-seated differences and often grave divergencies between Northern and Southern Italy afford much food for study and reflection. The north is permeated with the civilisation that modern industry engenders, it has good sanitation and an excellent train service. The south is the agricultural district; the population work on the land or are shepherds. There is a terrible scarcity of good water; the sanitation is, with few exceptions, sorely inadequate; for eight months in the year there is no rain. When rain comes, it comes in such profusion that the unpaved mud roads are more of a hindrance to traffic than a help and render communication practically impossible for remoter rural districts.

In the north the people are of Langobardian, French or even Gothic origin, while in the south they have a good streak of Greek and Arab blood. While the north regard the south as indolent and incapable, the south see in their northern compatriots their oppressors and ill-wishers; for most things with regard to their fate are decided in Rome or in Milan. The Church that we imagine so influential a body in Italy is so, though often a matter of habit and unthinking convention in the north, while the southern priest,

mostly glad after having been ordained to return to his previous occupation on the land, makes no great call to the spirit; thus the people live in superstitious awe of their God and saints, who to them represent powers that may grant or deny them material advantage. Yet the southerner is of the reflective philosophic type of mind, the thinker, the lover of legend and myth, while the northerner is practical, devoid of ideals, rationalist. The northern half produced Mussolini, as the south did the philosopher and educator, Gentile.

Cultural unity in Italy may be found in her literature solely, though the actual people as a whole have lost touch; folk-song and folk-lore are no living things, nor has any movement as yet succeeded in rousing a common cultural spirit. It is in the bourgeois ranks that the literary tradition may be sought and found. The Popular University set on foot by the educated middle class with a view to spreading knowledge to those deprived of an opportunity for acquiring it, failed through its lack of vision. A dissemination of book knowledge never reaches those concerned with life at close quarters. The working people need something more alive, or they need a deep spiritual message, nought else will suffice. Moreover Italians are individualists, who will not be led by some sweeping system or controlled by general regulations.

The one man influence or one man venture is most successful. Private initiative is always more effective than that of the State. Thus the Umanitaria in Milan, the Carducci Institute in Como, have flourished as centres of popular culture initiated and supported by single, private enterprise. Or is it a mere matter of chance or of material advantage that has put one of Italy's greatest problems, the stamping out of illiteracy, into the hands of private societies? The State proved incapable of coping with the problem; it had no driving force that could inspire men and women to lives of sacrifice in going out to the rural parts of the country to seek out and instruct those who, ignorant of the most primitive needs of modern civilisation, are a prey to disease and steeped in fathomless poverty.

Gentile and his collaborator, Lombardo Radice, have made great strides on the road to a reform of education, which should grow to be a reform of character and thus a revival of Italian culture generally. Gentile's wide-sweeping school reform is the most outstanding feature in modern Italian intellectual development, and Lombardo Radice's book "*Lezioni di Didattica*" carried inspiration to all those brave young men and women who were groping for light in their task of teaching. Gentile preached the spirit of common discovery in learning, the unity, liberty and practical idealism necessary to carry it through.

Nothing is more illuminating for a peep behind the scenes at Italian rural life than a visit to one of its schools for illiterates. Money does not make them and they are therefore hard to find. A converted barn or stable, the top rooms in a farmhouse, are luxurious examples. To wander out on a moonlight night and fight one's way through obstructing cattle, pigs, chickens and watchdogs, up a stone staircase outside a farmhouse to the little classroom within, where older boys and girls and men and women sit round their teacher, spelling out their own language, listening to the reading of some tale or singing patriotic songs, is well worth while. To see the little room leading out of this too, where the teacher lives during the whole of the school year, furnished with a camp bed, a chair and a table or so, is the surest sign that work of this kind could hardly be carried on were it not for some spirit of sacrifice, some hope, and some love of humanity. The teacher becomes the adviser, the doctor too, often enough, and it is the Society employing him or her that is responsible for the efficiency of the work—theirs the choice of the adequate person. Needless to say this is not always feasible, but gradually a strong network of education is being woven throughout the country which, while fighting illiteracy, stamps out malaria and encourages local handicraft. This is likely to help forward whole districts of the country which, as they develop, will become a new force of, let us hope, deepened and spiritualised vitality for Italy generally.

The Society known as the "*Associazione per gli Interessi del Mezzogiorno*" (Society for the Interests of the South), which covers the greater part of the south of Italy proper, Sicily and Sardinia, is turning its attention to the material welfare of the population by teaching methods of agriculture as well as local industry in order that the inhuman conditions in which these people have been living may more rapidly transform themselves. But there, again, if English or American eyes examine the schools and institutes they must look with a desire to understand rather than to criticise, for the solution of such Italian problems may bring light to places least aware of the innate vitality in these regions. The population may need pictures now for instruction in the rudiments of hygiene where in England the printed word would suffice; but let us not blame the Italian or pride ourselves on our superior school system—let us rather look into the question and explore the possibilities that may underlie the awakening of an unexploited country which may go forward vigorously in view of the educative experience of others in advance for the moment. Brain work and hand work, side by side, is one of our newest educational slogans. Here in Italy we find this being tried, not

as a new experiment in educational possibility, so much as a practical necessity. The educative results, nevertheless, will be instructive when fully explored by a pooling of experience in the world of education. The Southern Italian peasant is now a courteous, warm-hearted, naïve, trustful, lovable creature, but ignorant to a degree that conduces to the fostering of humanly unworthy conditions of living. His philosophy of life is based on the Roman Catholic tradition; wealth is God-given and not to be grudged, knowledge a grace of God bestowed on the few, who should be worshipped by the many and duly blessed for any crumbs they may pass on to the ignorant; fortunate the man privileged to touch the hem of the garment of one in whom the grace of God has placed wealth or wisdom. It is an experience on entering a farmhouse school, as described above, that embarrasses and overwhelms us with our Anglo-Saxon attitude of mind. The visitor may not remain discreetly in the background, conscious of the disturbance he creates and anxious to obliterate himself to the best of his ability. This is so radically misunderstood that it is a kindness on the visitor's part to allow himself to be hero-worshipped, to accept the hospitality that expresses itself on the faces of these peasant boys and girls who, not feeling in their poverty or ignorance any degradation, are with their freely offered homage to the visitor's superior rank and knowledge, quite his equal in the mere fact of all being members of one God-created human family. This experience is strengthened when, after school and study, coffee and cakes are served by the teacher in his or her primitive sleeping and living room combined, and it reaches its height when on wishing to leave the farmhouse, the farmer and his wife persist in proffering of their hospitality in the shape of more coffee, vermouth, or a packet of new-laid eggs to take home! The farmer feels himself to be a patron of progress; he has opened his doors to learning by demanding a school and giving rooms in his own house for the purpose; his next step will be to lay the foundation stone for a church and to call for the services of a doctor. What may not in a couple of decades arise from all this new life-building tendency? What a field for the practice of many a progressive theory, if workers and theorists would get together and for the welfare of generations to come forget geographical boundaries and race prejudices in order to solve the problems and, meeting where and whenever they can, stride forward in a common endeavour! Not only are art and science world embracing, but education, being as it is a mingling of art and science, is world forming.

A deeper insight and understanding of Italy raises but another proof of this great truth. Though these statements are but dis-

jointed examples thrown out at random of many extraordinary points of interest, if we will look at the country with the eyes of the curious, if we will travel through the land in the spirit of human adventure, they may for this reason be worth making. The Italian's love of exaggeration, of gesticulation, his incapacity to do without rhetoric and noise, his slackness in exact transaction, will appear then in the light of his many other characteristics as rather less significant than we often think. Before we attempt to criticise, before we seek to gauge the benefits or evils accruing from Fascism or Antifascism, let us know this other Italy, throbbing with life and intensity, to be elevated or led astray, it is true, by its government as the political wind may blow. We shall know her then, not only in her serenity and beauty, but in her suffering and struggle; we shall have heard her strike her chord in the grand uniting symphony that is humanity.

IDA KORITCHONER.

CORRECTION.

In Professor Delbrück's article on "The German-Polish Frontier" last month on page 19, line 6, by a misprint the percentage of the voting in Upper Silesia in favour of Germany was given as 50 instead of 60.—
ED. C.R.

THE CHURCH AND THE CRIMINAL.

"The difficulties in the way of chaplains are too many for them; the most zealous of them has to bow to the soulless mechanism of the system. Against him in every new development of work or new ideas has hitherto been ranged the conservatism of the official mind, fear of change and dislike of trouble. The most ardent are discouraged and they slip into the rôle of officials, expressing and supporting the official régime and performing their duties in a perfunctory way." (*English Prisons To-day.*)

"CRITICISM," said S. T. Coleridge, "is the valuation of forces." That is to say, criticism, as such, should not simply be a matter of finding fault with any specific form of human effort merely for the sake of finding fault. To merit the name at all it must take account of the results of such effort. This article, therefore, deals more particularly not with the valuation of forces, but with the valuation of results. I propose to deal with one phase of organised religion in its relation to the problem of crime, criminals, and their reclamation. Furthermore, I write from the view-point of the criminal. As one who has had the misfortune to spend the best years of his life in various prisons, I have had many opportunities of studying the influence of religion upon the inmates of our gaols, and of ascertaining why religion as a vital factor in the reform of criminals has more or less failed.

I believe it is generally conceded that the chief function of religion is reform; or, as the theologian might prefer to put it, regeneration. The Christian Church claims to be the supreme guide in all matters of moral and spiritual concern; and this claim obviously includes the criminal and the social outcast of every type and character. As a matter of logical inference one might say, that having regard to their weaknesses and the needs arising therefrom, the latter have the first claim upon the moral, spiritual, and social resources of the Church, that is, if there is any meaning and purpose in the Church at all. There are many, however, who assert that, so far from the felon and the outcast being able to find a dynamic in the Church, the nation as a whole cannot find it. It is said that the majority of people in all ranks of life have no manner of use for the Church, nor any vital interest in its concerns, because it is out of touch with the practical needs of ordinary men and women.

And as this unequivocal indictment is endorsed by many liberal thinkers within the ranks of organised religion, it is quite clear that whether such statements are wholly true or not there is widespread indifference to the Church's aims and ideals and also to its teaching generally. If, therefore, the Church, with its tremendous resources, fails to quicken the nation as a whole to nobler living and loftier ideals, what influence can it possibly have upon those

who have from various causes fallen by the way? To ask the question is to answer it. None. The Church has nothing but platitudes to offer the criminal and the outcast—platitudes and reprobation. With the attitude of the Church toward the general public I have no present concern. My object is to show that the Church is practically powerless to stem the ceaseless tide of crime, or to influence the criminal to any appreciable extent when he is brought into close contact with compulsory religion in prison or any other penal institution. Perhaps the reason for this is that, although the Church has long since given up its ancient claims to the right of sanctuary, it seems somehow to be no longer able to forgive. It exhorts sinners to repent, but itself withholds forgiveness. We know that since, say, Charles Kingsley's time the Church has been slowly but relentlessly driven from its former attitude of spiritual aloofness to the social and industrial conditions of the people and that it has entered more and more into the arena of social reconstruction. But it is not ungenerous to insist that it has done so only under the severest pressure in order to retain something of its waning influence over the masses. It has rarely taken a determined lead in any great social movement, it has reluctantly followed in the wake of forces greater than itself.

The Church has ever been conservative, resistant to change. Its religious attitude, past, present, and future, was symbolised by the late Dean Liddon in his Bampton Lectures. "The Church," he said, "The Church confronts the world to-day holding in her hands the Creed of Nicea." This slavery to tradition, this spirit of dogmatism, of resistance to a more liberal interpretation of the fundamental truths of religion in the light of modern knowledge, partly explains why the Church has but a very inarticulate message to the nation at large and none at all for the criminal, the slum-dweller, or the destitute outcast of the streets. It is quite certain that the Church fails to touch the criminal at any point of contact or inform him with the spiritual dynamic for regeneration. Moreover, the greatest weakness of the Church in its dealings with the criminal is that it too often confines its services to words and does not enlarge its sphere of practical corporate action. The existence of Church Army Labour Homes is a sign that the Church does realise the necessity for corporate action in the direction of finding some sort of employment for a very limited number of down-and-outs, but no one who has any personal knowledge of Church Army work would deny that it merely touches the fringe of the problem and is in no sense a practical solution of it. The attitude of the Church towards criminals and the fleeting shadows of the underworld is all the more strange when we remind ourselves that the Founder of the Christian Church directed practically

all His efforts to raising up the fallen—the Magdalens and the repentant thieves. It cannot, however, be said with truth that the Church has always kept this end in view, for it is still the Church of the well-to-do—not of the poor. In the case of the criminal, in particular, the Church has always stood for punishment on Mosaic lines, and has ever staunchly supported the State in the infliction of the most barbarous penalties, while it is true that criminals to-day are in no wise indebted to the Church for such tentative reforms in our penal administration as have been introduced during the last few years. It is obvious that, in the case of every convicted criminal, whether he be drawn from the mansion or the gutter, the Church has failed to exert any effective influence before conviction, and the tables of recidivism show that it has exerted very little afterwards.

There is an unending stream of the nation's youth and manhood passing through its penal institutions, many of whom commence their State discipline in a reformatory or Borstal Prison and finish up at Dartmoor or Camp Hill. In any case, a very large percentage of convicted prisoners return to prison again and again. Why is this? It is a popular but shortsighted view that assumes a deep-rooted criminal instinct or deliberate choice in the majority of men and women who spend their lives in prison. Every year, something like 50,000 persons are sent to prison for various offences ranging from drunkenness to murder, and many of them return again and again. But it is absurd to suppose that the majority of recidivists are criminals from deliberate choice; for the number of habitual criminals is relatively small. By habitual criminals I mean men and women who, having deliberately weighed the consequences, adopt crime as a profession. The ordinary "habitual" is one who deliberately pursues a life of crime without any of the excuses that so many accidental or occasional offenders may legitimately urge, such as ignorance, bad environment, unemployment, poverty, drink, or inherent weakness of character. The majority of criminals just drift into crime; but the "habitual" proper is one who deliberately pits his wits against society and is prepared to take the consequences. For this type there is no remedy short of life-long segregation. There still remains, however, the problem of the casual or accidental offender, who, without being deliberately criminal, is driven to crime again and again by the pressure of social and economic factors. It has been well said that the criminal has a past but no future. That is the crux of the situation.

Society maintains its police, prisons, warders, and hangmen at an enormous cost to deal with the criminal and punish him, but it does not permit him to have a future. It will spend a thousand pounds to punish a criminal, but it will not spend five

to help him to rehabilitate himself. We are on the crest of a wave of internal prison reform, but there is no effective machinery for enabling discharged prisoners to earn an honest livelihood, notwithstanding official statements to the contrary. It is right and meet that the prison system should be reformed on a reconstructive basis, but those who suppose that administrative reforms alone will solve the problem of crime are labouring under a delusion. The only method of approaching a solution of the problem of recidivism is to face the problem of the discharged prisoner. The aid of discharged prisoners is conducted on a selective basis which tends to exclude all men and women who have been several times convicted. The Report of the Prison Commissioners for 1923-4 shows that a total of over 50,000 prisoners passed through our prisons during the year, of whom thirty-three per cent. were assisted—some few with employment and others with temporary maintenance, clothes, tools, etc.; the extent to which assistance is given to those for whom no work is found ranges from half-a-crown to ten shillings for local prisoners, and rather more for convicts. This leaves sixty-seven per cent. for whom nothing was done. Some few go to the Church Army and Salvation Army Labour Homes or Settlements, but the casual nature of the work in such Homes and its blind-alley character affords too uncertain a basis by which to judge of permanent results. It is only fair to mention that the Discharged Prisoners Aid Societies are handicapped by three serious factors—inadequate funds, heavy cost of administration, and the reluctance of employers to employ men who have been to prison. I shall return to this subject later on.

But one fact stands out very prominently, and it is this: all the administrative reforms in the world will prove futile so long as there exists no adequate machinery to enable the discharged prisoner to earn an honest livelihood by honest work. At present, the vomit of our prisons are confined within a vicious circle. They circulate from prison to the streets, from the streets to the police court, and from the police court to prison; and each time the circle is completed their reclamation becomes more hopeless. It is utterly futile to prate about free will and the power to choose between right and wrong. The person who has been to prison is often up against factors too strong for the exercise of choice. How can society talk of choice to a person who leaves prison branded with disgrace, without a character, penniless, homeless, and friendless? Society has no use for such, neither has organised religion. But is the Christian Church, one of the wealthiest and most powerful social organisations in the world, wholly free from responsibility in this matter? Does the Church, claiming as it does to be inspired by the loftiest ideals of social service, do all that it could to reclaim the criminal,

not only by pointing to the supreme splendour of the Cross and all that it implies but by obedience to the command of Him Who was nailed to it for practising what He preached? It does not.

Let us examine the Church's position in regard to the criminal and its opportunities for real service to him. When the criminal passes from the dock to prison he is supposed to be brought under influences of a punitive and reformatory character. Without quibbling about the obvious contradiction that these terms involve, there is no doubt at all about the punitive influences. These are applied by the prison authorities, and comprise loss of liberty, deprivation of speech, subjection to a repressive discipline, a rigid, monotonous uniform routine, solitary confinement for at least sixteen hours per day, an enforced daily task of slave labour, the suppression of choice and personality, a hideous garb, constant espionage, and, in the vast majority of cases, release without prospects or adequate assistance to earn an honest livelihood. The so-called reformatory influences are entirely in the hands of the Church as represented by its chaplains, Church Army missionaries, and in some cases by approved lay visitors from outside. The fact remains, however, that these reformatory influences do not reform. Why? Does the fault lie with the system or with the Church as it is represented in our prisons? It lies with both. For, notwithstanding the recent introduction of reforms of a routine character, our prison system is based upon two mutually opposite principles. Viewed in its penal character it is fundamentally destructive of the finer attributes of manhood. It humiliates, degrades; it destroys the springs of hope and high endeavour; it destroys healthy initiative, it embitters, and, at the same time, it enfeebles mental and moral stamina. Prison life is still one long process of disintegration, of reaction to definitely destructive processes which operate psychologically and produce various forms of prison psychosis. These prison-induced psychoses are perfectly well understood, for they have been studied and classified by Drs. Nietzsche and Welmans (*Prison Psychoses*, 1912) and others. Every known form of prison-induced psychosis is morbid in character, and most of them are characterised by definitely marked sexual degeneration, which finds an outlet in auto-erotic syndromes that result in certain well-defined psycho-pathic reactions. This is one of the root causes of so much irresponsible conduct in those who have spent considerable terms in prison. The authorities have all along been cognisant of this phase of prison life, for until recent years there was a set scale of punishment for obsessional practices. It would seem, however, that they are now beginning to realise that the limited outlet for healthy pursuits drives men in upon themselves and leads to obsessional depravity of the worst kind. After many years of prison life and personal intercourse

with hundreds of prisoners of every type and character, I have no hesitation at all in saying that the majority of men committed to prison for considerable terms become addicted to practices which gradually sap their manhood, impair their sense of responsibility, and weaken their power of resistance in the struggle that awaits them on release. This is not because criminals are innately more depraved in this respect than their fellowmen outside, but because the conditions of prison life render any diversion, no matter how injurious to health, a welcome relief from eternal solitude and silence.

Side by side with this destructive process of reaction to penal conditions we have the Church working through its chaplains, Church Army missionaries, lay visitors, etc., striving to counteract the evil and effect reformation by insistence upon the ethics of Jesus Christ. In order to understand the reasons why the Church's fight against the evils of the present system fails, we must realise the conditions under which that fight has to be waged. What, then, are the chaplain's powers and duties, how does he exercise them, and what impression does he make on the prisoners thereby? In answering these questions it should be realised at the outset that all the work of the chaplain has to be done under Regulation 57 of the Prison Rules, which requires that

"the chaplain shall conform to the rules and regulations of the prison, and shall not interfere with the working of them as regards the safe custody, discipline, and labour of the prisoners, but shall support the governor in the maintenance thereof."
[Rules for Local Prisons 1899, Section 57.]

Chaplains are also forbidden to communicate with the Press, without special authority, information derived from official sources, or to publish any article or book relating to prisons or prisoners, unless the sanction of the Commissioners has been previously obtained. They may not even communicate with the friends of a prisoner without the sanction of the governor. A chaplain may not intervene to save a prisoner from injustice or cruelty, nor may he even hold a special service without the governor's permission. Every chaplain is, therefore, willingly or unwillingly obliged to perform his duties as a supporter of the authorities. He starts with as definitely designed a check on his initiative as does the warder, with this difference—that while the warder is admittedly an instrument in the repressive régime of prison discipline, the chaplain's relationship tends in an opposite direction to that discipline. For example, the warder is prohibited from speaking familiarly with the prisoner and is obliged to enforce the rule against conversation,* whilst it is the duty of the chaplain to have conversation with the prisoner and to become friendly with him. He is further allowed to give expression to truths which of themselves throw a sharp

* The rule of silence is still strictly enforced in all local prisons, but is partly relaxed in convict prisons.

light upon the ethics of prison conditions. Chaplains are appointed by the Home Secretary and are under the control of the Prison Commissioners. It is therefore clear that every clergyman in the prison service has consciously pledged himself to support the prison system without protest or criticism. The prison system is not a Christian system. Consequently, all Christian services and Christian teaching in prison strike one with a sense of futility, because the whole atmosphere of prison life is a denial of Christianity. Need we look farther for the reasons why the Church has failed to influence the criminal for good? Can clergymen who are tied hand and foot by the prison rules expect to reach the hearts and consciences of men who are chafing under a stupid, brutalising form of punishment? Of course not.

The prison system is wrong, inhuman. Why then does the Church continue to acquiesce in it? Why does it send its representatives into our prisons tied hand and foot? The moral responsibility for existing penal conditions lies as much at the door of the Church as of the State. For, if the Church were sincere in its desire to raise up the fallen and the outcast, it would long ago have raised its voice against the cruel futility of our existing penal methods. It would have used its tremendous resources to obtain saner principles of penal treatment and more adequate measures for helping ex-prisoners to get back again into the rhythm and sweep of industrial life. And if the Church had greater breadth of vision it would unite in demanding a higher status for its representatives within prison walls and also greater freedom of ministration. It is positively degrading for a clergyman to be constantly subject to the capricious authority of a prison governor, because the position is so equivocal that it undermines any influence he might otherwise have with his charges.

Of all places in the world we want men in our prisons who will serve Christ—not the Prison Commissioners. We want men with the courage and vision requisite to the task of rekindling faith in the hearts of those whose faith in God and man has been subjected to an unbearable strain. We want men who realise that thought is a fluid thing, and that to present religious truth to the best purpose it must embody the best thought of this age. And, above all, we want men who have a passionate disdain for the garments of formalism and Pharisaism—men who realise that if they are to succeed in helping their fallen brothers and sisters "to rise on stepping-stones of their dead selves to higher things," they must themselves be brother men—even to criminals. What greater or higher mission could the Church set itself than the earthly salvation of these pitiful ghosts of men and women who are doomed to brood out their lives in the dim recesses of a prison cell?

I have no space to go further into this matter, but it cannot be

too strongly emphasised that the problem of the criminal really begins when the prison gate swings open to admit him to freedom after months or years spent under unnatural conditions. He has a task before him which few of us appreciate. Jeremy Bentham, the great prison reformer and authority, long ago called attention to this acute problem. He said: "A criminal, after having undergone his punishment in prison, ought not to be restored to society without precautions and without trial . . . to transfer him suddenly from a state of supervision and captivity to unrestrained liberty, to abandon him to all kinds of temptations, of isolation and misery, and desire sharpened by long privation, is a mark of indifference and inhumanity." The same conclusion couched in language more poignant and more scathing was voiced by the late Oscar Wilde:

"Society takes upon itself the right to inflict appalling punishment on the individual, but it also has the supreme vice of shallowness, and fails to realise what it has done. When the man's punishment is over, it leaves him to himself; that is to say, it abandons him at the very moment its highest duty towards him begins. It is really ashamed of its own actions, and shuns those whom it has punished, as people shun a creditor whose debt they will not pay, or one on whom they have inflicted an irreparable wrong." Wilde knew what he was writing about, and he saw, as all who are brought into close personal contact with the problem must see, that the real problem of the criminal becomes acute not so much when the first lapse occurs but when the time comes for his return to the world. What is done for him then will probably determine the whole of his future. Abandon him and he will fall again. Stand by him and help him to live cleanly and honestly and the chances are that he will justify such help. There must be disappointments to be faced, but it is worth while.

The problem arises, how is the discharged prisoner to be reinstated? This problem is rendered more acute by the attitude of society. Generally speaking, it is suspicious and hostile. But if society, led by the Churches, were more willing to forgive I am sure the problem of the criminal would be considerably mitigated if not solved. Voluntary effort so far is quite inadequate to solve the problem, and it would seem that the solution lies between largely increased voluntary effort and public support, and some Government scheme which might be found practicable if planned on the lines of a labour colony, to which all needy discharged prisoners could be sent to work under communal conditions until such time as they could be absorbed in ordinary industry. If organised religious bodies, of which the Established Church is supreme, were to tackle this problem with determination I am convinced that the public would respond.

GUY S. DASHWOOD.

THE WORLD'S CHILDREN.

NOW that the world has become an economic unit it is evident that the prosperity of the masses of the people in any country is to the advantage of the people of every country, and conversely, whenever there is widespread destitution and misery, evils are engendered which cannot be confined within national boundaries. Similarly, though less obviously, the character, disposition, and outlook of the people of any nation exercise an influence for better or worse on the fate of their fellow-men far and near. Hence, the way in which children are brought up is a matter of international concern. If they are anywhere neglected, starved, or exploited, and allowed to grow up incompetent or degenerate, the whole world stands to suffer: it is, therefore, a responsibility incumbent upon the whole world to see that, so far as is humanly possible, every child should be given a chance of becoming a useful and happy citizen.

It is this sense of corporate responsibility which has led to the development of the Save the Children Movement. Originating in England after the War, when the unprecedented extension of child suffering brought home the evils it involved to many who had previously been blind to them, the Movement rapidly extended to the continent of Europe, and found special support in Switzerland, which had been the first country to send relief after the Armistice to the hungry children of Vienna. It was due principally to the late Pope, Benedict XV, that the scattered associations which were thus formed united themselves into a loose federation, termed the *Union Internationale de Secours aux Enfants* (Save the Children Fund International Union), under the patronage of the International Committee of the Red Cross, and with its headquarters at Geneva.

The view taken by Benedict XV received a striking expression in the rule which he laid down in regard to the administration of funds derived from Catholic sources, namely, that they should not be administered exclusively by Catholic Committees, or exclusively for the benefit of Catholic children. The objects of the Movement have been summed up by the Save the Children Fund International Union in the "Declaration of Geneva," which was endorsed by the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations. The Declaration runs as follows:

- I. The child should be given the means requisite for its normal development, both materially and spiritually.
- II. The child that is hungry should be fed; the child that is sick should be nursed; the child that is backward should be helped; and the delinquent child should be reclaimed; and the orphan and the waif should be sheltered and succoured.

- III. The child should be the first to receive relief in times of distress.
- IV. The child should be put in a position to earn a livelihood, and should be protected against every form of exploitation.
- V. The child should be brought up in the consciousness that its talents are to be used in the service of its fellow-men.

The Committees in some forty different countries, which compose the S.C.F. International Union, represent the nucleus of the organisation through which the peoples of the world can work towards the universal recognition in practice of the principles laid down by the Declaration. These Committees, divergent in character, are united by the double objective of promoting the fulfilment at home of the clauses of the Declaration, and supporting the action of the International Union in pressing for fulfilment of these clauses throughout the world; and their contributions to the International Fund, under the control of the Union, provide the tangible evidence of their recognition of a common duty. Altogether about £4,000,000 have been raised for the children's cause in six years by the Committees composing the S.C.F. International Union. Help has been given to children in over thirty countries.

The uses to which the S.C.F. International Union is put by its constituent societies are many and varied. There is hardly any branch of work under the Declaration of Geneva which is not touched upon: refugee children are fed and clothed; orphans are maintained; hospitals, clinics, and child welfare centres are supported; feeble-minded, blind, and crippled children are succoured; children are given vocational training, and so on. These activities may perhaps be divided into two categories, namely, those which relate (a), to times of emergency, and (b), to normal times. In times of emergency the S.C.F. International Union issues appeals to the constituent committees to initiate relief action. Pending the collection of special funds, it gives, however, immediate grants from its International Fund, so that the sufferers may receive help without any delay, and its organisation is such that relief can be administered with the greatest promptitude in any area where a sudden need may arise.

Again, the International Fund is of use in meeting emergency distress in circumstances which do not admit of a special appeal being readily made. The suffering, for instance, may be very acute, but not sufficiently widespread to justify a large public appeal. On the other hand, where there is some great call to the benevolence of the world, the S.C.F. International Union affords a centre for international co-operation, so that many nations and many societies can act together, in conjunction with the Union,

for the promotion of relief, while avoiding any overlapping, and maintaining the strictest economy.*

Apart, however, from what may be considered the Union's normal work in times of peace, there are two purposes for which it seeks to rally international effort; in the first place, for the solution of certain international problems affecting child life—and in this direction voluntary societies should increasingly co-operate with the League of Nations† and the International Labour Office—and in the second place, for the combating of the evils, such as the various forms of child mutilation and child slavery, which still persist in certain parts of the world. The methods adopted by the S.C.F. International Union in this work are based upon certain definite principles. One is that the administration of national funds (if at all considerable) should remain under national control, at any rate in the sense that the donors should have the means of definitely checking their expenditure. Certain standards of expenditure should also be recognised. For emergency feeding, for instance, the Union considers that, as a rule, it should be possible to give a hot meal of six hundred calories, with a menu varied over three days, for 1½d. per head per meal, administrative expenses included. It should always be possible for those who contribute large sums for emergency relief to know how many people, in what place and for how long, have been fed with their money. A single large International Fund, in which the money from different sources is pooled, has, moreover, all the disadvantages habitually attaching to governmental charity, and this not only for the donors, but also for the recipients, who in accepting "international" help feel relieved from the obligation of being grateful to the people of any nation in particular. For effective administration it is also necessary that the relief should be given through an experienced agency commanding the neces-

* In times of emergency, it is sometimes indispensable to take into account the situation of adults, and the statutes of the British Save the Children Fund Committee, therefore, enable it to appeal for adults in so far as this is necessary for the welfare of the children. So far, however, the S.C.F. has never had occasion to avail itself of this power, because it has received the requisite funds from other Societies, and chiefly from the Imperial War Relief Fund.

† The League, indeed, is asking for such co-operation. At its meeting in March last, the Council of the League passed the following resolution: "The Council desires to emphasise the fact . . . that the problem of the Greek refugees . . . requires for its complete solution the persevering humanitarian work of private relief organisations. The Council, therefore, addresses a fresh and pressing appeal to the international charitable institutions."

In this connection it may be interesting to note that the S.C.F. has worked in Greece since November, 1922, issuing rations, clothes, etc., to families awaiting re-settlement by the League Commission. In the Athens-Piraeus district (where we have just been obliged to cease our operations, owing to lack of funds), we issued 8,857,901 rations to children, and 5,849,939 rations to adults, (the latter on behalf of the I.W.R.F.) At present the S.C.F. is feeding about 9,000 persons in Macedonia, and about 12,000 in Salonika and its neighbourhood.

sary organisation, not through government officials, local authorities, diplomatic agents or other people who, however reliable, have not the necessary aptitude for the particular work.

Thus at the time of the Russian Famine the three agencies appealing for funds in England constituted together the "All-British Appeal," each agency, however, being left free to collect funds on its own lines and being enabled to retain control over what it collected, subject only to reporting to the central body. In Russia the administration of relief in the province of Saratov was entrusted to the British S.C.F., acting as agent for the S.C.F. International Union. At one period over 308,000 children and 375,000 adults (the latter on behalf of the Russian Famine Relief Fund and of Dr. Nansen's Organisation), were being fed daily, and kitchens were installed on behalf of Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Great Britain and the Dominions, Holland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland and of the Holy See. In all 157,000,970 rations were issued. On this occasion, therefore, a system was evolved which united the maximum of individual interest and initiative with the maximum of technical efficiency.

The responsibilities of the world for the world's children can only be adequately discharged by voluntary effort, both apart from and in conjunction with governmental action. Governments, however much they are actuated by generous motives, must still ultimately act from their national standpoint, or from the point of view of their national interests. A work of altruism such as the "saving" of children can only be effectually achieved by men and women of goodwill in every country determining to put into practice the highest ideals by the most proved, efficient, and practical means.

EGLANTYNE JEBB.

SOME PLAYS OF PIRANDELLO.

THE recent production in London of a series of Pirandello's plays, presented in the original Italian at the New Oxford Theatre has drawn the attention of a large and discerning section of the reading public to the work of this author, and may justify some consideration of the more outstanding of his experiments in the field of drama and of what it is that their exceptional character consists.

Though the author, over a number of years, of several novels, it was not until 1917 that Luigi Pirandello began that cycle of plays under the general but significant title of "*Maschere Nude*"—literally "*Naked Masks*"—which has made his name familiar to many others besides his Italian countrymen in the playgoing capitals of the world.

In order to view the underlying theme of Pirandello's plays in some perspective we may quote what might be described as something of a counter-irritant to his method of treatment, significant as it is of much of the prevailing tendency of thought in the present generation. In a recently published collection of newspaper articles Mr. Gerald Gould expresses himself in these terms on the subject of Mr. James Joyce's novel *Ulysses*. "The general idea of it is understandable—it is, in brief, the denial of the human soul. It is the idea that the truth about a man is the little separate bits of him, the tiny physical acts, the thwarted semi-conscious desires, the broken memories." The periodic tendency towards introspection, it may however be argued, seems to be a necessary process of stocktaking; necessary, that is, if our imaginative craftsmen are to evolve new syntheses of life with the aid of the newer thought of succeeding generations. It is at such moments, when the world which we have come to regard as a steady firmament composed of so many well-known and certain facts, suddenly seems "out of joint" with one's own reckonings, that we are at a loss to what to ascribe this clash of ourselves with others; for such is the usual instance in which we are brought up against the faulty character of our syntheses of what are the least stable factors in the world, other people.

Such at any rate was the avowal of *The Father* in Pirandello's "Six Characters in Search of an Author," who is, to my mind, the key-character to the group of plays that I am here considering: "I seem to be philosophising only for those who do not think what they feel when they blind themselves with their sentiment. For a man never reasons so much, and becomes so introspective, as when he suffers, since he is anxious to get at the root of his sufferings." The question naturally arises, and it is vital to a consider-

ation of all Pirandello's work: Can the alienation of a morbid egotist from his neighbours be resolved by introspection? The dramatist himself seems to doubt it, for elsewhere in the same play we find the following dialogue: "The Son: 'Oh, you're going to hear a fine bit now. He will talk to you of the Demon of Experiment.' The Father: 'You're a cynical imbecile. I've told you so already a hundred times. (To the manager). He tries to make fun of me on account of the expression which I have found to excuse myself with.' The Son: 'Yes, phrases! phrases!' The Father: 'Phrases. Isn't anyone consoled when faced with a trouble or fact he doesn't understand, by a word, some simple word, which tells us nothing and yet calms us?'"

The scene of "Six Characters" opens upon a stage rehearsal of a Pirandello play, "Mixing it Up." The manager has just read the dramatist's explanation of the symbolism of the piece as a preliminary to the imminent rehearsal: "The empty form of reason without the fullness of instinct which is blind," adding for the benefit of the leading man, "You stand for reason, your wife for instinct. It's a mixing up of the parts according to which you, who act your own part, become the puppet of yourself"—in itself something of a clue to that which is to follow—when there enter the theatre "The Six Characters." They explain that they have been conceived in the imagination of a dramatist who has forborne to give them life in written form, and are therefore in search of an author who will do so much for them. They approach the manager in this capacity. He is, of course, unable to credit them with being mere characters of an author's brain; but, scenting in what he takes to have been the tragedy that has happened to six actual persons material for a play for his waiting actors to perform, he encourages the intruders to proceed with their reminiscence, which, as they re-enact it, is taken down by the prompters as dialogue. In the second act the artistes proper try over their newly created parts; but the Characters interpose to show how it should have been done, and proceeding into the third act bring their adventures to their predestined tragic conclusion.

The theme of this inner play centres about the character of The Father who has married a wife of humble origin out of pity, in order to indulge his vision of himself as a benevolent person, and has later permitted her to leave him for a former secretary of his in whom she has inspired spontaneous affection. When she points out to him that the wish to be rid of her had been the prompting motive to this latter display of altruism on his part, so interested is he in the revelation of his own intellectual processes that he cheerfully admits that such a consideration had not been absent from his mind. By allowing his character this degree of

self-analysis Pirandello at once lifts *The Father* on to the plane of the really great egotists, enlisting our sympathies on his behalf as I think they never were for Sir Willoughby Patterne or Mr. Waddington of Wyck. It is a sure test of the depth of penetration into the character satirised if we feel inclined to take up our cudgels in his defence against his artistic creator, so compounded must he be of the stuff of our own ideals and foibles. Miss Stella Benson's "Poor Man" and Gerry Wickham in Mr. Middleton Murry's "The Voyage" stand this test, and so, I think, does *The Father* as he confesses to what resorts he has had recourse for company after the departure of his wife: "Each of us knows what unconfessable things pass within the secrecy of his own heart. One gives way to the temptation only to rise from it again afterwards, with a great eagerness to re-establish one's dignity as if it were a tombstone to place on the grave of one's shame and a monument to hide and sign the memory of our weaknesses."

Curious it is that the Lord Chamberlain's Committee should have refused to license the production of this play in English in spite of its performance by the Stage Society, while a section of the popular press is permitted to chronicle similar cases from life in the bare skeleton of their pathological details, devoid of just that "human interest" which this dramatist's sympathetic delineation provides and which it is the avowed aim of such periodicals to achieve.

As an old client of Madame Pace, an ostensible modiste, *The Father* encounters one day in her "shop" his step-daughter, who has been drawn into this traffic. She comes to his house, and there at once begins a conflict of wills between *The Father's* new mistress and his legitimate son and heir. "I divine from her manner," says the latter, "why it is they have come home. I had rather not say what I feel about it. Believe me, Mr. Manager, I am an unrealised character, and I feel myself not at all at ease in their company." The point of this is clearly not so much the son's disgust at this unnatural form of profligacy as the fact that the character of the son has only been realised in the imagination of the originating dramatist as a lay-figure representing Legitimacy as a foil to this half-sister of his with her parasitic status.

Mr. Arthur Livingston, whose translation of "Right you are (if you think you are)," as well as his version of "The Man with a flower in his Mouth" which appeared in the *Dial* I am using throughout, has contributed a prefatory note to Messrs. Dent's edition, which includes the first mentioned as well as "Henry IV" and "Six Characters," Englished by Mr. Edward Storer, to whom I am also indebted. In this preface Mr. Livingston

says: " 'The Six Characters' is a dramatisation of the artistic process itself, in relation to the problem of reality and unreality which has engaged Pirandello in one way or another for more than twenty years. I venture to insist upon this point as against those observers who have tried to see in the 'Six Characters' an ironical satire of the commercial drama. The object of Pirandello's bitter irony is not the stage manager, nor the theatrical producer, nor even the dramatic critic; it is the artist: it is, in the end, life itself. I suppose the human soul presents no mysteries to those who have been grounded in the science of Freud. But in spite of psycho-analysis a few Hamlets remain. Pirandello is one of them."

It seems a little improbable that even Dr. Sigmund Freud has ever made such a sweeping claim on behalf of his methods or their exponents, but, it may be objected, no more does Pirandello ascribe to himself the qualities attributed to him by his eulogist. Yet he would hardly be human if he did not in some fashion identify himself with Laudisi, who we may, perhaps, not unfairly describe as the "hero" of "Right you are (if you think you are)," since we read of him in the stage instructions prefatory to Act I that he "has a keen analytic mind, but is impatient and irritable in argument. Nevertheless, however angry he gets momentarily his good humour soon comes to prevail. Then he laughs and lets people have their way, enjoying, meantime, the spectacle of the stupidity and gullibility of others." Of others, not, be it noted, of himself. The "philosophising" in this play is the more obtrusive because it is so one-sided in its satire, unlike "Six Characters."

The curiosity of a small Italian town has been aroused by the arrival of a recently appointed official, Signor Ponza, who has settled with his wife in apartments quite separate from those of his mother-in-law. Furthermore, his wife is never seen abroad, and as for her mother, when she comes to visit them she is content to approach no further than the courtyard, from which she corresponds with her daughter by means of messages let down in a basket for the purpose. Naturally Laudisi's "credulous and gullible" relatives are on the tiptoe of expectancy to have this mystery unravelled. Their curiosity is still more intrigued when Signor Ponza explains that Signora Frola, his mother-in-law, is suffering from a mental delusion that precludes her from understanding that her daughter is dead, and that he has kept up this device to save his second wife from embarrassment. Signora Frola, on the other hand, makes the contrary statement, that it is Signor Ponza who is afflicted with a malady which constrains him to believe her daughter is dead and to regard his wife as his second

spouse. Finally, the Police Commissioner is persuaded to use his official powers to summon the mysterious Signora Ponza herself to reveal the secret of her identity. She comes with her face hidden beneath a veil which she does not lay aside. "What—the truth? The truth is simply this. I am the daughter of Signora Frola and I am the second wife of Signor Ponza." The Prefect: "Ah, but no, Madam, for yourself, you must be either the one or the other." Signora Ponza: "Not at all. Not at all, sir! No, for myself I am—whoever you choose to have me."

With this conclusion the dramatist succeeds in preserving unrevealed the enigma which has been the chief source of interest to the spectator. As Laudisi had remarked earlier in Act II when it is discovered that the village of Marsica from which the Ponzas had come had been destroyed by earthquake: "It is not because those documents have been destroyed in accident, but because those people have concealed those documents in themselves. She has created for him, or he for her, a world of fancy which has all the earmarks of reality itself. Oh, I grant you, if you could get a marriage certificate or birth certificate or something of the kind, you might be able to satisfy that stupid curiosity of yours."

It is just this admission which damages the whole validity of such a plot to illustrate Pirandello's lesson of the relativity of all human knowledge. If this narrative had been the right one for the purpose there would surely have been no need of such an inconclusive finale, which we feel is unworthy of an author who has not scorned to use all the tricks of the detective story vendor, and yet fails to produce a climax at once satisfying to our story-telling and philosophising instincts. When Centuri, the police commissioner, arrives to say that he has gained information about the Ponzas from a former neighbour of theirs, Laudisi is bursting with curiosity. Now one cannot help remarking that there are none of his "gullible and credulous" relatives there whose curiosity *he* can mock. There can be no doubt about his earnestness on this occasion, for in the stage directions we read (as he cons the bulletin of information): "He stands, reading the document and carefully commenting from time to time with exclamations in different tones." First an "Ah!" of satisfaction, then another "Ah!" which attenuates this enthusiasm very much. Finally, an "Eh!" of disappointment, which leads to another of complete disgust. By allowing his character Laudisi to relax his leisurely air of indifference Pirandello has certainly indicated the human limits beyond which the maintenance of impartiality can be carried no further; but he has also swept away the last barrier which was checking this play of avowed philosophic intent from degenerating into a detective play, in which almost everything

is subordinated to the provision of false clues in order to surprise the audience with an unexpected climax.

The title character in Pirandello's "Henry IV" suggests almost instantaneously to one's mind a facile comparison with Hamlet insofar as the element of insanity or pseudo-insanity enters into both characters. But, here again, it is the contrast between "reality" and "make-believe" that really engrosses the Italian dramatist's attention in this tragedy of a twentieth-century eccentric who sets himself to live the part of an eleventh-century German Emperor. It must, however, be confessed that the philosophic jargon with which its author contrives to deck out his themes is amongst the least impressive features of his work.

The sentiment that dreams are only distinguishable as such insofar as they alternate, with periods of reality might, one feels, have been attributed to Baldovino, "hero" of the piece that was presented two years ago at the Atelier Theatre, Montmartre, in Madame Camille Mallarmé's version as "La Volupté de l'honneur," without any reminder that it emanated originally from Descartes. Here again one cannot help being struck with the depth of penetration in Pirandello's observations of human nature where he is least concerned to wrap his meaning up in phrases that are the merest commonplaces in text-books of philosophy, as, for instance, where a friend remarks of Baldovino: "It's much easier, with him, to be a hero than an honest man. With luck one can be a hero once; to be an honest man one needs to keep it up the whole time." That is the problem that confronts all Pirandello's heroes, who are indeed the most poignant expressions of this age in their very duality, their realisation of the Mr. Hyde that they are and the Dr. Jekyll that society requires them to be.

It is true, as Dean Inge wrote *à propos* of the late Mr. Massingham's views on religion recently published in the *Spectator*, that the idea that "the individual is always innocent, society always guilty" is a mere "gospel of sentimentalism;" but this, however, is cold comfort for those of this generation who have followed the "bracing" maxim that every man's responsibility devolves solely upon himself to such a logical extent that they find themselves at variance of purpose with other less individualistically inclined. It is to such lonely egotists with their intellectual realisation of the isolation to which their solitarily developed temperaments have condemned them that Pirandello's plays will make especial appeal.

"The Man with a flower in his Mouth," recently produced by the Select Evenings Club in Bloomsbury, is perhaps Pirandello's most successful attempt at suggesting the utter loneliness that may encompass a human soul in the midst of its friends and neigh-

bours. The scene is a sidewalk along which are scattered the chairs and tables of a far from prosperous all-night café. The rise of the curtain discovers "The Man with the flower in his Mouth" inveigling a stranger into conversation. It is no difficult task, for the stranger, momentarily at any rate, is a man with a grievance. Encumbered with the commissions he has been discharging for his women-folk he has missed the night train back into the country, and having in his hurry left the keys of his town-house behind has no choice but to fritter his time away till the arrival of the 4 a.m. train, and hence is described in the *dramatis personæ* as "A customer (with time on his hands)"—an attribute which later appears to be not without other significance as the play progresses.

The customer manifests uneasiness as to the safety of his precious parcels, the outcome of his troublesome commissions, which he has left behind in the cloakroom, but supposes that since they were well tied up they will be secure. "The Man with the flower in his Mouth," however, is more concerned to conjure up a vision of the tying-up process itself: "Here's a long strip of doubled paper—pink with wavy lines—ah! a sight for sore eyes!—You'd almost like to put your face on it to feel the cool." The customer has by now almost forgotten his own grievances out of curiosity for the imaginative capacity with which, as the other explains of himself, "I cling to the lives of other people." Suddenly the customer is asked, did he notice the chairs in the waiting-room the last time he visited the doctor? and "The Man with a flower in this Mouth," realising he has made rather a rapid change in the topic of conversation, breaks out into what is, fortunately, the solitary instance of "philosophising" in this play: "The fact is that certain mental associations—oh! between things worlds apart—are so peculiar to each one of us and they are determined by considerations, experiences, habits of mind so individual that people would never understand one another unless they avoided them when they talked." After this "The Man" resumed his more usual form of utterance. "Do you suppose those chairs get any pleasure out of imagining who the patient is to be who will next sit down on them? No pleasure at all! Well, my job in life is something like theirs. Believe me, I find no pleasure in thinking of the train you lost, of the family you have in the country, all the annoyances I can imagine you have."

A little later a woman's head appears round the corner. "Do you know what that woman wants of me?" breaks out "The Man." "She wants me to stay quiet, peaceful-like at home. Every room in perfect order. Silence—deadly silence—broken only by the tick-tock, tick-tock of the grandfather's clock in our dining-room." One gets a sense of one of those times when a dreaded

event is almost imminent, and one seeks to pass each minute in something other than one's usual preoccupations in the hopes of forgetting temporarily the relentless fate which with every moment is drawing nearer and nearer. Such times serve as a real test of what is most fundamental if not what is most intelligent in one's psychological composition. In utter loneliness of spirit one ignores many of one's lightly assumed dogmas of life—from shallow rationalism one may relapse into the most grovelling superstition, from superficial faith into the most apathetic abandon. Above all, one realises for the first time how little family ties may mean to one and what complete strangers one's nearest and dearest can be. It is then that it is so difficult to play with the old familiar technique—the social rôle with which one has been entrusted. But, it may be contended, what is most fundamental may be that which one has learned to become, like Mr. Beerbohm's *Happy Hypocrite* who assimilated the beatific characteristics of the virtuous mask which he wore over his rascally features.

Possibly it is true that in such moments one is "beside oneself," and loses in what is most superficial that which is most characteristic of oneself. Humanity, however, presents in such a state what is probably the most easy medium for the dramatist who wishes to synthesise people in the mass and not in their cultivated individualities.

"Look," says "The Man with a flower in his Mouth," "I want to show you something. See this spot under my moustache? Death has passed my way and put this flower in my mouth. 'A souvenir, my dear sir, keep it, no charge.' I'll be back this way a few months hence. Do something for me to-morrow evening before you get home, will you? Well, the first tuft of grass you notice on the roadside—just count the blades for me. The number of blades of grass will be the number of the days I have still to live—choose a good-sized clump, if you please, eh? (He laughs). Well, goodnight—goodnight."

What is all this but a sick man's ravings, a reader may protest, about on a par with the hysterical introspection of the incestuous Father in "Six Characters," or of the posturing madman in "Henry IV" or Baldovino's fatuous compliance with the scheme to legitimise a married friend's illicit liason by going through the ceremony of matrimony with the latter's mistress? Are these abnormalities worthy of our attention? Perhaps these abnormalities, it may be answered, are just the dramatist's choice of an unusual theme on which we can almost imagine our own self-analysing faculties working, forgotten as they remain in their almost automatic character when they centre about the mere humdrum incidents of everyday life.

BERNARD CAUSTON.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE SECURITY PACT.

THE "Papers respecting the proposals for a Pact of Security made by the German Government on February 9th, 1925," were issued as a White Paper on June 18th. They contained the dossier of the chief pronouncements on the subject made by the three Governments, and afforded a starting point for discussion among those people in the three countries who have at heart the pacification of Europe. The main principles which have underlain the attitude of the German, French, and British Governments in the exchanges which led up to the publication of the White Paper have already been explained in this section of THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. It is arguable that the main value of discussions about a Security Pact lies in the consideration that so long as men and nations discuss proposals for peace the chances of war diminish. It is possible that, in a big international emergency, no Security Pact will be worth much more than the ink and paper which record it, but it is equally likely that the existence of a Security Pact would tend to postpone any such emergency. "Give us this day our daily bread" is sound diplomacy. Moreover, the fact that the statesmen of the three Western nations are engaged on the problem of peace is in itself a good thing; for thought, if it go far enough, must, sooner or later, lead to a realisation that peace is a matter of common sense and common interest. When that realisation takes place the problem is solved, for where there's a will there's a way. The particular machinery is unimportant. If Germany, France, and Great Britain were genuinely inspired by the belief that there would be no war between them ever, it would not matter whether the pacific law which bound them were provided by a League of Nations Covenant, a Geneva Protocol, a Pact of Security, or even if there were no specific instrument at all. At a time when men of good-will are weary of continuing disruption—war in Morocco, riots in China, diplomatic tension between Russia and Great Britain, to mention only a few—any opposite tendency is eagerly to be welcomed. It is clearly a healthy thing that the German, French, and British Governments should be discussing the possibility of making an arrangement designed to obviate war, even though the discussion be not conducted in Geneva.

DETAILS OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS.

There are certain points of detail arising out of the preliminary negotiations which, however, must be considered. The chief documents contained in the White Paper are the original German offer

(now fully disclosed for the first time), the French answer, and a letter from Mr. Chamberlain to M. Briand. Between the time of the original German offer and Mr. Chamberlain's final communication to M. Briand there took place a series of exchanges between the British and French Governments designed to work out a French reply to Berlin such as could be approved by the British Government. The first French draft was transmitted to London on May 13th (document 3 in the White Paper). It led to the communication of an informal memorandum by Mr. Chamberlain to the French Ambassador on May 19th, in which the British Government invited the French Government to "elucidate" some of the points involved. The chief interest of that communication lies in the following three points: (i) "Mr. Chamberlain notes that the French Government welcome the suggestion of treaties of arbitration guaranteeing the peaceful settlement of juridical and political disputes. But what exactly do the French Government understand by the term 'arbitration' in this respect? Is it contemplated that there shall be a settlement of a judicial nature in every case, to the exclusion, for instance, of the procedure of settlement by the Council laid down by the Covenant of the League of Nations? Or do the French Government include 'conciliation' in the general term 'arbitration' used in their draft? The French draft contains the phrase that the arbitration treaties 'should leave no room for coercive action save in case of failure to observe the provisions of the various treaties and agreements contemplated' in their Note of May 12th, but even in the latter case the French Government can hardly contemplate actual coercive action without a preliminary reference to some procedure for peaceful settlement, such, for example, as the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the general provisions of the Covenant. This is an important point, and one on which Mr. Chamberlain would be more particularly grateful for further information. (ii) What exactly is meant by the phrase 'the joint and several guarantee,' which under the French draft is to be given to the contemplated arbitration treaties? What actual obligation would devolve upon the guarantor? This is a point on which His Majesty's Government are in great doubt as to what is intended. (iii) Does such a guarantee involve an obligation on the guarantors to resort to force, and, if so, in what circumstances?"

The elucidations asked for were sent to London by M. Briand on May 22nd. The answers to the points raised by Mr. Chamberlain were as follows: (i) "The French Government have taken the word 'arbitration' in the most general sense, meaning by it an attempt to exclude solutions by force. As to the means of attaining this object, it is only during the negotiation of the

eventual agreements that it will be possible to define them. In all cases the obligatory nature of settlement by peaceful means must be specially affirmed and enshrined. There is, moreover, no question of encroaching upon the prerogatives of the Council of the League of Nations. The only condition which appears essential to the French Government, is that the pacific solution obtained shall have the character of an obligatory decision. It is necessary to distinguish two cases: (1) Failure to observe the conditions of treaties or agreements other than treaties of arbitration existing between the parties. In this case failure to observe the conditions of these treaties or agreements cannot give rise *ipso facto* to coercive action except in virtue of a special provision of the aforesaid treaties and agreements contemplating such action. (2) Failure to observe arbitration treaties. The object of these is assuredly, as has been said above, to exclude solutions by force, but if such treaties are not observed it is necessary to recognise that their violation appears to be a possible justification for coercive action appropriate to the nature of the violation."

(ii) and (iii) "By 'joint and several guarantee' is meant that the guarantee is given by all the signatories, who must in principle act together, but that each individual signatory is, nevertheless, bound to act even in the case where one or several of the co-signatories default; thus, on the occasion of the violation of Belgian neutrality by Germany, in 1914, Austria defaulted, but the other guarantors were bound to act and did not hesitate to honour their signature. A distinction must be drawn between a territorial guarantee and a guarantee given to an arbitration treaty. The first applies in case of the violation of a territory, and necessarily involves resort to force in defence of that territory. The guarantee of an arbitration treaty, on the other hand, does not necessarily take that form. It infers any means, diplomatic or other, appropriate to the nature of the violation. We have purposely avoided defining its nature or extent. It goes without saying, that in such a case each of the guarantors acts in such measure as he is able. If, for example, Germany were to violate the arbitration treaty with Poland, Great Britain could not be automatically drawn in to a greater extent than is involved in the first place by the guarantee which she has given to the arbitration treaty under the conditions laid down above, and in the second place by her capacity as a member of the League of Nations. In return, France could not be deemed to violate the Rhineland Pact if she should be called upon to help Poland. This very example demonstrates the necessity of making simultaneous the eventual conclusion of a Rhineland Pact with the conclusion of arbitration treaties between Germany and the neighbouring Allied States, as, indeed, Germany herself proposes."

Those "elucidations" led to the decisive letter of Mr. Chamberlain's (No. 6 in the dossier), in which the British Government restated its general policy, and went on to make detailed suggestions for modifications in the French draft. The important passages in the statement of the policy were as follows: "The basic principle, then, by which His Majesty's Government are guided in their approach to the matter now under discussion is, and must be, that any new obligation which they undertake shall be specific and limited to the maintenance of the existing territorial arrangement on the western frontier of Germany. His Majesty's Government are not prepared to assume fresh obligations elsewhere in addition to those already devolving upon them as signatories of the Covenant of the League of Nations and of the Peace Treaties. His Majesty's Government welcome any treaties of arbitration or conciliation which the Continental Powers concerned may be prepared to enter into, provided only that such treaties do not affect the rights and obligations attaching to membership of the League of Nations under the Covenant. Nevertheless, though His Majesty's Government are not prepared to go so far as the French Government suggest, yet they are prepared in principle (and, of course, subject to a careful examination of the actual terms ultimately proposed) to give a guarantee, following logically from the territorial guarantee of the Rhineland, of arbitration treaties which may be concluded between Germany and her Western neighbours signatories of the Pact. The type of guarantee which they have in mind would operate in the event of a failure on the part of one of the parties to refer a dispute to arbitration (using the term in its widest sense to cover both judicial awards and conciliation tribunals) or to carry out an award if such failure were coupled with a resort to hostilities. The guarantee would be, so to speak, defensive. It would not entail upon His Majesty's Government—as they conceive it—any obligation to resort to force elsewhere than in the areas covered by the proposed Rhineland Pact, and would not operate in any event in favour of the party which had refused arbitration or had refused to give effect to an arbitral award. My object has been to produce a statement of general principles without in any way committing either His Majesty's Government or their Allies to exact phraseology, or to particular proposals whose exact shape can only be determined when the time is reached for considering a draft instrument to give effect to these general objects. The agreement would be so framed that it would only become operative on Germany joining the League."

In the detailed suggestions the important one was the redrafting of the French Article IV as follows: "The German Govern-

ment next declare themselves prepared to conclude with France and with the other States parties to the Rhineland Pact arbitration treaties guaranteeing 'a peaceful settlement of juridical and political conflicts.' France considers that an arbitration treaty of the kind proposed would be the natural complement of a Rhineland Pact. But it must be understood that as between herself and Germany it would apply to all disputes of whatever nature, and should not leave room for coercive action save where such action may be taken consistently with the provision of treaties in force between the parties. It is hoped that the Belgian Government will be disposed to enter into a similar treaty. To give full effect to these two treaties their observance ought to be assured by the joint and several guarantee of the Powers which participate in the territorial guarantee contained in the Rhineland Pact, so as to ensure that any failure to refer a dispute to arbitration or to carry out an award would, if coupled with a resort to hostilities, bring the guarantee into immediate operation. In the absence of a resort to hostilities the Council of the League shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect to the treaty."

Those suggestions were substantially accepted by M. Briand in a Note which he sent to London on June 4th. His most interesting sentences were the following: "The French Government consider it essential to preserve their liberty to go to the assistance of States to which they deem it necessary to grant their guarantee without it being possible for the provisions of the proposed Rhineland Pact to block their way and thus to be turned against them. The verbal explanations which have reached them from the British Government have given them a firm assurance of this. France intends in this way to reserve her action in the case of a violation of an eventual arbitration treaty between Germany and Poland, for example, or between Germany and Czecho-Slovakia."

THE PACT AND COVENANT.

The question of the Rhineland Pact is one about which there is a considerable difference of opinion in Great Britain. The Government is in favour of it, but it is an established and universally respected principle of British foreign policy that important commitments of this kind should be backed, not by the support of one party only, even if that party happens to have an overwhelming majority in Parliament, but by the general consensus of opinion in all parties and in all classes. Mr. Chamberlain has recently stated that he shares this view. It would be unthinkable that one British Government should sign and ratify a

Security Pact, and that a succeeding Government should tear it up. It is, therefore, to be expected that the British Government will satisfy itself before finally concluding the Pact that it has the fairly general support of the whole people. Those who read the official documents which give the text of the negotiations which passed between London and Paris, should remember that these communications were not a binding diplomatic instrument. Mr. Chamberlain more than once emphasises the fact that the exchanges of view between the French and British Governments were provisional, and that they committed neither side to any final formula or to any precise interpretation of any principle agreed to. It is clearly impossible that any agreement between France and Britain should be reached before negotiations are begun with Germany. At various times during the exchange of view between London and Paris, when the Quai d'Orsay has been perhaps a little over-eager and a little too anxious to bind the British Government to a commitment, it has been pointed out from London that no binding commitments could be reached except between all the parties concerned, that is, including Germany. At any moment Germany could refuse the Pact. At any moment, therefore, Germany could bring the negotiations to an end. It is a matter of common sense that both the French and the British diplomats should hold their hand until the substantive negotiations begin.

Provided, however, that it be clearly understood in Berlin that what has been agreed to by Mr. Chamberlain and M. Briand is merely a basis of discussion with Germany, it is important for German opinion to realise exactly how far the British Government is prepared to go in meeting, what may be called for convenience, the French point of view. Although in general the British Government's point of view is that the proposed Rhineland Pact is merely a particularisation of a general obligation already existing as a result of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Government is prepared—and this is the sum total of what Great Britain offers—to make a modification in the situation produced by Article 16 of the Covenant. The Covenant in that article lays it down that "Should any Member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Articles 12, 13 or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other Members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a Member of the League or not." In

other words, the immediate obligation imposed on Great Britain by the Covenant in case of a violation of the Rhineland zone (for it is assumed for the purpose of this argument that Germany is to be a member of the League of Nations), is, that she shall take certain economic and financial retaliatory measures. Article 16 then goes on to stipulate that "It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military, naval or air force the Members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League." That is to say, that the obligation for war is a remote one, and that there is a buffer period during which the signatory Powers of the Covenant of the League have to decide whether or not to accept any recommendation for warlike measures which may be made by the Council of the League.

Now, according to the principles of the proposed Rhineland Pact, as laid down in section 4 of the French Note to Berlin, Great Britain, as one of the guarantors of the Arbitration Treaty in the West, would undertake to engage in immediate action in case the demilitarised zone was violated. In a statement which he made in the House of Commons on June 25th, Mr. Chamberlain confirmed the Government's attitude on this point. "If the wrongdoer," he said, "not only refuses to arbitrate or to carry out the award that an arbitral tribunal has pronounced against him, and he also resorts to force, then our guarantee becomes effective to protect the wronged party against the wrong which is done." That statement was the first downright explanation we had from the Government of what was intended by section 4 of the French Note to Berlin. There was an inconsistency between two passages in that section, one of which implied that coercive action should be taken only in accordance with existing treaties (that is, with the League Covenant), while in the second it was laid down that the guarantee of the Pact should be brought "into immediate operation if one of the parties, refusing to submit to arbitration or to carry out an arbitral award, resorts to hostile measures." Mr. Chamberlain has now explained that it is the latter and not the former principle which, in the Government's policy, is to hold good.

Little is to be gained at this stage by emphasising particular points involved in the French Note to Berlin, or in the exchanges which passed between Paris and London. The whole agreement reached between Mr. Chamberlain and M. Briand is conditional on agreement with the German delegates who will take part in the actual negotiations begin that the British Government will that it is the British Government's desire to make the Pact con-

form as far as possible with the Covenant of the League. In the case, for instance, of the departure from the Covenant which has been explained above, it will be necessary for some machinery to be set up to decide whether or not an aggression has been made in the West, and by what party. It will no doubt be found when the actual negotiations begin that the British Government will maintain that the judicial tribunal for such a purpose should be provided by the League of Nations. All that need be said about the eastern frontiers of Germany is that the British Government has made no commitment and will never make any commitment, which conflicts with the Treaty of Versailles; and Article 19 of the Covenant is Article 19 of the Treaty.

CHINA AND GREAT BRITAIN.

It became clear in July that the anti-foreign riots in China, which, since the end of May, had created a serious international crisis, were something more than transient disorders, and were rather the fruit of the deep-rooted Chinese movement for national independence, which has been in progress for a quarter of a century. The movement was bound to come, as it has come in the history of most nations whose inferior civilisation led to the planting of foreign interests in their territories.

The riot on the part of Chinese students which took place in Shanghai on May 30th and involved the killing and wounding of some of the rioters by the British police, called for action on the part of the Diplomatic Body at Peking. A Commission, in which the British representative was Mr. Vereker, First Secretary of the British Legation in Peking, was sent to Shanghai to investigate. Although the report of the Commission has not been published, it is commonly known that it contained certain criticisms on the conduct of the police and recommended that Mr. Fessenden, the American Chairman of the Shanghai Municipal Council, should be censured, and that the Chief of the British police at Shanghai, Colonel MacEuan, should be dismissed. The report has not been published, because the Chinese representatives who joined in the investigations insisted on enlarging the scope of the inquiry so as to embrace the general question of the future of China. Moreover, the examination of witnesses was not thoroughly carried out, there being no attempt, for instance, at cross-examination. The findings of the Commission could not therefore be regarded as final, and the Diplomatic Body proceeded to hold another investigation in Peking. The French Minister, the Italian Minister, and the American *Chargé d'Affaires* were appointed by the Diplomatic Body to represent the Treaty Powers, and the Chinese Government appointed three re-

presentatives of its own. As, however, the Chinese representatives, on second thoughts, decided not to take any part in the investigations, for fear, as they alleged, of coming into conflict with the anti-foreign feeling in China, that attempt, too, was frustrated. It is not clear, at the moment of writing, whether any judicial inquiry whatever can prove practicable, and the difficulty is increased by a controversy between the Diplomatic Body and the Shanghai Municipal Council. The immediate events in China and the distribution of responsibility are, however, of lesser importance than the general problem of the relationship of China with the Powers, and especially with Great Britain, which has a preponderant commercial and extra-territorial interest in China.

There seems to be little doubt that the Russian Government, which, in common with the German and one or two other Governments, has relinquished its extra-territorial rights in China, has taken the occasion for an intensive cultivation of Chinese feeling. Mr. Rakovsky himself has frankly told me that Russian foreign policy whole-heartedly advocates the complete liberation of China from foreign control. It is, moreover, realised in Moscow that such a policy raises an issue between Russia and Great Britain, in view of the British contention that the concessions, treaty ports, and judicial extra-territoriality, are matters of existing agreement between China and Great Britain, and that no other Power whatever is entitled to take an interest in those arrangements. The British Government has in its possession extensive evidence of organised attempts on the part of Russian agents to conduct in China a campaign of anti-foreign, and particularly anti-British, incitement. There was the case, for instance, of the Russian representative of an oil syndicate, one Dosser by name, who was arrested and was found to have in his possession detailed orders for a campaign of agitation in China. The incident in itself is no more important than the Note written by Mr. Chicherin to prove that the Dosser documents were forgeries. "The Riga Forgery Factory" is an important element in present-day Russian diplomacy. One does not suggest that the alleged prolific manufacture of forgeries in Riga, in Berlin and elsewhere is a fiction of Russian imagination; but when one recalls that both the Zinoviev and the Dosser "forgeries" happened to tally in substance with the open propaganda conducted from the public platforms in Moscow and elsewhere, the forgeries would hardly seem to have been worth paying for. It is, however, fair to quote the following statement made by Mr. Rakovsky on this subject on July 14th: "Various provinces of China have become operative centres for Russian White officers, and some of the soldiers of the depleted armies of Koltchak, Ungerin-Sternberg, and Semenoff

have taken refuge among the Chinese armies. Some of the Chinese generals have whole regiments composed of Whites. In addition Whites have found their way amongst the police of the international institutions of China. It was three such Whites who found the absurd, so-called comprising documents among Dosser's things, after the representative of the legal police, the English Captain York, who first searched the things in the presence of one White officer, had found nothing."

Another typical Russian argument is that Russian Communists cannot be held responsible for the acts of Chinese Communists. Debating points of such a kind are worse than useless. It is doubtful if Russian enthusiasm on behalf of China does any good to China. It has already had the effect of clouding what was the fair prospect of a square deal on the part of the Powers. The improvement of China's status is not a new question. For the last quarter of a century the chief Powers interested in China have readily responded to Chinese attempts at law reform. When China formally expressed a wish "to reform the judicial system and to bring it into accord with that of Western nations," the Powers at once showed their good-will. In 1902 Great Britain offered to surrender her extra-territorial rights "when the state of the Chinese laws and the arrangements for their administration warrant us in so doing." In the following year the United States and Japan both followed the British example. Since that time various efforts have been made in China to improve the judicial system, but there has been little achievement.

As a result of China's participation in the war, however, the Powers made certain renewed promises to China. By the Washington Treaty of February 6th, 1922, America, Belgium, the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, and Portugal agreed in Article I, paragraph 1: "To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China." On the same date another Washington treaty was signed by the same Powers and China, whereby a revision of the Chinese customs system was promised. The revision was to be effected by means of a special conference. "The Special Conference shall be composed of representatives of the Signatory Powers, and of such other Powers as may desire to participate and may adhere to the present Treaty, in sufficient time to allow their representatives to take part. It shall meet in China within three months after the coming into force of the present Treaty, on a day and at a place to be designated by the Chinese Government." (Article II). As France finally ratified the Washington treaties in the second week of July of this year, the Customs Conference ought to take place this autumn. It was at the Washington Conference,

also, that arrangements were made for a revision of the extra-territorial arrangements in China. A resolution was adopted by the Conference on December 10th, 1921, of which the principal sentences were the following:

"Having taken note of the fact that in the Treaty between Great Britain and China dated September 5th, 1902, in the Treaty between the United States of America and China dated October 8th, 1903, and in the Treaty between Japan and China dated October 8th, 1903, these several Powers have agreed to give every assistance towards the attainment by the Chinese Government of its expressed desire to reform its judicial system and to bring it into accord with that of Western nations, and have declared that they are also 'prepared to relinquish extra-territorial rights when satisfied that the state of the Chinese laws, the arrangements for their administration, and other considerations warrant' them in so doing;

"Being sympathetically disposed towards furthering in this regard the aspiration to which the Chinese delegation gave expression on November 16th, 1921, to the effect that 'immediately, or as soon as circumstances will permit, existing limitations upon China's political, jurisdictional, and administrative freedom of action are to be removed';

"Considering that any determination in regard to such action as might be appropriate to this end must depend upon the ascertainment and appreciation of complicated states of fact in regard to the laws and judicial system and the methods of judicial administration of China, which this Conference is not in a position to determine;

"Have resolved,

"That the Governments of the Powers above named shall establish a Commission (to which each of such Governments shall appoint one member) to inquire into the present practice of extra-territorial jurisdiction in China, and into the laws and the judicial system and the methods of judicial administration of China, with a view to reporting to the Governments of the several Powers above named their findings of fact in regard to these matters, and their recommendations as to such means as they may find suitable to improve the existing conditions of the administration of justice in China, and to assist and further the efforts of the Chinese Government to effect such legislative and judicial reforms as would warrant the several Powers in relinquishing, either progressively or otherwise, their respective rights of extra-territoriality;

"That the Commission herein contemplated shall be constituted within three months after the adjournment of the Conference in accordance with detailed arrangements to be hereafter agreed

upon by the Governments of the Powers above named, and shall be instructed to submit its report and recommendations within one year after the first meeting of the Commission;

"That each of the Powers above named shall be deemed free to accept or to reject all or any portion of the recommendations of the Commission herein contemplated, but that in no case shall any of the said Powers make its acceptance of all or any portion of such recommendations either directly or indirectly dependent on the granting by China of any special concession, favour, benefit, or immunity, whether political or economic."

The position, therefore, is that a Customs Conference is due to meet in the autumn so that, through an increase of customs revenue, the hands of the central Chinese Government may be strengthened in its difficult attempt to assert its authority, and that after that Conference has been held the Commission on extra-territoriality may begin its investigations.

RUSSIA AND THE DIPLOMATIC HARVEST.

British Governments and British farmers reap what they sow, but the harvest does not come at once. In July, 1925, the British Government began reaping what it had sown at the beginning of its period of office. "Sir, (wrote Mr. Chamberlain to Mr. Rakovsky on November 21st, 1924)—His Majesty's Government have had under review the treaties negotiated by their predecessors with the Government of the U.S.S.R., and signed on August 8th last. I have the honour to inform you that after due deliberation His Majesty's Government find themselves unable to recommend the treaties in question to the consideration of Parliament, or to submit them to the King for His Majesty's ratification." Nothing more. The "due deliberation" had lasted about two seconds; the Note was curt, even rude; there was in it an unmistakable tone of self-satisfied confidence in the snub administered; and any private schoolboy might have been proud of its complete omission to consider the effect on the Russian side or to count the cost.

Let it be granted that the treaties were unacceptable to Mr. Chamberlain and his colleagues and that Russian ideas about debts and national obligations are impossible—and no stronger things have been written on this subject than in this section of THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW—yet there is no excuse for bad diplomacy. Courtesy, even to the Soviet Government, especially to the Soviet Government, is a good investment. Anyone who has come into contact with Russians knows, that although they may be useless as friends, they are dangerous as enemies. Mr. MacDonald's realism in keeping Russia as a friend even though Mr. Ponsonby's indefatigable efforts failed to inspire them with

reason, was abundantly justified. We have the same problem in private life. We all of us have impossible people to deal with, and in the long run it is wiser not to provoke them into behaving even worse than they normally would. Mr. Chamberlain provoked the Russians. Whether the Russians were reasonable or unreasonable in taking offence is beside the point; and *ex hypothesi* they are unreasonable—which made tact all the more imperative from the British side. Those who know Russia best and who understand the essence of Bolshevism cannot be surprised at the harvest which Mr. Chamberlain and his colleagues are reaping in China. Bolshevik agitators are helped in their work if they are presented with a vendetta, and there is profound significance in the fact that Mr. Zinoviev was as pleased as Mr. Rakovsky was displeased with Mr. Chamberlain. Sir William Joynson-Hicks and Lord Birkenhead gallantly played the Zinoviev game by seeing red at the worst possible moment. Mr. Joynson-Hicks started a campaign against foreign Reds, took elaborate steps to exclude them from the unfruitful soil of this country and drove them instead to the more fruitful soil of China. Lord Birkenhead in public speeches paid unnecessary compliments to the power of Bolshevism.

It seems odd that in foreign policy the British Government should, in this particular instance, pursue a policy diametrically opposite to the policy which is found to be so successful in domestic policy. There is an open Socialist platform in Hyde Park; Trafalgar Square is at the disposal of any hotheaded ranting discontent that likes to hear his own voice; and police protection is granted him. The safety-valve in popular emotion is as salutary as the safety-valve in a locomotive, and the one prevents an explosion as effectively as the other. If Sir William Joynson-Hicks had wanted to minimise the danger of foreign Reds he would have suggested that the Territorials who escorted an American film to London would have been more profitably employed in escorting the German and Russian Communists to Glasgow. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. At this moment the British Government is in possession of rapidly accumulating evidence of Russian propaganda and Russian intrigue against the British Empire of so grave a character that they have led to unbalanced speculation about the rupture of Anglo-Russian relations, and Parliament has resounded with scares about Russia. And yet the Government not only had reason and common-sense, but recent experience, to warn them against the folly of irritating, instead of mollifying, the hare-brained agitators of Moscow. In 1923 the Government of Mr. Baldwin entered upon a similar course of recrimination against the Bolshevik Government, and

the Curzon Notes, which were published in a White Paper, presented a glowing tribute to the amount of mischief that a hostile Moscow was capable of doing to British interests.

In Anglo-Russian diplomacy there is no satisfactory halfway house between peace and war. At the beginning of 1924 the Labour Government recognised the Russian Government *de jure*, but stipulated that normal diplomatic relations could not be fully resumed until the outstanding political issues between the two countries had been settled. That step was taken in accordance with the Preamble of the Trade Agreement of 1921, which was drawn up "pending the conclusion of a formal general Peace Treaty between the Governments of these countries by which their economic and political relations shall be regulated in the future." The main problem was that of the Russian debt. The Treaty negotiated during 1924 by Mr. Ponsonby and Mr. Rakovsky constituted a good attempt to settle the differences. Its nature was wickedly misrepresented during the autumn election. There was no proposal in it for a guaranteed loan except on condition that the existing loans had been repaid first, a vastly different affair from what was alleged on the Conservative platforms.

Mr. Chamberlain, on assuming office, cut the threads and did nothing further. Mr. Rakovsky sat in his room at Chesham House as the representative of a recognised Power, but with the illogical status of a *Chargé d'Affaires* instead of Ambassador. Nothing happened. He hardly visited the Foreign Office, and the Foreign Office apparently took no interest in him. On June 12th he left London for Moscow, and his colleagues at Chesham House told us that he had gone on private business connected with the Embassy. Mr. Rakovsky is one of those moderate Russians who have worked for an understanding with Great Britain, and there is ample evidence that one of his main objects in going to Moscow was to make his contribution to the struggle then waging in Moscow between the extremist anti-British Russians and the moderate sensible Russians. It is arguable that it would have been wise for Mr. Chamberlain to have spent a little more sympathy on him.

While Mr. Rakovsky was away, events in China came to a head, and he hurriedly returned to London. He travelled from Moscow to Amsterdam by aeroplane, and finished the journey by sea and land owing to stormy conditions in the air which prevented his further progress by aeroplane. He reached London on July 8th and asked for an interview with Mr. Chamberlain, which was granted on July 13th. It was understood that the positions taken up at that time were roughly as follows: The British Government took the line that although it had not been able to

adopt the draft treaty left behind by Mr. MacDonald's Government, it would have been prepared sympathetically to discuss an alternative arrangement on the appropriate occasion, had not such discussion been made impossible by the Russian Government's failure to carry out the obligations incurred in the Preamble to the Trade Agreement of 1921.

The Trade Agreement has been made subject to certain conditions, one of which was: "That each party refrains from hostile action or undertakings against the other and from conducting outside of its own borders any official propaganda, direct or indirect, against the institutions of the British Empire or the Russian Soviet Republic respectively, and more particularly that the Russian Soviet Government refrains from any attempt by military or diplomatic or any other form of action or propaganda to encourage any of the peoples of Asia in any form of hostile action against British interests or the British Empire, especially in India and in the Independent State of Afghanistan." The British Government is in possession of evidence which proves that that undertaking has been broken on the Russian side, and Mr. Chamberlain made a statement to that effect in the House of Commons an hour or two before he saw Mr. Rakovsky on July 13th. Moreover, Mr. Rakovsky had not brought with him any renewed offer for the settlement of the Russian debt to Great Britain, although it was understood that Mr. Krassin returned to Paris about the same time as Mr. Rakovsky returned to London, taking with him renewed proposals for the settlement of the Russian debt to France. It is true that Mr. Krassin in 1921 and Mr. Rakovsky last year formally reaffirmed Russia's obligation to Great Britain, but no Russian formula had ever been suggested which in practice would have involved the handing over of cash, and British bondholders, of course, would consider no other method of liquidation than cash. It was understood that Mr. Chamberlain took the opportunity on July 13th of warning the Soviet Government, through Mr. Rakovsky, that the British Government could not indefinitely tolerate Russian interference in matters which affected China and Great Britain exclusively.

Mr. Rakovsky, for his part, was understood to have explained that in his view the Russian Communist Party could not be held responsible for the acts of the Chinese Communist Party; that the Soviet Government was unaware of any attempts, direct or indirect, having been made to damage the interests of the British Empire, but that the present misunderstandings and the possible mischief perpetrated by unauthorised agents in China were the inevitable consequence of the unsatisfactory relationship existing between the two Governments. I had conversations with Mr.

Rakovsky both before and after his interview with Mr. Chamberlain, and his unconcealed state of depression on the second occasion was a tribute to the success with which British official quarters had explained their point of view.

The fair criticism on British diplomacy in its present Russian aspect is not that it conflicts with justice, but with expediency. Since 1917 the Russian Government has undermined the world's confidence in Russia; for the repudiation of national obligations has its inevitable effect. The present Russian Government, however, is not the only Government in the world whose ideas of national honour do not come up to the British standard, and we have to live in the world as we find it. It is the business of diplomacy to find a *modus vivendi* rather than to deal out justice. Many people will sympathise with what Mr. Rakovsky said to me on July 14th, the day after he saw Mr. Chamberlain, in answer to a suggestion of mine that he should make a constructive proposal for the betterment of Anglo-Russian relations. "On your side," he said, "the moment appears not to be considered opportune for advancing beyond the 1921 basis, and in some senses we agree. None the less, on both sides we must face the fact that nations differ in interests, in temperament, in historical, geographical, and economic necessities. That problem is not confined to the relations of Great Britain with Russia. I need not mention other instances. It is the business of diplomacy to reconcile conflicting international interests, not to accentuate them. In the case of Russia and Great Britain this is impossible so long as our formal relationship remains what it is. Your Government has recognised Russia, and yet our relations are not normal. We must proceed to the full relationship before we can hope for anything better."

July 15th, 1925.

GEORGE GLASGOW.

No. 287.

August, 1925.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
1. REVIEWS	253
MR. BINYON'S NEW POEM; THE AMERICAN PEOPLE; BY CAR TO INDIA; EARLY ENGLISH LAWS; FIFTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND; TOM MOORE: DIARIST.	
2. SHORTER REVIEWS: "George Washington as a House-keeper, with glimpses of his domestic arrangements, dining, company, etc."; "Guide to the New Property Statutes, being the Law of Property Act, 1922; Law of Property (Amendment) Act, 1924; Law of Property Act, 1925; and the Settled Land, Trustee, Administration of Estates, Land Charges, Land Registration, and Universities and College Estates Act, 1925"; "Some Historical Principles of the Constitution"; "An Anthology of Indian Tales"; "The Priory of the Knights of St. John in England"; "Paul of Tarsus"	266
3. NOTICES OF BOOKS: "The History of the Irish State to 1914"; "The Godfather of Downing Street, Sir George Downing, 1623-1684"; "The British Commonwealth and its Unsolved Problems"; "The Autobiography of an African retold in Biographical Form and in the Wild African Setting of the Life of Daniel Mtusu"; "The Cathedral Church of Hereford"; "Recent Constitutional Developments in Egypt"	271

MR. BINYON'S NEW POEM.*

This great poem, for it is no less, strikes the note of that hunger of soul which is, perhaps, the justification of our modern civilisation in Heaven. The poet introduces his noble theme by a memory of youth when he first feels the significance of the relationship of his personality to that unknown universe which clothes us round. He feels within him the counterpart of what is without him:

I am known to the Unknown; chosen, charmed, endangered:
I flow to a music ocean-wild and starry,
And feel within me, for this mortality's answer,
Sea without shore.

The world's conquerors, age after age, have felt the outward pressure, the everlasting lure and wonder of things unconquered, such as gleamed before

Alexander's dying eyes
In the tent at Babylon.

They all heard the music, the immortal lure of the Sirens. The poet sees the wastes of nature and the lost adventurers who strove to conquer them; who gave up the sweetnesss of home for wild fruit and for strange music, not for the gains of conquest and traffic, but to satisfy the hunger of the soul for a wider world.

* *The Sirens; An Ode*, by Laurence Binyon. (Macmillan. 5s. net.)

The old conquerors who failed in the quest, they and their lost legions and lost ships, have given place to the new conquerors, have given place to the man who "has in himself begotten a new mind . . . a daring, a defiance, a desire." The philosopher, the man of science, the traveller in search of truth, hear the music:

Like him who quietly
Sitting in his Polar tent
Found so great a way to die;
Hope forsaken, famine spent,
Wrote his words of faith and cheer
Till the pen dropt from the hand
That wrote them.

The comparison of Alexander's tent at Babylon and Scott's polar tent is a very fine thought, and shows the old hunger in its new and nobler setting. Alexander died in the process of conquering kingdoms, Scott in conquering nature. Yet both failed as they faced the Sirens. The Sirens have changed their methods. Once with "sorcery of song" and "eyes of desire" they won their victory. But what of the "different music" that lures the traveller of to-day "beyond the borders of knowledge" on an "ever more extravagant quest"?

Until he glows to seem the unconfined
Master of earth, the world's sole will, but only
That you may taste his glory, spent and shared,
Before you press upon his lips the last
Kiss of annihilation, and he be cast
Into the void prepared,
Malignant Sirens!

Is that the end? Is all our knowledge, our peering into the ultimate structure of things, our weighing and measuring of the stars, our amazing knowledge of things which seems to pass the borders of knowledge that man ought to know; is all this to be meaningless, and the hunger of soul that made it possible to be meaningless, and the love that is conquering hate in every form of self-sacrifice to be meaningless? If so, the music that calls us upward and outward is malignant indeed, the supreme tragedy that comprises all other tragedy. The poet holds no such view. The "Unpenetrated Night" holds not malignancy, but the laughter of a child, the music of the Christ. The seeming malignancy is in ourselves, not in the Watchers of the Quest, not in the pure music that they pour forth.

The poet shows us once again how

Those Magian Kings, of knowledge satiate,
Of riches satiate, and forlornly wise,
Down desert gorges brought
Gifts for the Unknown
And under the vast cope of the wheeling skies
Found but a naked child, a child new-born.

So we come to a Dantesque conclusion after the record of the hard school of life. It is we who are sought, we who thought ourselves the seekers:

Who knows, through ignorant mists and storms upon that sea
What Lover, what unweariable Adventurer,
Makes still His guest of you?

Heaven is within us, a nobler counterpart of the universe without us. The youth's vision was right. Within us is "sea without shore," and then we can feel satisfaction for immortal longings in surrender to the Unweariable Adventurer. Heaven lies about us: "Why daily wander out from Paradise?" So Dante thought, so à Kempis taught, and so we may believe. But still the hunger of soul calls, and so it must be till the Will that sustains this phantasmagoria of things is withdrawn and this School of Souls is closed. Such thoughts must come in reading and re-reading this great Ode, and in endeavouring to set down some aspects and deductions from so noble and inspiring a theme. The sheer poetry of this great achievement of thought is worthy of the great conception, and not only in passages of rare and sustained beauty, but in single lines that have the haunting value of a Virgilian phrase. As an instance of the latter is the last line (which we have ventured to italicise) of the following choral passage:

Hymn the launcher of the keel
Carrying thought's arrow-aim
Beyond the sundown—sowing seed
Of man on coasts untrod before,
To widen memory's haunted shore
And add the nearness of a name.

The "nearness of a name" is untranslatable, but it brings into human thought all that humanity, all that art, adds to nature. And this is but one of many phrases so compact with thought that they add a new dignity to the English language.

Of the great sustained passages there is the temptation to quote the thrilling chorus describing the spirit of those who speed their planes through space, of those who woo "life on the invisible edge of airy precipices." Yet in a necessarily brief notice it is preferable to quote a passage of singular beauty that would have drawn the unstinted praise of that great critic-poet, Matthew Arnold:

Whither is she gone, winged by the evening airs,
Yon sail that draws the last of light afar,
On the sea-verge alone, despising other cares
Than her own errand and her guiding star?
She leaves the safe land, leaves the roofs, and the long roads
Travelling the hills to end for each at his own hearth.
She leaves the silence under slowly-darkening elms,

The friendly human voices, smell of dew and dust,
And generations of men asleep in the old earth.
Between two solitudes she glides and fades,
And round us falls the darkness she invades.

It is a passage quite perfect of its rare kind and can stand alone, but, in fact, it is a step in the great argument and leads up by an inevitable sequence out of the mystic twilight of evening into the tragic story of the sea :

I heard a trumpet from beyond the moon,
Piercing ice-blue gulfs of air,
Cry down the secret waters of the world,
Under the far sea-streams, to summon there
The foundered ships, the splendid ships, the lost ships.
In that ribb'd ruin and age-long sleep they heard,
Where each had found her shadowy burial-bed,
Clutched in blind reef, shoal-choked or shingle-bound;
Heard from betraying isles and capes of dread
In corners of all oceans, where the light
Gropes faltering over their spilt merchandize :
And shapes at last were stirred
On glimmerless abysses' oozy floors
Known to the dark fins only and drowned eyes;—
Sunk out of memory, they that glided forth
Bound from cold rivers to the tropical shores,
Or questing up the white gloom of the North,
Or shattered in the glory of old wars,
The laden ships, the gallant ships, the lost ships!

Mr. Laurence Binyon's Ode will show the world that the old English tongue has not exhausted its poetic cunning; that it is an instrument, and perhaps the only instrument, that can fully phrase the new spiritual hunger of an old and indomitable world.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.*

Professor Pollard, in these eight chapters on the History of the United States of America, based upon a series of brilliant lectures delivered on the Sir George Watson Foundation in various English universities in the spring of 1924, writes very frankly, and his notable epigrammatic style will help both England and America to think very seriously about one another. The United States have "inherited English problems," and the Revolution of 1776 was "the second volume of the English Revolution of 1688." But "since 1815 the British Empire has fought no wars" originating in the New World "because her legatee has been the United States, and with the assets of the British Empire the

* *Factors in American History*. By A. F. Pollard. (Cambridge: At the University Press. 8s. 6d. net.)

United States took over its share in the liabilities." Moreover, "slavery was an English before it was an American institution . . . Throughout the whole gamut of American institutions and ideas, from the lowest interests to the highest ideals, the origins go back to inheritance and tradition." The definition of Americans by Professor Pollard is strictly based upon historical facts, and the North and South War, and even the present resentment in America as to the gradual overwhelming of State Government by Federal Government, confirms the definition. It runs as follows : "Americans may be defined as that part of the English-speaking world which has instinctively revolted against the doctrine of the sovereignty of the State and has, not quite successfully, striven to maintain that attitude from the time of the Pilgrim Fathers to the present day. . . . It is the denial of all sovereignty which gives its profound and permanent interest to the American Revolution." The Americans are bringing back to us, says Professor Pollard in a gruesomely witty passage, "the views which we have held long since but lost awhile." He quotes the dictum of Professor McIlwain, "Congress in 1774 really furnished the formula . . . under which the British Empire of self-governing colonies has become possible, an empire absolutely unique in its working and its structure in the history of the world."

Admitting the above definition of Americans as correct within limits, it is perhaps legitimate for Englishmen to wonder if there are really any Americans left. If America has brought back to us the political ideals held in the days of the Saxon Heptarchy to enable us to mould a new and imperial heptarchy, she appears to have taken in exchange the Austinian doctrine which modern English lawyers and professors condemn with such awkward unanimity. Professor Pollard puts the point in a vivid sentence : "It is in America's reversion to the sovereignty of the State that lies the gravamen of the charge of becoming as imperialistic as the British Empire against which it rebelled under George III." But if the United States of America and Great Britain have exchanged coats the exchange was inevitable if we adopt the latest doctrine, that the course of history is not an evolution or a growth, or the working-out of an implicit idea, but is a process which represents something like a dog's curve, a curve of pursuit, a line which is intended to be the line of least resistance to apparent and present dangers. When Lee surrendered in the Court House of Appomattox, Imperialism, if that is the term, or sovereignty, if that is the term for the whole area of the expanding States, became inevitable if America was to avoid the internecine troubles of Europe.

The trouble of the dog's curve theory of the course of history

is that it takes little account of ideals or far thinking. If a nation is to be a unity and is to be great, it has got to think a century ahead and not merely adjust its course to present advantages. Professor Pollard deals with American idealism or lack of idealism, and he skilfully does his work by leaving to American writers the rebukes that needed and need to be administered. The most hopeful side of the subject of American materialism in the past, and, indeed, in the present, is the almost brutal frankness of American writers in relation to one another. How these Americans love one another! a Continental, or even an English or American cynic might be heard whispering. That is all to the good. The *New York Nation*, in 1911, denounced the "remorseless absorption of its best intellects and strongest personalities in the routine of business," with the result that politics and public life had become corrupt beyond the dreams of autocracy. This lack of far-sightedness in public life began immediately after the Civil War. Grant's views of Lee summed up all that was coming. The American public seem idealistic in theory, but in practice they seem hungry for great financial profits and quick returns. They seem to talk about idealism a great deal and yet to take the dog's curve all the while. Yet it is unwise to dogmatise on outward appearances. The idealism is really there and it is working to-day. "American idealism has found its fulcrum in the national State, despite the dogmas of the Revolution." The Law of Nature, to which Americans have always been so devoted, has come in to redress the balance of an Austinian State. Reasonableness is the term under which much legislation and much law is made to-day, and "reasonableness" is the old Law of Nature in a very slight disguise. The Common Law of England is to some very considerable extent based on the Law of Nature, and the American pilgrims to the shrine of the Common Law in London last year were a very earnest body of men.

The separation of 1776 foreshadowed a new union, not a political union, with the Mother Country. The two countries represent different developments of mediæval English history. "Since 1776, they have developed on independent but parallel lines." They have something in common that no other two nations of this rank have ever had. Between them, if the bonds of a common heredity mean anything, they can dominate with their ideals and their power the moral progress of the world. But this can only be if long views dominate the minds of the statesmen of both nations in all parts of the world. It is short views that have made famous empires rich and short-lived. The lesson of American history, as much as the lesson of British history, teaches that ideals are the only things that matter, and that the dog's curve,

or the Curve of Pursuit, may be made to become the path of the noblest civilisation.

J. E. G. DE M.

BY CAR TO INDIA.*

This brightly written account of an exciting journey to India by motor-car, 8,527 miles from Leeds to Quetta, made by Major Forbes-Leith and two companions, is a most interesting book. It never palls, though it is a long record of roads rough, and roads rocky, of no roads at all, of river crossings, of swamps and sand, of difficulties faced and overcome, of dangers scoffed at with an optimism that conquered seeming impossibilities. It took five and a half months to accomplish the journey to India. "Felix," the wonderful Standard Wolseley car, never failed them; they had only two punctures, and their bill for "spares" was but £2 17s.

Major Forbes-Leith's two companions were Mr. Alan Wroe and Mr. Montague Redknap. Unfortunately, the former had to drop out at Teheran from typhoid, and Mr. Redknap had several attacks of malaria, but he proved not only a good photographer, but a good second, and came through with flying colours to the winning post at Quetta. The chief of the expedition kept his health throughout the trying and adventurous journey. Robert Louis Stevenson says somewhere: "It is better to travel cheerfully than to arrive." Accomplishment often takes off the edge of the steel, but, nevertheless, the joy of arrival must have been his, when he pinched himself and found it was "Quetta at last!"

This little book teaches geography in a very memorable way, and history along with it; school teachers and pupils should read of the countries which the motor party passed through, and the races with whom they came in contact. Major Forbes-Leith is a keen observer of the social and political conditions of the countries which he traversed, he touches upon them lightly, but to the point. Of France, he speaks of her full employment—no one idle, and every acre cultivated; of Italy, he notes the extraordinary changes that Mussolini had wrought—"The green vineyards and corn-fields, smoking chimneys, and busy harbours, are testimony to the work of that great man who, in a few months, created order and efficiency out of anarchy and chaos." There is, of course, another side to the Italian Dictator's work. The author speaks with knowledge as to material prosperity as he knew Italy before the Fascist Movement, but the value of the Italian lira shows that something is still wrong. Serbia, which was a devastated land

* *By Car to India*. By Major Forbes-Leith. Illustrated. (Hutchinson & Co. 7s. 6d. net.)

and Belgrade a ruin at the time of the Armistice, now have new buildings springing up on every side, and all seems thriving and happy. Major Forbes-Leith thinks that there is a great field of exploitation in Jugo-Slavia, a land only waiting for capital, which other nations will supply if the English miss the opportunity. "The millions that Serbia is spending are going elsewhere, and principally to Germany, the country responsible for the destruction."

The author's description of "The Unchanging Turk" is interesting and amusing to the reader, but the fact that *to-morrow* is the best occasion for everything, especially business, must have been trying to our friends of the car. Yet the Englishman, as usual, conquered with his "*Laissez passer*,"² procured from the Turkish Minister at Sofia, and at last got through the Customs, only to find a more difficult barrier, in the shape of five feet of water in the river at the next break; but with the help of some Turkish infantry, and with broken girders and planks, they bridged the big stream and ploughed their way through the swamp. Major Forbes-Leith dwells on the tragedy of Constantinople provided by the Russian Royalist refugees. Thousands of them still remain there. It is a sad story of poverty and degradation. The author writes of the educated Turk as one of the most polished gentlemen in Europe, but still an insoluble mystery. The Turks afforded our travellers every courtesy, and would never accept payment for anything that they supplied to their guests. Curiously enough, their old allies, the Germans, were very unpopular.

The continuous bad weather in their last days in Asia Minor made travelling heavy with mud while they wended their way to the Taurus Mountains. As Major Forbes-Leith says, it was in reality "Tank work"; but "Felix" kept on rolling. After leaving Europe, our travellers mostly lived on the food of the peasants. Vegetables, unleavened bread, and curdled milk were their staple diet, with the addition of cheese, eggs, cucumbers, and tomatoes. On this food the author kept fit and well. The view of the Taurus Mountains from Bozanthi-Khan was magnificent and defies description. On they pushed, or rather motored, through the Cilician Gates to the famous "no mean" city of Tarsus, which was one of the greatest commercial markets of the Roman and Byzantine Empires, and is still an important centre for wool, cotton, and hides. It was here that Antony met Cleopatra on the river Cydnus. It was the birthplace of St. Paul, a fact of which he was justly proud.

The author describes their dash across the desert to Baghdad, "The City of the Caliphs," into "Beautiful Persia and towards Teheran," and also "the last and worst obstacles," which crowded

upon the party, but were overcome as India, the goal of their desire, was entered. The one thing lacking to the book is a route map. It would greatly have added to the value of the other illustrations.

S. DE M.

EARLY ENGLISH LAWS.*

Miss A. J. Robertson has carried a long step further Mr. F. L. Attenborough's admirable volume entitled *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings*. This work displaced for English readers Thorpe's famous edition of the laws of Æthelbert, of Ine, Alfred, Edward, and Æthelstan. The edition owed something to R. Schmidt's work, and still more to Liebermann's monumental edition, but it has special merits of its own; it represented a new collation of the more important manuscripts and has an independent point of view.

Miss Robertson's volume carries on the work for English readers from the laws of Edmund at the end of the second half of the tenth century to those of Henry I. It was entirely desirable to include the laws of the earliest Norman Kings. The three short pieces of legislation issued by William I are of undoubted authenticity though of doubtful date. There are, however, several collections of laws attributed to William I, compilations of a later date, but of earlier material, which may have comprised, in the case of the text beginning *Hic intimatur*, some genuine decrees of William I. The so-called *Leis Willelme* includes in its first section older laws and customs. There is mention of the old highways, Watling Street, Ermine Street, the Fosse Way, and the Icknield Way. To slay or assault a traveller on these highways was to violate the King's Peace. The Icknield Way was probably the winding pre-Roman road that ran from East Anglia through Newmarket and Dunstable, across the Thames at Streatley, and south-west into Dorset. The whole compilation is of extraordinary interest to the student of the early law of inheritance. It is worthy of notice that the law of primogeniture was not operative. The law is the law of gavelkind: "If a man dies intestate, his children shall divide the inheritance equally among themselves." The growth of the law is seen not only in the spread of the King's Peace, but in the right of appeal from the hundred or county courts to the king, a right indicated as early as the reign of King Edgar and again in that of Canute. The influence of Danish law is

* *The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I.* Edited and translated by A. J. Robertson, M.A. (Cambridge: At the University Press. 25s. net.)

apparent, and needs further analysis. But, clearly, these laws were not promulgated by William I, since, as Miss Robertson points out, there is no reference to such a code in the legislative measures of Henry I. But that reforms were introduced by William is also clear from the wording of Chapter 13 of the Coronation Charter of Henry I: "I restore to you the laws of King Edward with all the reforms which my father introduced with the consent of his barons." Henry was determined to secure not only peace but universal justice. His decree concerning the County and Hundred Courts is evidence enough of this. The old Courts of the time of King Edward the Confessor were restored, but all cases between the barons who held direct of the king were to be dealt with in the King's Court. The importance of all these post-Conquest laws and compilations is that they throw direct light on the law at work in the earlier part of the eleventh century. It is to be noted that in the days of Edgar and of Canute the appeal was to the King, but in the time of Henry I we hear of the King's Court. Clearly this is a feudal court. When did it become a general Court of Appeal?

Of these laws Miss Robertson, in the printing of excellent English versions of the various Anglo-Saxon texts, which have been carefully collated with the manuscript authorities, and by means of her notes, gives a detailed view. The history of the Hundred Court can be visualised more easily by the student with this authoritative material before him. The Hundred Court had been long at work before 962. The laws of Æthelred throw light on the relationship, in 994, between the invading Danes and the Saxons, while the laws of Canute have a special interest when seeking to unravel the influence of Danish on English law. But not the least of the value of these early laws is the light that they throw on the history of land and of inheritance. Many problems remain to be solved in this field, and it is important to have, in a narrow area of reference, most of the material that makes possible a sorting-out of the elements of customary law. The whole volume is a model of careful, detailed, scholarly work, and is a worthy successor to that edited by Mr. Attenborough.

* * *

FIFTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND.*

In these lectures Mr. Kingsford develops two main ideas; first, that "the truth about Fifteenth-century England has been distorted through the prejudice of chroniclers and Tudor historians," and second, "that the truth could only be discovered by the study

* *Prejudice and Promise in XVth Century England: The Ford Lectures, 1923-4.* By C. L. Kingsford. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 15s. net.)

from different sources of the Fifteenth Century as the seed-time of the future." The point of the first theme is well put in the following passage:

The violence and disorder incidental to the breakdown of mediævalism were but a superficial feature which confounded the politics and confused the chronicles of the time. Underneath it all there went on silently that steady growth of national consciousness which is the real quality of fifteenth-century England. The destruction of the old monarchy and the feudal nobility was only the crudest instance of a transformation which extended throughout the whole sphere of the nation's life. The political change which it helped to bring to pass was in truth no more than the instrument through which the greater intellectual forces were set to work.

This passage admirably illustrates the realism of a century that gave the world the printing press, opened up new geographical horizons, brought England into new economic relations, gave her the completion of her common law, saw the forces of religious reform arise, and welcomed the beginnings of a new humanism. The great new world is hidden in a haze of political malignity and in much social change and misery, but the fifteenth century is the seed-plot of a better world.

In the lectures on "English Letters and the Intellectual Ferment," "Social Life and the Wars of the Roses," "West Country Piracy: the School of English Seamen," and "London in the Fifteenth Century," Mr. Kingsford fully illustrates many of the aspects of a new world in the making. By the end of the fourteenth century the English language was in common use for letters and other documents. Literary English was coming into its own, and by the date of the death of Chaucer the language was finally established, and the way for the Renaissance of national and spiritual life was thrown open.

The sixteenth-century view of fifteenth-century history, in Mr. Kingsford's opinion, led to an exaggerated estimate of the effect of the Wars of the Roses on the social life of the time. The legal records show no catastrophic effect on social life. The deaths of kings had a great deal of significance in the Tudor period with its absolutism. But apart altogether from the Wars, the fifteenth century shows signs of decay and reconstruction everywhere. A new social and economic order was emerging. The fifteenth century is the outward and visible manifestation of changes that the Black Death emphasised and hastened. The Wars of the Roses, it may be suggested, were a symptom, not a cause. Little argument can be derived from the badness of the roads. They were better than they were in the eighteenth century, at any rate so long as pilgrimages were common. It was when the pilgrims vanished that a great inducement to keep up the roads vanished.

A recent volume issued by the Selden Society illustrates this point. The decay of the roads in the late fifteenth century was part and parcel of the decay of the ages of faith and of mediæval life. Mr. Kingsford does not take the point but it may be prayed in aid of his argument.

Mr. Kingsford's account of the uprising of the school of English seamen, the school of which Francis Drake was a late scholar, is fascinating. Piracy was common. The Scottish pirates were specially troublesome, and in the fourteenth century a Lord Mayor of London, the noblest of the Grocers, went down to the sea and slew them. The admirals of the west and the north commanded fleets which were requisitioned for special service, at any rate, from the days of the first Admiral, about 1300. These little ships, when not on royal service, had to fight for their own hand against French, Flemish, Scottish, Breton, and Spanish merchantmen and marauders. The English and the foreign ships when on private service were fully armed, and were ready enough for piracy. But the west of England ports reared a special breed of thorough-going Celtic pirates. Mr. Kingsford gives an entrancing account of these brave and daring villains, drawn from the Early Chancery Proceedings, the Patent Rolls, and other documents. Fowey and Polruan were their headquarters, and they used the political disorder of the time of Henry VI to cover up their traces. The leading pirates were country gentry, were eager politicians, but, above all, were freebooters of the finest breed. One amazing fact was that the pirates, men in a substantial position in Cornwall, sat in judgment, as county magnates, upon each other, and it is only fair to add that they did not bring each other to justice. The story of John Trevelyan, Thomas Bodulgate, and Richard Penpons must be read to be believed. It could only have been equalled on the south-west coast of Ireland. It had one good result, the upbuilding of the finest race of seamen that the world has known. The story of the Narrow Seas has yet to be written in detail, and it requires the ironic pen of a Gibbon and the frank romancing of a Froude to do it justice. Meantime, Mr. Kingsford's judicial pen makes the heart beat with excitement. It is a contrast to turn from the port of Fowey to the port of London, and to the dignity, a good deal plague-bitten but very splendid, of the fifteenth-century metropolis. This book reveals almost every aspect of the coming of the English Renaissance, and commands the attention of the student as well as the interest of the historical scholar.

J. E. G. DE M.

TOM MOORE: DIARIST.*

We are indebted to Mr. J. B. Priestley for this excellent selection from the diary of Thomas Moore, the poet, which he began in 1818 and continued more or less faithfully till 1847, when his powers began to fail. The author of this book felt that no more than a *Selection* was necessary, and he has only published about one-fifth of the complete journal as Moore left it. Never was a diary written with less egotism. The poet jots down, day by day, his comings and his goings, the people with whom he breakfasted and dined. Politicians and all the great literary men of the day were his hosts or fellow-guests; Holland House, which was famed for the learning, beauty and wit that gathered within its doors, was open to him as an ever-welcome guest, and never once does he speak of himself other than simply and naturally. As Mr. Priestley says in his Introduction, "He did not make his life serve his diary, but simply made his diary mirror his life."

Of all Moore's friends, and they were many, Samuel Rogers, poet and banker, was the most intimate. He always proved himself a true and good friend, as he was to many less fortunate men of letters. Lord and Lady Holland, Lord and Lady Lansdowne, were among Moore's greatest friends and patrons, but, though the diary teems with their friendship, there is never a word of "toadyism" in its pages—unless Mr. Priestley has deleted them. "Equality, liberty and fraternity" is shown in its best sense.

Mr. Priestley in his selection has omitted politics, as so much has been written of and already known of this period. The author's aim is to present from the diary an autobiography of the man, the poet, and his period, and he has certainly succeeded. The following is such a happy snapshot that it is worthy of quotation:

He was a troubadour to the Whig Society of the Regency (although the dates of the Journal carry us beyond the Regency, Moore and his friends were not only *in* but of the Regency its typical figures, and wherever they were, no matter what the year should be, *there* was still the Regency). The men liked his wit and humour and fund of good spirits over a bottle. The women liked his trim, little figure, bright eyes and fluttering tenor voice. He was, by nature, a gregarious, congenial soul, a born diner-out in the great age of dining-out. He was an Englishman's idea of what an Irishman should be.

Looking and reading back over a hundred years one wonders if the rush of to-day has improved matters. Are the friendships as many and as constant now as then? Every detail of the life

* *Tom Moore's Diary: A Selection*. Edited with an Introduction by J. B. Priestley. (Cambridge University Press. 6s. net.)

of to-day is made easier. The extraordinary advance in the means of locomotion, as shown by the railway centenary which is being celebrated at the present time, makes vivid the difficulty of travel in those early days of railways. What would we think of six miles an hour! Hardly better than the stage-coach; and yet distance did not deter friendships. To-day, the telephone and the wireless seem to be necessary adjuncts of daily life; and yet a hundred years ago, as this diary tells, life was quite cheery without them, and the social instinct was cultivated in no small or mean way. Ours is not a spacious age for most of us; though the heavens are opened for us, our feet are not set in a large room, and so we jostle each other, and often collide. There is fear for the friendships of to-day, because there is so little time for them. Events follow events so rapidly, that one puts out the other. All is too cinematic, and yet we would not, if we could, go back a century. Progress matters much. Yet all the same, we like to enter the Holland House circle for an hour.

Tom Moore's success came to him early, and apart from his literary and poetic genius, was greatly due to his personality and social instincts. Sorrow and loss were his portion later. Mr. Priestley has wisely retained those entries which show the domestic side of his life, and most pathetic are those touches. Love stands out for his Bessy, the wife who never failed Tom in joy or sorrow, whose thought was ever to spare him trouble and anxiety. He was devoted to his children but he outlived them all. Mr. Priestley wisely lets down the curtain on the latter part of the diary, preferring to leave the impress of the happy hours, like the dial which only records the sunshine. Lovers of Byron, especially at this time when the centenary of his death has just passed, will be interested in all the details of his life and work here recorded. Moore's criticism on the great writers of his day with whom he was in close touch are concise but to the point. Of Wordsworth he says: "I see he is a man to *hold forth*; one who does not understand the *give and take of conversation*." The reader will find many of these brief and pithy observations, and will close his book with thanks to Mr. Priestley for having selected wisely and well.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

In *George Washington as a Housekeeper, with glimpses of his domestic arrangements, dining, company, etc.*,* the student of American history will find (in the form of a letter from Philadelphia, dated June 1st, 1794, written by George Washington to Mr. Germain, * Joseph F. Sabin, New York.

the steward of his official household) a picture of the great President's domestic life. Mrs. Washington gave a general oversight to the household, but a Mrs. Emmerson was the official housekeeper, while Mr. Dandridge, the President's Secretary, settled the weekly accounts. But the President himself kept a tight hold on those officials. He gives full directions. Dandridge is to buy all the Liquors (capital L), groceries, and other shop articles of importance, but current provisions and trifling articles are to be bought by Germain, who is always to pay ready money. The President directs the marketing to be done in the early morning and all the expenditures of the day to be entered into a book, which the President is to see directly after breakfast the next day, "before the officers of Government are coming in." Mrs. Washington is to see the provisions bought. The cellars and other places of deposit are to be kept clean, as well as the yards and corners round the house. Company is not to be introduced to "your tables." The breaking of china, glasses and other brittle ware and the bruising of silver is to be prevented as much as possible. There is to be no waste. When there is company his table is to be handsomely set, not extravagantly furnished, and at other times "a decent and economical board" is to be spread. The residue of the meals is "to be given to the poor and needy householders in the neighbourhood, who may want and would [not apply] for it." The President is clearly disgusted at the waste in the household: "I have run so much beyond all calculation that I am resolved to discover the cause of the shere roguery, or want of care." So he appoints Germain at fifty guineas a year "and if I find myself much benefited by your skill, attention and economy it may be an inducement to me to add something more to it after sufficient and satisfactory proofs shall have appeared of these facts." Germain had evidently a difficult task before him, and it would be interesting to know if he gained further reward. The publisher states that this curious letter, which throws a great deal of light on Washington's character, "is from a letterpress copy of the original—so far as known not extant. Some letters blurred or indistinct have been worked out by Mr. J. C. Fitzpatrick of the MS. division of the Library of Congress. The publisher would be pleased to learn of the whereabouts of the original if discovered, or if anywhere printed." There can be little doubt of the authenticity of the letterpress, and it is worthy of close study.

* * *

The general public are hardly aware that from January 1st next the property law of this country is to undergo a vast change, which will uproot the traditional ideas of many generations. The editors of *Law Notes* have issued an admirable *Guide to the New Property Statutes, being the Law of Property Act, 1922; Law of Property (Amendment) Act, 1924; Law of Property Act, 1925; and the Settled Land, Trustee, Administration of Estates, Land Charges, Land Registration, and Universities and College Estates Act, 1925*. In former days such revolutionary changes would only have been contemplated on the advice of a Royal Commission of experts, but at the present time it has been thought sufficient to instruct a small group of conveyancers to carry out a policy one effect of which will be to multiply litigation, though, in the long run, the law will be simplified. A good

* The *Law Notes* Publishing Offices, 25-26, Chancery Lane, W.C. 2. (15s. net.)

many current absurdities are abolished, but it is not at all certain that a good many new absurdities will not arise as the result of changes that go to the very root of the history of law. Practically all the remnants of the mediæval system of landholding, such as copyhold and customary tenure and manorial incidents, are abolished, including Kentish gavelkind. The common law of Kent might well have been saved, while the simple system of registering copyhold lands is a definite loss. The law of real and personal property is assimilated, primogeniture is abolished, one uniform rule of succession on intestacy is introduced. "When a person dies intestate under the new law of succession, husband and wife are placed upon a footing of equality. And so are father and mother, and grandfather and grandmother respectively. Mother gets back the old priority over brothers and sisters which she lost in 1685. Whole-blood takes priority over half-blood—an alteration which would have mightily pleased the late Joshua Williams. Kindred more remote than first cousins and their issue are excluded from participation. Representation of deceased persons by their issue is allowed through all degrees." If a man or woman dies without nearer relations than second cousins and makes no will, his property goes to the Crown. One of the main objects of the Acts is to simplify and cheapen conveyancing. Whether this desirable result will be achieved remains to be seen. In future there will be only two "legal" estates in land, the fee simple and a term of years absolute, and this will involve a great simplification. The old Statute of Uses is abolished. But behind the curtain of a simplified legal system the old elaborations of settlements can still be carried out by means of "equitable" interests. These interests will not affect a purchaser without notice, and dealing with land as such is therefore much simplified. The whole subject is very technical, and many lawyers are most dubious about reforms that will involve a new vast region of legal learning but will not render unnecessary a full knowledge of the old law for, at any rate, the next half-century. The new law may work better than some expect, but the main thing for the public generally to recognise is that the legal practice in the matter of property has undergone a vast and, it may be hoped, a beneficial change.

* * *

Mr. Kenneth Pickthorn in *Some Historical Principles of the Constitution** and Mr. John Walter Hills (sometime Financial Secretary to the Treasury) assisted by Miss Dorothea Morison, in *The Finance of Government*, have contributed two excellent volumes to the very useful Westminster Library, a series dealing with the history, politics, and economic life of the British Empire. Mr. Pickthorn weightily attacks the essentially German doctrine that history is a tendency or a growth. It would, perhaps, be true to say that history, or at any rate constitutional history, represents the line of least resistance. Legislative sovereignty seems to illustrate the fact. Mr. Pickthorn, at any rate, makes the fact clear that no eschatological explanation is even reasonable. When Parliament conquered the Monarch there was no intention of creating a democracy. When the Cabinet conquered Parliament for a brief period during the late war there was no intention of creating a permanent oligarchy. We do not know whether Mr. Pickthorn would agree, but the course of the British Constitution seems to

* Philip Allan & Co., Quality Court, London. (3s. 6d. net each volume.)

have been the line of change intended to overcome purely current difficulties. The place of the Crown—of the individual monarch—on such a theory of constitutional history is certainly not negligible. The line of least resistance makes it possible for the Empire to hold together while there is a king. Practical observers, such as General Smuts, hold that with the disappearance of the monarchy the Empire would disappear. Mr. Pickthorn rightly points out that the influence of King Edward VII on foreign policy was "considerable, legitimate and beneficial." Moreover the Crown is "the one organ of the Constitution to which every section of the Empire can own itself subordinate without any sense of humiliation or resentment." It may be observed here that the absolute continuity of the life of the Crown must be contrasted with the discontinuity of Cabinets and Parliaments. The fact is one that makes the necessary sovereignty of the British Parliament possible. Mr. Hills' book on National Finance is one that should be closely studied by the general public. Our financial system has a continuity and permanence that can only be compared with the continuity and permanence of the Crown itself, and the working of an almost immortal system brought into modern shape by Pitt should be understood by every citizen. The failure to understand it wrecked Cromwell and has wrecked many Ministries.

* * *

Mr. C. A. Kincaid in the revised edition of his delightful volume, *An Anthology of Indian Tales*,* supplies not only a useful stimulus to that thinking about Indian life which is desirable in England to-day, when the Indian Civil Service offers a great field for English boys, while medical and social work in India offers a scarcely less important field for English women, but a book of great charm for the general reader. These stories from the Vedas are cast in heroic form. Gods and men walk the earth and heroism and self-sacrifice go hand in hand. The opening story of Satyavan and Savitri, in which a wife faces death for her husband's sake and conquers, is Aryan through and through with no Sumerian corruption, and is part of the common stock that gave us some of the noblest Greek legends. The stories are folk tales of what perhaps may be called the second Aryan period in India when the dim but wondrous epoch of conquest depicted in the Rig-Veda has passed away and the great Aryan Kings are settled in the land where they still face the enmity of the dark Dravidian and earlier peoples whom they have conquered. The stories give the sense of vastness that is common to the Indian, Babylonian and Russian folk tales, but these sagas have a nobility about them and the sense of ultimate righteousness that as a rule is absent from the terrible folk tales of Russia and the hopeless folk tales of Sumerian Babylon. The story of Sakuntala's lost ring is one of the most charming in the book, instinct with fairy lore but at the same time full of human hopes and fears and the immortality of human love. A boy reading these stories will feel that India has something to offer that no other country in the world possesses.

* * *

Colonel E. J. King has compiled a deeply interesting history of *The Priory of the Knights of St. John in England*.† It enables us to realise

* Humphrey Milford. 1s. 3d. net.

† Fleetwood Press. 7s. 6d. net.

more fully the great part it has played in its service to mankind both in ancient times, and in its work of the present day. The author pictures the army of the Crusaders marching across Europe, full of zeal and self-sacrifice, until in the summer of 1099, it lay camped around the walls of Jerusalem. After a siege of forty days the pilgrims stormed the Holy City, and in the capture of Jerusalem the end of the great pilgrimage was accomplished. There was at that time in Jerusalem a little hospital for Christian soldiers dedicated to St. John the Baptist under the rule of Brother Gerard. This hospital proved to be the bed-rock and foundation of the Order. Brother Gerard welcomed the Christian soldiers and by his care of the sick and suffering attracted the attention of Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lorraine. He visited the hospital and was so impressed by the good work that was being done that he endowed it with the manor of Montboise, in Brabant, and his example was followed by many other Christian leaders, who conferred rich gifts upon it. So famous did the hospital become that Brother Gerard determined to give it "a more regular constitution." "So he and his brethren decided to take the regular vows of chastity, obedience and poverty before the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and formally to dedicate their lives at the foot of the Holy Sepulchre to the service of the poor and pilgrims. They adopted the Augustinian rule and took as their habit the black robe, with a white cross of eight points on the left side near the heart." Such was the beginning of the famous Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem from which sprang, in the nineteenth century, the English Branch with its service in the Dominions and Colonies of the British Empire. This book will fascinate every lover of history, and many will see in the St. John's Ambulance Brigade living echoes of the Hospitallers of old.

* * *

"Paul of Tarsus," says Dr. T. R. Glover in this excellent book,* "like Plato . . . remains to charm and challenge." Paul and Plato had this in common; neither sought to develop a Paulinism or a Platonism; "they both pursued Truth; and to keep abreast of Truth leaves a man little time to be consistent with himself, and little wish for it. Hence, any Paulinism or any Platonism, if correct and consistent, will so far misrepresent Paul and Plato. The only ism that will represent either of them is a habit of mind, a temper, an attitude to life, a faith in God and what God does." This great but, perhaps, enigmatic figure, fiery with faith and thought and cleansing goodness is revealed anew in these pages written from that wealth of knowledge of the period that Dr. Glover possesses. He makes it clear that Paul was uncompromising on the claims of Christ, but laid little stress on his own claims. Outwardly, Paul was no doubt affected by the forms of current mystery-religions—all tribal religions are mystery-religions—but inwardly it was the personality of Christ that only mattered. To penetrate that personality is to solve the mystery of human life.

* *Paul of Tarsus.* (Student Christian Movement. 9s. net.)

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Miss Alice Stopford Green has added to her historical achievements in writing this volume on "The History of the Irish State to 1914."* She has co-ordinated the scattered fragments, and thus has "attempted to construct for the first time a continuous and reasonable account of the Irish Commonwealth down to the death of its greatest leader, Brian Boru." She has received much help from Dr. Eoin MacNeill, the authority on old Irish history. From the point of view of Celtic migrations this book in its earlier part is full of value. What was the date of the first Celtic invasion of Ireland? It was a final movement of the Goidelic wave, and it is tempting to put it very early, as early perhaps as 1000 B.C. Miss Green dates the first Brythonic invasion, iron-armed invaders, at about 350 B.C., and that is almost certainly right. The second Brythonic, presumably Belgic, invasion, perhaps, was in the second century before our era, but it may well have been at any time up to the date of the Roman settlement of Britain, though Miss Green limits the Gallic source to a period previous to Caesar's final domination of Gaul. The story is made more valuable by the account of the Irish Brehons, though a fuller account might have been given of early Irish Law. Sir Harry Maine attacked but did not solve the tribal problems involved.

* * *

Mr. John Beresford, in his attractive book, "The Godfather of Downing Street, Sir George Downing, 1623-1684,"† provides an account of a striking personality, descended on his mother's side from the Winthrop, famous in the history of Massachusetts and Connecticut, and on his father's side from a family long settled at Beccles, in Suffolk. George Downing was (by chance) born in Dublin in 1623. In 1638 the family migrated, with John Winthrop, to Salem, in Massachusetts, in the "Arabella," the voyage lasting seventy-six days. In 1646 George returned to England in the rôle of a Puritan preacher, and he was attached to Colonel Okey's regiment. But high politics was his true field, and here we have the story of this shrewd and rather mean diplomatist under Cromwell and under Charles II, and full details of his work at the Hague. His brilliant diplomatic career is carefully traced in this book. He was the builder of four great houses in Downing Street, and substantial parts survive in the present No. 10 and No. 11. He has another title to fame, for the wealth that he accumulated enabled his grandson, also Sir George Downing, to found Downing College, Cambridge.

* * *

Mr. C. M. MacInnes, of the University of Bristol, in his excellent book "The British Commonwealth and its Unsolved problems,"‡ sets out "some phases of the Imperial problems, particularly those affected by considerations of nation and race." The question of Dominion Status brings up the view that if the Empire dissolves and the Dominions go their separate ways, "mastered by the spirit of a self-centred nationalism . . . possibilities of lasting peace among the nations will become

* Macmillan. 2s. 6d. net.

† Richard Cobden-Sanderson. 15s. net.

‡ Longmans. 5s. net.

remote. . . . The British group can do more than any other political system in the world to solve the problems of international and inter-racial co-operation." The system of trusteeship, which has been developed by Great Britain in her tropical possessions, is well discussed. We should provide higher education for the natives based on their humanism. That is possible, since the real trustees, the political administrator, the doctor, the teacher, and the missionary, have no axes to grind and no fortunes to make. The chapters on India and our Indian relations to the Dominions should be studied. The important task of the present generation is the improvement of transport in communications.

* * *

In "The Autobiography of an African retold in Biographical Form and in the Wild African Setting of the Life of Daniel Mtusu,"* Dr. Donald Fraser gives a vivid life picture of a man who was the son of Chipatula Nhlane, a Bantu chief, who dominated the fishing folk of Lake Nyasa. Brought up in the strictest bonds of native chieftainship in a dominant tribe he became, under missionary influence, a Christian and social force for good and a loyal servant of Queen Victoria. The whole story shows how susceptible to good influence are the leaders of the Bantu peoples, even when they have been born into the darkest traditions of tribal warfare.

* * *

Now that the holiday season is with us and many tourists are visiting the English Cathedrals, attention must be drawn to Canon A. T. Bannister's admirable volume on the history and constitutions of "The Cathedral Church of Hereford."† Mr. Bannister's historical method is one that Dr. Rice Holmes adopted in his famous work "Ancient Britain," a continuous narrative of comparatively early reading supplemented by a series of learned monographs in an appendix dealing with the special problems. Haddan and Stubbs think that Hereford may have been British before it was Saxon, but Mr. Bannister has his doubts. It was not till the second half of the seventh century that the Saxons were well established in Hereford and we can say for certain that by 800 there was a see there, though the mists of time do not fade till two centuries later. The whole story is well told and should be widely read as an admirable footnote to English ecclesiastical history.

* * *

The late Sir William Hayter's two lectures on "Recent Constitutional Developments in Egypt,"‡ delivered by deputy at Cambridge last August, has permanent value, containing as they do the considered views of the able lawyer who had acted as legal adviser to the Egyptian Government. The lectures were, of course, delivered before the murder of Sir Lee Stack, and Sir William Hayter could hardly have contemplated the developments which have taken place since the lectures were delivered; but the settlement of these difficulties seems to show that his long view is right and that "what the country requires is steady government on moderate and conservative lines to consolidate the position already won, and to establish in the eyes of the world that Egypt is fit to take her place in the community of independent nations." The only point is whether such government can be secured permanently.

* Seeley Service. 6s. net.

† S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d. net.

‡ Cambridge University Press. 1s. 6d. net.

THE SESSION AND THE PARTIES.

MR. BALDWIN'S real trouble during the past Parliamentary Session has been that he is too kindly a man. In trying to please everybody he has run the grave risk of pleasing nobody. He attempted to please his Liberal followers by carrying the method of insurance for sickness and unemployment into widowhood and old age. But he proceeded to displease them by his colossal naval programme and his game of hide-and-seek with Protection. Meanwhile, as he fed the Labour Party with odds and ends he found that their appetite grew to a fever of greed, and like all traffickers in such wares, he discovered that the receivers of such gifts make payment by asking for more, until their appetite had to be assuaged by the great coal surrender.

A visit to the present House of Commons gives an illuminating glimpse of the political situation. On the right hand of the Speaker sit serried rows of well-dressed, well-fed men, pleased with power and anxious to make use of it, but for the most part silent and embarrassed. On the left hand of the Speaker the whole of the benches above the gangway are occupied by a rougher and noisier set of men, free from all the reticences of the old order, russet-coated workmen mixed with black-coated intellectuals, all in a fever and ferment of change. The interplay between these two sides is often lively, and must be trying enough for the Speaker. Sometimes the Labour comments are rough and brutal, and you hear the undertone of the storm that threatens society. The "Have-Nots" are face to face with the "Haves" and the "Possessing" with the "Non-Possessing." Meanwhile, away below the gangway, in those two high seats where the Irish Party used to sit, there is now foregathered the decimated remnant of the old Liberal Party, with Mr. Lloyd George at one corner and Captain Wedgwood Benn at the other.

It is a sorry remainder of that great company which once thronged all the benches to the left of the Speaker. But we live in a moment when numbers seem to count less than usual, and minorities have more than their normal power. Those high benches contain some of the best speaking ability of the House of Commons. In great debates, like those on the Naval Estimates and the Coal Subvention, the Liberals have counted for more than the Labour Opposition. They have a less embarrassing past. They attend more regularly. They represent a mediating and moderating element. They seem more in tune with the prevalent opinion of the country; and in spite of their diminished numbers they still seem the most probable inheritors of power.

Mr. Baldwin has vision enough to perceive these possibilities.

VOL. CXXVIII.

Few men in history have been less intoxicated with success than, since last November, this plain-speaking Prime Minister, who addresses Britain in the language of the Sunday School. He has invented a new art of dealing with his antagonists—by refusing to reply to them. Reading the brilliant lightning sallies of Mr. Lloyd George at the expense of Mr. Baldwin is rather like listening to the chaff of the London crowd at a Lord Mayor's Show. You have a feeling that the Lord Mayor, dressed up in his chain and robes, cannot possibly deal with such amenities. Mr. Baldwin does not reply. He cultivates the impression of being an elderly gentleman too dignified and well-dressed to make answer. As Matthew Arnold said of another and greater man:

"Others abide our question. Thou art free.
We ask and ask—Thou smilest and art still."

Unshaken and unabashed, Mr. Stanley Baldwin goes steadily forward with his discourses on the higher life, while Mr. Lloyd George barks at his shadow and bites his shins. It is a new form of politics—this refusal to reply—and it will be interesting to see how long the country will endure it. It is an appeal to that element of English life which we call respectability. Curiously enough, that element is mainly to be found in the Liberal Party and the Nonconformist churches. It may be that Mr. Baldwin understands his business better than we know. Perhaps we may find that his sermons on peace have detached the Nonconformist Liberal, while the light sword-play of Mr. Lloyd George has annexed the Conservative freelances. For the strange fact of the moment is that while there is considerable discontent with Mr. Baldwin among the young bloods of the Junior Carlton, he has achieved some degree of admiration among the elderly gentlemen of the National Liberal Club. Perhaps there is some calculation in this policy. For Mr. Baldwin is quite conscious of the fact that he was returned to power by at least a million Liberal votes. He has not forgotten his past experience—his sudden downfall in 1923. Like Charles II, he does not want to "go again on his travels." But his difficulty is that the more he tries to play the Nonconformist Liberal, the more he is in danger of losing the Conservative Die-hard. He is walking a tight rope with an "Old Man of the Sea" on his back, and he knows that he may fall on either side.

Mr. Baldwin's acute dilemma came to a sharp point over the Naval Estimates. Here he found himself between the old Liberal economists, led by Mr. Winston Churchill—who retains that part of his Liberalism—and the Tory naval enthusiasts who represent the bulk of the Conservative Party. The struggle was long and difficult. Mr. Baldwin surrendered alternately to both sides. Mr. Lloyd George gave an inimitable description of this process in the

most brilliant speech of the Session, and powerfully emphasised the gravest aspect of the whole matter. That aspect is the tyranny exercised over modern governments by the Lords of the Admiralty. That tyranny, of course, has its root in the historic affection of the British people for that "sure shield," their Navy. The sinking of the German Fleet has not abolished the love of the Briton for the White Ensign. Here is not a reasoning, but an instinct. The Admiralty would not be able to bully the British public unless the British public wanted to be bullied by them. In this great matter the country trusts the Admiralty more than the House of Commons and the Cabinet put together. The historic reason of that is that Nelson was starved of supplies and Fisher of ships. So we must not take this constitutional aspect too seriously. We may be sure that when Britain really desires to assert herself she will send the Admirals to the right about. The time for that has almost come. For it is a growing menace—this claim of the Admiralty to hold up the Government by threat of resignation: and it may not be a bad thing if Mr. Lloyd George when he returns to power—as he surely will—will set an example by sending a squad of Admirals to St. Helena.

Mr. Winston Churchill is far too clever to try to whip up a Jingo sentiment which is dead. While Mr. Bridgeman was attempting to summon up the ghost of panic on all the seven seas, Mr. Churchill entrenched himself securely behind a simpler line of defence. It was not that England was in danger from any Power, either in the present or the future. He boldly accepted the fact that the German Fleet had been sunk. The real menace, as he put it, is that the British Fleet has to be rebuilt. So he brought the argument back to the technical dialectic of replacement, which hands us over to a devastating army of experts.

The acid test of the Government's willingness for peace will come when either the United States or some other Power makes a call to a second Washington Conference. The next effort must be to draw the Plimsoll line of disarmament below the monster cruiser, which is rapidly becoming the danger of the future. The first Washington Conference knocked out the battleship. It is now clear that we shall want another conference if another naval war is to be avoided on the issue of the cruiser.

In that remarkable naval debate Mr. Lloyd George described Mr. Baldwin as standing before the country "with the Sermon on the Mount in one hand and an order for £58,000,000 worth of battle-ships in the other." It was a searching and picturesque criticism of Mr. Baldwin's attitude and his method of divorcing precept from practice. Mr. Pecksniff was never more eloquent on humility than Mr. Baldwin on peace. Mr. Chadband never discoursed so edify-

ingly on moderation as Mr. Baldwin on conciliation just before wrecking the disarmament conference. For while this Government may achieve some reputation for peace in London, in Geneva its stock stands at the lowest point. It gives less than no help to the pathetic efforts after disarmament with which the League of Nations attempts to combat the passionate missionary activities of the armament firms throughout the capitals of Europe. Geneva knows as well as any other capital that the troubles in China and Morocco are largely the fruit of armament trade enterprise. The League's committees on disarmament meet from time to time to check this defiance of the great private firms, but with little success. The Britain of Mr. Baldwin is powerless in face of these fervent activities, and is mute at the conference table. More and more all the dreams of peace that find their misty shapes in the pacts and protocols of the Assembly of the League are defeated by the re-arming of the nations. This seven-year scheme of naval re-armament, will, at this crisis, prove a new blow to the cause of world peace.

That being the case, Mr. Chamberlain's dream of the Pact between Germany, France, and England drifts further and further into the shadows, and more and more loses touch with reality. The British Government has made very little progress. The reply of Germany in early July was regarded in this country as a step forward. But France took quite another view. She saw in the rigid refusal of Germany to allow the troops of the League to cross her territory from West to East, practically a refusal to enter the League of Nations. Of course, France is right. If England is to go on joining France in her absolute refusal to bargain over the sixteenth clause of the Covenant, Germany will not easily enter the League. The Nationalists in Germany are quite strong enough to prevent any Government from running the risk of having French troops carried across their country to Poland, and it is at present useless to argue with that sentiment.*

It is common form to say that it is impossible to make any concession to Germany on that point. There is no impossibility whatever. "All in all, or not at all" may be a good sentiment in love, but it is a very bad one in politics. Several States have already been admitted into the League under reservations, especially Switzerland, who has been allowed to keep her neutrality. The United States would be allowed extensive reservations if she ever felt inclined to come in. Every Leaguer is fully aware of that fact: and, therefore, there is no candour in the talk about the impossibility of negotiating a settlement with Germany along

* Under the sixteenth clause of the Covenant of the League, third section, members of the League "will take the necessary steps to afford passages through their territory to the forces of any of the Members of the League which are co-operating to protect the covenants of the League."

the line of some abatement of the sixteenth clause of the Covenant. Until the Foreign Office realises that fact there would appear to be little hope of Mr. Austen Chamberlain carrying out his policy of the enlarged Pact.

If Germany and France were to come together on reservation lines it would mean a real victory for peace, and therefore the Pact might be worth saving. But Signor Nitti is perfectly right when he points out to Europe that what is wanted is not any Protocol, or Pact, or one-sided Treaty, but a new spirit of forgiveness and toleration between victors and vanquished. "The war is still going on," he said in a remarkable speech which he delivered in London this summer, "and it will go on until we treat our enemies as friends." The attitude of France towards Germany still falls far short of that feeling, and until Paris undergoes this conversion there will be no real peace. Morocco, indeed, is proving a great teacher. The Ruhr has been evacuated to save Fez. France is being schooled in adversity, and it is even possible that the wars in Africa and Syria may produce true peace in Europe. Still the whole matter hangs in the balance, and Mr. Austen Chamberlain's efforts will be fruitless until the atmosphere improves.

The final pacification of Europe cannot be arrived at until all the armies of occupation in Central Europe are withdrawn. The withdrawal from the Ruhr has been the most important step towards peace yet achieved. The withdrawal from Cologne is the next to come. Then surely it should be the policy of the British Government to urge on Europe a general withdrawal of all the Allied armed forces from occupied German territory. That was the settlement achieved in Europe in regard to France a few years after the Battle of Waterloo, and now that seven years have passed since the end of the Great War it surely might be worth our while to follow in the footsteps of the Duke of Wellington. It must always be remembered that the Reparations money handed over by Germany is at present being entirely expended on the armies in the occupied areas of Europe: whereas if those territories were free, that money would be instantly available for the relief of the taxpayer in France and Great Britain.

The outstanding political fact of the situation is that the Government have been proved to have a gigantic working Parliamentary majority, capable of passing into law all their serious proposals. The main legislative plan of the past Session was included in the scope of Mr. Winston Churchill's Budget, which embraced a strange mixture of reactionary tariffs and progressive social insurance. The political attack mainly concentrated on Mr. Churchill's tariff proposals, which included not merely the revival of the McKenna duties, but also a new proposal for taxing

luxury imports, including especially silk, but also in the result lace. These proposals were subjected to a commercial attack by interested parties in the silk trade. But as those traders really at heart were simply demanding higher protection it proved quite easy for Mr. Winston Churchill to persuade the Conservatives to meet their demands. He dropped the excise duty and gave some slight relief to artificial silk. The main result was a considerable victory for the cause of Protection, and it seemed at one moment that the high tariff impulse would extend to trades like the steel and iron. But at that moment Mr. Baldwin took Lord Balfour into his Government, and the impulse was instantly checked. The proposal to protect steel led to a formidable revolt of the shipbuilding industry, which regarded that proposal as threatening it with final doom. Lord Balfour, who conceals his passion for Free Trade behind a smiling Protectionist face, buried the steel proposal in one of those philosophic inquiries which delight his temperament, and I do not think we shall hear any more of that enterprise. It was a bad setback for Protection, and it almost looked as if, for the moment, the high tariff impulse in its various shapes and forms had reached its limit. The attack will undoubtedly be renewed next Session, but in these days of swift politics it is of little use for a Chancellor of the Exchequer to make assurance of a second Session. The fact that increasing tariffs have gone along with deeper trade depression and higher unemployment must have a discouraging effect even upon the most ardent enthusiasts of the Tariff Reform League.

In surveying this chapter of the Session the highest credit should be given to the gallant fight carried on from day to day by the small band of Liberal Free Traders, who received but uncertain aid and assistance from the dwindling company of Free Trade enthusiasts within the Labour Party. Indeed, one of the most conspicuous incidents of the Session was the crossing over of a considerable body of the Labour Party to the Conservatives on the subject of Imperial Trade Preference. There are too many deep social divisions between the Conservative Government and the Labour Opposition to make it conceivable that they should unite in forming a Protectionist Coalition. But it is undoubtedly possible that they may, with their combined forces, help to bind this ancient realm in the straight waistcoat of a high imperial tariff.

The other side of Mr. Winston Churchill's Budget, extending social insurance to widows and orphans and old people of sixty-five, was at first received with a howl of fury from critics like Mr. Wheatley and Mr. Kirkwood. It looked as if the Labour Party were going to commit the error of setting themselves across the line of social progress in this matter. Mr. Lloyd George gave the Liberal Party a wiser lead by advising a policy of assent and

amendment. The Labour Party fell into line with that policy. But at first the advance of the measure was marked by a series of all-night sittings, which certainly had no friendly intent. Then the Government and the Labour Party came to a sudden bargain, and the Labour Opposition was bought off by a series of concessions, all of them meaning an immense increase in the Exchequer payments. The course of this policy was watched with increasing indignation and fury by the leaders of the new anti-waste campaign which began to develop in the spring. Those two popular papers the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Express* both threw themselves into a campaign against "The Four Black Pennies," but seemed to have singularly little effect on public opinion.

Lord Milner has shrewdly remarked in the Notes published in *The Times* since his death that the capitalist Peers who run our great newspapers are mainly thinking about lower income-tax while the people are thinking of cheaper beer and tobacco. That may, perhaps, partly explain why these financial campaigns of these great papers seem to pass across the horizon like clouds without bringing any sweet refreshing rain. The Government, at any rate, went steadily on with their policy, carried their bills, and on the whole strengthened their position in the country by the concession of social endowment.

But none of these successes will be of any avail unless the Government can settle the acute industrial crises which constantly threaten the peace of the realm. The coal crisis of the summer has largely swept away the memory of social insurance, and has increased the unpopularity of the Government's naval policy. The settlement finally arrived at after a long process of pressure is a return to that ancient practice of buying off the barbarian which prevailed in the Roman Empire some centuries before its downfall. From the moment that Mr. Baldwin mentioned the word "subsidy" in the House of Commons it was clear that no settlement could be arrived at without paying a great price. The opposition of the Cabinet was bought by the substitution of the word "subvention" for "subsidy." "Convey the wise it call." The peril is that now that one industry has held up the State and succeeded in being bought off, some of the principal other industries in the country—such as railways and shipbuilding—may decide to do likewise, and along that road lies the way to sure financial ruin. The new method obviously is to terrify the country by a threat of strikes accompanied by appalling estimates of ruin, and then to extract your Danegeld. But it is not impossible that in the end even a temporary stoppage of industry would prove less expensive than paying tribute to ruined industries.

In their general policy the Government gives an impression of being a housewife who continues to be busy with her cupboards.

and her cooking while the house is on fire. The cause of the widows is undoubtedly one of the noblest and greatest of social objects. But there is a feeling that when the wives are hungry the widows can wait. We all know in private life the man who ruins himself by excessive insurance, and who calmly tells you that he is insuring for old age when you know that cancer is eating his vitals. There is just a touch of that folly in the policy of the Government, and it has been quickly caught at by unfriendly critics.

It is to be noted that one of the results of the quarrel which Mr. Ramsay MacDonald has so recklessly picked with the old Liberal and Radical parties is that the Liberal leaders have been forced back into a middle course that has all the appearance of a rational Conservatism. The constant opposition of Labour to Liberals leads to the exaggeration of the Liberal divorce from Socialism, and whereas the nationalisation of railways and mines was an open question to earlier Liberals, it is now beyond the pale of the Liberal faith. This constant wear and tear of Labour attrition is indeed converting the Liberal Party into a great central group which stands ready at any moment to intervene as conciliator and mediator in any national crisis. There lies the chief prospect of a Party ultimately as certain of its future as it is proud of its past. The Party that has made England Liberal is certain to be called for once more by a Liberal England.

The Government, then, emerges from its first Session with an unshaken majority but a diminished faith. Mr. Baldwin, with all his merits, has shown himself amenable to many pressures, often diverse and divided. He remains a popular figure, highly esteemed for his character and intentions. But he has been found weak in action and indecisive in control. "Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel" seems to be the growing verdict of the political mind of the country, and in any crisis that may demand swift decisions and rapid actions it seems probable that he will be overshadowed by more powerful personalities. He relies almost entirely on the gradual spread of that atmosphere of peace which emanates from his speeches. If that policy falls he has little reserve to fall back on.

It is fortunate, therefore, from the point of view of the country that we are able to record a gradual return of strength to the almost annihilated Liberal Party, a slow rally of reviving energy, a sure return of the country's confidence. That Party still has a long hill to climb. But it is no longer in the valley of the shadow, and it looks as if the coming winter will be chiefly marked in our domestic politics by the signal and decisive move forward of what is now the Middle Party in our national life.

HAROLD SPENDER.

THE PROBLEM OF THE UNEMPLOYED.

FOR some time after the Armistice employment was good. The home market needed replenishment; people had the money wherewith to overtake the arrears of the war period; and, further, with characteristic energy and enterprise, manufacturers were busy stocking supplies for the "boom" that must follow directly Europe set about making good the shortage caused by war. The home market activity, of course, soon came to an end; and, by the late summer of 1920, it became clear that the hopes of a big re-establishment of foreign trade were doomed to disappointment. The shortage was there all right. But our neighbours and old customers were not in a position to make it good. Accordingly, by the early autumn of 1920, the trade barometer fell alarmingly. From that day to this, unemployment has hung like a pall over our people, here and there relieved by fitful gleams of improvement, but persistently black in respect of several of our more important staple industries—notably shipbuilding, engineering, iron and steel, and, latterly, coal.

By the beginning of 1921, the unemployed register had risen to over a million. Six months later it was over two millions, with nearly another million on short time. Painfully slow improvement, with intermittent set-back, followed until we get to the beginning of June, 1924, when the unemployed roll had got down to 1,002,915. The glass, however, backed again; and 1925 opened with 1,307,140 names on the unemployed register. By the beginning of April, 1925, this figure had got down to 1,166,353. Again the situation worsened; this time mainly due to coal. We reached the end of June with a roll of 1,304,300 unemployed. In July things improved, the figure for August 4th being 1,260,400. This, however, is 180,000 more than at the same period of 1924.

How calamitous the present depression has been, and is, may be seen from an examination of pre-war figures. The Trade Union Unemployment Returns—they cover a narrower field than those I have been considering, but are fairly comparable—show that for the ten years prior to August, 1914, the percentage of unemployment amongst trade unionists was 4.7 per cent. 1908 and 1909 were bad years as we then used to measure things. In those years, the trade union unemployment percentages were 7.8 per cent. and 7.7 per cent. respectively. Now look at the post-war percentages over the wider field. By June, 1921, it was 23.1 per cent.; 1922 opened with 16.8 per cent., 1923 with 14 per cent., 1924 with 9.7 per cent., and 1925 with 9.2 per cent. Here, then, is an unrelieved and permanently gloomy picture of five years of depression continuously worse, in the main very much worse, than the two worst years of the ten years prior to the war.

Now, when in the late summer of 1920, coming events began to cast their shadows before them, the then Government tackled the situation with what I hope I may be forgiven for describing as considerable energy and no little resourcefulness. A many-sided endeavour to stimulate trade recovery and to make emergency public utility work was initiated. And though three successive Governments have since been confronted with this continuing scourge of unemployment—one of them committed by the most profuse and reckless promises—it cannot be said that either of them has added much to what they found already in operation. Schemes which were designed to meet an emergency are still doing duty even though the emergency has become a permanency. They ought long ago to have been widely extended and supplemented.

It is not easy to speak calmly about this, especially after the most disappointing debate of August 5th. The toll of decay and degeneration piling up against us is appalling. Quite young men, across whose lives war crashed so disastrously, have either never acquired or are rapidly losing the habit of regular occupation. And we go "pottering along," as Mr. Baldwin would say. The fact is, the long continuance of this infliction appears to be more or less blunting our susceptibility. People look with far less concern at the queue outside the employment exchange in 1925 than they did in 1920. That is fatal. The longer this thing continues the greater should be the determination not to be beaten by it.

What is imperatively and immediately needed is the putting in hand of development schemes on a scale out of all relation to anything so far attempted. These will give work to the workless and be twice justified in the fact that they will add to the productive capacity of the country. Afforestation, land reclamation, land drainage and improvement, canal reconditioning, should be undertaken at once on a big scale. There should be far more arterial road and bridge work put in hand. Electrical power development should be actively entered upon. Heaven knows it has been talked about long enough.

I confess I am not a little concerned by the attitude of the Minister of Labour towards public utility relief works as disclosed by his speech of August 5th. He tells us, and I am not surprised, that the amount likely to be put in hand this winter is not so great as last year. But after all, he asks, what are relief works? Not exactly a vice; but "*a pis aller*, something to be applied if there is nothing else in order to meet an emergency." Yes. But during the General Election his Prime Minister promised to "press on with such works of local utility as may be possible to absorb at least a part of the unemployed." And later, on June 29th, he thought "we need to make a great and special effort for this

winter." Had he not better have a few words with his Minister of Labour?

If the Treasury cannot adequately finance these schemes out of revenue, and of course it cannot with a new "Anti-Waste" campaign blowing up, they should be financed out of loan. The municipal authorities who have so loyally co-operated with succeeding Governments since the slump developed should be encouraged to put further public utility work in hand during the winter before us, *the sixth in succession*, by the offer of larger State aid; and wherever a local authority, which has been badly hit by unemployment, proposes to raise a loan for purposes connected with the present depression, the question of the repayment of interest and sinking fund charges should stand over until times are easier.

These things attack the problem at short range and with the view to finding immediate work. But, of course, they will not solve the post-war unemployment problem. It differs fundamentally from that of pre-war days. Then the unemployment problem meant a couple of hundred thousand men, most of them getting on in years, many physically unfit and, for the most part, unskilled. To them, from time to time, were added a number of craftsmen and their mates thrown out by a temporary trade depression in this or that industry. To-day, the problem is one of far greater magnitude and differs materially in nature. The presence of so many young men amongst the more or less permanently out-of-work gives the post-war problem a new and poignant character. And the situation is rendered the more difficult by reason of the fact that as a result of the cessation of emigration during the war, and the continuance in industry of lots of the women who came in temporarily to make munitions, we have got to find openings for something like a million more people than prior to 1914.

The post-war problem, therefore, presents two aspects. In the first place, we must find productive work quickly, so that the decay which has gone on far too long may be effectually arrested. And this can be achieved to an appreciable degree along the lines I have already indicated. If, further, employers and employed would everywhere sit down together, both fully realising the extreme gravity of the situation, and both determined to make what contribution may be possible for the purpose of easing the situation, a good deal more would be achieved than most of us imagine.

There remains the duty of looking at the permanent problem at longer range. Here the whole question of British Empire Development should be systematically examined by the Home and Overseas Governments. I cannot think that either here or at the other end of the line the nature and urgency of our post-war pro-

blem is sufficiently understood. The Dominions saw, as if by flash-light, the menace to the Old Country of 1914. The menace of 1925 is more obscure; but is very real, nevertheless. Now, in England and Wales we have 650 people to the square mile. There are parts of the British Empire with climate and soil not inferior to ours with but two or three. Conscious of this fact the Government of 1918-22 passed the Empire Settlement Act, which came into operation in June of the latter year. That Act empowered the Home Government, in association with the Government of any other part of the Empire, or with public authorities or public or private organisations, either at home or overseas, to co-operate in formulating and carrying out agreed schemes for affording joint assistance to suitable persons here at home desirous of settling in the Dominions overseas. Parliament gave authority to spend not more than £1,500,000 as the Home Government's contribution under the Act during the remainder of the financial year, 1922-23; and not more than £3,000,000 a year for each of the succeeding fourteen years. The Act, therefore, has been in operation for over three years. Over £8,000,000 might have been spent in carrying its provisions into effect. Down to the end of June, 1925, the actual expenditure had been £892,838, and 109,022 persons had started on their way to found new homes in Britain beyond the seas.

The hope and expectation with which the Act was passed have been very largely disappointed. We knew, of course, that the emigration methods of the past had left deeply-rooted prejudice behind them, both here and on the other side. The thing had been done, at any rate so far as adult emigrants were concerned, without system or method. It was, in the main, simply a question as to whether the intending emigrant could furnish the shipping company's passage money. As often as not it was a last throw to win a smile from Fortune. Consequently, in many cases hopes were not realised. Entirely unfitted and untrained for the arduous task before them, the emigrants had either been brought home again by the heavy sacrifice of relatives quite unable to bear the cost, or had drifted into the Dominion cities to swell the ranks of the unemployed. Accordingly, it was realised that to be successful the post-war Empire Settlement Scheme must be put upon a basis far more satisfactory than the old emigration procedure. But prejudice dies hard; and to that fact must be attributed a good deal of the comparative failure encountered.

And, undoubtedly, another potent reason for the way the thing hangs fire is the lack of training. The young men for whom this scheme is primarily intended are practically all town residents. They can be seen any day outside the larger employment exchanges,

a pretty despairful sight. Failure to find work is rapidly causing them to lose heart, and to pick up what is contemptuously styled "the dole" in black despair lest nothing better will ever come their way. These are the men we have got somehow or other to rescue. In 1914-18 they fought our battles; we have now got to fight theirs. It is not desired to denude the country of skilled agricultural workers. What is needed is that the younger unemployed urban population should be induced to take up training with a view to overseas settlement. During the war we took these lads and in thirteen weeks turned them out as first-class infantry soldiers. There is no reason whatever why, with the same resolution, we should not in the same time now turn them out equipped to open up and people the vacant spaces of the British Empire. Suitably selected and trained, they should be sent out in small communities. If they go out alone and have to work in more or less of solitude in the remote places of the Empire, the probability is that they will get lonely and homesick. If they do not or cannot come home they will probably drift back into the Dominion centres of population. Going out together in communities they could provide themselves of an evening, after the day's toil, with such fun and recreation as would keep them happy and contented.

Further, the policy of calling upon the Dominions to pay half the cost of each scheme needs reconsideration. It may very well be that the Home Government's contribution to particular schemes should be more than half. Indeed, I do not think training—the importance of which, I am glad to see, the Minister of Labour is beginning to realise—is likely to be effectually carried out unless the "fifty-fifty" policy is reconsidered. I am told also that the text of the Act compels the Government to await proposals from others for initiating schemes; and, when received, consider how far they should be helped financially. If that be so, the Act needs amendment. It should be the policy of the Home Government itself, with, of course, the concurrence and co-operation of the Dominion Government concerned, to initiate schemes and not wait till this or that organisation comes along and makes proposals.

There remains the development of our own agricultural resources. Fifty years from now one of the things that will provoke the greatest amazement is the fact that during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries we drifted along so unconcernedly about the neglect of the countryside. I put this great problem last because, frankly, I cannot see effective reform coming from either a Tory or a Socialist Government. You certainly will not get the drastic Land Reform, which is a condition precedent to a permanent agricultural revival, from a Tory Government; and Labour, so long as it stands committed to Socialism, will here, as elsewhere, continue completely

to sacrifice practicability in order to vindicate doctrinaire preconceptions regarding the reorganisation of society.

Now no one will deny that, save for the more or less artificial stimulus given under the pressure of war, agriculture in this country has been allowed to drift along in an atmosphere of national disregard and unconcern, for many decades past the Cinderella among national industries. The result to-day is that our greatest national asset is our least considered asset. Let me just recall the fact that whilst only about six per cent. of our occupied population is engaged in agricultural pursuits, in adjacent European countries the corresponding percentages run from sixteen to forty per cent. respectively. Let me further say that we purchase annually from these countries not less than £200,000,000 worth of what I may call miscellaneous agricultural produce—milk, cream, cheese, eggs, poultry, fruit, bacon, and so on, all of which could just as easily be raised here if we went the right way to work.

To that end, I suggest that it is high time the State definitely assumed the responsibility for seeing that its agricultural land is used to the best advantage in the interests of the community; and that those who till the soil shall have reasonable security and a reasonable chance of prosperity. We cannot have the first-class farmer discouraged by the thought that the better he farms the more he may have to pay in rent when his lease comes up for renewal. We cannot have him compelled to purchase in order to keep his roof-tree over his head—his resources, which ought to be applied to the development of his work, locked up in mortgage and interest repayments. We have got to secure to the agricultural population fair wages, reasonable conditions, decent housing, and opportunities for education, recreation, and social life not inferior to those of the urban populations. You have only to notice the number of rudely-constructed wireless aerials that are now part of the equipment of the most remote and humble rural homesteads to gauge the demand for enlightenment and recreation which has for so long gone unsatisfied. We must open up a reasonable chance of advancement in status and prospects for the labourer. We must see that the old tag, "Once a labourer, always a labourer" is not any longer true. The very description itself, applied to a skilled man, casts a flood of illumination upon our attitude towards agriculture.

Tinkering with the problem will not do. There must be a radical cure. A new system of land tenure must be established, which shall give security to the good cultivator, give access to the land to the good labourer, give fair treatment to the good land-owner, and give the community the safeguard of full use of all its land.

There must be more direct touch between producer and consumer; and such organisation for putting produce on the rail in bulk as shall mitigate the heavy burden of transport. We must establish a sound system of agricultural credit and administer it courageously. Not only the farmer but the labourer must be assisted. And for the man with a good sound record and practical experience we must be ready to give what I may call "commencing credit" on easy and even generous terms. A prosperous agrarian population is not only a vital security for the continued health and vigour of the race—it means a big and direct contribution to the post-war employment problem. More people at work prosperously upon the land means more demand for the busy hands of urban mill and workshop.

It all comes to this then: that both as regards the immediate and ultimate treatment of the problem, unemployment needs to be tackled with much greater determination and vision than at present; tackled with work-making and work-finding the main objective, and money-relief a necessary but bad second-best. If we do not promptly realise this conception of our duty and seek to give it practical application, we shall certainly pay a long price for our neglect.

T. J. MACNAMARA.

AMERICA AND FUNDAMENTALISM.

HERE is, I submit, no social phenomenon in the contemporary world more singular, and there are few more regrettable, than the gulf between Britain and the United States, as revealed particularly in our general indifference towards the national life of the American people. Roughly speaking, we are interested in American affairs only at those times when some startling movement is discernible, not in politics, but in business, in conduct, or in belief. Prohibition is pre-eminently such a movement, for in England it arouses passion no less than curiosity. And to Prohibition there has now been added Fundamentalism. Large numbers of English people have been amused and startled by the recent affair in Tennessee. They have likewise been greatly puzzled by it; and perhaps no recent event in America stands more in need of explanation, in all its bearings, than the verdict of "Guilty" in the Dayton trial and the fine imposed upon the high-school teacher, John T. Scopes, for violating the Anti-Evolution Law of the State of Tennessee.

In THE CONTEMPORARY of July, 1922, I described what appeared to be at that time the more salient characteristics of the reaction that was affecting the American churches and colleges after the war. The movement against enlightenment had gathered great force. An organised attack was being made upon liberal professors and ministers. In colleges subject to denominational influences religious tests were being applied. Modernist preachers were having to fight for the retention of their pulpits. There was a violent recrudescence of millennial belief, and when the movement called Fundamentalism adopted its aggressive policy, a "drive" was made to get the early and visible Second Advent accepted as an item of the orthodox creed, no less essential than the inerrancy of Scripture, the Virgin Birth, or vicarious atonement.

It would be accurate to say, however, that so recently as four years ago the fear of Evolution that is now so much in evidence was not a governing part of the Fundamentalist consciousness. At all events, it had not then obtained possession of the old-fashioned religious public, as, under the leadership of W. J. Bryan, it was soon to do. The first indication of the coming struggle that received widespread notice in the Press was the introduction into the Kentucky Legislature of a Bill designed to forbid the teaching of evolutionary doctrine in public schools and colleges. The defeat of this measure by one vote was treated as a political joke or an isolated curiosity. But those who knew the educational conditions of the Southern States were aware that the attempt in Kentucky was the first manoeuvre in a campaign that would pro-

bably develop into a grave spiritual civil war involving the entire country.

The late W. J. Bryan was, from the beginning, the unchallenged leader of the lay forces of Fundamentalism. No man in America knew so well as he the formidable strength of the country's religious conservatism. His extraordinary experience as a politician-evangelist had made him aware of the field of conquest awaiting him in the South and West. His party was rapidly organised, and it had large financial reserves to draw upon. No small section of the American business world is Fundamentalist in sympathy, for a reason not at all difficult to understand: namely, the instinctive realisation of the fact that if traditional religious beliefs are questioned, there can be no security for the economic assumptions of existing society. Mr. Bryan, good Democrat that he was, calculated that by making an attack, State by State, upon the modernists and evolutionists he might hope to achieve, as the crowning work of his life, a triumphant affirmation in the laws of the United States of the doctrines which were to him the fundamentals equally of Christianity and Americanism.

Thus, for the Fundamentalists, the passage of the Tennessee Anti-Evolution Law, early in the present year, was an important initial victory. It was made a misdemeanour for any person employed in a public school of the State to teach any biological doctrine which implied the descent of man from lower forms of animal life or contradicted the Biblical story of the Divine creation of man. The Bill appears to have gone through without causing alarm in the educated minority of Tennessee. It ought, of course, to have been seriously opposed at every stage, especially by the teachers. But they, it would seem, shared the opinion that was expressed by the Governor of the State when he signed the measure—namely, that, like some thousands of laws upon the books of the United States, it would prove to be inoperative. As a matter of fact, the public challenge could easily have been foreseen by anyone who had taken the trouble to follow the activities of the American Civil Liberties Union. This body, working vigilantly from New York, exists for the purpose of upholding the rights of the citizens as guaranteed in the Federal Constitution and especially of resisting the invasions upon civic freedom which have become in recent years a grave menace in the United States. The Civil Liberties Union was seeking the opportunity for a good test case. The opportunity was afforded by Tennessee; and when it had been agreed that a teacher should be indicted for transgressing the law by taking his class through a textbook of evolutionary biology, everybody could see that the trial would become a national event, with all the agencies of publicity combining to exploit it.

There is no need for me to dwell here at any length upon the scenes of the Dayton trial. For a fortnight of this last July it provided an unparalleled tragi-comedy, which, while provoking the world to laughter, could not be other than a grief and humiliation for educated and thoughtful Americans. The farcical elements were, inevitably, overplayed by the American Press, but there are several points in the affair that need to be clearly brought out.

Both sides were resolved to make of Dayton something much more than the trial of J. T. Scopes, who, as it happened, was almost forgotten during the proceedings. "This is the day I have waited for," said W. J. Bryan, who went to Dayton in the conviction that he was leading the hosts of the Lord in a final grapple with the forces of Hell. The defence naturally embraced the opportunity. With Bryan advising the prosecution, it was certain that Genesis would be the battleground, and no less certain that the defence would so lay its plans that the Fundamentalist leader might be enticed into the exposure of his own ignorance and remoteness from the elements of modern knowledge. It was for no other reason than this that the leading counsel for the defence was a famous criminal lawyer of Chicago. Mr. Clarence Darrow would have had no interest in the Tennessee case if the intention had been to fight it upon a constitutional principle alone. He went into it with the passion of a Bradlaugh presented with an almost certain chance of turning to ridicule a popular leader who was untroubled by any doubts as to the absolute rightness of his opinions and his faith. Bryan had made preparations for a great display on behalf of the Faith, but he was not able to make it. Instead, with a childlikeness that is almost unimaginable, he handed himself over to his opponent. Although present in court as advisory attorney to the prosecution, Bryan consented to take the witness-stand and submit to examination by a skilled cross-examiner who is also a militant agnostic. The ordeal lasted for two hours: Darrow questioning in cold scorn; Bryan answering questions upon incidents and characters of the Old Testament, the Eden story, his belief in the verbal inerrancy of Scripture, and what not. The purpose of this grotesque exhibition was twofold: to expose the ignorance and self-contradiction of the ingenuous Fundamentalist leader, and to draw from him the confession that, despite his assertions as to verbal inspiration, he did not believe that everything in the Bible must be taken literally. The judge, who had given up even the pretence of directing the court, on the following day ordered the report of Bryan's examination to be expunged from the record as irrelevant. Irrelevant also was the evidence of the men of science, who had been brought

to Dayton at heavy cost. One only of these, a prominent zoologist, was allowed to testify in person. The evidence of the others was admitted to the record in the form of affidavits. And, as a crowning absurdity, the jurors were sent out of court whenever an approach was made to the subject of Evolution. The newspaper reports indicate that the greater part of the proceedings went forward in the absence of the jury, one of whom was admittedly illiterate.

The judge himself was a Fundamentalist; and as such, presumably, he began with the intention of allowing full discussion of the question of Evolution *versus* Genesis. But this could not be without the admission of scientific evidence, and that he was determined not to allow. He made it clear that the sole issue before the court was the charge against Scopes of teaching in violation of the State law; and in the end the defence asked for a conviction in order that the case might be carried to the higher courts. The educated public in America appear to believe that the Supreme Court must declare the Tennessee law to be unconstitutional and void; but that is by no means a foregone conclusion. The case, however, cannot reach Washington for many months, and in the meantime it is to be presumed that the campaign in favour of further anti-evolution laws will be suspended. Oklahoma has lately rescinded its statute, and Georgia, which ranks among the most backward of States, has refused to follow the lead of Tennessee. The educational effect of Dayton upon public opinion may not be nearly so great as many people suppose, but at least the Fundamentalists must now fight hard for obscurantist legislation, wherever they may introduce it.

Complaints have been made by several prominent Americans in England that the Press, on both sides of the Ocean, has been concerned almost entirely with the comedic or spectacular features of the Dayton trial and of Bryan's crusade, while almost no endeavour was made to account for Fundamentalism as a social product: to describe the religious and educational conditions in the Fundamentalist States, the feeling of their people, and the circumstances which made the emergence of Fundamentalism as an aggressive force practically inevitable. These complaints, I think, are not unjustified. Dayton is not an isolated incident. It is a symptom. W. J. Bryan was not an accident or a freak. He was a representative Westerner, and a portent. Behind him and the agitation to which he devoted his marvellous energy and eloquence during his last years there lies a complicated social condition, the phenomena of which are certainly deserving of study.

Three-quarters of a century ago James Russell Lowell described the American public as the most common-schooled and the least educated in the world. The common school is, in the North and

West, a ubiquitous institution. In the progressive States public money is devoted to education on an immense scale. In the course of another generation the schools and colleges of these States will bring about a transformation of the common mind. But there are wide areas of the United States, especially in the South and South-West, where no such fortunate conditions prevail. And in trying to indicate the differences between the contrasted regions, I cannot, perhaps, do better than quote from two especially qualified students of present-day America.

Professor S. E. Morison, whose retirement from the Harmsworth Professorship of American History is a great loss to Oxford and to the Anglo-American cause, has given an illuminating analysis* of the social conditions of Tennessee and kindred areas near the borderline between North and South. Tennessee, he reminds us, is a State more than one-third larger than Scotland, with less than half the population. About one person in five is coloured, and about one adult white in ten illiterate. The white Tennesseans are the purest "Nordic" Anglo-Saxons in America. Less than three per cent. are foreign-born or of foreign-born parentage. They belong to the Upland-Southern stock, one of the three main divisions of the British race in America. The Southern Uplander, Professor Morison says, was a magnificent pioneer. But he lost all contact with civilisation on the frontier, and brought very little with him. "Tennessee is a backwater, untouched by any of the main currents of American life since 1865. So it is not surprising that modern scientific and social thought, even in the most diluted form, has never penetrated to these cultural depths, or that the conflict between science and theology that rocked England sixty years ago has just reached Tennessee."

By the side of this vivid summary, from one of the best of the younger American historians, we may place a description of the typical small town of the border, suggested by the scenes of the Scopes trial.

Mr. Frank R. Kent, an able journalist on the staff of the *Baltimore Sun*, in an article written just after the trial,† asks us to believe that the real drama in Dayton was not in the court. It was in the townsfolk, who are typical of a great multitude of American citizens:

"Religion—real religion, basic Bible religion—is the big thing in this country; the religion of the camp meeting, the revivals, prayer meetings and Sunday Schools of the evangelical churches in the little towns; and of queer, violent, acrobatic sects, creeds and faiths, all based on literal Bible beliefs, in the more isolated districts. The whole region is saturated in religion. Nine-tenths of the people are steeped in it. It is their mode of recreation, as well as their

* *The Observer*, July 19th, 1925.

† *The New Republic*, July 29th, 1925.

means of redemption: their single emotional outlet, the one relief from the deadly drabness of a cut-off existence."

In the areas here described there are almost no Catholics, Episcopalians, or Jews. There are Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and half-a-dozen other denominations; and Mr. Kent makes the surprising statement that of the 2,000 people in Dayton not more than fifty are without some touch with one or other of the nine evangelical churches, and that this proportion prevails in the towns throughout Tennessee, the neighbouring States, and kindred regions further west. Take religion away from such places, and the desolation and distress would be pitiable to contemplate, while to think of convincing these people, even the relatively educated section of church members, of the soundness of Evolution as opposed to their view of Bible truth, would be fantastic.

There remains to say a word as to the wider results that may be expected from the dramatic death of W. J. Bryan, on the Sunday following the verdict of the Dayton trial. The first thought of the European reader would naturally be that the removal of this extraordinary man at that precise moment is a shattering blow to Fundamentalism, since an aggressive movement must be crippled by the loss of a leader who cannot be replaced. We may think that not even to the simplest Daytonian could this sudden death after a distressing collapse on the witness-stand be anything but a merciful release for a man who had done his life-work and for whom realities were too strong at the end. But we may well ask whether, as a matter of fact, this commonsense view has any relation to the popular feeling at present prevailing throughout the rural States in which for thirty years the name of Bryan has been as the sound of consolation and triumph. Let us remember that all Fundamentalist America was with Bryan in his view of Dayton as the arena of the conflict between the only Truth and the lies of Satan, and that he was the leader of the winning side. Mr. Kent, who sat through the hearing, says:

"If during the trial a bolt of lightning from the sky had singled out Mr. Darrow for slaughter, few would have been surprised. Many actually expected it. On the other hand, to thousands . . . it would have come as no surprise if Mr. Bryan, having gloriously defeated the forces of unrighteousness, were to be visited by an angel of the Lord who would whisk the old gentleman off to heaven in a chariot of fire."

Will they not, indeed, say that this is almost exactly what occurred, since their champion was silently translated during a Sunday-afternoon sleep? Here, indeed, is evidence in favour of the immediate creation of a Bryan legend, growing spontaneously among the simple people of the farms and small towns—a legend, we may anticipate, that may be far more pervasive and actual than the

Roosevelt legend which family pride and an interested patriotism have been employed in creating during the past six years.

So far I have been dealing almost entirely with that large portion of the American public which inhabits the backward regions and is by geographic and social conditions remote from modern influences. I turn now to another important aspect of the subject, equally peculiar to North America.

There has been in the United States, since the beginning of the century, vast expansion of colleges, State universities, and technical institutes. Immense endowments from private donors have shown the world an example of the social use of wealth going far beyond anything known in Europe. The number of college graduates is constantly and rapidly increasing. There has come to exist the general notion that a college course is the right thing to aim at for as large a percentage of the population as possible. Now, in this connection we must have in mind the important fact that, as they say in America, the people as a whole "live on Main Street." In other words, the great majority of the youths and girls who obtain the coveted advantage of a college education come from the small town or rural community where social life is centred in the churches. They step into the stimulating atmosphere of a large institution, where the students are allowed the most complete freedom, and where, in the absence of the classical humanities, the main interest is concentrated in the departments of history, economics, and science—including, emphatically, the many-sided subject of psychology, which is pursued in America in a fashion that would be unrealisable in the older universities of England. The resulting situation is not difficult to imagine. The student goes from his home in Iowa or Nebraska to the State university, or to one of the vast conglomerate universities of Chicago, or some other centre. He makes the immediate discovery that the small body of religious and patriotic doctrine which is the whole of orthodoxy in his hometown has no place in the new world he has entered. The professors of history introduce him to a body of knowledge that makes his boyish Fourth-of-July notions of American origins seem like an infantile fairy tale. His memories of Sunday School dissolve in the laboratory, while his elementary studies in psychology make havoc of the simple notions of conscience and the soul with which he started out in life. Bryan and the Fundamentalists, calamitously behind the times, have made a bogey out of Darwin. They would have been much nearer the mark if they had directed their main assault upon Freud and his American interpreters, and upon the young and powerful school of Behaviourists. This newer psychology has made an extraordinary conquest of the United States. Its theories are, to a large extent, treated as final

discoveries. Its terms have passed into current speech. The departments of psychology furnish employment throughout America for an army of professors and instructors, many of whom, it is alleged, make no effort to teach their subject with restraint, but, on the contrary, find a particular interest in giving emphasis to a radical materialism. A similar complaint is made in relation to the teaching of physical and biological science. If these things are so, as seems likely enough, we cannot wonder that many parents, who may have no sympathy whatever with the Fundamentalists, should be resentful in the knowledge that their sons and daughters are studying in institutions which, necessarily secular by American law and custom, are open to the charge of permitting and encouraging a multiple assault upon traditional faiths. Bryan's miserable plaint that the boys and girls go from home and church to college and become unbelievers has a certain plausibility if the many complaints of the kind I have referred to have any considerable foundation in fact. They point, one may remark, to a state of affairs in the American universities strikingly different from that existing in the English academic world. No one imagines that college life can afford protection in matters of Faith. The student, obviously, must face all the risks for himself. But it would greatly surprise the parents of English youth at the university to learn that the teaching of any scientific subject could be accurately described as part of a definite materialist propaganda.

However these things may be, we may perceive the gathering evidence of a conflict that cannot fail to be painful, destructive, and in its results incalculable. Over the larger part of North America, for a century or more, a great pioneer population has been engaged in subduing the land and laying the foundations of a new civilisation. The swiftly expanding forces of knowledge and inquiry reveal, at this relatively late hour, that for many millions of these people, who, with their immediate ancestors have accomplished the world's greatest miracle in nation-building, there is coming the shock of a profoundly revolutionary discovery. It falls to the generation now reaching maturity to realise that the material progress of America has been made without a corresponding advance in mental enlightenment and spiritual experience. The conclusion towards which we are led by this latest uprising of obscurantism is that America is on the eve of a final encounter between its vast inertia of "plain Bible religion" and the spirit of the modern world. If the Fundamentalists elect to pursue the course marked out for them by Bryan the main result will be a mass of wreckage, amid which the inevitable church schisms will be relatively unimportant. And, in any event, the central question of intellectual and social freedom still remains to be decided by the American people.

S. K. RATCLIFFE.

THE CHURCH UNION MOVEMENT IN SCOTLAND.

PUBLIC attention is at present specially directed to the union of the two great Presbyterian Churches in Scotland. Ever since the inception of the movement towards union, interest has indeed again and again been manifested. But when, after sixteen years' negotiations, the General Assemblies are now able for the first time to send down to Presbyteries, Kirk Sessions, and congregations certain definite information and questions, all bearing upon the union, special interest is awakened to which, among others, the powerful Scottish press bears witness.

In order to understand the Church Union Movement, it is necessary to envisage the condition of things which gave it birth. Thoughtful men in both Churches saw, with profound regret, the divisions which obtained and sincerely lamented the rivalries which prevailed. They were also painfully aware that there were many districts of the country where Church agencies were needlessly multiplied, while in others most inadequate provision was made for the spiritual needs of a growing population. The more they reflected upon these divisions, rivalries, and misplaced agencies, the keener grew their desire that a strenuous endeavour should be made to remedy them.

Accordingly the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1878, and again in 1886, resolved to ask the sister Church to enter into co-operation. This request was courteously declined, for the reasons that nothing less than an incorporating union would meet the situation, and that the question of disestablishment must be left open. It is difficult at the present time to imagine with what surprise the Church of Scotland received this reply; for she had again and again declared for a State Establishment of Religion, and maintained that thus only could the country's religious wants be met and satisfied. It will be seen in a moment how she at a later date reaffirmed her determination to preserve the Establishment. But meantime it should be said that an incalculably great service was rendered to the Church and country by Professor Flint while the controversy was still fiercely raging. At that critical period he publicly announced that State Establishment was not "a principle," and that the Church was not dependent upon it for her efficiency. This pronouncement, made by one of the greatest scholars of the Church of Scotland, did perhaps more than anything else to prepare the way for union; for it opened the eyes of many to the possibility of a new ecclesiastical situation being created; and certainly when proposals for union were afterwards made, the influence of his pronouncement had a determining effect.

Twenty-two years elapsed before the question of union was again raised and discussed. In 1908 Dr. Scott, of St. George's Parish Church, Edinburgh, at that time the able leader of the General Assembly, on the urgent representations made to him by the venerable Dr. Mair, submitted to the Assembly a motion in favour of a Conference on co-operation in their work at home and abroad with the other Presbyterian Churches in Scotland. To this invitation the United Free Church replied, as was done in 1878 and 1886, that any Conference held must be unrestricted and that no subject of dispute between the Churches could be excluded. It is to the honour of the Church of Scotland that she at once agreed to an entirely unrestricted Conference. Her outlook had entirely changed since last she proposed co-operation between the two Churches. Professor Flint's service had borne good fruit. But keeping well in view the supreme importance which she attached to "the establishment principle," one can easily see the forward step which she took, and understand the sacrifice which she made when she consented to leave the establishment of religion by the State an open question which the Conference was left free to discuss.

If an analogy may be used, it was as if the English Church in her Church Assembly at Westminster were to invite the Free Churches of England to an unrestricted conference on union, and say to their representatives, "Episcopacy is not a principle or article of the Church's Faith. We find that Our Lord gave some to be apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers; that specific reference is made in the New Testament to deacons, elders, and bishops, the two latter terms being applied at Miletus to the same persons by St. Paul (Acts xx, 17, 28), who also generally used the term elder when writing to Gentile Christians and the term bishop when to Jewish believers; that for the first two centuries the Christian Churches at Corinth and Ephesus, where there were large colonies of Jews, copying the offices of the Synagogue, adopted Presbyterian government, and those at Antioch and Ephesus, copying the civic offices of the Greeks, chose Episcopal government; that it was the good, but also the ingenious, St. Cyprian, who, in the third century, developed the elaborate hierarchy which obtains in the West as well as in the East; and that personally, we believe Episcopacy to be the best of all ecclesiastical organisations. You may not share this belief. We therefore differ, but not on any absolutely essential question. Let us then confer together and see if any modification can be made on our different Church organisations with a view to the union of all the Reformed Churches in England." One need not place the State establishment of religion and Episcopacy in point of importance on a par, but the analogy holds since neither of them is an

Article of the Faith which must be accepted as a condition of entrance into the Kingdom of God, and a good life; and they are alike in this respect that both may be a bar to the union of the Churches. The former has been for many years an obstacle to union in Scotland, and the latter in England is still a barrier which, notwithstanding all that the Lambeth Conferences have accomplished, is not yet surmounted.

How acute the differences were in Scotland will be apparent if it be remembered that the question of disestablishment reached a crisis when, in 1890, Mr. Gladstone, it was believed, was about to bring in a measure to disestablish the Church of Scotland. Public opinion both in Scotland and England was, however, against him. At the last moment he abandoned his intention, and greatly disappointed many of his followers, especially in Scotland, though, it should be added, he could scarcely have acted otherwise, in view of the hostile attitude adopted by prominent politicians and the press. His unexpected change of mind did not, however, abate the controversy. If anything, it rather intensified the strife. Strong language was used by both parties. Lord Balfour of Burleigh emphatically declared that "the acceptance on our part of disestablishment pure and simple was excluded," and, on the other hand, a well-known theologian of the United Free Church, who is now a fervent advocate of union, said that if a measure of disestablishment was not carried the Churches would require to wait till the millennium before they could be brought together. It was while this controversy was still acute that Dr. Scott, as already stated, submitted a motion for Union, and that the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland agreed to enter into an unrestricted Conference. Such action was startling; for until this time the idea of the Church herself being ready to prepare an entirely new Constitution in which no reference would be made to an Established Church never once entered into their minds. Reference is made to these preceding events in order to show the ecclesiastical situation and how it was treated, but especially to give prominence to the fact that the history of the Church Union Movement supplies the discerning with the key to its right interpretation, and also to an explanation of its issues.

Immediately after it was agreed to meet in Conference, both General Assemblies appointed special committees. The published Reports of their deliberations form instructive reading. At first there seems to have been a good deal of manœuvring for position, an exercise not unknown to ecclesiastics. Some of the acutest minds in the Churches were pitted against each other, with the result that there was much discussion, though little progress. But it also appears that when it became manifest to both sides that

neither could find a solution to the questions raised in the way that each side thought alone possible, and that if success with the negotiations was to be achieved, an impartial treatment must be given to these questions. When this was perceived, harmony prevailed.

It is here all important to observe what the committees were instructed to attempt. They were to make an earnest endeavour to discover the main causes which kept the two Churches apart; and inferentially it followed that when the chief barriers to union were definitely ascertained a similar endeavour was to be made by them to remove all obstructions, and thus prepare the way for union. They were not, however, instructed to prepare a basis of union. That task did not lie within the terms of their remit; and though the Declaratory Articles, approved by both General Assemblies and embodied in the Act of Parliament, 1921, are often treated as a basis of union, they are really and only a *declaration of the new Constitution of the Church of Scotland*. This Constitution and that of the United Free Church, which was restated and unanimously approved by the General Assembly in 1906, will, in the near future, be taken together, and when compared, if found to be essentially in agreement, a basis of incorporating union will then, and only then, be prepared. When the Conference proceeded to deal with the weighty matters remitted to it, both sides agreed that the obstacle which kept the Churches apart should be stated and frankly discussed. This was done.

(1) First it was, as the Reports of the General Assemblies show, contended by the representatives of the United Free Church that the Church of Scotland had not, under her present Constitution, what is termed "liberty of separate action." This phrase means that she could not make any change in her creed or ecclesiastical organisation without the consent of Parliament; that she was bound fast by certain ancient statutes; and that she was not therefore free. Her representatives replied that they were not conscious of any restraint, or hindrance, or humiliation; and that they were able to carry on their work with the utmost freedom notwithstanding anything in the ancient statutes. Here then was a definite issue, and also one of the main causes which kept the two Churches apart. This barrier to union, it was contended by the United Free Church Committee, must be removed, otherwise the Conference must come to an end. The General Assembly of the United Free Church endorsed the action of her Committee, which in its Report stated that all restrictions upon the Church's spiritual autonomy and freedom must be wiped off the slate, and that unless this was done there could be no union. Fortunately the question at issue was so plain that the man in the street could understand it, and therefore, throughout the whole Church, the Assembly's decision was almost unanimously approved.

(2) But while this question was still in suspense, so far as the Conference was concerned with it, consideration was given to another barrier which kept the Churches apart. It was that erected by the Scots Parliament Act of 1592, according to which the Church of Scotland is, in the eye of the law, the only Church in the country. In the quaint language of that Act it is described as the only "face o' Kirk" in the land. This meant that all other Churches were not branches of the Church of Christ, but merely societies or corporations. It was at once recognised that this exclusive privilege must cease, and that in the eye of the law all Churches should be recognised. But it was said by way of explanation that the Act of 1592 was passed to guard against the claims of the Roman Catholic Church on the one hand, and those of the Episcopalian on the other; and further, that it now had no hampering effect on the work of other Churches. The explanation was not satisfactory, and did not justify the position of privilege given to the Church of Scotland. The action of Lord Halsbury in the Church case in 1904 threw, it may be added, much light on this position; for he treated the United Free Church not as a Christian Church, but merely as a society or company, and demanded its title deeds, which he strangely found in Dr. Thomas Chalmers's Moderatorial address to the General Assembly in 1843 when the Disruption took place, because, as he argued, the Assembly passed a resolution to print and circulate the address. On this untenable ground he gave his decision against the United Free Church. A Moderator, it should be said, has no authority to speak with finality as to what is the Church's Constitution. That right belongs to the General Assembly itself. With all these things therefore in view, it is not surprising that great stress was laid upon the recognition by the State of all Churches as branches of the Church of Christ.

(3) But again, while this question was still under debate, that of the National recognition of religion was also discussed and reported upon to the General Assemblies. Fortunately it gave little trouble. The Church of Scotland claimed to be National, but so also did the United Free Church. Both maintained their historical continuity with the Church of the Reformation. In the end it was found that the term *National* meant no more than that the United Church would be National in the sense that she provided religious agencies for the whole country, and met the spiritual needs of the people, not only in cities and towns, but also in the remotest villages. In this sense alone will the United Church be National. The King's representatives may attend her General Assembly; but in view of what the new Constitution of the Church of Scotland contains he will be unable to interfere in any way with the spiritual functions of the Assembly, and can, therefore,

be nothing more than a welcomed guest. The functions at present observed in Holyrood and elsewhere may or may not be continued. They are not enjoined under any law or statute, but come under the category of things consuetudinary, and like all customs may or may not be abolished.

(4) The final question investigated by the Conference and discussed in the General Assemblies was that of the ancient endowments. The possession of these, it was maintained by some, was an obstacle to union. From the first the Church of Scotland held that these should not be secularised, and the United Free Church said that this was not a domestic question. It concerned the Church of Scotland and Parliament. The only condition upon which she insisted was that any money recognised by Parliament as belonging to the Church of Scotland must be at her disposal, she being free to use it wherever the religious needs of the people required its employment.

The four main causes which kept the Churches apart have now been stated. They stand out quite clearly, and are easily apprehended. But their removal was far from being a simple task. If, however, negotiations were to be continued they required immediate and thoughtful treatment. The year 1911 was a critical period. In that year the first phase of the Union Movement was reached, and during the early part of it no one saw a possible solution of the questions raised. Many, indeed, thought that now, as in 1878 and 1886, negotiations would cease. The outlook was dark, and very disappointing, especially to those who had devoted their best energies to the cause of Union. It was under these conditions that the Committee of the Church of Scotland during the latter part of 1911 reviewed the causes of separation, and in the spring of 1912 produced their famous Memorandum. In this historic document the Church of Scotland frankly acknowledged that she must change her Constitution and bridge the differences. She had initiated the Union Movement, and now recognised that she must outline definite proposals for the removal of the obstacles to union. One can state in a few sentences the action thus taken, but one cannot describe the emotions awakened, or the hopes entertained, by the publication of the Memorandum. It created an entirely new situation and outlook. The United Free Church cordially welcomed it. Her representatives, however, while joining in the chorus of praise gave to it a sympathetic but also a searching investigation, with the result that they felt obliged to request the Church of Scotland to embody her proposals in a set form. Joint Conferences were held, and in 1914 Draft Articles were prepared. These were submitted to the Committee of the United Free Church, and sent down to the Presbyteries of the Church of Scotland for suggestions upon them. The Great War interrupted the nego-

tiations for five years, but in 1918, and again in 1919, the Articles were revised in the light of the suggestions which were made, and finally, as thus revised, they came before Parliament, and in the Act of 1921 were recognised as the Declaratory Articles of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland. This Act deals with the spiritual autonomy and freedom of the Church, the Act of 1925 with temporalities.

Thus far the union negotiations have been briefly described. But now questions arise as to what has actually been accomplished, and how far the issues of the negotiations, together with the action of Parliament, give one good reasons for holding that the United Church will be in the most absolute sense of the term a Free Church; that the interests of other Churches will be duly conserved; that the claim to be a National Church will not carry with it any exclusive privileges; and that Parliament's settlement of the ancient endowments is fair. If to these questions an adequate answer can be returned, objections raised, especially by some in the United Free Church, and in the English Free Churches, will perhaps be removed. One cannot, however, speak with finality respecting the removal of objections, for they rest mainly upon lack of information as to what has been done; but the lack of such information, and a willingness to accept evidence which would entail a change of mind, are the last admissions which are made by those who commit themselves to public statements on any question. This is said with no disrespect. It is the statement of a fact too often verified, and applies to politicians and publicists as well as to churchmen.

Examine these questions for a moment, and first that of the spiritual freedom which will be enjoyed by the United Church. On this question the new Constitution of the Church of Scotland speaks for itself. Article IV states in clear and unambiguous terms that the United Church will possess all the powers, rights, and liberties given to her by the Lord Jesus Christ, and "not as the gift of the civil power, nor in any respect limited or restrained by any special relation to the State"; and that she will have the right and power to adjudicate finally in all matters of doctrine, worship, government, and discipline, including the right to determine all questions concerning membership and office in the Church, the constitution and membership of its Courts, the boundaries and sphere of labour of its ministers and other office-bearers. This is quite explicit, and should answer all questions as to the spiritual autonomy and freedom of the United Church. But if further evidence be demanded, it will be found in the circumstance that the new Constitution of the Church of Scotland was not framed by the State, as is invariably done when new statutes are made. It is not imposed on the Church by the State, for the Church herself prepared the Constitution.

One might reasonably conclude that all these circumstances being clearly kept in view, controversy as to the Church's spiritual freedom would come to an end; but unfortunately it still prevails, though now in a minor degree. It is alleged that there remains a statutory relation of the Church to the State. What does this complaint mean? Examine it. All Churches stand in a definite relation to the State so far as civil matters are concerned. None is excluded from the law of the land. Statutes exist and are enforced where questions of property and civil rights arise. But if there be no statutes imposing obligations on the Church in the discharge of her spiritual functions; if the State does not hold the Church responsible to it for such discharge; and if, further, Parliament fully recognises her spiritual autonomy and freedom, there can manifestly be no statutory relation of the Church to the State so far as spiritual functions are concerned. That is conclusive.

But additional evidence is supplied if next a brief reference be made to the position of other Churches. Article VII declares not only the right but also the duty of the Church, without seeking Parliamentary sanction, to enter into union with any branch of the Church of Christ without loss of her identity, on terms consistent with the Articles. Such a union, it should be specially noted, would be on the further basis that the Church entering into union with the Church of Scotland would not become subject to statutory obligation or control. This is further proof that statutory relation to the State in matters spiritual no longer exists. It may be added that all ancient statutes which are inconsistent with the Declaratory Articles are rescinded. The Articles alone describe the Constitution of the Church, and any possible question that may arise must be determined by an exclusive reference to them.

All that needs to be said respecting the Church as National has already been stated. But the ancient endowments require a further short treatment. There is only one authentic history of them. They do not come from either Imperial taxes or local rates. They are not, as Cosmo Innes, Stevenson, and Mair contend, the ancient donations of pious persons. There is no evidence for this contention. But, as recent investigations show, there is the amplest proof that King David I, *circa* 1147, in a Court held in Edinburgh Castle, which was attended by barons and other landlords, enjoined the latter to give yearly a tenth of all that grew on their lands to titulars who were authorised to hold these tenths or teinds on behalf of incumbents in each parish. This is King David's famous law of tithes which Innocent III in 1212 adopted as the *commune jus* for the whole continent, and which was at a later date put into operation in England. Charles I, in order to conciliate the large landholders and win them to his side when he was fighting for the divine right of kings, reduced the teinds in 1633

to a fifth of the then rental. Ever since his time landowners pay them, not on the rental of the present day, but on that of 1633.

One can scarcely say that these ancient endowments were recently discussed either by Parliament or the negotiating Churches in the light of their origin and history. Parliament only dealt with them as they are to-day held by the Church of Scotland, and after a long debate decided that the Church of Scotland should undertake the burden of the upkeep of churches, manses, and churchyards, a burden which represents about £70,000 a year; and that in the future teinds should be a burden on the land, like feu duties, and not on its produce. Some argue that the Church should be disendowed, but why should she lose her ancient property if the descendants of landowners who received their lands from the same feudal king are allowed to retain them, not for public use, as is the case of the Church, but for private and personal ends? Go for land nationalisation, and then the ancient teinds would also disappear. But, as a matter of fact, there has already been a disendowment of the Church to the extent, as just stated, of £70,000 yearly. The Church's loss is indeed greater than that of the Church of Wales, which lost by compulsory disendowment only £50,000 a year, and received a special grant of £1,000,000 from the public exchequer.

There remains only space to say in the briefest form that the United Church herself, and not the State, will authorise the meetings of all her Courts, which will no longer be Courts of the realm, but Spiritual Courts; that there can in future be no dissenters or dissent from the position which she will occupy, since she will be free from State control in matters spiritual, and receive no State patronage; that between her and other branches of the Church of Christ there will be perfect religious equality, since she will not gain anything from the State denied to them; that the United Church will not in any sense be "as by law established," since her Constitution is not given or imposed by the State, but has been prepared by herself and is now only *recognised* by Parliament as her final authority in all spiritual functions; and, finally, that since neither of the negotiating Churches claims a monopoly of evangelical fervour, and since both now co-operate in religious and social work, the factors which make for the Church Union Movement in Scotland coming to its goal are present, and supply the amplest guarantee that the long and faithful service rendered in the interests of union will issue in a United Church, able to meet the religious needs of the people, and to further the Kingdom of God, the supreme end of the Church, and also that of all her members.

J. WILSON HARPER.

GREECE SINCE THE JUNE "REVOLUTION."

THE bloodless "revolution" of June 25th, which made General Pangalos Prime Minister, has been considerably exaggerated abroad. Like most similar movements in modern Greek history, from the famous "revolution" of September 3rd to 15th, 1843, which gave Greece a Constitution, down to the expulsion of King George II in December, 1923, it passed off quietly, and the mass of the people, even in the capital, was absolutely indifferent to it. The Athenians have seen so much, especially since the inauguration of a new era in Greek history by the march of the Military League from Goudi in 1909, that nothing surprises them. In the morning of the day when the soldiers of General Pangalos seized the Post and Telegraph Office and half the National Bank, the streets were deserted, but the shops were reopened by order in the afternoon, and next day business was transacted as if nothing had happened. Mr. Michalakopoulos, who had been Premier for eight months—the longest term of office of any of the Republican chiefs—rather than provoke civil war, disappeared with his loyal supporter, Mr. Kaphandares, into private life, and even General Kondyles, who is supposed to have counselled resistance, announced that he was living quietly in his house at Athens.

There was no necessity for the *pronunciamiento* of "passionate Panga," as our soldiers called the new Greek Premier when they made his acquaintance during the War. Mr. Michalakopoulos, the leader of the Conservative Republicans and a statesman of marked ability and of considerable knowledge of foreign countries, had done well during his comparatively long Premiership, in spite of considerable difficulties. Holding moderate views and having electoral reasons for not offending his numerous Royalist constituents at Patras—the former stronghold of Gounares—he had largely advanced the blessed cause of "reconciliation." A prominent Royalist expressed to me his admiration of the manner in which the Conservative Republican Premier had handled the strike, and it was believed that he was aiming at the formation of a centre party at the next election, which should include Moderate Republicans and Moderate Royalists. It may be explained that the term "Royalist" is now rather a survival, for most "Royalists" are rather anti-Venizelist than adherents of any particular member of the deposed dynasty. Officially they are designated as "extra-parliamentarians," owing to their regrettable abstention from the last election. Like the Republicans, they are sub-divided into numerous parties, each with its organ in the

Press—for Athens boasts twenty-one daily newspapers—and between some of these parties there is apparently little love lost. The great service rendered to the cause of "reconciliation" by the definitive withdrawal of Mr. Venizelos from Greek public life to the interpretation of Thucydides, has robbed the Royalists of much of their negative programme. A restoration might follow some great national disaster, but the Republic possesses a powerful defence in the fact that at least three prominent Republican Generals would certainly fight for it, because they know that a Royalist restoration would probably mean a firing-party for themselves.

Mr. Michalakopoulos had, at the time of his fall, an unbroken majority in the National Assembly, where, from the outset, he had been as faithfully supported by Mr. Kaphandares as was Lord Salisbury thirty-five years ago by the Liberal-Unionists. Repeated votes of want of confidence, provoked by Mr. Papanastasiou, the leader of the "Republican Union," had failed, and the recent crisis, due to the complaint made by the President of the Refugees' Settlement Commission against the inaction of General Kondyles' police at the Kaisariané colony, had shown that the civilian Premier was stronger than his military colleague, who resigned. Yet Mr. Michalakopoulos, who had latterly acted also as Minister of Foreign Affairs, had had difficult foreign questions to face. The expulsion of the Œcumenical Patriarch by the Turks had wounded Greek national feeling, because the expelled ecclesiastic was the traditional chief of "unredeemed" Hellenism, even though his sphere of influence had been much reduced by the successive expansions of the Hellenic kingdom. The Bulgarian Minorities' Protocol, believed at Athens to have been largely the work of Professor Gilbert Murray—a fine Greek scholar, but a political doctrinaire with no practical knowledge of the Eastern question—was a *damnosa hereditas*, which Mr. Michalakopoulos had inherited from the preceding Sophoules Cabinet. The Protocol was unpopular alike in Greece and Yugoslavia, which has a far larger Bulgarian minority in Serbian Macedonia than Greece has in Greek Macedonia—a province, since the immigration of the Asiatic refugees, ninety per cent. Greek. The Yugoslav Government saw in its application to Greek Voden a dangerous precedent for Serbian Monastir, and made it the excuse for denouncing the treaty of alliance which had united the two countries since 1913. Thus, Mr. Michalakopoulos had thrust upon him another foreign question, more important than the Minorities Protocol, which the Assembly, with his approval, unanimously refused to ratify.

The breaking-off of the Greco-Yugoslav negotiations at Belgrade,

due partly to the claims of the Yugoslavs to the railway which connects Salonika with their southern frontier at Gevgheli, and partly (so I am credibly informed) to Italian intrigues at Belgrade to prevent an alliance between Italy's two Balkan rivals, and to divert Yugoslav attention from the Adriatic to the Ægean, furnished General Pangalos with a pretext for his *coup d'état*. He claimed that, had Greece possessed a better army, Yugoslavia would have been more amenable to reason. A subsequent visit to Belgrade has taught me that politicians there under-estimate the value of Greece as an ally and over-estimate that of Salonika as a port for Yugoslav commerce. But the lesson should not be lost upon the Greeks, that nothing so greatly injures their country's prestige abroad as frequent revolutions, especially if these be the work of the army and navy. Moreover, the *pronunciamiento* of June 25th came at an unfortunate moment, when Mr. Diomedes, the Governor of the National Bank, whose tact and agreeable presence inspires confidence in London banking circles, had gone to England to negotiate a second Refugees' Loan.

On the morning of the "revolution," a very high authority on that subject said to me: "This morning Greece has lost £5,000,000"; the next day a leading Athenian banker told me that there could no longer be any question of another Refugees' Loan. These were first impressions; all friends of Greece will hope that General Pangalos and his Minister of Finance, Mr. Kophinâs, may inspire renewed confidence by their maintenance of the obligations of their predecessors and by their hearty collaboration with the Refugees' Settlement Commission, with which the new Premier has had a serious difference. That body has still sufficient funds to continue its work till the end of February. But by that date a new loan must be negotiated, else the refugees, who are the special clients of General Pangalos, himself a deputy for Macedonia, will call aloud to their patron, *redde rationem!*

Whatever may be the opinion about the manner in which General Pangalos seized power—for his parliamentary "mantle" scarcely covers his military uniform—his programme contains some excellent measures. In the first place, he has speeded up the passing of the new Constitution. The Assembly, elected on December 16th, 1923, mainly for the purpose of proclaiming the Republic and drawing up a new Constitution, has during all this time advanced no further than article 35, or about one-third of the whole number. Some articles have been the object of long discussions, followed by still longer intervals of debates on other subjects. Yet surely the proper course was to pass the Constitution as rapidly as possible, and then later on to amend such portions of it as practical experience had shown to be defective. For

the only test of a Constitution is how it works in the particular country in which it is applied. Consequently, arguments drawn from other countries or from *à priori* considerations are valueless.

General Pangalos has insisted that a parliamentary committee of thirty, nominated by the Speaker of the Assembly, shall finish the remaining articles of the Constitution during the recess, and that this Constituent Assembly shall pass the whole document within fifteen days from its reassembling on October 15th, becoming an ordinary Parliament on November 1st. A corollary of this summary procedure will be the dissolution of the Assembly at the end of the year, or before March 15th at latest, and the holding of an election on the system of proportional representation for an ordinary Parliament, in which the Royalists, if they like, will be represented. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that Messrs. Michalakopoulos and Kaphandares, the leaders of the two parties of the Republican "Right," have declined to serve on this Committee, just as they refused to take part in the meeting of the Assembly, which—as the lesser of two evils—threw a parliamentary "mantle" over the military uniform of General Pangalos. The two Moderate Republican leaders are men of principle, who will have no compromise with militarism; but the practical result of their abstention will be that the Constitution will be almost wholly the handiwork of the less moderate deputies, those of the "Republican Union," whereas it ought to have been that of the whole people's representatives, as in 1844, in 1864, and in 1911. On the second of those occasions, there was so much delay in passing the Constitution, that a Royal message from George I was needed to hasten the work. General Pangalos has now adopted a similar procedure. He has also obtained for his Government the right to issue decrees during the recess, subject to the approval respectively of the Parliamentary Committee for Refugees' Questions and of a special parliamentary committee of twenty-five for other questions. In "specially urgent cases, particularly in questions relating to the army, the navy, the suppression of brigandage and of profiteering," the signatures of all the Ministers are sufficient without the approval of the latter committee.

Thus, General Pangalos is dictator in fact, if not in name; thanks to Mr. Papanastasiou, the form of parliamentary government has been preserved. Indeed, those who, like myself, listened to the quiet tones of the debate on the morrow of the *coup d'état*, interrupted by the vehement interposition of one solitary private member, might have imagined that the Assembly was discussing a new road between Athens and Piræus—more wanted than a change of Government. General Pangalos, in civilian dress, with one hand in his pocket, read his speech in five minutes with-

out the smallest rhetoric. A stranger, arriving without knowledge of the situation, would not have known that a revolution had just occurred.

Superficial observers of Greek affairs pay too much attention to the sudden changes of the political barometer at Athens and too little to the real progress of the country. In the early days of the Glücksburg dynasty ministerial crises were even more frequent than in those of the young Republic. On the three occasions when Republican Cabinets have fallen, the rate of exchange on London has varied but slightly—a phenomenon particularly remarkable after the June "revolution," when a heavy fall of the drachma was expected. The trade of the Piræus, now the third port of the Mediterranean, continues to increase, and will increase still more when the system of landing in small boats is abolished after just compensation to the boatmen for the loss of their means of subsistence by a small tax upon tickets. All experts agree that the refugees will, in a few years' time, make Macedonia blossom like the rose. Already, for example, at the suburban Athenian settlements of Kokkinia and Podarades, and at Ampelokepoi, they have introduced the industry of carpet-making, previously unknown in Greece, for which, as Sir Arthur Salter told me, they will do what the Huguenots expelled from France by the Edict of Nantes, did for England. They have already solved the racial problem in Greek Macedonia, which had perplexed students of the Macedonian question for the last fifty years. The peasants, and the people generally, are tired of political changes, which they have come to regard as the affair of "the politicians"—a distinct class even in Greece where everyone talks, but everyone does not practise, politics.

The danger is that General Pangalos, who is said to have had only eighty soldiers with him when he occupied the Roup barracks, may have taught other military leaders the lesson, to parody a phrase of Tacitus, that governments can be made elsewhere than in Parliament. Those "who take the sword" usually "perish by the sword," and the fear has been expressed that when, in due course, the present military Government falls, it can only fall through a counter-revolution of a military type. As General Pangalos is not the man to yield without resistance—he wished to dash upon Constantinople when he commanded the army of the Hebras, and some think that he would have succeeded—this next possible *pronunciamiento* is not likely to be bloodless. But as long as his government lasts there does not seem to be much ground for apprehension of what it will do. In Mr. Rendes, a member of the "Republican Union," he possesses a Foreign Minister who has been a professional diplomatist and knows the

current questions. To supply his place would be difficult, for Greek diplomatists abroad are unwilling to sacrifice their posts for the risky honour of being Minister of Foreign Affairs for a few months, and in the Greek, as in all Parliaments, experts in foreign policy are rare. Consequently, Mr. Rendes should be able to exercise a check upon "passionate" policy towards other countries.

Indeed, General Pangalos is understood to have shown in his conversations with the diplomatic corps a marked tendency to defend his action in taking power. None can better realise than a strategist the long frontier which Greece has to defend without allies, and the consequent importance to her of the Yugoslav Alliance, which is also in the interest of Great Britain and France. As regards Italy, which has for some months made efforts, culminating in the very official Santarosa commemoration, to improve her relations with Greece, it was noticeable that the Italian Minister in Athens hastened, before his colleagues, to pay a visit of recognition to General Pangalos, whose advent to power somewhat resembled that of his own chief. But violent speeches in the Italian Chamber about the Dodekanese have made a bad impression in Greece and retarded, by way of reprisals, the passing of the Convention for an Italian air-service between Brindisi and Athens. Nor did the Corfiotes, who shut themselves up in their houses, appreciate the arrival of five Italian ships to remove the bones of the forgotten Venetian Admiral Graziani, which had laid undisturbed in Corfù since 1852. This particular item of the Santarosa celebration came too soon after the Italian bombardment. If, however, as some think, the Italian fortification of Leros as a naval base be the preliminary step to an Italian attack upon Asiatic Turkey, then Italo-Greek relations may undergo a change. For Italian penetration in the Levant can scarcely succeed without Greek collaboration.

Greece is one of the few countries where Great Britain is popular with all parties. Indeed, her popularity far exceeds that of other nations. While Italy has to live down the retention of the Dodekanese and the cannonade of Corfù, and France, despite the constant propaganda of her popular Minister, Comte de Chambrun, has not effaced the memory of M. Franklin-Bouillon's Turkophil policy, Great Britain holds the first place in the affection of the Greeks. She obtains spontaneously what other Powers obtain by asking. For example, nothing could have been more spontaneous than the tribute of admiration to Rupert Brooke's memory on the tenth anniversary of his death, for which we have to thank Mr. Caclamanos, the distinguished diplomatic representative of Greece in London (at that moment in Athens), and Mr. Drosines, the

eminent Greek novelist and poet. While other Great Powers devote much time to propaganda, while French and even Italian schools are founded—the latter especially in Corfù—and French lecturers and dramatic companies come to Athens, Great Britain does nothing to bring herself before the notice of the Athenian public, a considerable proportion of which knows, and a still larger proportion is eager to know, English. What is needed above all else, in the interest of British commercial expansion, is an English school at Athens, where young Greeks can learn our language. Mr. Moschopoulos, a well-known Greek publicist, recently launched this idea in the official *Messenger d'Athènes*, and it deserves warm support in London. Moreover, good English lectures on popular subjects and good English theatrical companies would find crowded houses at Athens—now (with the Piræus) a city of over 900,000 inhabitants with (in many cases) plenty of money to spend.

Meanwhile, the British Archæological School is practically the only British foundation in Athens, and, even in Greece, everyone is not interested in classical archæology. Besides, our school, despite its excellent work during the last two seasons at Sparta, perhaps owing to lack of appreciation of learning by our materialistic millionaires, does not possess the funds at the disposal of the similar American institution soon to be further enriched by the opening of the Geunadios library. To neglect Greece is from every point of view, sentimental, political, naval, commercial, and educational, a mistake, which other Powers, with far fewer natural advantages than Great Britain, are not likely to commit. The appreciation of British methods shown by the Greeks is exemplified by the appointment of a British naval mission and by the maintenance by successive Governments, Venizelist, Royalist and Republican, of Sir Frederick Halliday's British-trained police, who exercise jurisdiction over Corfù, Patras, the Piræus and the two central districts of Athens, where they have been the objects of general admiration and, according to the plan of the late Government, should subsequently take over the rest of the capital and Salonika. The rumoured abolition of this admirable force by the Pangalos Ministry provoked a strong protest from the Greek press. It would, indeed, be a misfortune if General Pangalos destroyed what the Royalists had spared.

Greece should be, in these circumstances, a favourable field for British capital. Greece has met her public obligations, thus setting an example to some greater Powers, which have shown no desire to pay even the interest on their war debts to the overburdened British taxpayers. An American firm has obtained the important contract for the water-supply of Athens, thus solving a

question which was raised by the late Mr. Rangavès,* when he was Minister of Foreign Affairs in the 'fifties. An Anglo-American company has acquired the concession for the Vardan drainage scheme, which should make that part of Macedonia healthy. A British syndicate has been negotiating for the better electric lighting of the capital. No Greek Government is likely to cancel contracts. Only a little more "push" seems to be needed on our part. Great Britain in these days, when she has active and self-advertising competitors in the field, cannot continue "to blush unseen." She should realise that "the Hellenic factor" in the Near East is the most intelligent and the most Anglophil, the most commercial and the most sensitive of the importance of sea-power in all political relations. On their side the Greeks, and especially the business classes, are probably well aware that nothing will impress Great Britain so favourably as political stability. Unfortunately, the more sensational London newspapers devote attention to the Near East only when it provides matter for their scare-headlines: the steady progress of every day passes unobserved. There is, therefore, all the more reason to avoid military "revolutions." Greece will accomplish her destiny as the most civilised of the South-Eastern States, when her army and navy, leaving politics to the civilians, definitely and exclusively devote themselves to their own professional occupations.

WILLIAM MILLER.

* *Memoirs*, II, 410.

TRANSJORDAN TO-DAY.*

THE territory known as Transjordan, which falls under the British Mandate for Palestine, is bounded on the north by the French mandated Syria, on the west by the river Jordan and the Dead Sea, and on the south by the so-called Kingdom of the Hejaz. On the east the frontier has never been clearly defined, but it is common to that of Mesopotamia. The country, therefore, forms a material factor in British policy and it constitutes an important link in our imperial chain. Thus, whilst Transjordan and Palestine must be of great significance in the protection of the Suez Canal, these two zones, taken together with Mesopotamia, give us an all-British land route from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf—a route which, in case of need, might well be used as an alternative to the Canal. Moreover, from the commercial standpoint, the fact that at least two companies are now maintaining a regular motor service from Damascus to Baghdad, by way of French and British territories proves that the difficulties of the desert can be overcome and suggests that there is nothing to prevent the establishment of an all-British motor service from Jerusalem by way of Amman to Mesopotamia. The route to be covered by car is somewhat longer than that from Damascus to Baghdad, a limited amount of work is necessary upon the track, and public security might have to be improved in Transjordan, but the practical nature of the line has been proved by the recent motor journey made by Mr. Norman Nairn, of the Nairn Transport Company, from Jerusalem to Baghdad. Consequently, whereas there may be those who dispute the advisability of our presence in Palestine and Transjordan, who object to the upkeep of certain imperial forces in these countries, and who resent the provision of a grant in aid for the Government of the Emir Abdulla, it must at least be remembered that there are already imperial advantages from this policy, and that, as local prosperity increases, these advantages will be materially augmented.

Transjordan forms a sort of borderland or outpost between the Jordan and the unknown, and it must be visualised as consisting of two distinct parts. Starting from the western frontier, along which the valley has an average width of about three miles, there is an abrupt rise of 3,500 to 4,000 feet to the Western Arabian plateau, which falls slightly before it reaches the line of the Hejaz railway. The Jordan Valley, which is the most fertile part of the whole country, is capable of producing oranges, bananas, and

* Those who wish to make a further study of this question will do well to read Sir Herbert Samuel's Report on Palestine (Colonial No. 15, price 2s. net, 1925), and the Annual Report by the British Government on Palestine and Transjordan (Colonial No. 12, price 2s 3d. net, 1925).

cotton, which require its warm climate, and the remainder of this zone, particularly its more northerly section, is cultivated largely for wheat and barley and it forms the granary of the country. To the east of the railway, there is first grass land and then entirely barren territory, and the ground slopes gradually down to the desert and the Mesopotamia frontier. No reliable statistics are available as to the area and population, but it is safe to say that whilst the regularly inhabited region, which lies between the Jordan and the Hejaz railway, includes about 4,500 square miles, making it less than twice the area of Devonshire, the whole country is many times that size. No census has been taken, but the inhabitants are believed to number about 200,000 souls, of whom some 18,000 are Christians (mostly members of the Orthodox Greek Church) and the remainder are Moslems. From one-quarter to one-half of the population are Bedouin, who have no definite or permanent homes, and there are a number of Circassians, for the most part imported by the Turks after the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78. The vast majority of the people live in the country and the most important towns are Amman and Salt, which provide homes for a considerable number of foreigners, belonging largely to the neighbouring countries and domiciled in Transjordan, partly because of the business opportunities which exist and partly because their presence is not always desired in the place of their origin.

Amman, the capital, which may be reached by a five hours' motor drive from Jerusalem or by train from Haifa or Damascus, is the ancient Rabbath Ammon and afterwards Philadelphia. It lies in a hollow and on the banks of the River Jabbok, and at the time of my visit, last April, the town was rendered picturesque by the freshly leaved poplar trees introduced by the Circassians. Situated about three miles from the Hejaz Railway, on which it has a station, the capital is made up for the most part of small houses surrounded by gardens, it has good shops for the size of the place, and the narrow streets are crowded with residents and with visitors, who, naturally, come to the seat of Government. The newly-constructed palace, which takes the form of an ultra-modern villa, occupies a commanding suburban position above the river, and its ugliness and lack of grace seem to enhance the beauty and interest of the magnificent ruined theatre which lies but a short mile away. There is no hotel worthy of such a name, and the traveller is therefore compelled to put up with great discomfort, unless he receives hospitality such as that provided for me at the hands of Colonel Holmes—the Director of the Palestinian Railways—who kindly placed the Directors' luxurious saloon at my disposal during my stay in the capital.

Salt, or es Salt, which lies on the road from Jerusalem and

Jericho to Amman, is a large and quite different place. Possessed of a population of about 18,000 souls, it is perched on the sides of a steep valley and at an elevation of about 2,700 feet above the level of the sea. Owing to lack of space, the houses are crowded together and built tier upon tier, and it is nothing uncommon for one owner to sell or let the roof of his abode for the construction of another dwelling, which is usually approached from a road or path running higher up the hill side. But in spite of its curious appearance and construction, Salt is a great market centre, especially for the Bedouin, and had the locality been more accessible the town would probably have been chosen as the capital.

The greatest material asset possessed by Transjordan is the narrow gauge railway, which runs from north to south of the country at an approximate and average distance of between thirty and forty miles from its western frontier. It forms part of the Hejaz line from Damascus to Medina, which was built by the Turks largely for the benefit of the pilgrims during the closing years of the reign of Abdul Hamid, and it (the railway) is connected with the Mediterranean coast by a branch from Deraa to Haifa. This railway system, which now falls partly in Syria, partly in Palestine, partly in Transjordan, and perhaps partly in the somewhat uncertain territory to the south, is still run and administered as religious property, and the Palestinian and Transjordanian sections are under the management of the Director of Railways in Palestine. So far so good, but now come two questions of great importance for future adjustment. When the frontiers in this area were settled, about fifty miles of the railway, near the Transjordanian-Syrian border, and forming part of the line which connects the port of Haifa with Amman, were left just within Syrian territory. The question is a difficult one because the line also connects Haifa with Damascus, but from the British standpoint the present arrangement is fatal to the efficient working of the railway, it enables the French, should they so desire, to impose preferential tariffs, and it tends to prevent traffic from following its natural course. Good relations between the British and French are vital in these parts and the interests of Palestine, Transjordan, and Syria are all necessary of consideration. But, as the line cannot ever be French all the way from Damascus to Haifa, perhaps some territorial readjustment might be made under which the section of the railway from El Hamme to Nassib, which is now French, would change hands and under which Deraa Junction would become a joint station. Such an arrangement, which might well be compensated by a cession of British mandated territory to the north of Lake Tiberias, or by some other concession, would certainly lead to a better international and local

understanding in a district where sufficient complications are always likely to exist.

The other point of difficulty concerns the southern section of the railway which is, or ought to be, in Transjordanian territory. The British claim that the district of Maan, which lies to the south of Amman, forms part of Transjordan and that the frontier crosses the railway at some point between Maan and Tebuk. But for some time this area has been, and in April was being, administered by the Hejaz authorities in spite of protests from the British Government. Moreover, whilst there is some dispute as to who was responsible for that action, in April, 1924, the control of the railway from Amman to Maan was handed over by the British to the Hejaz authorities, who in April were working, and who perhaps still work, that section together with the stretch from Maan towards the south. This state of things has been, and is, most unsatisfactory from the commercial and political standpoints, and it creates great difficulties and hardships in regard to, and for, pilgrims on their way to and from Mecca. It is to be hoped, therefore, that this question will be cleared up, as I believe it is now being cleared up by the taking over of the Maan district by the Transjordanian authorities, for in addition to benefits thereby to be derived, a settlement would facilitate the provision of a proper quarantine station for pilgrims at Maan—a station which I believe existed in Turkish times and a station the absence of which now necessitates the taking of special and individual sanitary precautions in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt.

The present situation in Transjordan can only be explained by reference to the recent past. The country, with the surrounding territory, was part of the former Ottoman Empire, and after the construction of the Hejaz Railway, the control of Constantinople became somewhat more real than in former times. That line played a material part in the war, but Kerak was taken by the Emir Feisal in April, 1918, and the capture of Maan by the British in September of that year signified the end of Turkish resistance in that area. After the armistice, Transjordan was included within the dominions of the Emir Feisal, who was forced by the French to leave Damascus in July, 1920, and in the following month Sir Herbert Samuel, who had then taken over his duties as High Commissioner of Palestine, went to Salt, where he declared that the British Government favoured the establishment of a local régime assisted by a small number of English officers. Councils were established in three districts, but the situation was complicated by the arrival, in November, 1920, of the Emir Abdulla, who avowed his intention to reconquer Syria. A few months later, when that chieftain had moved from Maan to Amman and during

the visit of Mr. Churchill, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, to Jerusalem, an arrangement was made by which His Highness was recognised as the temporary administrator of the country, and this arrangement was confirmed when the Emir came to London in 1922. Later, Sir Herbert Samuel paid a visit to Amman, which had then become the capital, and he there declared that, subject to the approval of the League of Nations, His Majesty's Government recognised the existence of an independent administration in Transjordan provided the British Government was left in a position to fulfil its international obligations by means of a subsequent agreement—an agreement which so far has not been concluded.

The meaning of the negotiations which have taken place and the arrangements already made is that whereas Transjordan falls within the mandate for Palestine, the situations in the two zones are almost entirely distinct. In Palestine the British Government is pledged to the policy of the Balfour declaration, and in Transjordan it is committed to various promises to recognise and support the independence of the Arabs. This incongruous situation is supported by the fact that the clauses of the mandate referring to the special position of the Jews in Palestine do not apply to Transjordan, and by the maintenance of entirely separate administrations. Indeed, the only practical links between the two zones are that the Chief British Representative in Transjordan is under the High Commissioner of Palestine, that the British Government maintains a flight of aeroplanes, a section of four armoured cars, and an aerodrome at Amman, and that it provides financial assistance for the two Governments. Thus, whereas in Palestine the administration is openly and directly in British hands, as a result of a declaration made by His Majesty's Government to the Council of the League of Nations in September, 1922, the action there taken by the Palestinian Administration is carried out in Transjordan "under the general supervision of the Mandatory." These words are responsible for the presence of the Chief British Representative and two British assistants, who, although they possess no executive powers, now really control the situation on the east of the Jordan.

After the recognition of the Emir Abdulla, a Council of Ministers was formed, the country was united under a central administration, and the British Government undertook temporarily to provide a grant in aid towards the maintenance of the State. But chaos, and particularly financial chaos, largely due to the extravagance of the Emir, continued, and the Government persistently refused or failed to furnish satisfactory accounts. The result of this was that the grant in aid, which in 1921-22 amounted to £180,000 and

which in 1923-24 came to £150,000, was reduced for 1924-25 to £15,000, supplemented by about three times that sum held by Palestine for the credit of Transjordan. Colonel Cox, the present Chief British Representative, succeeded Mr. Philby in April, 1924, and directly after the Emir's return from Mecca in the following August a letter, which seems to have been a sort of ultimatum, was presented to him indicating the reforms required by the British Government. These measures included a new system of financial control, which came into operation last October and which reduced the deficit on the budget for the current year from about £132,000 to about £43,000. The Emir's Civil List was at once cut down from £30,000 to £20,000 per year and it has since been reduced to £13,000, the taxes, which formerly had not been properly paid, are now collected without reference to the importance or influence of those from whom they are due, and the salaries of the officials are paid up to date. In short, whereas a great deal remains to be accomplished, Colonel Cox has now got a hold upon the situation, and the corruption, favouritism, and chaos which previously existed have become more difficult than was the case prior to the arrival of that official.

Over and above the financial question, arrangements were made last year for the modification of the system of tribal law, for the better control and inspection of the military forces of Transjordan, and for an extradition agreement with Syria. The Ottoman Code is in operation with a few changes, but the special legal position, formerly enjoyed by the Bedouin, has been considerably modified. Indeed, although tribal courts, consisting of local judges, still exist for the purpose of dealing with purely tribal matters, these courts are now controlled by legal officials and they have no power in cases where non-tribesmen are concerned. This is a matter of material importance, for, whereas the new order of things insures greater justice to the tribesmen themselves, it is beginning to constitute, and later on will constitute, much more full protection to the located population and particularly to the permanent agricultural population. Thus, whereas it may be a long time before the migratory element of the community becomes subject to the ordinary law, the fact that the Bedouin, who rob the farmers of their crops and who, therefore, make the cultivation of large areas unsafe, now stand to suffer, must tend, sooner or later, to prevent such an abuse and therefore to increase the production and the prosperity of a country which badly requires additional funds for the upkeep of the State.

The Arab Legion, with which goes the police, is a powerful factor in British control, and it is by far the strongest asset possessed by Transjordan. Ignoring about 100 policemen, distributed

between the larger towns, the Legion, organised as a gendarmerie, consists of about 950 men and 40 officers under the command of Colonel Peake Pasha, who has one British subordinate. This contingent, which is made up of infantry, cavalry, and mountain and machine guns, maintains reasonable public safety, and the influence of Peake Pasha as Director of Public Security is an asset which counts for good throughout the country. Moreover, even if the expense of the Legion and of the police, which comes to about £115,000 per year out of a budget of only about £240,000, is very heavy, these forces are absolutely necessary as a protection for the existing farmer against the raids of the Bedouin and as an encouragement to the agriculturist to cultivate greater amounts of land than those already under the plough.

If we omit the real, though not the officially avowed, power of the British Representative, the country is governed by the Emir and by the Prime Minister, whose relations are far from cordial. The Emir Abdulla, who is the second son of the ex-King Hussein of the Hejaz, is about thirty-eight years of age. Short in stature and stout in build, he has an oval face and fair skin which make him quite unlike his brother, King Feisal. His Highness, who received me cordially, has a pleasant smile and a good manner, but in spite of his kindness and often foolish liberality to his friends he is far from popular in the country of his adoption. Moreover, even a brief and somewhat formal conversation, carried on through an interpreter, is sufficient to prove that the Emir has little experience or capacity for government, and that if he is to remain the ruler of Transjordan it is absolutely necessary to maintain a strict control over his actions and particularly over his methods of expenditure. Ali Riza Pasha el Rikabi, the President of the Council of Ministers, is an Arab from Damascus who held many high commands in the Turkish army, and who is most unpopular with the French authorities in Syria. He appears to be a strong man in the oriental sense, and to possess many of the merits and of the faults of those who occupied the more important posts in Turkey before the War. But his presence and position in Transjordan have at least the advantages that he constitutes a counterpoise to the Emir and that he works with, and accepts the advice of, the British Representative, who is, and must remain, paramount unless the situation is once more to relapse into the more chaotic state which existed for several years.

The political and economic relations between Transjordan and her neighbours are very complicated. With the exception of alcohol and tobacco, upon which there are duties amounting respectively to 100 per cent. and 50 per cent., there is no customs barrier with Palestine, which country pays Transjordan an annual sum of

£19,000 on account of the duties collected upon goods of foreign origin and re-exported to Transjordan. An extradition agreement exists with Palestine and another has now been concluded with Syria, and this has materially improved the situation, since it is more difficult for malefactors to cross the frontier, and particularly to leave Syria for Transjordan, without being brought to justice. From the economic standpoint, Syria follows more or less the same policy as Palestine and she refunds to Transjordan 15 per cent. on goods re-exported to that country, leaving her to prove the places of origin of goods upon which she is entitled to a higher benefit. There is little intercourse with Mesopotamia, but when we come to Hejaz and to the Wahabis the position is much more critical. As already stated, the position of the southern frontier has been under discussion, and I understand that, at last, the ownership of the Port of Akaba, which should belong to Transjordan in order to give her access to the sea, has been definitely decided with the Hejaz. The Wahabis and the Sultan Ibn Saud appear to have nothing definite against the British, but their attack upon Amman, delivered about a year ago, proves that they are opposed to the régime which has its headquarters there. That attack was repulsed by the Royal Air Force when the enemy had got within twelve miles of the capital, but it (the Wahabi attack), nevertheless, suggests that the presence of the Emir Abdulla, whose father has been forced to abdicate from the Hejaz throne, constitutes an ever-present enticement to a people who are strongly opposed to the Hashmite family to which, of course, those potentates belong.

The foregoing remarks are sufficient to indicate that, if certain reforms have been introduced during the last year, the situation still leaves a great deal to be desired. In the opinion of the present writer three courses are possible of adoption by those responsible. A separate British administration, on the lines of that existing in Palestine, might be set up in Transjordan. This is hardly practical because it would cost much more than the present system and, as the extra expenditure could not be recovered from local taxation at any rate for some time to come, a much larger grant in aid would have to be supplied from home, which is out of the question. Or, considering that Syria, Palestine, and Transjordan were closely linked in Turkish times, the last two named areas, now under a more or less common mandate, might be directly governed by the High Commissioner and controlled by British officials as a single unit. Such a policy, for which, as for the first suggestion, the approval of the League of Nations might be required, would have many advantages, and, had it been adopted in the beginning, it would probably have been the most satisfactory

of acceptance. But, under present circumstances, the change would give rise to increased agitation in the Arab world and it would raise a difficulty as to whether the Jews were to occupy a special position in the territory which is now Transjordanian. Moreover, and this is most important, it would be hardly fair to encumber Palestine, which now has a surplus on its budget, with Transjordan which has a deficit—a deficit bound to increase with the appointment of more numerous foreign functionaries. Lastly, the present régime, with its nominally native independence, but really carried on under the semi-secret control of a strictly limited number of British officials, can be prolonged with or without the rulership of the Emir Abdulla. This method has the advantages of comparative economy and of fulfilling, at least to some extent, the War promises made to the Arabs. But if it is to be tolerated by the British Commonwealth and if the native population is to be expected to maintain the peace, the Emir, whose reduced Civil List is still nearly twice as much as the salary provided for the High Commissioner and his personal staff, should be even more strictly controlled in the future than in the past. Provided this is done and provided His Highness recognises the necessity of bowing before British advice, there is no reason why he should not remain the occupant of a position which must become, if it has not already become, purely titular. Alternatively, should the British Representative be unable to maintain a working equilibrium between the Head of the State and his present or some other Prime Minister, then a fundamental change must be brought about in order to save this agriculturally rich country from disorder, ruin and destruction.

H. CHARLES WOODS.

THE BALANCE OF POWER IN THE BALKANS.

SINCE the war the Balkan States have all passed through various forms of crises. There have been numberless problems to deal with, some of which have been settled and some are still in suspense. Amongst the latter the question of Yugoslav-Greek relations is undoubtedly the most important, as no lasting Balkan settlement is likely to be achieved until Yugoslavia and Greece reach some kind of agreement. When in November, 1924, Yugoslavia denounced her ten-years-old Treaty of Alliance with Greece it was obvious to any competent observer that it was going to be extremely difficult for these two neighbouring States to renew their Alliance. Although the Yugoslav Note denouncing the Alliance did not lay any especial emphasis on conditions prevailing at Salonika and along the railway between Yugoslavia and Salonika, one could guess that these were the real reasons which dictated Yugoslavia to break with her former Ally.

Salonika became Greek after the first Balkan war (1912), and during the brief period before the outbreak of the World War Serbia, as she then was, showed herself extremely discontented at the way in which her merchandise was treated at Salonika. At that time she had no "free zone" in Salonika although negotiations with this end in view were being conducted. During the war years, 1914-1918, little was perforce heard of Serbian grievances, but ever since the question has been dragged more and more into the limelight. On May 10th, 1923, a Convention was signed at Belgrade which granted Yugoslavia, for fifty years, a space of 94,000 square metres in the port of Salonika, to be known as the "Yugoslav Free Zone." Four protocols attached to this Convention provided for other privileges connected with the working of the free zone. Although this Convention greatly improved matters, it was not considered altogether satisfactory while the question of the railway remained an open sore. This railway, single gauge and forty-four miles long, runs from Guevgueli, the frontier town, to Salonika. It is to a certain extent a strategic line, as in time of hostilities Yugoslavia, and also Roumania, might find their other lines of communication with France, who supplies them with war material, cut off.

During the spring of this year fresh negotiations took place at Athens and Belgrade regarding the conclusion of a new Treaty of Alliance. At Athens matters proceeded satisfactorily but when the conversations were transferred to Belgrade a deadlock set in. The principal reason was that the Yugoslavs demanded the exploitation of the Guevgueli-Salonika railway line. The Greeks, whilst

offering further concessions which included the double tracking of the line, refused to grant Yugoslavia the right of exploitation on the grounds that this would gravely affect Greece's sovereign rights. After a few weeks the negotiations broke down and they show no signs of being renewed. Without wishing to take sides in this controversy it would seem clear that Yugoslavia has set her heart on possessing both the railway which leads to Salonika and, perhaps, the port itself. For, as one glance at the map will show, Salonika is the natural outlet for Southern Serbia. Yugoslav cattle, dairy produce, and building materials all find their way to Greece, Turkey, and France *via* Salonika. Discontent at the present arrangement has thus been equally shared between business and political circles. Furthermore, the desire to have an unrestricted outlet to the Ægean has been greatly increased since the port of Fiume became Italian in 1924.

It is at this juncture that matters become interesting in the Balkans. A few weeks after Yugoslavia and Greece had failed to settle their differences round a conference table, the military and extreme republican party in Greece, led by General Pangalos, carried out a bloodless *coup d'État* and set up what practically amounts to a military dictatorship. Although dissatisfaction with the late Michaelopoulis Government, on the grounds that insufficient credits had been forthcoming for the Army, was one of the reasons responsible for the *coup d'État*, it is unquestionable that the desire to present a stiffer front towards Yugoslav demands was the principal argument which appealed to Pangalos and his supporters. That this has been realised in Yugoslavia is proved by the tone of the Belgrade press, which has been practically unanimous in condemning and criticising the military movement in Greece.

But in Yugoslavia there have also been important events during the last few weeks. As everyone who follows Balkan affairs knows, the Triune Kingdom has laboured under one great handicap since its inception, to wit, the inability or non-desire of Serbs and Croats to work together. Since the virtual disappearance from the political arena of Stephan Raditch, the Croat peasant leader, relations between the two groups have considerably improved, and for some time past negotiations have been proceeding with a view to the formation of a coalition Government. After the pourparlers with Greece broke down the Serb-Croat negotiations proceeded apace, and they have now resulted in the formation of a Radical-Croat Coalition Cabinet. Thus for the first time in the history of Yugoslavia the Government will represent both old Serbia and Croatia. If this accord is not merely formal, which is not likely to be the case, the result will be immensely to strengthen the Yugoslav Kingdom in any external events it has to deal with.

Leaving Belgrade and Athens aside for a moment, one can examine the situation and points of view of the other Balkan States regarding a possible Yugoslav-Greek Alliance. Roumania, the ally of Yugoslavia in the Little Entente, has directed all her efforts towards bringing about a friendly understanding. But it would seem that at Belgrade, at any rate, she has been politely told to mind her own business. Bulgaria, whose interests are incalculably bound up in anything relating to Greece and Yugoslavia, has so far held her hand. Considerably smaller and weaker than any of her neighbours, she has lost so much by trying to play "la grande politique" that she feels it safer to remain a neutral onlooker. But it is not certain whether she will be able to persist in this rôle, always assuming that Yugoslavia and Greece do not amicably settle their differences. On account of her geographical position, Bulgaria could be a considerable asset or hindrance to Yugoslavia if the latter decided that Salonika must be won. The Bulgarian army is small, but there is a mass of reserve officers, Macedonians and others who can always be counted on to play their part in time of war. Belgrade and Athens are well aware of this, hence their steadfast refusals to allow any increase in the Bulgarian Army on the plea that the Bolshevist danger necessitates the same. There is no shadow of a doubt that the great majority of thinking Bulgarians would prefer to side with Yugoslavia rather than with Greece. Firstly, because Yugoslavia is regarded as the stronger, and secondly, because Bulgaria has also set her eye towards the Ægean Sea. There is, however, one dissentient voice, and a powerful one it is. The Macedonians will never allow any Bulgarian Government, no matter its political complexion, to come to an agreement with Yugoslavia unless their rights are fully safeguarded. By this it is meant to say that the Macedonians will insist on receiving educational, religious, and to a certain extent political rights in the territory now belonging to Yugoslavia and styled by the latter "Southern Serbia." If Yugoslavia is willing to make concessions to the Macedonians, and this is not so impossible as many people believe, both pure Bulgarians and Macedonians will eagerly welcome an understanding, an agreement, or an alliance with Yugoslavia.

Lastly, there is the position of Turkey to be considered. The Turks have of late interested themselves more in Asiatic than European affairs, but they still keep an eye on the Ægean seaboard. It is unlikely that they would interfere in any Yugoslav-Greek conflict as their enmity towards Greece is too recent. On the other hand, they are unlikely to make common ground with the Slavs in the Balkans, for fear that this might ultimately constitute a menace to themselves. Turkey's attitude would probably be to

wait and watch, without being dissatisfied that her neighbours have troubles of their own.

The above is a brief description of the Balkan States' attitudes toward Yugoslavia's difference of opinion with Greece. For the world to be peaceful there must be a balance of power. This is a truism, but nowhere is it truer than in South-Eastern Europe. Since the war there has been no balance of power in the Balkans. Yugoslavia is unquestionably the greatest force, and while other nations are groping in the dark trying to lay their hands on some secure support, Yugoslavia has been steadily reorganising and consolidating. She has to a great extent the military power of France behind her, whilst the other countries have nothing if the "moral, maritime, and financial" assistance promised to Greece by Great Britain be left out of account. Gone are the days when Russia and Austria-Hungary wrestled for Balkan supremacy. The latter has now become an insignificant buffer State, while Russia, although recovering from the devastating effects of an internal revolution, is still not to be seriously reckoned with.

There is, however, one other European factor which must be taken into consideration. On several occasions Mussolini has declared that Italy will view with disfavour any change in the present Balkan *status quo*. He has been referring to the oft repeated rumours that Yugoslavia was preparing to occupy South-Western Bulgaria and the important Pernik coal mine. But it can also be assumed that Italy would regard with similar disfavour any move on the part of Yugoslavia towards Salonika. Certainly Italian-Greek relations have not been very friendly during recent years, and even now the question of the Dodecanese is still in dispute. All the same, there have been indications that Italy is becoming better disposed towards Greece, and the recent visit to Athens of Signor Grandi, the Italian Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, is not without significance. For Italy is not likely to regard with equanimity the passing of Salonika into Yugoslav hands. Such a valuable acquisition would greatly strengthen the position of the Triune Kingdom, and Italy is thus taking a close interest in the matter. There are also other nations—Hungary is one and Austria is another—who would be sorry to see Yugoslavia in Salonika. But they are of less importance.

Reverting to the rights and wrongs of Yugoslavia's demand to control the Guevgueli-Salonika railway (which, after all, is but a short step from possessing Salonika itself) one finds in *The Times* of June 9th an admirable exposition of the Yugoslav and Greek points of view regarding this question. In reading the two statements one cannot help being struck by the theoretical weakness of

the Yugoslav case. Indeed, the only really convincing argument which Yugoslavia advances is that of strategical necessity. It is true that if the two countries were on unfriendly terms, Yugoslavia's access to the Southern Sea would be threatened. But are there any reasons why the two countries should not always be allies? Apart from the question of the ownership of the Guevgueli-Salonika railway and the port itself, there are absolutely no conflicting economic and political interests between Greece and Yugoslavia. On the contrary, Yugoslavs and Greeks have everything to gain and nothing to lose by remaining allies. Both countries have enemies who will be only too glad to see them embroiled. It is undeniable that Greece, in adopting a pinprick policy towards Yugoslav transit merchandise at Salonika, has acted against her own interests and has not unnaturally provoked the wrath of Yugoslavia. But it is not too late for the Greeks to remedy this state of affairs, and if the present Government is as patriotic as it makes itself out to be, it should give this matter its most urgent attention. The Guevgueli-Salonika railway line should be at once double-tracked, while the size of the Yugoslav free zone at Salonika should be greatly increased. At the same time, everything possible should be done to ensure the efficient working of the port itself.

If, after these improvements have been effected, Yugoslavia remains dissatisfied, then it will be clear to the civilised world that Yugoslav ambitions are purely territorial and must be treated as such. The League of Nations, whose work in the Balkans—humanitarian activities excepted—leaves much to be desired, could then be called in. The Great Powers, who have had sufficient lessons of disunity in the Near East to realise that it only causes prejudice to each one concerned, should then use their good services in order to avert any threatened Yugoslav-Greek war. For the meantime one can only "wait and see." As far as the writer is aware, neither Bulgaria, Roumania, nor Turkey is dreaming or preparing for hostilities. Yugoslavia and Greece are indulging in a violent press polemic, which may turn out advantageous in that much loose steam is let off. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to say that the situation is not fraught with danger, and diplomatic circles, especially at home, would do well to give the matter closer consideration than they have hitherto done. For the old adage that the Balkans are the volcano of Europe is as true to-day as it ever was.

J. WALTER COLLINS.

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE U.S. IMMIGRATION LAW OF 1924.

A NATION, no less than an individual, is the slave of its circumstances. The United States of America, in establishing the new "Home of the Brave and the Land of the Free," defiantly proclaimed a new theory of migration. Launching boldly with the fresh hopes and aspirations announced as her fixed policy, that man has the inalienable right to change his abode in pursuit of his unfettered happiness, "The Melting-pot of the Races" was the proud title which she appropriated for herself.

But with the steady increase of European immigration in the middle of the eighties the pot began to simmer. In the nineties it began to bubble. In 1917, with the entrance of the nation into the world struggle, she found the fabulous number of 7,000,000 souls within her own gates unable to read or write. The pot then literally boiled over. It resulted in the immigration laws of 1917, 1921 and 1924. It is generally conceded now in the United States that a nation is the sole and final judge as to who shall come to her shores. This theory seems to enjoy a wide support in the immigration-receiving countries as well as in some of the emigrating nations.

If we accept the American point of view in our present discussion, whether the question of immigration between certain countries is or has become a matter of international concern depends firstly upon the existence of the international commitments between them; secondly, upon the matter in which one nation has acted toward another. By far the most important opinion on this point is advanced by Sir Douglas Hogg, representing Great Britain in a case involving the nationality of the Maltese in Morocco and Tunis. He said:

"Let us consider that State A passes a law, for instance, as to immigration, prohibiting the entrance of subjects of State B, and which is injurious to the interests of State B. . . . There can be no question of international law arising between the parties, because it is clear that every State has an exclusive jurisdiction as to whom it will admit within its territory."

"Let us again assume a similar law, State A restricting immigration, and let us assume that there is a treaty between State A and State B which, according to State B, prevents State A from imposing that restriction. It is true that matters of immigration are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of State A. But since State B has an international treaty right, or alleges that it has an international treaty right, as against State A, the question as to whether or not such a right exists, can no longer be a matter solely within the domestic jurisdiction of State A." ("Publica-

tions of the Permanent Court of International Justice, Series C," No. 2, pp. 20-27.)

Moreover, the present American contention is that "The control of immigration belongs to the Congress of the United States alone," as is seen in the report of Mr. Albert Johnson, Chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to the House of Representatives. He says in his report to the House :

"The treaty of 1911 is by title and intent a treaty of commerce and navigation. If there be a provision therein regulating immigration, it is *improperly there*, since regulation of immigration is a prerogative of Congress, and there cannot be reasonable objection to Congress exercising such prerogative *notwithstanding a provision erroneously inserted in such a treaty*."

Therefore, we shall now inquire, first, whether the President of the United States through his diplomatic channels may make treaties involving the question of immigration; second, what is meant by "immigrant" over which a nation claims its jurisdiction. We are unable to discover authorities who say that the prerogative of the President is limited beyond what is expressly reserved to several States and what is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States, concerning which the reader needs no further elucidation. Butler in his *Treaty-making Power in the United States* says :

"It (treaty-making power) extends to every subject which can be the basis of negotiation and contract between any of the sovereign powers of the world in regard to which the several States of the Union themselves had not expressly prohibited the States from the exercising the treaty-making power in any manner whatever and vested that power exclusively in, and expressly delegated it to, the Federal Government."

This contention is exactly in line with the opinion of Judge Story, who said in *Martin v. Hunter* :

"So with treaties; and while there is no inherent power in the Federal Government to regulate commerce or make treaties, the words themselves carry all that 'inheres' in the generic term 'commerce' and in the generic term 'treaty'."

An outstanding authority on this question of the treaty-making and the subject matter of a treaty is, undoubtedly, Professor Corwin, of Princetown University. He holds :

"On the precise question, therefore, of the relation of the treaty-making power to the reserved rights of the State, our conclusion must be that the latter do not limit the former to any extent; that, in other words, the United States had exactly the same range of power in making treaties that it would have if the States did not exist." ("Treaty-making Power: A rejoinder by Edward S. Corwin." *The North American Review*, June, 1914.)

Futhermore Justice Field in the case *in re Ah Lung* said :

"The immigration of foreigners to the United States and the conditions upon which they shall be permitted to remain are appropriate subjects of legislation as well as of treaty stipulations."

This is more thoroughly evinced by the fact that in 1893 the Senate passed a resolution which was transmitted to the then Secretary of State through the Hon. William E. Chandler, Chairman of Senate Committee on Immigration :

"January, 1893.

"Resolved that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to transmit to the Secretary of State a copy of Senate Bill numbered 3613, now pending in this body, entitled 'A bill for the suspension of immigration for one year,' and that the Secretary of State be and is hereby directed to inform the Senate whether the provisions of the said bill absolutely suspending immigration for a period of one year are in conflict with any treaties now existing between the United States and any foreign countries, and, if so, with what countries, and any further information which he may deem necessary for the information of the Senate during the consideration of said bill."

In fact the United States has made immigration treaties in her history : with China in 1868, 1880 and 1894; a treaty of emigration with Mexico in 1868 and with Spain in 1900, all of which were made with the knowledge and consent of the Senate.

"The Committee believes that the exemption of those entitled to enter under the treaty provisions, and the exemption of 'aliens visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for business or pleasure' fully satisfies treaty stipulations." Such was the unreserved statement of Mr. Albert Johnson in his report to the House. But after the receipt of the pertinent advice of Secretary Hughes, the Committee was reluctantly compelled to admit that the treaty obligations of the United States concerning conditions of entrance of aliens were the matter of international concern and was forced to make the necessary modifications. We find in Moore's Digest that there are two classes of provisions which must be taken into consideration : "(1) Those granting to the citizens or subjects of another country the liberty to frequent, to come, to enter, travel, sojourn or reside in the United States." There appear to be thirty-two treaties containing provisions of this class. "(2) Those securing generally to the citizens or subjects of another country the same privileges of residence and trade as to the citizens or subjects of the most favoured nation." These apparent discrepancies are due largely to the absence of a uniform definition of "immigrant" and "immigration" and a broad interpretation of treaties of commerce and navigation.

Suppose, for the sake of convenience, we accept the American theory of the control of immigration by Congress. It is quite

obvious that there still remains overlapping ground between the range within which the President can bind his nation with another, possibly by a treaty of commerce and navigation, and the range that is claimed as the exclusive control of Congress. And the extent of such ground, over which two branches may claim the authority, varies with the scope that is covered by the several definitions of immigrant of various states. In Great Britain immigrant "means an alien steerage passenger who is to be landed in the United Kingdom" but does not include certain classes of foreigners. In Venezuela it "includes all foreigners who are engaged in any kind of occupation, who are over ten and under sixty years of age, whose moral character and attainments are satisfactory, and who land on the territory of the Republic for the purpose of settlement." In Australia it is the "person arriving in Australia to settle, excluding tourists." In Uruguay, it is defined as "all foreigners of good repute and capable of work who arrive in the Republic by second or third class with the intention of settling."

Bringing the question closer to the point of our interest, the American definitions of 1908 and to-day are not alike. In 1908, three years before the Japanese-American treaty was concluded, it was as follows: "Immigrant aliens are those whose place of residence was some foreign country, and who are coming here with the intention of residing permanently." This definition surely includes merchants whose movements are guided largely by a treaty of commerce and navigation, of which the President or the Secretary of State is the author. Even during the same session of Congress the definition of Mr. Johnson was not identical with that of Mr. Reed of the Senate. The final form which was adopted as the result of the triangular consultation between the House, the Senate and the State Department reads as follows:

"Section 3. When used in this Act the term 'immigrant' includes all aliens departing from any place outside the United States, destined for the United States except (1) a government official, his family, attendants, servants, and employees, (2) an alien visiting the United States as a tourist or temporarily for business or pleasure, (3) an alien in continuous transit through the United States, (4) an alien lawfully admitted to the United States who later goes in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory, and (5) a *bona fide* alien seaman serving as such on a vessel arriving at a port of the United States and seeking to enter the United States in the pursuit of his calling, (6) the alien entitled to enter the United States solely to carry on trade under and in pursuance of the provisions of a present existing treaty of commerce and navigation."

Thus it will be seen that there are many classes of people who

are classified as immigrants whose activities come under the jurisdiction of a treaty of commerce and navigation.

The other reason for evident discrepancies is due to the fact that the movements of peoples in pursuance of treaties of commerce and navigation in these days of gasoline and electricity argue for broad and expanding interpretation as to its scope and manner. It may be true, for instance, that "the Treaty of 1911 (between America and Japan) is by title and intent a treaty of commerce and navigation," as Mr. Johnson avers. But we are not to overlook the fact that commerce is a word of great import. In *Gibbons v. Ogden*, Justice Marshall, of the Supreme Court, defines it thus: "Commerce, undoubtedly is traffic, but it is something more . . . it is intercourse. It described the commercial intercourse between nations, and parts of nations, in all branches, and is regulated by prescribing rules for carrying on that intercourse." Indeed he goes on to say that to regulate commerce with foreign nations included the power to regulate navigation. With the advancement of society the meaning of "commerce" is more potent, as illustrated in *Riverside Mills v. Atlantic Coast Line Railway Co.*, 168 Fe. 987: "Commerce in its simplest signification means an exchange of goods; but in the advancement of society, labor, transportation, intelligence; various mediums of exchange between commodities, and various operations become the object of commercial regulation." The growing relationships of economic and commercial activities, which are unquestionably a subject for the Executive Department to deal with, may naturally interlock with immigration regulations which are supposedly reserved to Congress. In view of these facts even Congress no longer is the sole judge of international commitments.

Aside from the possible existence of legal international obligations, there is still the question of honour and comity. Unfortunately, international law is not yet codified. It is not too much to say that it is yet in the embryonic stage. It is almost impossible to define what constitutes the breach of proper international courtesy and respect. The police power is commonly considered to be a domestic question, pure and simple. But what was the consequence of a murder in Servia of an Austrian Crown Prince? Was not the treatment of Cubans an internal affair of Spain in 1898? But did America fold her hands and watch the tantalising administration? Perhaps the question of armament is a matter of national concern. From the point of view of international law, it is no one else's affair, legally speaking, until its employment constitutes an unfriendly act or threat of war. No one could question that levying of taxes is the exclusive jurisdiction of a nation. Yet

did not the Western Powers dispute Japan's right to tax a certain plot of her own land for the reason that there was a perpetual lease in favour of the foreigners in Japan?

Japan does not deny that, "fundamentally speaking, it lies within the inherent power of each State to limit and control immigration to its own domain;" but she does hold that "when, in the exercise of such right, an evident injustice is done to a foreign nation in disregard of its proper self-respect, of international understandings or of ordinary rules of comity, the question necessarily assumes an aspect which justifies diplomatic discussion and adjustment." In the co-operating spirit of friendliness and neighbourliness, Japan, through her Ambassador in Washington, expressed her willingness to further impose upon herself restriction of the emigration of her people to the United States. The suggestion was received kindly by the State Department, but it did not provoke any sentiment of reciprocity in Congress. We do not hold that Ambassador Hanihara's choice of words, "Grave consequences," was a happy one in view of the existing relationship between America and Japan. Undoubtedly Mr. Hanihara never dreamed that such grave consequences were forthcoming, judging from the language before and after those two words. But he did more, which is almost unprecedented in diplomatic history. He explained that he had no intention of conveying the meaning which the Senators chose to read into them. But this was of no avail.

The fact that the immigration law is discriminatory is the lesser of the two troubles. The greater is the fact that it is aimed directly against the Japanese alone and not at Orientals at large. The reader recalls that Chinese immigration has been stopped since 1882 by discriminatory statutes. The barred zone provision of the Immigration Law of 1917 excludes all Asiatics east of Persia except Siberians, Philipinos and the Japanese. Siberians are eligible for naturalisation. Philipinos are a subject race of the Republic, although it may sound strange to a political scientist. In passing a law with the provision to exclude at this time, "the people who are ineligible to citizenship," the United States might as well substitute the word "Japanese." Strictly speaking, the "Gentlemen's Agreement" may not pass the rigid tests of a treaty, but it was recognised by both America and Japan and has been in force for seventeen years. Yet it has been summarily abrogated by an unusual course of politics without any conference or previous exchange of views!

Furthermore, if there had been no other method of control of immigration the story might have been different. But a mere extension of the same rules to the Japanese which apply to

Britishers or Hottentots would have answered the purpose without any material difference, as the percentage basis would have allowed only one hundred Japanese immigrants in a year. It is a deliberate affront to a friendly, self-respecting and neighbouring nation, who is more than willing always to co-operate in order to minimise any international friction. To quote from Mr. Hanihara's note, dated April 10th, 1924, to Secretary Hughes:

"To Japan the question is not one of expediency but of principle. To her the mere fact that a few hundreds or thousands of her nationals will or will not be admitted into the domains of other countries is immaterial so long as no question of national susceptibilities is involved. The important question is whether Japan as a nation is, or is not, entitled to the proper respect and consideration of other nations. In other words, the Japanese Government ask of the United States Government simply that proper consideration ordinarily given by one nation to the self-respect of another, which, after all, forms the basis of amicable international intercourse throughout the civilised world."

Let it be known, however, that this shortcoming as regards the attitude of Congress concerning international relations is not confined to the United States alone. It is a common political and social attitude of a new and frontier country which is usually so self-confident and self-assertive. Thus Louisiana in her early days took the case of the murder of an Italian into her own hands; neither did California hesitate to encroach upon the rights and prerogative of the National Government at the expense of the Chinese or Japanese. The further west in America one goes the more unconstitutional and illegal are the laws which they have enacted. This exists only in the process of social evolution perpetrated under the guise of democracy and sovereignty. Is it too much to hope, after ten long trying years of bitter experience, that the nations of the world, particularly of the extreme west, shall have learned the impelling necessity of international co-operation and conciliation?

KIYO SUE INUI

IS CHINA MAKING PROGRESS?

ON a journey of 800 miles up the Yangtze-kiang, the fourth largest river in the world, through endless cities and the teeming life of the great river, one feels that so much has been learnt which some of us previously interested in the life of China never knew; it is worth while, especially at this "crisis," recording some of the facts for others. To begin with, the fact that so-called crises meet one in Europe, in Egypt, in India and everywhere else, makes one doubt whether crises are not really only steps in evolution—and whether they are not as desirable in spite of disturbing the peace of mind of some, and the cost of property and life they involve to others, as the divine discontent that Charles Kingsley was acquitted for stirring up a few years ago in England. Is it not true that the lives lost are a mere bagatelle compared with those eventually saved, exactly as the trickle of "alcohol" getting into America now is negligible compared with what used to be poured down the throats of their people in pre-prohibition and open saloon temptation days? The moonshine looms large only because so well advertised by supporters of that toxin traffic. In reality it is infinitesimal compared with what previously cursed the country.

The first great fact that strikes any rational human being with a soul all along this crowded cradle of humanity is the extraordinary depth to which already Christian missionaries have dug themselves into the hearts of the Chinese. It is to some extent true that a so-called anti-Christian, really a Bolshevik and anti-foreign movement, is going on—but in any case that could only mean that the power of Christianity really is being felt, and is an excellent proof of a fact which any man cannot help seeing, if he looks, and as the Scotch say, "uses his powers of observation." Still travelers easily miss the ways in which this is coming about, come to wrong conclusions about missions, and carry away wrong impressions altogether of their immense value in the struggle toward world peace. It is scarcely possible, however, to blame round-the-world trippers, who can barely be classed as travellers, as their time and opportunities available are so limited. Even those in business do not take time as a rule to make their own observations, and this has also been one's experience of many even in political life. Thus we have just been showing a merchant of many years' standing in Hankow some industrial work which we bought in the native, non-treaty port of Wuchang—exactly across the Yangtze river from Hankow. "Beautiful," he said. "I shall order some at once—we really know nothing of what is going on around us." That particular industrial work happens to be part of the gospel of the University of Central China of the Episcopal Church Mis-

sion, established over fifty years ago in the middle of the Chinese city of Wuchang, on the edge of the Serpent Mountain. Its large campus runs out to the old city walls, that are still shut every night at seven o'clock—so tightly that even a European doctor on an emergency call from the great mission hospital has to get the Governor's permission to open the gates. Yet here, as in many another centre, is a most up-to-date method which, besides its other services, is used to help the students to get education and those other advantages that are the very essence of the message of human love that effectively reflects divine love. Many of the missions are already busy with industrial work, teaching women and helpless folk how to earn an independent living. At Pao-tingfu to-day a young man was run over, and the doctor who had to cut off both legs said, "If he gets well we shall expect to put him to work in a rug factory, where much of the work is done by legless men." Again in Anking we were shown a much more advanced plan. The work began with one or two poor women doing cross-stitch work. The money was loaned for a house to work in and more and more women were given occupation. Now ground, buildings of the most modern kind, and an extended plant yielding some \$35,000 Mexican per year has developed. Out of this a babies' crèche, an attending physician with a dispensary, a rest room and all kinds of social work are maintained. We visited another industrial work in Peking very similar to this. In Songdo, in Korea, is a very large and widely known cloth-weaving plant.

In how many and diverse ways Christianity is being inculcated, even in Central China, is shown by the fact that the last thing we did in Wuchang was to run down to see an Oxford University football player, who incidentally teaches science in Chinese to Chinese, refereeing at one of their football matches, which looked exactly like an English public school game. "The student governing body," he said with pride, "have passed a law for themselves that every boy in the school must possess a pair of shorts." I remembered what the Duke of Wellington said about the Battle of Waterloo being won on the playing fields of Eton. That sartorial detail alone is a crisis and a significant sign in a country where most young athletes still affect the incapacitating native petticoats. This man's cousin has been a captain of England in many international matches; and like many another missionary he himself is out here solely for that "joy of life," which in English means more and more the joy of answering a tough challenge to help out others, as against the old meaning of "joie de vivre" which was so often translated as a night in the "Quartier Latin" or something like what that is supposed to mean to youth. It so happened that my host on the staff of this great undiluted channel of affection was also a man of independent wealth. "We

take the mission salary and we live on that entirely, so as to make no difference whatever between us and anyone else," he said, "and in that way we can put our own money all into the work." I don't think another man in that mission even knows he has private means. But we happen to know the public utility which the family invented and manufactures. Lest this should be said to be a solitary couple of cases, I want to say it is nothing of the kind, for I alone know of many more. The fool of the family doesn't find a job on the mission staff for want of able workers nowadays, allowing he ever did. If any doctor thinks that is not correct let him try to get on the staff of "Yale in China" at Changsha, or the Peking Union Medical College or any other of the modern mission staffs, and see what he gets if he isn't a first-class professional man. In the last few years, three M.D.'s of London and Fellows of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, have laid down their lives for China from typhus alone.

What, however, surprised us perhaps most was that we couldn't get off at a city anywhere, however primeval looking or smelling, without finding a mission hospital, or school, or Christian effort of some sort sweetening the atmosphere. Don't let anyone at home worry about things they read in the papers *re* anti-Christian efforts. The men in the field are not a bit disturbed. No one knows better that God is on His Throne. Most of these reports are like those of Mark Twain's death, "greatly exaggerated." Anyhow, no one expects the way of the Cross—which by the bye is the way of *all* real evolution of every kind—to be wheeling a perambulator down the sidewalk any more than it was formerly, or will be in the future. The wagging of the devil's tail is the best sign manual of Christian activity—it won't hurt the real spiritual Church, of which George Adam Smith said, "There is no danger that it will be destroyed by being blown up, but only from being sat upon by endless numbers of indifferent nobodies." Moreover, the Chinese are a wiser race than many take them for—and their hearts are human and can tell the real thing from the false. Or, in other words, they know a good thing when they see it, as their attitude to missions has amply testified in the past. The Boxer outrage was an anti-Imperial political movement, cleverly switched by the reactionary Empress-Dowager into an anti-foreign and only so an anti-Christian one.

We dined one day in a Chinese city with a famous Christian Chinese doctor, Dean of the Faculty and Medical School of probably the largest single and best equipped settlement in Middle China, one of whose brothers was recently Prime Minister of China and another brother a member of the Cabinet. On the other hand, a *Christian* man is not just any man who is so labelled after having submitted to certain Christian ceremonies; and many an Indian

or Chinaman to-day who has not yet assumed the name has more of the spirit that was in Christ Jesus and follows more self-sacrificingly Him who does not ask for our recognition but our loyalty, than many who bear that proud title, and, while utterly unfamiliar with the deep facts around them, ever loudly proclaim they have "no use for foreign missions," as if man-made limitations or differences of longitude and latitude should bound the efficiency of the love of God.

If the number of sane rational centres of Healing, Learning, Industry and Charity, reflecting the spirit of love in China, strikes the careful observer most of all the sights along this great river, as well as elsewhere, I think the second fact is the happy nature and kindly sense of humour the Chinese people themselves display. For we Europeans make the silliest mistakes and repeatedly do things that seem to them the most absurd we could possibly invent. Take one out of a thousand. An ardent young bachelor missionary was invited to a tea-party given to a number of Europeans by Chinese students, the ladies having supplied the cakes and candies themselves. Generously the students voted to offer the surplus stock to him at the close of the party. He thanked them in his best Chinese, "Thank you, thank you, they are so dirty." The students kept saying, "They can't be. The foreign ladies have made them themselves." But he kept on bowing and saying, "they are so dirty." He thought he was saying "Thank you, thank you, thank you. I am unworthy. I am unworthy." Our personal experiences, fresh in our minds, make us feel that the Chinese are full of a happier nature than most men, or at least "purr" more readily and universally, a very valuable trait. The very tilt of their eyes makes their faces appear to us full of merriment.

Is there no danger to travellers in China from bandits? There is—and so there is in America. With the passing of the Empire and the translation into an attempted Republic, there was no hand big enough to cover the whole seething masses of China throughout its immense area. Many in different parts, therefore, tried to uphold authority, far too many. Banditti are largely the result of hunger. China is a rich country but undeveloped, and its easily gotten sources of revenue have been depleted, without any attempt at conservation, at least during the Chin and Ming dynasties, covering six hundred years. Nor did the Manchus do any re-afforestation, or extend the irrigation facilities. Men finding it hard work to live off the land, greatly subdivided according to the family system of China, are easily persuaded to put on soldiers' uniforms, become persons of position to the ordinary civilian, get privileges of free rides and opportunities of small "squeezes," besides being promised food, clothing and lodging, with \$7 a month in cash. The very circumstances that incline such men to

leave their farms are also some of the causes why the general in command of the locality cannot find money to pay his soldiers, who, having nothing to send their wives and families, then desert, and joining with others form roving bands of bandits. Most do not want to take life, but to get money and hold for ransom. Passenger cars belonging to an American ex-official ply between Kalgan and Urga. They have been held up occasionally and robbed but no one has been killed, and the drivers' property is generally respected. A personal acquaintance who was recently held up on the journey with seven other men showed the bandits, who were about 130 in number, that they were all well armed with repeating rifles, saying, "You have struck the wrong car this time." Whereupon they grinned, and let them go on. Another friend, missionary doctor, after journeying around Western China from Yunnan to Peking, quite recently ran into such a band near the end of his journey. They took all he had, broke up all they did not want and kept him for ransom, treating him however much better than the Soviet regulars on the borders of outer Mongolia treated another friend, whom they threw for three days into prison, giving him only a little black bread and hot water. The missionary doctor eventually escaped, the most of his troubles having been the incessant marching he had to do, as the brigands dared not remain in one place. So long as no strong hand is found to unify Chinese authority brigandage will always exist. Widespread poverty and misery must ever be a cause of lawlessness.

It is to be remembered that there are, besides educators, legislators, doctors and lawyers, many generals who are now outstanding Christian men, and who, like Marshal Feng, are literally doing all in their power to avert fighting and to induce new conditions that shall make civil war in China, or any other war, impossible. Some men are pessimists and say that "only when one general succeeds at last in beating all the rest, then we shall have peace again." The wiser, and I believe the larger number, however, say "each province will eventually rule itself and one day China will have a United States with its headquarters in Peking." The average man, however, is not worrying, even though really the country is being very seriously impoverished by the lack of stability. The Bolshevik element is a more serious menace. At present it is mainly among students. But the propaganda is very intensive, and at the end of his life it made an impression even on Dr. Sun Yat Sen. The Reds are, moreover, now sending forty Mongolian students to Moscow, and have actually full sway in outer Mongolia. The resistance to it is another indication of Chinese character. For there is no question that Chinese have much reason to complain of foreigners of sorts, and of imperialism that has been cruel, repressive and reactionary. Grin and bear it,

or keep smiling, is, so some think, too much a characteristic of the Chinese. It might well be said of China to-day that she doesn't yet know what she wants; but, unlike what was claimed for the Irish, she seems to the stranger too content without it, though she has sense to know that Bolshevism is no way out.

At Kiukiang to-day we heard that a professor at the college, who refused a holiday to his students in order to let them celebrate Dr. Sun's death, was locked up seven hours in a bitter cold class room, and much threatened, and a little knocked about. But the missionary was an ex-British naval officer, and though we did not see him after, we feel sure he is not squealing. A valuable experience he will find it, and less hard than many of his mates went through for no nobler a purpose a few years ago in the other great war. It may alter his views with regard to the education Chinese boys need, which is to our minds more inspiration than information. The poor coolies still stagger along under terrible burdens for the merest subsistence, and much in rags; there are endless rickshawmen, apparently perfectly contented; though their hard lot, in the north especially, can be guessed from the fact that three years ago in one night 163 perished in Hankow, because their miserable cotton garments failed to protect them against a sudden fall of temperature. As age comes on their earning capacity necessarily decreases, and many suffer from starvation in spite of their guild.

The pigtailed have mostly gone from the heads of Chinamen, but are only going slowly from their minds. The walls which obscure the light and air from people's houses, though originally put there to keep spirits from getting in, for the latter can't turn corners, are falling down nowadays; one seldom sees the scaffolding of a new house ornamented with branches at the top to make spirits, trying to get into the house, think it is a forest. Here, as in India, a new international language is springing up, because even when five generals came down to Shanghai to discuss a campaign they couldn't understand one another—the Cantonese and Pekingese dialects being as different almost as French and English. So one finds English here as in India and Palestine and Mesopotamia and Malaya springing up into general use for international service. One language will help every man to understand his neighbour better in the times to come, and then men will want less to heave half a brick at every stranger as being a "foreign devil." The rising tide of colour, the Armageddon of racial differences, are disturbing possibilities of course—but like the worst troubles the old warrior had in life most of them will never happen, if—if—if we ourselves all play the game. If we go on seeking our own welfare first, either as individuals or nations, if we care merely for animal pleasures, if we rely on diplomacy and force, if we are blind and

deaf and too dull to understand that the only way to a better world is for each man to get to work to make his corner better, then it will continue to be "the Devil take the hindmost," and the troubles we fear, but might help to avoid, will have to overtake the whole human race as well as China, before the universal kingdom of peace is possible. Deeds, not words, are the best philosophy. For much we hear and read under that guise anyhow has well been termed "foolosophy." Fifty years ago it was an "age of reason"—we knew it all. Darwin and Huxley and Spencer misinterpreted, and one or two shallow folks who were not misinterpreted told us that "beyond matter there was nothing"—now we think that the realest matter is immaterial. Once an Italian started the idea that he was infallible, and England had as a consequence for centuries as watchword, "to Hell with the Pope." Nowadays, there are too many people calling themselves Christ's followers and thinking they are the only ones, who again "know it all," and don't mind what it costs even the Kingdom of Peace on Earth if they can persuade other people they are infallible. But in the Yangtze Valley and the mission field in China, one notices a wonderful absence of such jarring sounds, which when translated into action "puzzle a Chinaman" as much as they do the average Englishman or American. There is a beautiful unity, and a steadily growing one, between all the various workers who profess to possess the Spirit of their Master. If they are not uniting so much in the unimportant matter of what they individually believe, they are certainly in the all-important matter of what they do. And Union colleges, Union hospitals, Union churches, and other efforts are giving a new strength to the drive for "peace on earth" in all parts of China. Not least among these efforts is the perfectly splendid work of the Peking Medical College, which is definitely a Christian effort to make healing done in Christ's name the very highest type of medical and surgical work done anywhere in the world. This work is unique and so far-reaching that it deserves a whole article to itself.

We had nothing whatever but kindly courtesy from anyone, Chinese or foreigner. We enjoyed every moment from Shanghai to the great lake Tung King and back, and both body and mind and spirit returned feeling that those who can just now afford to live out here are to be envied for the great problems that challenge every human being—problems to make one realise that every moment of life on earth is unquestionably worth while, and in spite of all changes and chances eminently satisfying.

WILFRED T. GRENFELL.

April, 1925.

GIACOMO BONI: POET OF ARCHÆOLOGY.

"There is no other Creator but God and the Poet."—Torquato Tasso.

HAD Giacomo Boni been a contemporary of Carlyle, is there not some probability that the writer of "Heroes and Hero Worship" might have added to his six portraits of typical heroes a seventh on *The Hero as Archæologist*? How graphically and forcibly would he then have portrayed Boni's deep and subtle sense of mystery, as expressed by his head bowed low before men's "footprints in the sands of time," in adoration of the infinity of time, to him a manifestation of Divinity, as is to the astronomer the infinity of space; his keen artistic capacity for creating out of his inner vision and hidden life the object which was to spring into existence and stand in the light on the background of the Roman Forum and the blue sky; his exuberant, passionate curiosity; his easy power of "high talk with the departed dead," the ancient Greeks and Romans, whose voices actually whispered in his ears, suggesting, leading, interpreting; nay, the reincarnation through him, as through a "medium," not merely of the old Romans and Italic aborigines, but of the spirit of the past, of the very soul of Latinism.

Certain it is that the possibility of Giacomo Boni as a type was seized upon not only by Thomas Nelson Page, the late United States Ambassador to Italy, in his *Roman Souvenirs*, but chiefly by Anatole France, who immortalised in his *Sur la Pierre Blanche* this seer and prophet of the past, this poet and philosopher, "avec son aménité silencieuse, avec ses yeux clairs et changeants, avec ses gestes respectueux et presque rituels, se plaisant à parler comme les anciens;" this "astronomer of the earth," who—in Boni's own words—"knew how to read such pages of history hidden in the inner strata of the underground as deserve to be immortalised;" who used "to see first by the X-rays of the mind what is afterwards brought to light." And certain it is that now that Giacomo Boni's bewitching blue eyes are no more gazing at far distant visions, and the early history of Rome has lost its interpreter and reviver, "there hath passed away a glory from the earth."

* * * * *

Giacomo Boni, like most of the famous old "Romans," was not born in Rome; he was a child of the Queen of the Laguna, where he was born on April 25th, 1859, of a family of seamen. By birth and temperament a poet, the enchantment of the stones of Venice and the religion of antiquity led him, after a course at the Academy of Fine Arts and the degree of civil engineer, to become

the poet of the stones; and his first poem was sung in honour of the stones of the city which owes her existence "rather to the rod of the enchanter than to the fear of the fugitive." The author of *The Stones of Venice* met the enthusiastic poet of stones, who in his twentieth year had translated *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, and was perfectly acquainted with the English language and literature, while the latter was occupied in the restoration of Santa Maria dei Miracoli, after having worked at the Doges' Palace and at the foundations of San Marco's belfry.

Boni grasped at once the idealistic force of Ruskin's æsthetics and his social gospel, "There is no wealth but life"; "we have not been sent into this world to do anything into which we cannot put our hearts." Boni felt this with every fibre of his soul, and became the spiritual disciple of Ruskin, who made use of his exceptional abilities, especially in the work of interpreting the laws of eurythmy, which rule the mediæval buildings of Venice, Verona, and Pisa. It was in the Duomo of Pisa that Boni, then in his twenty-fifth year, asked Ruskin whether of all beautiful things on earth, on the ocean, and in the sky, the most beautiful was not a fine action. One's mind runs to another question, asked by a great young poet, on the eve of his drowning in the Gulf of Spezia some sixty years before, in the same cathedral of another friend: whether a true religion might not be founded, whose basis should be not faith, but love. About this time are dated Boni's *Studies on Venice*, a volume on Westminster Abbey, and the beginning of his work as inspector of monuments of Greek, Roman, and Norman art in the south of Italy. Then the powerful, alluring voice of Rome took hold of his imagination, and in 1888 we find him settled in the Eternal City, which was to be for almost forty years the field of his battles and victories.

When Boni was first appointed by Guido Baccelli (then Minister of Public Instruction) Commissioner for Roman Monuments and then Inspector of the Foro, the Roman Forum and the Palatine Hill, cradle and centre of Rome and Roman Empire, were no more "the grave and the wilderness" nor the "chaos of ruins," that Shelley and Byron had seen and mourned; nor would it have been fair to repeat with the latter: "All that Learning reap'd from her research hath been, that these are walls." After the systematic scientific explorations by Fea, Canina, and since 1870 by Rosa, Fiorelli, Lanciani, Gatti, the Roman Forum had already been unearthed to a large extent, so as to reveal the remains of most of the buildings of the Imperial era; while on the Palatine Hill the excavations were still in a backward stage. But now a period of slackness had succeeded the former fervour, as official science had declared that, the topography of the Roman Forum

being now firmly established, there was no room left for further activity.

Giacomo Boni appeared at this critical moment. His accurate examination and intuitive "feeling" convinced him that the ploughing of that sacred soil had been but shallow, and that deeper strata were just awaiting the pick of an archæologist daring enough to violate the official "tabù," to yield up their most sacred secrets. But despairing of overcoming the strong opposition to his "digging mania," Boni went round the difficulty, and simply proposed to restore two or three monuments, fragments of which lay scattered through the Forum. He wanted to oppose argument by experiment, guided by the inner light of intuition and prophecy and strengthened by criticism.

The permission being granted, Boni took advantage of his chance. "Living in the Forum," he wrote to Ruskin, "there was born within me a close intimacy with those stones which had appeared at first sight mute and indifferent; and, moved by force unknown before, I set out on my journey." His life's adventure had begun.

* * * * *

Here, in a few words, is the secret of Boni's divination:

The darkness which time gathers upon the memories of the past, grows more and more thick and impervious in proportion as one presumes to enlighten them at once by the artificial light of one's knowledge. . . . While he who approaches the unknown in all humility, searching for truth and not for a confirmation of his own forecasts, living in an unknown *milieu*, gets accustomed, little by little, to penumbra, pierces through it, discerns and touches with his own hands, never tires of gathering positive data and elements for criticism, feeds with them his own brain which will spontaneously elaborate them and yield, perchance, the instinctive solution of a problem, or point out where to carry out a thorough exploration to resolve it.

As befitted a priest of Nature, Boni used to meet the rising sun at the entrance of the Forum, when a restlessness and a fever for exploration took hold of him. He made his digging collaborators first acquainted with his plan, and inflamed them with his contagious fervour; and they keenly felt the dignity of their work. 'I saw them,' so is Boni made to speak of his workmen in *Sur la Pierre Blanche*, "pale with enthusiasm when they had uncovered the 'tomb of Romulus.' I am their daily companion. If one of them falls ill, I go and sit by his bedside. I trust them just as they trust me; that is why I have loyal workmen."

I remember myself, in 1901, arriving in the Forum early one spring morning with a party of students, just at the moment when one of the workmen had exposed among the ruins the inscription, which

I was then able to read first after Boni himself : *Sancta Maria quae vocatur Antiqua*. It concluded a long controversy among leading archæologists, and opened up a series of marvellous discoveries, to which reference will be made later. Boni was too much "hidden in the light of thought" to offer replies except by gestures, to our fond questions—his rôle seemed confined to that of a prompter from behind the scene; and the task fell upon his workmen in the forefront to explain and to illustrate what "they" had discovered. I remember one of them offering me his apologies for having, by a wrong stroke of the pick, all but beheaded a fresco of Mary of the eighth century A.D.

* * * * *

I must, of necessity, confine myself here to a very summary sketch of a wonderful series of discoveries, spreading over a period of thirty-five years. While carrying on the restoration of the famous house of the Vestal Virgins—and all visitors know with what touch of gentle intimacy he restored this gem of the Forum, even to the replacing of water in the basins and of flowers in the flower-beds, to make a home for the haunting shadows—he conducted with a party of his workmen some tentative excavations here and there, and one day he succeeded in bringing to light before the Arch of Septimius Severus, in the middle of the area of the Comitia, the ruins of a most archaic monument, which to the Romans of the Empire themselves was already surrounded by legend and mystery, and was believed to be the Tomb of Romulus, the founder of the town; and which, from the square slab of black marble, marking in Julius Cæsar's restoration of the Forum the ruins of that most sacred monument, had been called *Lapis Niger*, the "Black Stone." This discovery, in 1899, was to be the beginning of Boni's popular fame.

The conflicting host of hypotheses which now rose from all the fields of archæology, of glossology and history, to contend for more than ten years, without arriving as yet at an agreement as to the real destination of the ruined tomb (which had evidently been sacked and devastated probably in the fourth century B.C.) and as to the real meaning of the mutilated archaic inscription, certainly the oldest one written in Latin, which very likely contained a *lex sacra*, left Giacomo Boni none the less perfectly calm and satisfied. The discovery witnessed to the early existence—in spite of the adverse hypercriticism of German archæologists—of a Roman history and civilisation at least in the fifth century B.C.; and it restored credit to the narrative of Titus Livius of the burning and sack of Rome by the Gauls at the beginning of the fourth century B.C. But the critics of Boni's method did not surrender their arms, and accounted for this success merely as good luck. Boni's reply was

to propose a thorough excavation on a "given theme," to be carried out under the heap of ruins at the point where the Forum and Palatine meet, over which stood the mediæval church of Santa Maria Liberatrice. A series of famous discoveries followed as soon as the pick of the magician had touched the charmed spot. First the "Lacus Juturnæ," with fragments of the horses of Castor and Pollux, and a sacred well, came to light. Then the Oratory dedicated to the forty Christian martyrs from Sebaste (eighth century A.D.) and other Christian souvenirs were discovered; and then that marvellous complex of buildings and halls and chapels, their walls and ceilings covered with as many as four layers of frescoes (seventh to eighth centuries A.D.) was revealed, witnessing to the transformation, in the fourth to fifth centuries A.D., of an Imperial building into a Christian Church (the first in the Forum) dedicated to Mary—as a counterpart to the temple of Vesta close by.

The history of Roman, Byzantine, and primitive Italian painting received a sudden illumination; and the relation between the Papacy and Byzantine Emperors also. The first outcry of wonder and admiration was followed by years of study and discussion. Partial discoveries or substantial illustrations followed, of the Temple of Castor and Pollux, the *Regia*—the residence of the *Pontifex Maximus*—the *Heróon* of Julius Cæsar, the *Comitia* or place for popular assemblies of the Republican period, the *Rostra* or platform for public speaking in Julius Cæsar's period, the *favissæ*, with underground passages, the primitive pavement of the *Sacra Via*; and other monuments. The eyes of the cultured world were turned towards the magician, wondering what else was coming to life under his enchanter's wand. "Not satisfied with uncovering the monuments of Emperors of the Republican era and of the Kings," Joseph Leclerc, a character in *Sur la Pierre Blanche*, is thus made to address Giacomo Boni: "You are now digging into such strata as produced a flora and a fauna which have long since disappeared; you are digging on into strata belonging to the quaternary period; . . . from Latin archæology you are passing to prehistoric archæology and to palæontology." The expectation of the world was not to be frustrated in the year 1902.

* * * * *

Boni had for long been obsessed with the idea that the cemetery of the primitive inhabitants of the Palatine Hill and of the Sabines of the Quirinal was to be found in the upper part of the Forum, that is, in the dry edge commanding the marshy valley; and he had clearly divined and openly foretold its location between the *Basilica Maxentii* and the *Basilica Aemilia*. Never was a scientific

induction more clearly propounded nor more sceptically received. Never was a discovery greeted with greater enthusiasm and higher cries of admiration, than those felt and uttered by the spell-bound world before the *Sepulcretum*, or archaic necropolis of the ninth to eighth centuries B.C., prior to the traditional date of the foundation of Rome. The numerous tombs of circular shape, both for inhumation and cremation, and the rich harvest of utensils dating back to the first Iron Age, furnished the definitive triumphal reply of the Italian archæologist to Mommsen and his school and marked the breaking of a servile monopoly. The *Antiquarium Forense*, the museum of excavations and of the plans of monuments, the Photographic Museum of Roman Antiquities, the museum of marbles of ancient Italian quarries, all founded by Boni, now accommodated the treasures the Roman soil had yielded, and preserved the record of the epic struggle.

It was while Boni was measuring the skulls of those ancient forefathers of Rome, and confronting them with an Egyptian skull in bronze, that Anatole France makes him thus address the boy who had been the owner of the skull he held reverently in his hands:

"Petit enfant qui dors depuis les jours du Dieu Quirinus, un empire a passé sur ton cercueil agreste, et les mêmes astres qui brillaient sur la naissance vont s'allumer tout à l'heure sur nos têtes. L'insondable espace qui sépare tes heures des nôtres n'est qu'un moment imperceptible dans la vie de l'univers."

The Forum became now the object of pilgrimage for cultivated people of all nations. Emperors, kings and queens, statesmen, church dignitaries, historians, scientists, men of letters—from King Victor Emanuel II of Italy to Edward VII and George V of England; from Loubet, Roosevelt, Wilson, to Lord Kitchener; from Prince Hiroito of Japan to Gorki. All visitors were captivated by the marvellous simplicity of intuition of the genius who had presided over the excavations, by the power of insight which had made classical writers, inscriptions, medals, fragments, traces and vestiges, speak and yield up their secrets. Honours upon honours were conferred on Boni by various sovereigns and Academies; he was made doctor by Oxford and Cambridge Universities and appointed Italian Senator.

But now the heavy task fell upon him of undertaking the direction of the excavations on the Palatine Hill, the cradle of Rome, the residential quarter of noble Roman families in the later Republican period, and the Imperial residence, especially in the first two centuries of the Christian era. New laurels were awaiting him on the summit of the sacred hill of Pales. I will mention only his research of the remains of the walls of the *urbs quadrata*,

the primitive square town; his discoveries of Republican houses under the Palace of the Flavian Emperors, still preserving their bright coloured frescoes and traces of marble floors; the light cast by him on that complex of very archaic monuments, mostly in tufa, discovered in 1907 before the *Templum Magnæ Matris*, and on the remains of the *Casa Romuli* at the top of the *Scala Caci*. All remember the outburst of intense curiosity and expectation when it was announced that the excavations under the peristyle of the Flavian Palace had revealed a very ancient vaulted structure of squared tufa, with a pit in the middle leading to a gallery, which was at first identified by Boni with the *Mundus*, or central shrine of the primitive town, and which is, in any case, generally considered one of the most venerable monuments of the early town, probably a *silo* for storing corn.

It was on this occasion that I, then in London, having been asked by English friends to read a paper on the recent discoveries on the Palatine, went to Rome, and on introduction by my formerly esteemed teacher and Boni's predecessor in the direction of Palatine excavations, Giuseppe Gatti, climbed the sacred hill one May morning in 1914, to interview Giacomo Boni. I was told he would probably be found in the *Viridarium*, the old imperial flower garden into which he was now collecting all the flower-plants mentioned by classical Roman writers. On reaching the *Viridarium*, I saw three workmen bending over flower-beds, dressing plants, and on my asking one of them where the Director could be found, "Here I am," replied one of the gardeners, dressed in plain, rough clothes, with a large straw gardener's hat on his head; and on being acquainted with my purpose on coming from England, "Do you really want to lecture there on the Palatine?" he asked. "Well, let us go for a walk." He took me first for a brief visit to his latest discoveries of the Republican houses underlying the *Domus Augustanæ*, and then the subject which had lately taken hold of his imagination seized him entirely. We visited the *Viridarium*, looking towards the Capitol, the nursery garden of laurels, cypresses, myrtle and pine trees, his plantations of violets at the foot of ancient walls, of red and white roses around the *piscinæ*, of a great variety of roses, lilies, and other classical flowers before the temples and in the house of the Vestal Virgins; and the clumps of cythus everywhere among the ruins, with their gold flowers. In the meantime, he was explaining by abrupt sentences, and as talking to himself, his plan for restoring Latin consciousness through the tangible evocation of the ancient Roman life and spirit. The Palatine and Forum were not merely palimpsests on which to read the past history of Rome: they were a living much-needed lesson of the early simplicity of life of our

Roman ancestors and of the fate that befell their degenerate descendants; of the necessity of going back to direct contact with nature, by return to agriculture and the simple life, if Italy was to get a fresh source of inspiration, to be saved morally and economically, and to proceed with newly gathered force to her destiny.

* * * * *

And now, at the evocation of my Virgil, not only did the Forum and Palatine, which lay under my eyes, appear to me an immense temple, the meeting-place of gods and heroes, but from every corner and every ruin, by the voice of thousands of plants and millions of flowers, a hymn rose high towards the blue sky, mingling—as the midday bells rang from the towers of all the Christian churches which through centuries have besieged the Forum—with their vibrations of *Sursum Corda* and their cries of joy and sorrow and hope. And I could hardly perceive, in my emotion, Boni's last words which are still ringing in my ears, "The lesson of Roman civilisation which, after all, is still our own."

Boni's wonderful activity in the ensuing years of the war period, and later, when he turned all his fervour, multiplied a hundred-fold, towards devising practical forms of assistance for soldiers and the civil population—resulting in the first serious breakdown of his health—and towards the moral and social education of the people and the intensification of human brotherhood, were to show me how marvellously, in Boni's *forma mentis*, pagan naturalism and Christian humanitarianism blended in a perfect unity. Afforestation, suppression of malaria, the best utilisation of water-motor power, the increased use of chemical manures, the extension of corn-growing, the substitution of grape-juice free from alcohol for wine; represent some of the battles he fought in his later years, though his health was impaired by partial paralysis; but he was still carrying on his plans for further discovery and for the restoration of the *Curia Senatus*, the *Circus Maximus*, and the *Lupercal* on the Palatine.

Death overtook him actually fighting in the advanced lines; he was, in fact, the victim of an excess of fatigue in a tour of five weeks through the Marche, which he undertook to study and promote the intensification of corn culture, and which resulted in a great, though final triumph. His last letter, dated the beginning of July, to a devoted friend and collaborator, is a document eloquent of the versatility of his genius, the catholicity of his interests, the happy combination of the ideal and practical elements in his spirit. Archæological, artistic, historical, agricultural, hygienic, cultural interests, appear mixed and interwoven in it in an atmosphere of noble idealism. One of his last thoughts was again for "the preservation of fruit in pure grape-juice" and

for the condensation of "the grape-juice in such a way as to preserve unaltered all its flavour . . . to great advantage for taste and also for exportation."

It was his burning interest in the production of grape-juice free from alcohol, and his high praise of Da Ponte sparkling wine without alcohol, in articles in the *Nuova Antologia*, 1921, that drew the interest and support of the present writer to the subject.

* * * * *

It was at the foot of a mutilated statue of Victory, all dash and flight, recently discovered by Boni among the ruins of the mediæval tower of Frangipani on the Palatine, that he fell. On the morning of Friday, July 10th, his great spirit passed on to the Kingdom where the great dead live who never died. The funeral of Giacomo Boni was solemn, austere, a silent apotheosis of a Roman hero, nay, of a saint. People knelt while the coffin passed them on the last journey to the summit of the Palatine, where the poet and priest of archæology now sleeps under the tall palm-tree overlooking the *Foro*, the first to be buried on the Palatine Hill since the origin of the village of Pales—the first, and in all probability the last.

"Sit tibi terra levis." "In hac luce vives."

The Roman Forum and the Palatine, still watched by his tomb, having lost their prophet and interpreter and priest, have henceforth acquired instead a "genius of the place": *Genius Loci—Numen Indiges*.

GIOVANNI PIOLI.

PEACE AND THE "STATUS QUO."

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.

THE "Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes" voted by the Fifth Assembly has raised in an acute form a question implicit in the constitution of the League and indeed inevitable in any attempt to organise the world for peace. The problem is how to reconcile order with the need for change. So long as "private" war existed, States with a grievance against the existing order might hope to redress it by war or threats of war. Under the Covenant, however, only a very small loophole has been left for war, and that hole is stopped in the Protocol. The question then is how international changes can be accomplished when war as an agency is banned.

Before attempting an answer, we must examine the problem in the concrete, try, that is, to establish what are the chief changes "trying to happen" so to speak, and what is the position of the British Commonwealth as regards these potential changes:

Emigration and Oriental Nationalism. There are two big, mainly extra-European forces working against the *status quo*, namely (1) the desire of Italy and Japan for an outlet for their surplus population, and (2) the rise of nationalism in the Near, Middle and Far East. The only procedure so far suggested to deal with the former is the so-called "Japanese Amendment" in the Protocol, and even this has awakened grave misgivings both at home and in the Dominions, although it amounts to nothing more than a re-affirmation of the existing duties of the Council and Assembly under Article XI of the Covenant. As regards the second case, it is obviously impossible to invent any procedure or formula for such a vast and complex process as the awakening of Asia and the desire of her peoples to win independence and equality with the West. It is, however, to be hoped that the League, particularly after it includes Germany and has established working relations with Russia and the United States, may prove a useful instrument for reconciling national independence with international exigencies. Experience with "A" Mandates and League Commissions in Austria and Hungary, as well as financial and technical advisers in various countries, may afford useful hints in this connection. But it is obvious that although willing to treat the case for change under these two heads in a fair and even generous spirit whenever it comes up as a specific issue, the British Commonwealth, on the whole, must be on the *status quo* side and could not afford to agree to any drastic procedure for facilitating change.

Revision of Treaties. In Europe, however, the position is apparently different. Here the main force making for change is the

dissatisfaction of the ex-enemy Powers and Russia with the treaties imposed upon them as a result of the war. Important sections of public opinion in Great Britain sympathise with their attitude and demand the immediate invention of procedure for the revision of treaties. Exactly what this procedure should be is not specified, but judging by the fervour of its champions in the Press and the importance they attach to the idea, it should be no less drastic than that proposed by the German Government in its Note on the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance:

"Side by side with the Court of International Justice for purely legal disputes, create a Court of Arbitration for political conflicts and endow it with every guarantee for the juridical independence of its members. Decree compulsory adherence thereto as well as to the Permanent Court of International Justice. . . . Finally, see to it that the justified wishes of the population for an adjustment of frontiers be met by means of properly regulated legal procedure."

But difficulties begin to appear the moment the matter is studied more closely. In the first place, France, Belgium and the new States, while expressing willingness to show themselves conciliatory and do their utmost to remove any specific economic or national grievances arising out of the Peace Treaties, declare with the greatest emphasis that the only revision of treaties they will contemplate is revision by agreement between the signatories. Moreover, they go on to remark pertinently, any argument for changing the *status quo* by revising treaties applies with equal force to overriding the plea of "domestic jurisdiction." We are therefore thrown back on the "Japanese amendment," and as we cannot accept any drastic suggestions on this head are crippled in our advocacy of procedure for revising treaties—quite apart from the fact that such procedure, if once set up, would, of course, be available also for, e.g., Germany to reclaim her Colonies, or Spain to ask for Gibraltar, or Greece for Cyprus, or Turkey for Palestine and Mesopotamia, or Egypt (if and when she enters the League) for the Sudan and the Suez Canal.

Hence there is small immediate prospect of anything being done as regards procedure for revision of treaties, and no chance of the British Empire being able to sanction anything drastic in this respect. All that can be hoped for perhaps is some method of enabling public opinion to be focussed on such questions by empowering the Council and Assembly and the Arbitration Commissions provided for in the Protocol, to discuss matters connected with the revision of treaties. To do this would merely require interpretative resolutions by the Assembly to the effect that under Articles XI and XV of the Covenant, the Council could discuss a menace to peace arising out of a treaty question just as it could discuss a similar situation arising out of "domestic jurisdiction,"

and that the Assembly, when advising reconsideration of treaties under Article XIX of the Covenant, should do so by the same procedure as when giving an award in a dispute under Article XV, paragraph 10, of the Covenant, namely, by a vote of the Members of the Council and a majority of the Assembly, excluding the parties to the dispute.

In addition, the Jurists' Committee which is to consider the possibility of developing international law through the League might be entrusted with the task of studying the whole question of facilities for periodic reconsideration of treaties at the request of a certain proportion of the signatories, or some similar method for meeting the *status quo* difficulty. But is this all that can be done to meet the urgent need for change in a rapidly changing world? If so, the prospects for lasting peace would be bleak indeed. But it is not all—there are tremendous social and economic forces at work, and we may well find the *status quo* in Europe changing more rapidly in the next few years than anyone could have believed possible before the war. It is too often forgotten that the "Holy Alliance," the classic instance of an attempt to stereotype the *status quo*, was founded not primarily to keep frontiers intact but to suppress revolution and uphold the principle of autocracy. It is reactionary and militarist political systems within States that maintain the *status quo*, rather than the absence of machinery for compulsorily changing frontiers between States.

THE SITUATION IN EUROPE.

Political Democracy. The outstanding facts in all Europe East of the Rhine are the advanced democratic constitutions left by the war. Germany and most countries* to the east and south of her are now republics with proportional representation, full manhood and womanhood suffrage, practically single chamber legislatures, and presidents that are hardly more than figureheads. In most of these countries there has been something like an agrarian revolution—the rise to power of the peasantry is already or is fast becoming the basis of the internal politics of all East Europe. Democracy and the rise of the peasantry do not necessarily mean good government or enlightened wisdom. But they do mean that no large section of the community can for long remain acutely discontented—its grievances have too much voting value to be left to blush unseen. This fact has a direct bearing on the question of minorities. They further mean pre-occupation with internal problems and unwillingness to stand more in the way of taxes and military service than is absolutely essential. They mean a willingness to experiment and learn, anxiety to understand and be

* The exceptions are Italy, Hungary and Russia, and the present régime in all three is even in the eyes of its supporters a mere transition stage.

understood, a spirit of reconstruction and hope. Sensitiveness to public opinion is heightened by the fact that the new States want credits and are anxious to attract foreign capital, and that they look up to France and Great Britain as their liberators, and as not only the strongest Powers in Europe but the embodiment of that Western culture with which they are determined to identify themselves. When we talk glibly about a Balkanised Europe, we are apt to forget that it is also a democratised Europe, that the position has changed enormously in the last five years and is still changing, that it may develop either towards peace or war, and that not only the present state but the future evolution of East Europe depends to a high degree upon the policy of Great Britain and France.

Military Facts. What are the chief influences at work? There is, first of all, one gross fact, namely, that the new States have all set up efficient armies, largely equipped and trained by France, and are for the most part in close relation with each other and with France. As the ex-enemy Powers are disarmed, Russia disorganised and full of her own troubles for a long time, and the whole world exhausted and sick of war, it is almost physically impossible for war to break out in this part of the world for some years. It is always just after a great war that the next war seems most probable, and in fact is most unlikely.

The New States and the League. All these factors, however, while giving something like certainty of some five to ten years' time for experiment, do not afford any guarantee of lasting peace. But there are permanent influences. The first of these is the existence of the League itself. The League is becoming an ever bigger reality in East Europe, and the new States are more and more reckoning with it in the conduct of their foreign policy. The presence of the French and British Prime Ministers at the Fifth Assembly and the drafting of the Protocol gave a big impetus to this movement. In general the League is the basis for the foreign policy of moderate and left groups in East Europe and is opposed by the nationalists. The abandonment of the Protocol without any constructive alternative based on the League would mean a triumph for nationalism and militarism throughout East Europe.

Poland. It is unfortunate that current impressions of Poland are from two to five years out of date, for that country has turned over a new leaf and begun to set her house in order during the last year and a half with truly formidable energy. She has stabilised her currency, balanced her Budget, funded her debts to the United States (on the same terms as the British Debt) and Great Britain, raised 400 million lire in Italy and 50 million

dollars in the U.S.A., and is now very resolutely taking in hand the question of national minorities and agrarian reform. For this purpose M. Thugutt, the former leader of the Radical Peasant Party, has been brought into the Cabinet, and anyone who has the privilege of his acquaintance knows his determination to solve the question of national minorities by a policy of generous and wise concessions, including autonomy, land reform, good administration and law courts, material help in reconstruction, and liberal language and school laws. As for the Foreign Minister, his speeches in defence of the Protocol have been characterised by true understanding of the League and what a League policy implies. Poland's foreign policy is now definitely pacific and constructive—in spite of temperamental relapses such as, e.g., the Danzig imbroglio. The change of outlook in Poland has passed almost unnoticed in England, but is nevertheless great and the more remarkable since the present Sejm was elected when Poland was still under the influence of the "war mind." A great improvement is hoped of the new Sejm, which is to be elected in about eighteen months.

The Baltic States. Latvia and Esthonia have concluded a customs union and a standing alliance with each other and are working to include Lithuania. All these States have balanced budgets and stable currencies. They have special clauses in their commercial agreements reserving the right to go beyond the most-favoured-nation clause with their neighbours, and this is done with a view to an eventual customs union with Poland or Russia or both. The Baltic States have no illusions as to their position and are resolutely pacific. They want to form themselves into a confederation of five millions, which should serve as a bridge between Russia and the West. Already they have transit and harbour treaties with Russia assuring that country the fullest and freest access to the sea.

Russia. Meanwhile the Communist dictatorship in Russia has at last come face to face with the necessity, since stabilising the currency, of balancing its budget, and to do so must tax the peasants, which again (since force for this purpose has been tried and failed) means necessarily making concessions. The peasants, on the other hand, as a result of the tremendous events of the last few years, are at last being roused from their torpor. At the same time the policy of encouraging nationalism among all the races and tribes composing Russia, which was started for propaganda purposes, is taking on a certain momentum of its own and tending to go beyond what the Bolsheviks intended or wish. Federalism may yet become a reality. Russia will be absorbed with her own internal problems and adjustments for a long period

of years, and will badly need the help of the West. The Bolsheviks may foment revolutionary troubles among their neighbours, but Russia will not—because she cannot—embark on a large-scale war for some years.

Germany. So soon as Germany enters the League Council, political questions in East Europe will assume great importance—particularly if Poland at the same time takes Belgium's place as a temporary member.* Germany will be in an exceedingly strong position, owing to the economic dependence on her of many of the new States (nearly 50 per cent. of Polish exports and imports are with Germany) and to the Minorities Treaties. She will hardly be able to ask for revision of treaties on general grounds, but wherever she has a specific grievance, such as transit difficulties caused by the Polish corridor, or economic difficulties in the Polish part of Upper Silesia (whose population it must be remembered contains 60 per cent. of Poles), she will be in a strong position for obtaining redress, particularly since France is now working for a *rapprochement* with Germany and so would be anxious to exercise a moderating and mediatorial influence—and in this no doubt would be seconded by Great Britain, Italy and most of the other Members of the League.

The Danube States. Germany could ask the Council to authorise Austria to vote for union with her. If the Czechs were anxious to avoid this, they could do so only by offering Austria counter-inducements in the shape of economic concessions. In any case Czechoslovakia is bound to be sensitive to Germany because of the large and powerful German minority within her frontiers and her economic dependence on Germany. Indeed, it is freely predicted that Germany's entry into the League would mean the fairly rapid conversion of Czechoslovakia to a policy of friendship with Germany. In any event the coalition of five Czech parties that at present governs the country is not expected to have a clear majority after the election this year, thus making co-operation with the German minority or the Slovak autonomists compulsory. And there has been a good deal of talk in Czechoslovakia lately about the necessity of economic *rapprochement* with the Secession States or, perhaps, even something like a Danubian economic federation as the only way of meeting competition from Germany when that country begins to recover as a result of the Dawes Settlement. The growing necessity for an economic corollary to the League financial settlement in Austria is another factor working in the same direction.

International Finance. It is at this point that a new factor has

* Poland's candidature will almost certainly be put forward next September, and considering the size of the country (27½ millions) and its key-position in Europe, will have to be reckoned with seriously.

to be considered—the power of international finance. It is a truism that the Dawes Report was the result of the bankers' victory over the politicians. It will sooner or later be followed up by a Franco-German economic *rapprochement* on the basis of steel and coal, with effects on Franco-German policy and influence in East Europe that are too obvious to need emphasis (Polish and German Upper Silesia would both, for instance, be included in the international coal and steel combine). But the new States, too, want foreign loans, and Czechoslovakia, indeed, has been trying to raise one lately. The result was some very strong remarks in the *Times*' "City Notes" of November 19th, in which Czechoslovakia was told that her prosperity depended on that of her neighbours, and that unless she gave up her Protectionism and agreed to "some measure of economic co-operation leading ultimately in the direction of free economic unity" with the latter, she would not get any loans, for her economic prospects would not be considered sufficiently stable and favourable. Something of the sort, although not nearly so strong, was said when Czechoslovakia showed a disposition to obstruct the Hungarian loan settlement, and had the desired effect.

Economic Interdependence. Apart from international finance, the effects of economic interdependence are making themselves felt. Thus through the League a number of railway, waterway and port conventions are being concluded, which are certainly the beginning of big developments. It would be Utopian to-day to talk of the various European railway systems being linked up in a universal transport union under the League, but it would take a bold man to deny the possibility of some such development in the next ten or twenty years. Then, again, a conference on customs formalities—a purely technical affair—was held by the League and gave birth to a convention, and a conference is now being planned for the removal of import and export restrictions and prohibitions—which is clearly a matter of tariff policy. It is, of course, open to any Member of the League to press for still further advance along these lines. The idea of a European Customs Union is not yet practical politics, but it is in the air. The Austrian, Hungarian and Greek loan settlements, the Danzig loan and the help given to Esthonia, are all further examples of "applied internationalism" in the financial field.

National Minorities. The second great factor at work in the new Europe is the so-called National Minorities, of whom there are altogether some forty millions. By the Minorities Treaties citizens of the new States that are ethnically different from the majority have certain cultural and religious rights guaranteed by treaties, including the right of appeal to the League, where their

case may be taken up by a Member of the Council. The German Minorities (about eleven millions) have already become organised internationally, and there is a movement on foot for forming an international organisation of all the national minorities. The promoters of this movement say that they wish the minorities to take their stand on loyalty to the States of which they are citizens and to the League and the Minorities Treaty System, while working for an extension of their rights under the latter and a universalisation of the system. They claim furthermore that the "constitutional" parties among the national minorities are gradually gaining over the Irredentists, and beginning to deal more and more with realities, such as autonomy and full rights under the treaties. They argue that there is no possibility of drawing frontiers in Europe so as not to leave national minorities somewhere, and that the only way to solve the problem is by a policy of tolerance, autonomy, etc. The minorities, they say, have no interest in a fresh war, which would not solve their problem, but which would mean their being conscripted and made to fight in a cause for which they had no interest, and even against their own blood brothers. As every State has minorities belonging to its neighbours within its own frontiers, and minorities of its own nationality in the territories of its neighbours, without distinction as to political alignments during the war, an international minority movement of this sort will obviously cut many ways and constitute a very big factor in the life of Europe.

The Geneva Atmosphere. These three factors, economic and financial interdependence, national minorities and, behind all, the League, are having an incalculable influence on the democratic Europe that has arisen after the war. The "Geneva atmosphere"—the sense of being members of a great organisation whose aim is peace, the necessity of observing certain obligations, of working through international machinery and of meeting frequently in conferences—is an imponderable of the first magnitude. Its influence is cumulative, and will be enormously increased so soon as Germany is a Member of the League, something like the Protocol has been passed, and an Armaments Conference has been held. What lines development will follow is difficult to foretell. It depends to some extent upon our own policy. But it is at least probable that the tendency will be to accomplish necessary changes, not so much by altering frontiers as by "transnational" arrangements, cutting across frontiers and reducing the importance of frontiers. There is something anomalous in the idea of sovereign States freely shifting their boundaries at each other's expense. Change is more likely to come by emptying the word "sovereignty" of much of its contents. The very state of mind that leads a nation

to cling to its sovereignty will make it violently opposed to losing part of its territory—that is the last thing a State will consent to do. And changing a frontier is definite—you either shift it or you do not. There is no room for compromise. On the other hand, economic and minority arrangements between States, as well as policies of tolerance and autonomy within States, can come so gradually as not at any stage to be resented by public opinion in the countries concerned, although their cumulative effect may well be such as to cause consternation among all nationalists, could it but be foreseen. Something like this has happened with the League already—who could have believed ten years ago that what the League is to-day and may be to-morrow could have been possible in our generation? The world wags fast after the shock of the war.

In short, international change is probably going to take the form not so much of law-suits over frontiers, as of changes in the relations between States and of organisation within the State. These changes may, of course, eventually include revision of frontiers by agreement. But that is not practical politics to-day—although advisory procedure might well be set up in preparation for the day—whereas there is already a vast field for reconstruction and adjustment that can be tackled through the League and that opens up new avenues for further change in the future. Great Britain is in a strategic position for mobilising the forces of international finance and economic interdependence, thus incidentally developing our own markets and increasing our security.

ROTH WILLIAMS.

MONSIEUR OF FRANCE AND HIS TWO WIVES.

“Ce petit homme, avec longue perruque, et des rubans partout où il en pouvait mettre; plein de toutes sortes de parfum, et en toutes choses la propreté même.”

THUS appeared to contemporary eyes le petit Monsieur, only brother of Louis XIV, and one of the lesser lights of the great reign, whose two strangely contrasting marriages have left to posterity a couple of delightful character studies in the English woman and the German, who were both so striking at the conventional court of Versailles.

Education, since it first swayed human destiny, has sworn itself to many ends, yet surely none so strange as that of good Anne of Austria and the great Cardinal, of foisting femininity upon a male being. Their policy intended that this younger brother of the young king should never prove politically tiresome in the destiny of Europe's greatest monarch to be; if he viewed life through a woman's eyes, such a danger would be negligible. Therefore, entirely in agreement, the admirable couple worked together to an end proving completely successful, and Monsieur was launched on the world the strange little man whom Madame de la Fayette so aptly describes. “He was,” she says, “handsome, well made, but of a beauty and figure more fitting to a princess than a prince: likewise did he dream more of being admired of everybody than of contriving how he should himself be adored by women, though he was continually in their society. His *amour-propre* appeared to make him incapable of any attachment other than himself.” It was obvious that the reigning powers could be free of any dread of interference in matters of State from a man whose first care was his complexion. As good as a side-show at the Court must the little Monsieur have been with his freakish ways, his deep anxiety over his toilettes, his nightcaps with their brilliant ribbons; his passion for great occasions, necessitating gorgeous displays and deep ceremonial; his jewels, his abstention from hunting lest he should become sunburned.

There was a good downright lady who came as a royal *incognita* to visit at the Court of Versailles when Monsieur had been diverting the world for a good number of years. He had, in fact, by this time progressed as far as the possession of his second wife, of whom this lady was the aunt, Sophie of Hanover—well Germanised by now—and herself as curious as any of her adopted nation could be concerning the inner “holy of holies” of the great court. Sophie was very kindly disposed towards the little man about whom her niece had been writing such reams and such eulogies

ever since her marriage; and she in due course wrote home to Hanover, ". . . he behaved with me as if he had known me all his life . . ." and also—enthusiastically—" . . . he was a handsome prince, very well made, who had the manner of his rank . . ." and this shows which way the wind blew, for Sophie never spared her criticisms.

The two ladies whom Fate had destined to grace in turn the domestic hearth of Phillip d'Orléans might have stood for human poetry and prose—exquisite poetry and stormy prose; the lovely oval-faced daughter of Charles I, Henriette; of whose beauty and charm he very soon, in his unmasculine mind, grew desperately jealous; and the downright Liselotte with her predilection for smoked sausages, garnished with sauer-kraut and black puddings. Henriette, married at seventeen, seemed component of all the charm and all the brilliancy of her delightful family. Her life at the brilliant court of France opened like a flower in the triumphant first era of the great reign. In incessant and lovely variety the scenes through which she moved shift from *fête galante* to *bal masqué*; one reads with dazzled vision of unceasing spectacles of greatest beauty; "feux d'artifice, guirlandes de fleurs, et de chars allégoriques." The pale scent of daffodils in murmuring summer dusks; a white moon rising over the sumptuous shapes of great trees to look down on alfresco suppers; swaying out of the shadows the sweet strangled notes of violins; on the swards a moving pageant of lovely women and courtly men. And loveliest of all women there, sweetest and most gracious, the girl "beloved," as Bossuet said, "of two great kings."

Charles II, who committed some political errors for which posterity has never forgiven him, but who possessed a grasp of the exceedingly intricate policy of a difficult period, and who kept the ship of state at any rate from sinking—a fact also ignored very often by us of later generations—greatly loved this youngest sister, the "Minette" of his affectionate letters; Louis XIV never danced in another *bal masqué* after her tragic death. Henriette was very simple and unselfish, an unusually rare nature; but her beauty and her success were things past bearing for Monsieur who would have died to possess a meed of her popularity. He raged with jealousy, and descended to the meanest, most paltry ways with his beautiful wife. There was a certain disgraced bishop, one of Madame's very devoted servants, who risked all to venture to Paris at a time when she had great need of him; Francis Vernon, an attaché of the British Embassy in Paris at the time, has left on record an example of the way Monsieur would behave. This young man wrote home, November 29th, 1670, ". . . They say that Monsieur, in dressing himself before he went to Saint Germain, broke the

business to Madame and said, "Madame, ne savez vous pas que Monsieur l'évêque de Valence est à Paris?" She said she thought he would not be so indiscreet as to come contrary to the king's orders. So he combed his head, and a little while after said, "Oui Madame, il est vrai, il est à Paris; il est encore en prison!" Whereupon she expressed a passion, and said she "hoped they would consider his character and use him with respect."

Pettish and weak, and for ever surrounded by his favourites, whose influence over him made life a purgatory for both the Madames, Monsieur suffered perpetually from gusts of anger. He had a way at such times of sweeping off Henriette from Paris to punish her, and likewise to punish the Court which doted on her. On one occasion when exile seemed imminent she wrote, "Unless the king detains us by much affection and a little force, we go to-day to Villers Cotteret, to return I know not when!" Louis, who found himself almost invariably appealed to, handled these matrimonial differences with the tact which was his in greater matters, and was an excellent brother-in-law. When the second Madame came to fill the stage, there were worse storms than in Henriette's time. The king once said to Liselotte, "All that I can do without upsetting my brother to ease your worries, I will." And he kept his word.

To her mother, the widowed queen, Henriette was dearer than any of that bevy of lovely children who smile out at us from the big canvas in the National Portrait Gallery. This frail and lovely little girl was born at the tragic time when the great business of English Liberty rent husband and wife apart; she was a mere baby when English Liberty had demanded and gotten her father's head; so the queen spent all her powers upon the little girl's upbringing and education, and "ma petite princesse," as old Father Cyprian at Colombes called her in his loving old man's way, presently developed into the great lady with the brains of a politician who ran England's French policy for a time; in fact until her death put an end to matters. Here again Monsieur's jealousy was up in arms. It destroyed his peace of mind that Madame should thus play a part from which he himself was excluded, though the scandalous goings-on of his own little court were a byword and liberal proof of his incompetence. He became enmeshed by the greedy and vulgar intrigues of his favourites, and affairs reached a pitch at last which necessarily banished the chief offender, the impudent and shameless Duc de Lorraine. No doubt even great Louis dreaded the moment when he would have to make known to Monsieur his decision concerning this gentleman, and the customary feminine touch was, of course, not wanting when the matter came in hand. "Monsieur wept, fainted, and made a scene with the

king." He chose to assume that Henriette had played an important part of this *dénouement*, and he never rested until, as a counter-stroke, he had driven from his household Madame de Ste. Chaumont, his wife's very dear and most trusted friend. Madame wrote with simple pathos to this lady afterwards. Henriette was a charming letter writer, her successor, on the contrary, flung her information at her friends' heads upon immense paper at the rate of ten or eleven letters per day, in later years. Madame Henriette said to her friend ". . . I have often blamed you for the tender love you feel for my child (the little Mlle. de Valois). In God's name put that love away. The poor child cannot return your affection, and will, alas, be brought up to hate you. . . . Since my return the king has gone to Versailles, where Monsieur would not follow him, lest I should have the pleasure of being with him." Nothing indeed was too small for the smallness of Monsieur's mind. He wept copiously at the first Madame's tragic death, but he inspires one with the feeling nevertheless, that he was glad to hold the stage himself for a time.

The beautiful granddaughter of Henri Quatre was, however, hardly passed into the shades, when the second Madame, the Palatine princess, Charlotte Elizabeth, "Liselotte" familiarly in the home circle, burst like a breath of the north wind across the serene surface of the precise Court of France. Her aunt, Sophie of Hanover, the lady privileged to meet at close range the entrancing night-cap with the flame coloured adornments, "when Monsieur turned his head away in confusion," considered this Court of France a very fatiguing place. "Because of the crowds, 'la foule épouvantable,' the fuss and noise which this crowd made, the immense pains they were at to amuse themselves, and the extraordinary amount of bowing—to the king, to the queen, to the altar in the chapel, to all the royal family, to the entire world, and at all hours of the day!" In parenthesis let it be said that Sophie was a racy correspondent in an age when most people wrote good letters. The court felt more than a little doubtful of Liselotte, "Monsieur's little German savage" la grande Mademoiselle called her; Monsieur, however, suffered no more than a "little astonishment" when he found himself face to face with his bride on the eve of the wedding in November, 1667; while as for the stately king, I confess one reads with amazement, "Il fut conquis d'emblée par sa franchise savoureuse et son bon rire." La grande Mademoiselle goes on to volunteer that the late Madame was nothing to him afterwards, but there she erred; proof exists that Louis never forgot Henriette.

The poor Palatinates at home rejoiced at the marriage. "Papa," Liselotte wrote, "trembled lest I should be an old maid, and dis-

embarrassed himself of me as quickly as he could." But once arrived in France, Charlotte Elizabeth quickly took her place as a great royalty, no doubt helped by her Stuart blood and some of the autocratic spirit of her father, who once in a tense moment remarked, "I am the Elector and a German prince, and I listen to none, and I depend upon none, save God and the Emperor." It soon became, however, an open secret that he hoped he was going to depend a good deal upon French money. The Palatinate was bankrupt after the Thirty Years' War, and he had an evergrowing family of impecunious young *rau-grafs* and *gräfinnen* at Heidelberg; but French money did not flow into his coffers, and though Liselotte wrote home a vast deal, and listened to all the family's complaints, nothing ever came of it, beyond an occasional invitation to her half-brothers. When she arrived a bride in Paris there was a scandal because of her insufficient trousseau, and her aunt, Madame de Gonzalez, grew tragic over the matter of underclothing. She wrote off to the Palatinate representative in Paris, "You know perfectly well she has only six nightgowns and six chemises, soon we shall be hearing pleasantries to the effect that she has not one to her back! It is shameful to send the daughter of the Elector to the brother of the King of France, possessing only six chemises! The affection of Monsieur, the regard of the King, those are things that count. . . . Therefore, see to the matter of the linen!" At first Liselotte's path was smooth. The king had taken to her, and she was to enjoy many years of his kindly friendship; she became his indefatigable hunting companion, and the most familiar memory of Liselotte is the red-faced girl in the monstrous riding boots and the amazon's wig, tearing through the glades of Fontainebleau after the stag. There was her Stuart blood again; Charles II made Newmarket; Queen Anne, fat and red-faced, inaugurated Ascot; every Stuart of them loved sport. The king was her stand-by when the old struggle began with the reigning Madame and Monsieur's terrible favourites; the situation was delicate but he was always ready to do what he could. The Duc de Lorraine, reinstated, drove the second Madame to such a state of frenzy that she came in desperation to think of the convent of Maubisson as the only way out of her troubles. At the critical moment of this particular domestic strife, the king came along, took her for a drive in his calèche, and broached the subject.

"Well Madame, what is your sentiment at the moment?"

It appeared to be an unchanged sentiment, she would be parted from Monsieur!

"Well, Madame, since I see that it is really your intention to go to Maubisson just get it out of your head—for so long as I live I will never give my consent!"

Wise and pleasant and most human king! His ballet-dancing days were over; the first shadows of the austere reign of the Maintenon were projecting over the gay sunshine of Versailles, but to those who knew him intimately, the king had lapsed into a very kindly head of his family. Of course, Liselotte never went into the convent. But neither for all her brother-in-law's good offices did she recover the happiness that made her write to her old governess, Madame de Harling, just a month after her first baby's birth, "Here is another Liselotte in the world. God will that she may never be more unhappy than I, and then she will have nothing to complain about!"

However, a good deal of Madame's life in France, after she settled in to things, partook of the nature of a combat with other difficulties than favourites; she fought French cuisine, French doctors, French smells, French theology. She lost a child and laid its decease at the door of the doctors; when they prescribed for her she "walked a couple of leagues and was cured." Of French hygiene or the lack of it her pen is too realistic to bear translation, but she declared she had perpetual sore throat from the matutinal smells of Paris. At French cookery she never ceased to rail. "Lard," she complained, "lard for all uses! Never a crumb of butter. And soup, eternally soup, which distends me." And she rambles on at all times of this sore subject—of the complete lack of understanding of the proper making of sauer-kraut and of the good smoked sausage that went with it; "and three rubbishing abominations—three new inventions—tea, coffee, and chocolate. To me coffee has the odour of bad breath [the late Archbishop of Paris had that peculiarity which made me sick]. But coffee is nothing to tea, which is so bad in its effects as if one were to eat hay; chocolate is rich and upsets the inside." Later on she became a trifle optimistic, she fancied she had set a fashion. "No one here," she writes, "is astonished that I like black pudding. I have set the fashion of raw ham and many of our German dishes, venison—which they hardly eat at all—and sour herring fried. It is I who have made all this possible!" The conventual French world found her as incorrigible in religion as in other matters. To be sure she read her Bible in the good old Lutheran way, but converted to any grand doctrines she would never be. The divines talked and she listened, and in conclusion she always protested that she feared God, although He existed so incomprehensibly; and she intreated them to ask no more of her than this for fear of reducing her to Bedlam, for she had a very "feeble spirit" for "the subtleties of theology."

Time passed on. Monsieur and the king were growing old, a new century had begun. Père de Trévou, his confessor, did not

mince matters, but seems to have seized every possible opportunity to tell Monsieur unpalatable home truths; he averred that he was "short-necked, fat, and showed every appearance of apoplexy." From this Monsieur conceived an exaggerated fear of the Devil, and applied devotion to his daily life. More to the point, the terrible favourites were once for all given their *congé*. But between him and Louis there grew to be trouble, a matter of some unfairness shown to Monsieur's brilliant son, the Duc de Chartres. On June 8, at Marly, the king and he had considerable difference on this subject; they differed so critically that it was deemed necessary to announce dinner in order that they should be interrupted. At table it was remarked that Monsieur appeared very red. The next morning Madame was writing to the ever faithful Tante Sophie, "I am the most miserable of all your correspondents. Monsieur was seized with apoplexy yesterday evening at ten o'clock. He is at the point of death, and I in the greatest of all trouble." A few hours after, he died, and to Madame was left a reflected glory and fourteen odd years of widowhood. She lived to see her son the all-powerful regent of France, between him and the throne only the frail life of Louis' great-grandson; she lived to see a debasement of morals and manners which should have made Madame de Maintenon turn in her grave, greatly brought about by this son for whom, in his childhood, she had so valiantly fought that he should be preserved from corruption. Old Liselotte never lost her affection for Louis. One of her last letters says: "Would to God that the king were still of this world. I had more happiness, more pleasure in a single day then, than in the six years of my son's regency; in those days it was a Court and not a *bourgeois* existence such as I can never accustom myself to, for I have been used to a Court since the day of my birth."

ETTA ELWES.

THE TIMID HARE.

ONE of the many charming wild-life legends which Mr. Long—America's Gilbert White—collected from the Millicete Indians describes the manner in which the hare of the New World obtained her white winter coat, as a protection against her arch-enemy—the shadowy lynx of the brushwood. It would seem, however, that the good "Clote Scarpe," or his European representative, has been equally kind to the timid brown hare of our own fields and woods, for one of the most remarkable things about the hare, wherever she occurs, is her protective colouring. In highly cultivated country, for example, where bright tints prevail, her fur acquires a rich golden shade, which assimilates wonderfully either with the shimmering stubble, the brown earth, or the more pronounced colours of the countryside. Every experienced sportsman knows how easily a brown hare squatting motionless among roots or on the stubble may escape notice, even at ridiculously close quarters.

Upon downlands, again, or bleak granite hills, where the dominant hue of the landscape is bronze or grey, the hare is dressed accordingly, here wearing a greyish brown coat in perfect harmony with the scattered boulders and wind-bleached upland herbage. Nature, indeed, owed her this measure of protection, for so many are her enemies—comprising practically every preying animal from the eagle to the boy with the "angle-bow"—and so subject to mortality from other natural causes are the young, that one can but wonder how she ever contrives to hold her own under conditions so unfavourable. The hare is, perhaps, the most delicate of living things, seldom recovering from a wound or any severe shock, of which a pathetic instance recently came to my knowledge.

A party of village youths, walking one Sunday afternoon along the slopes of Cosdon Beacon, the "wet mountain" which overlooks practically the entire panorama of Dartmoor Forest, by ill-fortune stumbled upon a litter numbering four, lodged in the heather on the lee side of a boulder. The leverets, being very young, were allowed to remain, but the temptation to earmark them for future identification proved irresistible—and in every case fatal, all four being found dead a few days later. Incidentally, I have known instances when well-grown leverets which have come to hand by various means were earmarked and subsequently released, but never to my knowledge was one of them seen again.

I have a theory that young and timid animals frequently die from the effects of being man-handled, no matter how gently, the terror of the experience proving too much for them. When rabbit-shooting with ferrets not long ago, I had occasion to pick up a

tiny rabbit which had bolted from the burrow we were trying, and thinking only to save the little creature's life, at my companion's suggestion I consigned him to the empty ferret-bag, *pro tem.*, intending to restore him to the burrow when it was safe to do so. As it happened, some considerable time elapsed before we recovered the ferrets, and upon opening the bag to release the little prisoner, I found him already stiff and cold. He had sustained no injury; suffocation was out of the question; and to fright alone could his death be attributed. The fact that a hunted hare, even if she escapes, rarely survives the experience is common knowledge, and I have elsewhere described the coursing incident—possibly unique, but fully authenticated—in which one hare, after executing several doubles, was actually seen to drop dead in front of the greyhounds, who were themselves too exhausted to reach her.

Hares, like partridges, will not, or cannot, live everywhere. They are curiously partial to certain tracts of country, assiduously avoiding other localities which one might consider equally suitable. They may be plentiful on one side of a road and entirely unknown on the other. As a general rule their requirements differ considerably from those of the rabbit, which doubtless has given rise to the common but erroneous theory that hares and rabbits cannot exist amicably together. Upon Dartmoor, the district from which I write, brown hares have become more numerous within recent years, for which a series of mild winters has been mainly responsible. A popular notion prevails that dry cold hurts nothing, and that wet seasons work the greater havoc with wild life. One likes to think so, naturally, and therein lies the origin of many comfortable theories which are quite untrue to natural history. As a matter of fact, a "green winter" in the ordinary course of events means abundant food and, therefore, a season of prosperity for graminivorous creatures, whereas prolonged or severe cold involves inevitable famine and a high rate of mortality.

Another factor which, indirectly, has aided the hare to maintain her status in country where even the fox appears to be making his last stand, is the ever-increasing popularity of hare-hunting. While foxhounds can scarcely carry on, new packs of harriers and beagles are springing up everywhere, and receiving enthusiastic support. There is a hail-fellow-well-met atmosphere inseparable from the "merry harriers" which appeals forcibly, it would seem, to the native mind. The actual sport does not appeal to everybody, but they who can enjoy and appreciate harrier work are usually good sportsmen, although the keen fox-hunter is rarely of the number. One cannot, indeed, compare the one sport with the other, any more than fishing can be compared with shooting. The feeling in each case is so different. Moreover, without wishing in

any way to denounce the pursuit of the timid hare, bare justice compels the admission that there is something about it which goes against the grain. The gentleness, harmlessness, and very timidity of the quarry are so disarming, and when, as frequently happens, the interests of sport and a natural sympathy for the hunted are at variance, it is not always easy to know what to do.

Out of many such occasions which have arisen in the course of a long hunting experience, there stands forth one, remembered all down the years which have intervened, and never called to mind even now without a regretful pang. It happened on the lowlands of Somerset one brilliant September morning, and as I write, memory recalls the whole picture with astonishing clearness; a long white road, fringed on either side with swaying sword-reeds; the glint of sunlight on sparkling reans; wide sweeps of marsh, once emerald green, now mellowed by autumn's touch; afar on the slopes of Mendip the reddening woods; and, coming slowly up the road, a little brown hare, very limp and dirty, and very sorry for herself. I was afoot that day and had been watching the road, by special request, for a long while, with a view to rendering assistance when required. Half a mile away across the sedgy waste the hounds were at check, quartering wide for news of that self-same hare. It had been a trying morning. Conditions were too summerlike, hares too numerous, their stronghold too extensive. No success had rewarded the hounds, and this hare, like several others in the course of the morning, had got the better of the argument. She had steered the chase back upon the foiled ground, and, leaving her pursuers to work out the puzzle as best they might, was making good her escape by means of the road, not necessarily with the knowledge that the hard, dusty highway would tell no tales—I do not believe that animal psychology quite extends to that—but merely because it led in the right direction, and was less trying to tired feet.

At the moment I was leaning against a finger-post where two ways met, having taken my stand there for strategical purposes, and so intent was the hare upon her own affairs that she did not notice me until quite near, when she pulled up short, uncertain whether to turn or to proceed. I have always observed that absolute stillness—the hare's own favourite device—puzzles her more than anything else. Movement she connects with danger, but anything that does not stir is merely inexplicable, differing little, according to her lights, from the inanimate objects of the countryside. Upon one occasion when occupying a stile, a hare ran to my very feet, and actually *sat* there, longer than one would have believed possible, before discovering that I was not part of the woodwork. This one was not quite so brazen. None the less, she too sat stock

still within a few yards of me, and so placed we studied one another. High overhead a flock of disturbed widgeon drew mazes in the blue. From the sand-dunes to the north came the curlew's call. The sea-wind, sweeping across the marsh, sent waves of shadow over the sedges. Out of the corner of my eye, through gaps in a lane of pollards, I could see the hounds casting towards us. And still the hare did not move. She had obviously run hard. I noted the quick rise and fall of her sides, the mud which stained her brown fur, the acute physical distress indicated by a peculiar glazed look in her large expressive eyes. That my sympathies were with her then goes without saying. The poet who bewailed the sportsman's "apathy" was somewhat too sweeping in his denunciation, nor is it possible to meet the gaze of a hunted creature at close quarters without experiencing a heart-felt desire to effect its deliverance. At that moment, indeed, as the beautiful wild thing looked me in the face, I felt compassion only, and goodwill. The distant note of a hound recalled me to the true state of affairs. They were picking out the line, inch by inch. The hare jumped as if shot, circled the signpost wearily, then abandoning the road, she turned into a gateway, gave me one haunting backward look, and limped slowly away across a meadow beyond. I watched her out of sight, and wished her well. The temptation to say nothing was strong, and might have prevailed in defiance of convention, but for one uncomfortable consideration. The hounds were busy, and it appeared more than possible that even if I kept silence they would eventually work out the puzzle, at any rate as far as the road, in which case there would certainly be some awkward questions to answer. Nobody would understand, and I had all a healthy boy's horror of appearing quixotic or sentimental. Moreover I had accepted a position of trust, and it seemed incumbent upon me to keep faith. It ended in the inevitable compromise. I allowed the hare liberal "law," then, conscience somewhat appeased, gave the customary signal.

Far too soon, as it seemed to me, the pack arrived, and in due course picked up the line across the grass. I was anything save happy about my own share in the proceedings, unwilling though it had been, and hoped against hope that the hare had made the most of her time. There was reason to fear otherwise, however, and back of my mind there lurked an uneasy conviction that she had not gone far. It was no surprise, therefore, when a minute or so later an unmistakable cry sounded from the hedge into which she had disappeared. My relief when it transpired that the hare killed was a fresh one can be better imagined than described. But I was not destined to get off so lightly. The Master was not content with the measure of success achieved. He thought the hunted hare might yet be brought to book and resumed the hunt, with

what result requires no telling. Fortunately for my peace of mind, I did not witness the actual end, but I kept the "scut" of that hare for many years, and the memory of the experience has saved the lives of not a few of her kind upon occasions when it has been in my power to render or withhold information which involved life or death to the hunted.

A somewhat remarkable hare story was recently told to me. A northern sportsman, when shooting one day on the mountains, was surprised to see a blue hare heading straight towards him. His first impulse was to shoot it, but by the time it got within range he noticed something peculiar in its action. It shambled along with blind uncertain steps. Its coat was staring. Its eyes bulged with terror, and, seeing that it was in trouble of some sort, he refrained from firing, while the hare, instead of dashing wildly away upon discovering its danger, ran to within a few feet of him, and there crouched, shrinking and trembling. The phenomenon was soon explained—in part. Along the hare's back track the lean lithe form of a hunting ermine came gliding through the bracken. The gun came into use then, and the bloodthirsty little wretch blind to every other consideration—as a weasel always is when hot upon a scent—was bowled over when almost within springing distance of its intended victim. The hare, strange to relate, did not scamper off at the sound of the shot, but kept close to the sportsman, even following him when he moved on. And this it continued to do for some distance until apparently convinced that the danger was over, when at last it took leave of him.

Apart from the "following," there would be nothing so astonishing in the story. It is wonderful how frequently timid animals fly to man for protection when hunted by natural enemies. Small birds do not hesitate to enter houses when hard pressed by the dreaded sparrowhawk, and the late Benjamin Kidd mentions the case of a hare who went so far as to jump upon a man's back to escape from hounds. Personally I cannot help thinking that the hare's far-famed subtlety when hunted has been a trifle overrated. Her artifices, after all, are pathetically simple, whereas for actual nimbleness she is put to shame by her insignificant cousin, the rabbit. The common lurcher who can make short work of as many hares as its owner can show him, is seldom quick enough for the rabbit's lightning-like double, and it is not generally known, perhaps, that for a *short* distance the rabbit even has the advantage of speed. Either animal, by the way, takes to water readily if necessary. I have seen rabbits cross pools and even swift rivers without any apparent difficulty, nor is it unusual for hares, like deer, to swim out to sea when all other hope of escape fails. I well remember one who swam off from Brean Down, a rocky promontory on the North Somerset coast, whose outward course was watched for

a long while by the light of a late November sunset. Our last impression of her was a tiny brown spot far out upon the waves, holding resolutely away from the unfriendly shore; and whether she ever landed again none can say.

The prevailing idea that hares never, under any circumstances, take refuge underground is quite incorrect. In sandy countries—or anywhere where rabbit-burrows are exceedingly numerous—it is nothing unusual for them to seek sanctuary in Mother Earth. I have known ferrets tried upon such occasions with varying success, but it is rather the exception than the rule for a hunted hare to "bolt." The extent to which the character of a country affects the habits of animals who inhabit it is not, perhaps, fully realised, and I can understand even experienced sportsmen hesitating to believe that in certain localities hares not only enter rabbit holes readily when hard pressed, but upon rare occasions actually *lie* underground. I have good reason for assuming that such is the case, however. After a long hunt on Mendip some years ago, a hare was marked into a little shallow burrow, but after baying her for a while the pack carried on—with a fresh line, we supposed—and soon claimed what proved to be their original quarry. Returning later, we found that during the interval the inevitable crowd of yokels which collects from nowhere upon such occasions had torn open the burrow and drawn forth a palpably fresh doe hare.

High altitudes represent the final refuge rather than the chosen home of the brown hare. Unlike the blue variety, she is not content to subsist on the tender heather tips, and even during summer she comes down from the hills as evening falls, to nibble the meadow grass or the fresh green of the spring corn. Severe weather, if prolonged, always brings her down, particularly deep snow, to which all out-lying creatures have a strong aversion. I once saw a striking example of this when shooting on the West Dorset hills. We had been out all morning, but about midday a smart blizzard set in, which, lasting an hour or more, effectually whitened the landscape, and made the conditions so unpropitious for our sport that we decided to abandon it. Our homeward way lay over some furzy downs, and we were astonished to see rabbit-tracks dimpling the newly-fallen snow in every direction leading from the brakes to burrows in the vicinity. After the first snowfall of the season rabbits sometimes remain underground for a day or two, until hunger drives them forth, while hares lie close in their forms for a corresponding period. Deep snow is indeed the hare's worst enemy, for not only does it betray her whereabouts, but it also deprives her of her one means of defence—her speed. Her long slender legs sink like stilts at every step, so that when danger threatens she can only plunge helplessly along and is soon exhausted. "Tracing" hares after a snowfall is a favourite pastime upon

Dartmoor among gentry of a certain type, and the method appears to be both simple and effective. The hare is tracked to her form, and, if possible, shot or netted where she squats. If she escapes, the "sportsmen" merely follow her trail, knowing that she cannot run far in the snow, and "hop" her again. She speedily becomes exhausted, and after two or three scares, hare-like, she throws up the sponge, and allows herself to be taken.

Both hares and rabbits have a trick of burrowing under a snow-bank, and allowing the accumulating drift to cover them completely, leaving no trace of their entrance. In such cases, however, the breath of the animal always keeps open a small round hole which can readily be detected by anyone who knows what to look for. Dogs and foxes also find these air-shafts by other means than sight, and when otherwise undiscovered, the occupant of this queer burrow, puzzled by the muffled footfall of the passerby, which must sound very strangely in the ears of a creature buried under the snow, as likely as not may betray itself by bumping, i.e., stamping with the hind foot. The latter, by the way, is a very curious habit, peculiar, I think, to the *Leporidae*, and it is done in moments of alarm or excitement. The sound produced is unmistakable. Sometimes it takes the form of a challenge, to startle a possible enemy and make him show his true colours. A little rabbit will do it at sight of any strange, still object, just as a fox-cub barks at a rock or a tree stump, to see whether he can make it move. It is most noticeable, however, as dusk falls,

"When day declining sheds a milder gleam. . . .
What time the timorous hare limps forth to feed,"

particularly during spring and early summer—the height of the mating season—when it appears to correspond with the drumming of grouse or woodpeckers. There is something comically suggestive about it when heard in some moonlit glade where several hares or rabbits are at play, especially when followed, as it often is, by bumps of another sort, the unmistakable sounds of conflict, and perhaps the squeals of the vanquished.

Hares cover enormous distances when the rutting season commences, i.e., late February or March. The proverbial madness, by the way, has its foundation in natural history, for they play strange pranks during the festal months, and the age-old tales of their merry-makings by starlight on meadow lawns or snow-swept plateaux are not entirely fictitious. I have seen as many as a dozen hares gambolling together in the April twilight, and very little imagination would be required to supply the element of romance or fantasy with which the folk-lore of many lands has invested their doings.

DOUGLAS GORDON.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE PACT AND THE GLOOM.

ON July 20th a Note was handed by the German Ambassador in Paris to the French Foreign Minister, which gave new pabulum to the pessimists. Is it possible for an uncivilised Europe which, as lately as 1914-1918, gave a fair sample of itself, to behave as if it were civilised? That is the question raised by what is now happening. The Note referred to was the German Government's answer to the French Note of June 16th about the proposed Security Pact. For six months the helpless diplomatists, fairly representative of the helpless people they serve, have attempted, with little success, to agree on an arrangement whereby in the future the grown-up millions of the nations' manhood shall not stick bayonets into each other's stomachs, or wipe out whole towns at a swoop. It is an unbelievable thing. First one Government, then another, makes difficulties and keeps the vicious circle on the move. It would need another Lucian adequately to describe the contemporary phase of diplomatic imbecility. What seems chiefly to be needed is some leader capable of thinking straight, who would explain to us simply what kind of things we do. The beginning of wisdom is remorse. Or, if we cannot achieve wisdom direct, let us achieve it by the Sophoclean means of chastisement. A scientist who could devise an infallible means of destroying towns by pressing a button would do immense good. Let those who do research work in poisonous gases, those who attempt to perfect the instruments of destruction from the air and from under the earth, those who see the possibility of wholesale horror in wireless developments—let all such pioneers reap abundant success.

By the time it becomes possible for a scientist sitting in a London laboratory to wipe out Berlin, Moscow, or Paris, or for a German scientist sitting at his bench in Berlin to wipe out London, the problem of war will be solved by a simple reduction to the absurdity it is. Let war, in fact, become more dangerous, more terrible. Let it become devastating. Let it fall on women, children, parsons, and diplomatists, as on soldiers. Let it be capable of killing in one day as many human beings as were killed in the four and a half years of the Great War. Then, perhaps, we shall wake up—those of us who may be left—and agree on a Security Pact. Those who talk of humane war, of the rules of civilised warfare, of the barbarity of sinking the "Lusitania" or of bombing hospitals, talk nonsense. Let war be what it is, the business of honest murderers, murdering the maximum number of people in the minimum time, and then we have taken the first step away from war. The healthy Tommy in the trenches is as defenceless as the

maimed Tommy in the hospital base, and his murder is ethically worse than the latter's. The idiotic conventions which associate honour and decency with the conduct of war are war's assets. The League of Nations could contribute to the cause of peace by setting up research laboratories in Geneva for the discovery of new and atrocious methods of conducting war, including the use of poisonous gases for troops and poisoned food for civilians.

But why, it may be asked, need one worry about war just now? Because those whose sickening duty it is to observe the course of diplomacy know as certainly as to-day is followed by to-morrow that the Great War of 1914-18 will be followed by a Greater War, soon or late, in Europe. The babies born this year may be destined to be torn limb from limb on some stinking European battlefield, in as senseless a cause as that which made us fight in 1914. At this moment the diplomatists of Germany, France, and Great Britain are doing what the German, French, and British people allow them, or force them to do. The Note written by the German Government to the French Government on July 20th was written, as British and French diplomatists were quick to recognise, for German home consumption. M. Briand thereupon began to rage for the primary purpose of satisfying French public opinion. The British Government, whose problem is not to satisfy an excited public, but to rouse an apathetic public to take an interest in matters affecting their own life and death, has been able to pour oil on troubled waters. In the meantime, however, an opportunity is passing, the chances of a Pact of Security being signed grow less, and the British people refuse to hear anything about it.

It is not a question of eliminating quarrels, misunderstandings, uncharitableness. It is merely a question of eliminating war, or at least of making it less likely. It is clear that human nature being what by experience we know it to be, the only certain thing is that misunderstandings will arise, and the amount of misunderstanding will increase with the number of people who come into contact with each other. In private life we all misunderstand each other, and Pilate's famous question was both a fair jest and a serious comment on life; but in private life, fortunately, we most of us refrain from murdering each other, and we accept the blindness of the law as a harmless substitute. Correspondingly, in international affairs all that is wanted is an agreement not to murder each other. Justice is at best a gamble, and is of no importance compared with the settled prospect of peace. If peace at any price be the ideal in international affairs, as it is in national affairs, in what way did the German Note of July 20th fall short of that ideal? The answer may be put shortly in this way. The three main parties to the proposed Security Pact, Germany, France,

and Great Britain disagree, of course, on most things, but Germany and Great Britain happen to agree on wanting the pact. France has raised serious difficulties, and Great Britain, in an attempt to carry France, agreed to a formula in the French Note of June 16th, which contained two diametrically opposed ideas. Now, German opinion sympathised with the idea that had been inspired by Great Britain, and was incensed by that inspired by France. In the German Note, however, it was the French idea that was taken for comment, not the British, and the comment was hostile. Its main object was to appease the wrath of the German Nationalists against the French Note. The result was a furious France, a disconcerted Great Britain, and a general obscuring of the prospect of peace. If the German Note, instead of combatting the French formula, had welcomed the British formula, French opinion would have been disarmed and the Pact conference could have been arranged without much delay.

The German Note made its first tactical mistake by referring to the Note of June 16th as having been sent by "the Allied Governments," whereas the distinction of its being in form a French Note ought to have been respected in Germany's own interests. Next, it was a somewhat clumsy move to draw attention to the delicate point about the sacrosanctity of the treaties, for it was wholly unnecessary to excite French susceptibilities on that subject, in view of the fact that Article 19 of the Covenant of the League is likewise Article 19 of the Treaty of Versailles; and German opinion knew that in the British view neither the Polish corridor nor the partition of Upper Silesia could be regarded as permanent arrangements. If ever there was occasion for putting the diplomatic blind eye to the telescope, that was the occasion. Mr. Chamberlain has repeatedly put his blind eye to his monocle in order not to see the French point about frontiers. The important thing—and German diplomacy ought to be astute enough to understand it—is to get the Pact through and Germany inside the League. The rest will all happen in good time. For the German Government to raise the controversial difficulties in advance of the conference shows a lack of tactical sense.

Having once embarked on the unintelligent line of argument the German Government proceeded to elaborate its points and to make them irresistibly provocative to French feeling. "The German Government (ran a passage in Section I of the German Note) would like to point out that the conclusion of a Security Pact would represent an innovation of such importance that it could not but react on the conditions in the occupied territories and the questions of occupation in general." What could be more naïve? The German Note might

have been written for the exclusive purpose of answering the question put by crude and short-sighted German Nationalists: "If we give this guarantee about the Franco-German and the Belgian-German frontiers, what do we get as *quid pro quo*? Will the occupied regions be evacuated?" Now, no serious Englishman wants anything better than the earliest possible evacuation of all the German territories occupied under the Treaty of Versailles. Mr. Chamberlain went out of his way in June to express the hope, during the course of a speech which he made in the House of Commons, that Cologne might be evacuated in August, that is, at the same time as the French evacuation of the Ruhr. What, however, was the practical effect of Germany's raising the question in that way? M. Briand promptly pointed to that passage of the German Note as an instance of German sabotage of the Treaty of Versailles, and the British Government was left with no alternative but to agree with the French Government that the occupied territories are a matter of contractual arrangement under the Treaty, agreed to by all the signatories including Germany, and that there can be no question of making the conclusion of the Pact conditional on any such treaty modification as Germany appeared to suggest. The German Note, therefore, defeated its object in that respect.

Next, a still worse lapse of judgment. In Section II of the Note it was stated: "What chiefly attracts attention are the cases of exception provided for by the Allied Governments in which coercive action by one State against another State is to be permitted. In this respect the German Government, judging by the terms of the Note of June 16th and the correspondence published between the French and His Britannic Majesty's Governments, cannot but assume that in those cases, in the opinion of the Allied Governments, coercive action can take place, without any regular procedure laid down in advance either by arbitral or some other international procedure." That assumption was unfair so far as the British Government was concerned, although it was sound enough as an interpretation of French ideas. It was based on the Briand phraseology of that sentence of Section IV of the French Note of June 16th which declared: "To give full effect to these two treaties, their observance ought to be assured by the joint and several guarantee of the Powers which also participate in the territorial guarantee contained in the Rhineland Pact, so as to bring this guarantee into immediate operation if one of the parties, refusing to submit a dispute to arbitration or to carry out an arbitral award, resorts to hostile measures." Why should the German Government have assumed that the French formula, and not the British formula, would be the decisive one, when German opinion agreed with the latter, and not with the former?

The German Note ignored the sentence, inserted on British prompting, in that same section of the French Note, which said: "But it must be understood that, as between France and Germany, such a treaty ought to apply to all disputes, and ought not to leave room for coercive action save where such action shall be undertaken consistently with the provisions of treaties in force between the parties, or of the Rhineland Pact, or in virtue of the guarantee given to an arbitration treaty by the parties or by any one of them." Moreover, Lord Balfour and Mr. Baldwin made a special point of emphasising publicly that the Pact should conform to the Covenant of the League. Mr. Chamberlain had made reservations in this sense, and has always maintained that, in the words he used at Geneva on March 12th: "Any arrangement into which we might enter should be purely defensive in character, it should be framed in the spirit of the Covenant, working in close harmony with the League, and under its guidance if possible."

In the course of the correspondence with Paris on the subject of the Pact Mr. Chamberlain made the definite reservation, in writing to Lord Crewe on May 28th: "In communicating it [the recast French draft] to M. Briand, I request that your Lordship will lay emphasis on the principles without in any way committing either His Majesty's Government or their Allies to exact phraseology or to particular proposals whose exact shape can only be determined when the time is reached for considering a draft instrument to give effect to these general objects." That was published as part of the Pact dossier in Berlin as well as in London and in Paris. Yet, unbelievable as it may seem to men of affairs, the German Government in its Note of July 20th chose to assume a precise interpretation of a principle exclusively French, and to assume it to be an Allied principle into the bargain! Moreover, it must have been known informally in Berlin that, when the time came for a conference, the British delegation would regard it as essential that some judicial body, preferably set up by the League of Nations, should adjudicate and establish the fact of an aggression before the "immediate action" contemplated even in the French formula of Section IV of the French Note could arise, unless the aggression was grossly flagrant.

Perversity, however, was not yet exhausted. The German Note, arguing from the unsound assumption exposed above, proceeded to exploit the fear "that the Allied Governments, for instance, would not wish to subject the decision on the question of the admissibility or inadmissibility of reprisals on account of reparation obligations to a regular procedure, but would leave the decision of their own unilateral discretion." Now, did the German Government really forget the whole content and purpose of the

Dawes Scheme which was actually in operation when the German Note of July 20th was written? One of the outstanding merits of the Dawes Scheme was the network of safeguards of an arbitral kind (American participation in the safeguards being one of the factors) which put the possibility hinted at in the German Note into the remote background. Why did Germany thus raise a wholly unnecessary and unsubstantial bogey? The question becomes still more unanswerable when one reads the last sentence of the German Note, which ran: "They [the German Government] would heartily welcome an acceleration of these discussions." The practical effect of the German Note was to retard those discussions. Lastly, the fact that the German Note raised the question of Article 16 of the Covenant and hitched it on to the big question of general disarmament—admirable as the thesis was on philosophic grounds—was an obstacle to the speeding-up process postulated in that sentence of the German Note just quoted. "Germany, as a member of the League of Nations (it was stated in Section III of the German Note), can only be considered as enjoying equal rights when her disarmament is followed by the general disarmament provided for by the Covenant of the League of Nations and the preamble to Part V of the Treaty of Versailles. Therefore, if the immediate entrance of Germany into the League of Nations is to be rendered possible, a solution has to be found to tide over the time till general disarmament has become a reality."

That important and reasonable argument ought to have been made when the delegates were seated round the conference table. The general effect of the Note was deplorable. M. Briand lost no time in writing a spirited memorandum of French views on it, and M. de Fleuriau, the French Ambassador in London, gave Mr. Chamberlain a copy of it on July 23rd. The British Government had to acquiesce in the renewed prospect of Franco-British exchanges designed to discuss French resentment against the unnecessary provocation of the German Note. British official comment on the German Note had to be content with emphasising the concluding passages of the German Note, which indicated German anxiety to get on with the business—even though that anxiety proved to be still-born for reasons given above. What one understood would have been acceptable to German opinion would have been a preliminary talk between the Foreign Ministers of the three countries at which to pave the way for the full conference. That, however, was made impossible by the effect of the Note in Paris, and the general horizon was clouded over.

TALK ABOUT DEBTS.

In the last week of July it was announced from Paris that the expert discussions about the French debt to Great Britain would be immediately resumed. The lull in the Pact negotiations produced by the German Note was presumably regarded by French diplomacy as a suitable opportunity for an investment of moral capital in London. The wheels of diplomacy grind wondrous slowly in these days, and they do not grind exceeding small.

On Sunday evening, July 27th, the French Financial Mission arrived in London. It consisted of M. Moreau-Menet, Sub-Director of the General Movement of Funds (it is odd how static this movement is in one respect); M. Thion de la Chaume, a Director of the Indo-China Bank and former Inspector of Finances, and two "Inspectors of Finance" from the French Treasury, MM. Barnard and Roussel. They began to discuss the French debt with Sir Otto Niemeyer and his colleagues at the British Treasury at 3 p.m. on the Monday, carried the discussion till 6 p.m., resumed them the following day and on Wednesday and Thursday, and went back to Paris on the Friday. It had been given out from Paris that M. Caillaux would come to London after a week's discussions, if those discussions went well; that is, if the experts could find enough common ground to work on. No doubt there had been some advance since the beginning of the year. The Churchill memorandum of February 6th had been followed two months later by expert discussions in London, which lasted one day, the fall of the French Finance Minister, M. Clémentel, on April 2nd bringing them to a sudden end. The Chamberlain circular sent out at the beginning of July to remind our French and other debtors that no steps had yet been taken to fund the debts was followed with less delay, and the expert discussions lasted four days instead of one. That is gratifying as a promise of better things, but the satisfaction is far to seek. The discussions which took place in the last week of July were enveloped in a mysterious official silence, which was no doubt fairly descriptive of the position. It is a little difficult for plain people to understand what there is to discuss. By the usual principle, debts are paid, not discussed. It has already been explained in this section of THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW that the Balfour principle reduces the French debt by more than half, but even so the French Treasury continues to argue the point. Last April the French experts insisted on fixing the liability at a capital sum, a meaningless settlement, for the only effective thing is an annuity. During the past seven years the French debt has, in effect, been fixed at precisely nothing, simply because no annuities have been paid. A moratorium is equivalent to an additional loan, for time is money, and the British taxpayer every year

has to find the £30,000,000 for America, plus the £30,000,000 interest on the War loan of £600,000,000 passed on to France. In the last week of July the French experts saw this point, and consented to talk about annual payments instead of capital figures. The discrepancy between the British estimate of what France could pay and the French estimate of the same thing was too great, or, put differently, the French experts showed themselves unwilling to fund the British debt even on the Balfour principle, which cancelled the greater part of it, and they returned home. They said they would report the British view to M. Caillaux (who knew it already by heart), and would, perhaps, come to London again at a date unspecified. It is known that the British Government would have accepted even small annuities for a few years, provided they were definitely a part of a scheme involving substantial annuities a few years hence, but the French are not only hard bargainers; they have, so far, shared the views of Moscow about national obligations.

M. BRIAND IN LONDON.

Three weeks after the receipt of the German Note about the proposed Security Pact, M. Briand came to London to discuss with Mr. Chamberlain what the French answer should be. He arrived in London on Monday, August 10th, and on the following day, which happened to be the twentieth anniversary of the birth of the Entente Cordiale, he began discussions with Mr. Chamberlain at the Foreign Office. He was invited to Buckingham Palace to see the King before going to the Foreign Office, a ceremony which added to the solemnity of the attempt about to be made to inspire life into the moribund Entente. By luncheon of the next day (August 12th), the conversations were over, and M. Briand returned to Paris on the 13th. The pivot of the conversations had been a difference between the French and British interpretation of the meaning of the word "immediate" which appeared in Section IV of the French Note of June 16th. Since Mr. Chamberlain had given his approval to that Note, it had been realised in London that it was ambiguously capable of bearing a meaning akin to that assigned to it in the German Note of July 20th, and therefore Lord Balfour in the House of Lords and Mr. Baldwin at Knowsley Park had made public statements designed to emphasise that in the British view the Covenant of the League of Nations ought not to be superseded by the Pact. Mr. Baldwin went so far as to declare that his Government would incur no new commitment, beyond those of the Covenant, a declaration which hardly tallied with Mr. Chamberlain's published communications to the Quai d'Orsay, but which was expressive of one of

the Government's vague anxieties. What was made clear during the Briand-Chamberlain conversations was that the British Government reserved to itself the right to decide whether a flagrant aggression had been made by either France or Germany, and in doubtful cases to refer to the League for a decision. An alleged aggression by Germany against France or by France against Germany would be either flagrantly serious and obvious in origin or would be doubtful in either or both respects. In the case of a flagrant aggression—the *casus fœderis* to be judged by the British Government—Great Britain would declare war on France or Germany, whichever was the aggressor. In doubtful cases the League would decide. M. Briand presumably accepted that limitation of the proposed British commitment under the Pact, and agreement, therefore, became easy. All appeared now to be plain sailing so far as the Western European Security Pact, the Franco-German and the Belgian-German Arbitration Treaties were concerned, if, as seemed likely, the Belgian, Italian, and German Governments agreed with the Briand-Chamberlain formula.

It was obvious, however, that two important difficulties remained in the prospective attempt to conclude the German-Czechoslovak and the German-Polish Arbitration Treaties. One was the probable German objection to what would amount to a virtual French supervision of those treaties. It has been clear for some time that the Wilhelmstrasse is inclined to regard the French treaties with Poland and Czechoslovakia as virtually committing France to act as guarantor for a German fulfilment of the Eastern Arbitration Treaties. If Germany attacked, say, Poland, France would be committed by the Franco-Polish Treaty to defend Poland. If, on the other hand, Poland attacked Germany, there would be no party to help Germany. To that extent there is a unilateral element in the prospective Eastern Arbitration Treaties, and the natural German anxiety caused thereby will have to be allayed. It is not allayed by the argument that the security treaties presuppose German membership of the League, and that, therefore, Germany would be defended against aggression by all the States members of the League, for the League safeguard would be common both to Germany and Poland, whereas Poland would have the additional and independent support of France. Moreover, Article 16 of the Covenant prescribes first a Council decision about an aggression (which would involve delay) and, secondly, a mere recommendation for military action on the part of States members. By contrast the Franco-Polish Treaty prescribes automatic and immediate French support of Poland. The other difficulty is that Article 3 of the Franco-Polish Treaty provides for a French defence of the *status quo* in the East, whereas Article 19 of the Covenant

provides for possible revision of any frontier. There is increasing ground to expect, however, that this difficulty will be met by a French undertaking that if Article 19 of the Covenant ever operated and led to a revision of the Polish frontiers, Article 3 of the Franco-Polish Treaty would, in the French view, automatically adjust itself, and in that event would refer to the revised frontiers.

BRITISH OBJECTORS TO THE PACT.

The opinion is held in some sections of the Liberal Party that a Pact of the kind suggested is a danger to British interests. Why, it is asked, should Great Britain guarantee either French territory against Germany or German territory against France; why should the British Government undertake to engage in war in any contingency whatever—flagrant or other? Would it not, the argument proceeds, be infinitely better for Great Britain to reserve her complete liberty of action in all circumstances? Many will feel disposed to answer at once that the precedent of 1914 hardly encourages such an isolationist philosophy; that the treaty commitment about Belgium was not the decisive factor which brought Great Britain into the war; that Great Britain entered the war because, in the Government's view, British security demanded such a course in face of a German menace to France and thereby to the Channel ports and to Great Britain herself. It may be that discussion about the particular war origins of 1914 is fruitless, and that the simple explanation of the Great War, as of all wars, was mutual fear among the nations. Now the object both of those who favour the Pact and those who oppose it is the same in Germany, in France, and in Belgium, as well as in Great Britain. They want to avoid war. As the discussion about the proposed Pact is likely to go on for some time, it may be well to put forward a point of view which must be held by many who have spent much thought on the subject. The problem of peace has two aspects. The immediate problem is to secure peace in our time: the ultimate object is the cultivating of the spirit of peace—a very practical thing—between the nations. How practical the latter is is best illustrated by the case of Scotland and England. There is now no danger of war between these two countries. Once upon a time they armed themselves (in mutual self-defence, as they thought), and, of course, fought idiotic wars, still in self-defence, against each other. What is the difference now? Merely that no one now thinks of war as a practical thing between England and Scotland. That is security. Between Canada and the United States there is a frontier of some 5,000 miles unguarded on both sides. There is no danger of war. If

that frontier were guarded by soldiers, war would be a certainty. The remote ideal, therefore, is the cultivation of the habit and of the assumption of peace and the complete disarming of the nations. There can be no security until not a soldier and not a gun remains. That is a remote ideal. Lord Carson hit the nail on the head in 1919 when he said (I forget his exact words) that the potential value of the League of Nations was that it might make peace fashionable. The problem in its remote and ultimate aspect is therefore one of education.

There is, however, the immediate need of staving off trouble. The position is something like this. Imagine twelve men standing in a circle, each armed with a loaded revolver, each suspecting the others and holding his revolver in readiness. The attitude of each is that of self-defence, just as is the attitude of the nations of Europe. There is, probably, no such thing as aggressive war. All war is defensive, in the minds of those who wage it. The twelve imaginary men, the symbol of the European nations, stand in fear. Some of them, say, make a pact of security whereby each undertakes to shoot if one is attacked. The whole twelve may evolve a League of Nations, all of them undertaking to shoot if one is attacked. How futile! Someone sooner or later, with or without pacts or leagues, is bound to pull his trigger either from sudden fright or from sheer nervous tension: immediately the rest begin shooting everybody promiscuously in self-defence. Now if those twelve men had been sitting in a club, or walking in a park unarmed, would there be the slightest danger of shooting? The answer is obvious and trite, and everyone agrees. The problem is how to disarm Europe. The best approach to a solution, as it appears to me, is through some immediate, opportunist, possibly even unjust stabilisation of the *status quo* as a measure for avoiding the first shot and, in the respite thus gained, some sustained educational work designed to convince the world of the gross and almost unbelievable stupidity of armaments. The immediate problem is to quieten nerves and avoid the first shot. Agitation for the revision even of admitted injustices ordained by the Treaty of Versailles must necessarily have an irritant effect. It is a frankly opportunist argument in this respect. On November 12th, 1918, there was little danger of war. Would it be wise to cut the painter too precipitately? It is possible, of course, that in one or two respects the injustices are too serious and are themselves more irritant than would be an attempt at revision, but in general the negative and sedative principles of the maintenance of the *status quo* has, I think, its value. To stabilise Europe on the basis of the Treaty of Versailles is not to stabilise it for ever, for there is no such thing as permanence in anything, and one of the

admirable features of that Treaty is the integral incorporation in it of the Covenant of the League, in which Article 19 provides the necessary elasticity for future revision of anything that may in experience be proved to be bad. The immediate, the overwhelming, problem is to avoid or postpone to the utmost limit another outbreak. Those who follow the course of foreign affairs closely know how real is the danger of such an outbreak. Once war breaks out it is uncontrollable, and we are all equally involved, as helplessly as if we were visited by an earthquake. The proposed Pact of Security and its collateral arbitration treaties deserve support simply because they would establish a pacifist principle in the main danger zones. The detailed imperfections of the Pact are of small importance by comparison.

THE DIPLOMATIC TANGLE.

There is in Europe an existing network of political treaties and understandings of varying degrees of validity which, none the less, have to be considered by those who are attempting to solve the problem of security. They may not be important, but they have an effect which must be faced. There is not only the Treaty of Versailles, with its Articles 42 to 44, and the League of Nations, which is an integral part of that Treaty. There are regional understandings between nations and groups of nations providing for mutual support in given contingencies. Perhaps the most important of the European relationships which have a bearing on the problem of European security is that between France, the Little Entente, and Poland.

The Little Entente grew out of the post-war conditions of general unrest and danger, and affords an interesting illustration of what can be done in pacific reconstruction by three nations—Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Rumania—in their common interests. Czechoslovak statesmanship has been the guiding spirit of the Little Entente, Dr. Eduard Beneš its leading exponent and craftsman. The Little Entente has been the subject of much misunderstanding in Great Britain. A common criticism has been that it is a catspaw of French diplomacy. This much is true, that Czechoslovak interests are more immediately bound up with French interests than with British interests, and therefore, of course, the orientation of Czechoslovak foreign policy has been of a more pronounced French complexion than British. It is, however, unsound to regard the Little Entente as a catspaw of France. Czechoslovakia is the offspring of France and Great Britain, and those who have followed Czechoslovak affairs, and especially the work of Dr. Beneš, know that the chief motive behind Czechoslovak

slovak policy has been the reconciliation of Czechoslovakia's parents. What more natural? Oddly enough, those very critics who have objected to Czechoslovakia's sympathy with France have at the same time objected to Czechoslovakia's "interfering" efforts to bridge the Franco-British gulf. The composition, policy, and behaviour of the Little Entente are easy enough to understand. The component countries have achieved remarkable success in the economic consolidation of Central Europe, where the conditions after the war were desperate and chaotic; in foreign affairs have jointly advocated whatever was commonly desired by each; and for the rest have followed their separate ways.

The French view of the Little Entente is another matter. Can Prague be blamed for what Paris thinks? The Quai d'Orsay certainly has wanted Czechoslovakia to be a pawn in the French game of encircling Germany, and owing to geographical and political circumstances Czechoslovakia, up to a point, has necessarily served the purposes of the Quai d'Orsay. The striking thing however is, that placed as she is, and small nation as she is, Czechoslovakia has not become in effect a French dependency. She has shown remarkable courage and statesmanship, such as one expected from a country whose President is Dr. Masaryk, in taking an independent line.

The political substructure of the Little Entente consists of a series of diplomatic agreements.

First, there is the Czechoslovak-Yugoslav Agreement of August 14th, 1920. It provided that in case of an unprovoked attack by Hungary on either party, the other pledged its assistance (Article 1: "En cas d'une attaque, non-provoquée, de la Hongrie contre l'une des hautes parties contractantes, l'autre partie s'engage à concourir à la défense de la partie attaquée de la façon déterminée par l'arrangement prévu dans l'article 2 de la présente convention.") Article 2: "Les autorités techniques compétentes de la République tchécoslovaque et du Royaume des Serbes, Croates et Slovenes fixeront, d'un commun accord, les dispositions nécessaires pour l'exécution de la présente convention.") It was further provided that neither party should make any diplomatic agreement with a third party without first notifying the other. (Article 3: "Aucune des hautes parties contractantes ne pourra conclure une alliance avec une tierce Puissance sans avis préalable de l'autre.") Article 4 provided that the agreement should remain in force for two years, whereafter it could be denounced at six months' notice; Article 5 that this agreement should be communicated to the League of Nations.

In the following year (April 23rd, 1921) a corresponding agreement was made between Czechoslovakia and Rumania. Except

in two respects this agreement was identical with that between Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. The two exceptions were, first, Article 2 had the added provision that the method of mutual assistance was to be defined "in a military convention to be concluded eventually" ("dans une convention militaire à conclure ultérieurement"), and that pending the conclusion of such a convention a protocol making interim arrangements in the same sense should hold good; second, that an additional Article (Article 4) provided that "in order to co-ordinate their efforts towards peace, the two Governments agree to concert together on questions of foreign policy affecting their relations with Hungary" ("Afin de coordonner leurs efforts pacifiques, les deux Gouvernements s'engagent à se concerter sur les questions de politique extérieure qui ont trait à leurs rapports avec la Hongrie").

Next, there was a Rumanian-Yugoslav Agreement dated June, 1921, in identical terms to those of the Czechoslovak-Rumanian Agreement.

Such were the diplomatic liens between the three constituent members of the Little Entente. The next step was to rope in by treaty both Poland and Austria. Czechoslovakia concluded an agreement with Poland and with Austria; and Rumania with Poland.

The Czechoslovak-Polish Agreement of November 6th, 1921, provided that the two parties should mutually guarantee each other's territory, as based on existing treaties (Article 1: "Les deux Etats se donnent mutuellement la garantie de l'état de possession, ayant pour base les traités sur lesquels repose l'indépendance et l'organisation d'Etat de la Pologne et de la Tchécoslovaquie. Les deux Etats vont se concerter, quand le besoin et l'occasion l'exigeront, sur l'application des traités signés en commun"). By Article 2 it was agreed that in the event of one of the parties being attacked by a third party, the other should adopt an attitude of benevolent neutrality and should assure the free transit of war material ("Les deux Etats s'engagent à garder la neutralité bienveillante en cas où l'un d'eux serait attaqué par un de leurs voisins, et particulièrement à assurer le libre transit du matériel de guerre.") Articles 3 to 9 made other arrangements, less important from the point of view of security, such as that Czechoslovakia should not interfere in Eastern Galicia, should forbid anti-Polish propaganda in or from Czechoslovakia, that Poland should return a similar service to Czechoslovakia, that certain questions should be referred to arbitration, that the agreement should last for five years, but could be denounced after two years at six months' notice.

The Rumanian-Polish Agreement of March, 1921, took the form of "a defensive alliance against unprovoked attack from the

East," of like duration as the Czechoslovak-Polish Agreement. It provided for the drawing up of military plans against Magyar or Bulgarian aggression; Poland undertook to modify the frontiers of Bukovina and Galicia in return for Rumanian diplomatic support in Eastern Galicia; and the treaty was not to operate until the Treaty of Riga had defined the frontiers.

The Treaty of Lana, concluded between Czechoslovakia and Austria on December 16th, 1921, had a similar object and need not be detailed. Each party guaranteed the territory of the other and undertook to resist any attempts to restore the pre-war régime.

There is a further understanding of an indefinite kind between Czechoslovakia and Italy whereby each party pledges itself to resist a Habsburg coup. The understanding was not reduced to the terms of a formal agreement, but was reached by means of correspondence which passed between Dr. Beneš and Count Sforza in February, 1921.

The relations of France with the Little Entente and with Poland are a matter of importance. During 1921 and 1922 the two countries concluded a political treaty (the famous Franco-Polish Treaty of February 19th, 1921) a military convention, an oil convention, and a commercial convention.

The political treaty went to the full length of a mutual defence of their existing frontiers—one of the great stumbling blocks that have impeded the security negotiations. The treaty was worded in such a way as to operate both against Germany and against Russia. The two important Articles, 1 and 3, had the effect of pledging France and Poland to defend each other in case of an unprovoked attack by any third party against the existing territorial integrity of the two countries. These Articles should be quoted in full:

Article 1: "Afin de coordonner leurs efforts pacifiques, les deux Gouvernements s'engagent à se concerter sur toutes les questions de politique extérieure intéressant les deux Etats et relatives au règlement des relations internationales dans l'esprit des traités et conformément au Pacte de la Société des Nations."

Article 3: "Si, contrairement aux prévisions et aux intentions sincèrement pacifiques des deux Etats contractants, ceux-ci ou l'un des deux se voyaient attaqués sans provocation de leur part, les deux Gouvernements se concerteraient en vue de la défense de leur territoire et de la sauvegarde de leurs intérêts légitimes, dans les limites précisées dans le préambule."

It is commonly understood that Article 3 has been supplemented by a military convention. The Poles, who have an obvious interest in advertising the existence of such a military convention, have advertised it, but the French have never admitted its existence, and its text is secret. There is, however, good reason for knowing

that it exists, that it provides for a French military mission to Poland and for credits for arms and equipment. There is, in fact, a French military mission in Poland, and Marshal Foch has ceremonially visited the Chief of the Polish General Staff in Warsaw.

The Treaty "of Alliance and Friendship" between France and Czechoslovakia (January 25th, 1924) is less far-reaching than that between France and Poland. It provides for consultation over matters affecting their common security (Article 1: "Les Gouvernements de la République française et de la République tchécoslovaque s'engagent à se concerter sur les questions extérieures de nature à mettre en danger leur sécurité et à porter atteinte à l'ordre établi par les traités de paix dont ils sont l'un et l'autre signataires." Article 2: "Les hautes parties contractantes se mettront d'accord sur les mesures propres à sauvegarder leurs intérêts communs dans le cas où ils seraient menacés.") The particular dangers entertained are specified in Articles 3 to 5, and consist of any attempt to modify the independent status of Austria or to restore the Habsburg or Hohenzollern dynasties. There are further stipulations, among which is one for the submission of Franco-Czechoslovak disputes to the League Court of Justice or to other arbitration.

It appears to be conclusively proved that there is no military convention between France and Czechoslovakia, in spite of ill-informed rumours which have made the allegation, but the Czechoslovak army is largely trained by a French military mission.

In addition to the Little Entente treaties and the treaties between France and the countries of Eastern Europe—which are the important factors in the situation—there are certain other treaties of less importance which need not be described here. There is, for instance, a treaty, dated January 27th, 1924, between Italy and Yugoslavia, of which the object is to safeguard the *status quo* of the Treaties of Trianon, St. Germain, and Neuilly; a treaty between Italy and Czechoslovakia, dated July 5th, 1924, on similar lines; an alliance between Greece and Yugoslavia, which was concluded in May, 1913, was denounced by Yugoslavia in December, 1924, and will therefore expire in December, 1925. Negotiations recently conducted in Belgrade for a new treaty failed and had to be suspended.

Such, then, are the arrangements which have been made in Europe between various nations which are afraid for the future. Being sectional and unrelated to any general scheme for immediate security, their value as assets for security is doubtful.

GEORGE GLASGOW.

August 15th, 1925.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
1. THE VERGER'S TALE. By J. E. G. DE M.	389
2. REVIEWS	394
RACIAL INTERACTIONS; SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE; IRISH VERSE; LORD KELVIN; INTERNATIONAL LAW.	
3. SHORTER REVIEWS: "The Structure of Light"; "Treatise on Light"; "The Transactions of the Cardiganshire Antiquarian Society"	407
4. NOTICES OF BOOKS: "Movements in European History"; "Mary Glen"	408

THE VERGER'S TALE.

Mr. George Salt, the Head Verger of the Priory of Jesus of Bethlehem at Corham, in Wessex, was worthy of that immemorial foundation. A man of fine presence, past middle age, with great natural intellectual gifts, widened by quiet reading and close observation, he was the ideal custodian of that superb edifice. There was no stone nor beam that he did not know. The growth of the place was as familiar to him as the growth from babyhood onward of a great man is to the mother of the man. The career of Mr. Salt had marked him out as the custodian. Born in the shadow of the Priory and educated in the school attached to it, he became at the age of fourteen a page boy in the household of that famous scholar, Lord Liberham, and the lad's natural love of books attracted his lordship's attention. At the age of eighteen he became the personal servant of the scholar, and his duties included a good deal of work in the notable library which housed not only the classical and theological works of three centuries, but the special collection of books on magic, witchcraft, and astrology that Lord Liberham had gathered from all parts of the world, and especially from Spain and Persia. On no less than five occasions he had travelled with his master in search of books, and had been privileged not only to listen to the learning that the old peer poured out to his attentive and silent valet, but had the good fortune of receiving instruction from him in the elements of the Latin tongue and in the principles of architecture. Salt did not,

of course, become a scholar in the strict sense, but his capacious mind became wrapped in the garment of thought woven by his beloved master, and he was, before the age of thirty, able to read Latin with tolerable fluency, while the spirit of architecture, of growth in stone, had by then claimed him for her own.

Lord Liberham, as is well-known to those who remember that remarkable man, held well-defined views as to the spirit-world, of which, in his belief, mankind forms a part. He held with fervency the main articles of the Christian faith, but he supplemented these articles with the belief that man is not only immortal but that he continues to take the fullest possible interest in the affairs of his former life, and not infrequently superintends, and not always in unseen fashion, the development of plans formulated in the days of the flesh.

For many years Salt served the old scholar and grew greatly beloved of the whole Liberham family. When his master died he felt that the world, as he knew it, was at an end; but, in fact, a new phase was about to begin. Lord Liberham specially mentioned in his lengthy will his "friend and servant, George Salt," making liberal provision for him and expressing a wish that he should, as soon as a vacancy occurred, be appointed Head Verger of the Priory. He added: "Salt will continue to watch, as we have together watched, the needs of the Priory, and will report, as we have reported, those needs to the Chapter." Lord Liberham's wish was respected. The Dean and Chapter knew well the value of Salt's services, and he was soon in a position to overlook the whole of the ancient structure. By the unanimous vote of the Dean and Chapter the mediæval post of Ferryman and Watcher of the Verge was revived for him, and included the duties of collecting the river tolls and of reporting all matters that affected the physical well-being of the House.

The ancient ferry was one of the many charms of the Priory. The willow-edged river Avon bounded more than half of the stately precincts and great lawns of perfect grass that surrounded the vast grey building. On the south side was the ferry, and in the old days it was a substantial source of revenue since pilgrims were many, and saints and sinners alike sought the shrine of Saint Anna of Corham, where all found healing of soul or body. Moreover, from Saxon times it had been the rule that the Priory should provide some destitute Englishman with food and raiment, and many a wanderer drifted in, across the ferry, to seek, it might be sanctuary, it might be food, it might be clothing, it might be soul's help. With the Reformation the pilgrims disappeared, and the monks and the Prior disappeared too; and the Priory became a glorified parish church, though still

under the government of a body called the Chapter. The old form of government in a measure was maintained, and the canonries of Corham were reserved for clergy of distinction under the rule of a Dean of still greater distinction. Bishop there was none, but by a legal fiction it was assumed that there had been one Bishop and that the Crown had forgotten to appoint another. The Dean and Chapter were quite happy without a Bishop. Their minds were much more engrossed with the line of Priors, and most of all with the last Prior, John Trembleleaf, who was pensioned in 1539, and who died suddenly in 1541 after he had spoken with a stranger in the Ferry Way that leads to the great west door.

That was one of the mysteries of the Priory. John Horne, the ferryman, at the inquisition deposed that a poor man, on September 6th, 1541, hailed him, and that he sped across the river and bade the man pay his penny and come into the boat. The man, who was about thirty years of age and bearded, said that he was a carpenter and came to do work in the Priory, but that he had no money and was faint for lack of food, and had only his bag of tools and his old clothes in the world. John Horne hesitated, since he did not know the man, a stranger to those parts, and feared strangers in days of unrest. But he gave him food and drink, the ferryman's supper, which he had kept in the boat. Then he heard a call from the north bank, and he saw the former Prior standing in the Ferry Way, a green avenue, and then Prior Trembleleaf waved for him to bring the man, and, as John Horne greatly loved the old Prior, he brought him. As the carpenter landed he said to the Prior, who to the astonishment of the ferryman bowed gravely and reverently to the stranger, "Give me, for the nonce, the ferry-penny. I will repay thee forthwith in other kind." Receiving the sum he gave it to John Horne and bade him kneel on the shore and praise God for good things to come. Then the Prior leant on the stranger's arm and they went up the Ferry Way. And as they went he heard the Prior give a little cry, and saw him sit down on the grassy verge, then lit up with the westering sun. The stranger passed on. Presently John Horne tied up his boat and went up the alley and there he found the old Prior dead with a rapturous glory on his face. Suspicion would have fallen on the ferryman, but it so happened that children playing on the bank had seen all, and as no sign of violence was apparent and the man had died, as it were, in a dream of bliss, and he was old and ripe for God, the matter dropped after due and fruitless search was made for the strange carpenter.

The story was one that had greatly moved both Lord Liberham and George Salt, especially in view of the fact that from that date onwards there were records of curious happenings in the various

works of reparation. When Salt became Head Verger he paid new and special attention to the story. The strange carpenter was the object of his search, and he looked for evidence of him everywhere. He re-read the Latin inquisition into the death, and then he went through the Priory records of work done on the structure since September, 1541. The first thing that he noticed was the abundant gifts of oak and walnut wood for the necessary reparation of the roof. The dates when the rafts of ripe trunks were floated up to the Ferry Way were entered and, in another hand, after each entry were the words *Donum Dei*. Then there were the wages. There were twelve men working in the roof, and the weekly wage was entered in each case, but there was also, after the names, a thirteenth entry in another hand: *Peregrinus—ex animo*. Then comes the long entry in the book of accounts in Latin of a curious happening. This is Salt's translation:

The twelve carpenters, when they came for their wages on September 6, 1544, were much excited, and told a tale of the strange man—a waif of God, greatly expert in the use of the chisel as well as of the saw, who works for no reward save bread and meat and beer, which is served to him from the buttery—that greatly redounds to the praise of the Priory. The gifts of seasoned wood from an unknown source having ceased, after and perhaps because of the late Dean's jest about wooden manna (*in vino non veritas*), the men in the roof knew not how to secure a long beam of walnut or even of oak for a last cross rafter. The only beam was seven feet short and that was of poor quality. And the foreman in the dinner hour said, "Let me ask the stranger about it." And the stranger said, "The beam will be provided, but you must pay for it." "That is the Chapter's work." "No, you must pay, but not with money. Look, James Thorpe!" And he said to each of them by name, in turn, "Look!" Then as each looked he saw the sin that he must undo. Then they gathered round the stranger as he sat at his bread and meat and beer, and they said, "We will pay." And they sat at meat again with him. Then said he, "Ye have paid, and now let us swing the beam." And lo! he sat at his meat on the beam already prepared for use, and they sat with him, the twelve of them, six on either side.

George Salt was never tired of dwelling on this entry in the accounts, and he brought together in a little book all the entries that seemed to show this same stranger at work. He always made men pay in that kind for his help. But no one thought very much about him. Workpeople did not connect the kindly, grave man who was with them as the same who had worked with their forefathers. He was, so far as they knew, one of them. He was a good mason, too, and bore his share of the reparations in stone. George Salt traced his mason's mark, as he thought, on various stones, but one day he was startled to find that strange mark on

the earliest stones, in the crypt, as well as on the latest stones that were even then being brought to the ferry and up the Ferry Way to renovate the decayed wall that bounds the Lady Chapel.

The Verger in his little house in the precincts sat one September evening full of thought. He had finished his little book of transcripts, Latin and English, English from Elizabethan times, and, re-reading it all, he saw a complete story, an unbroken record. The Carpenter, the Mason, was still at work. Of that he was certain. But the Verger's Tale would not be complete until, and a strange thrill went through him, until he could meet and face the man. It was a lovely autumn Sunday evening. The full moon had penetrated the Priory Church as he had lingered long after the folk had gone and the last strains of the mellow organ had thrilled like life through the aisles and all the very veins of the enchanted place. The clergy had gone, his helpers had gone, and, last of all, he closed the little wicket door in the north aisle and crossed the hallowed grass to his dwelling. Now after supper he had gone to his book, and then to the list of men who were working in the roof and on the decayed wall. Yes, he knew them all. They all came from the village. He knew them all and the lives that they led. There was no stranger. The Carpenter could not be one of them. He felt that he was not worthy to meet the Stranger. Then he began to think of his old master and of the theory that men do revisit the scenes of their labours and their fellowworkers. While he mused there was a knocking at the door, and, opening it, he saw the foreman of the works. "Well, Garrett, is anything wrong?" "No, sir; but I looked round to see that we must have an extra hand or two with this heavy, difficult stone-work. There is no one in the village, but I have found a man, a tramp, seemingly, who crossed the Ferry with me to-night. I talked with him and he seemed to know more of masonry than I do, and he said he worked here once and came seeking a job in the old place." "Where is he?" said the Verger, with strained, knitted brows. "Well, I gave him some supper at 'The Crown,' and, it may be I have taken a liberty, but you like to know the men. He is sitting on the bench in the north porch while I have come here. He may not be your sort of man, but you may like to see him, Mr. Salt." "I will come with you. I want to look into the church again for a special reason. You and he can come with me, and we can talk with him and test his knowledge." They walked together across the moonlit green and Salt's heart failed him.

The Stranger rose from the stone bench as they approached, and said: "Good evening. I fear I am too late. Work is hard to find. Is there room for me, a poor mason and carpenter, who

worked here long ago?" "There will be room for a good man. Where do you come from?" "I have been at the quarries. Here is my discharge. I helped to quarry the new stones sent here. I should like to see the church again." The three went in and wandered about in the moonlight. "Do you know," said the Stranger, "that the Bell-Tower is unsafe and may come down at any time?" "That is not so," said Salt and the foreman, stoutly. "My experience tells me that it is so. I studied the Tower as I came across the marsh. But we can test it now. It is a fit Sabbath task." And he said this with a humorous smile. The Stranger had a bag of tools with him, and the three men, the lights being turned on, set to work measuring, and speedily found so dangerous a subsidence that it was by a miracle that the old structure stood. "We are not too late," said the Stranger, "but, if you will allow me, I will return to the quarry and select the necessary stones. I am glad we are not too late," he added, as they stood outside the church. "Good-night. Indeed, it is almost morning. No, I must not stay, but I shall see you both again." As he melted into the moonlight the foreman said, "I seem to know his face," but George Salt said nothing. He had met the Carpenter.

J. E. G. DE M.

REVIEWS.

RACIAL INTERACTIONS.*

This remarkable book by Dr. J. W. Gregory, the Professor of Geology in the University of Glasgow, boldly faces the problems offered by racial interaction on a large scale. It is a strictly judicial survey. Professor Gregory has no brief for any race, and his goal is a scientific world-policy which shall secure the best chance of true development for all races and a fair chance for the white race in a world in which the coloured races outnumber the white by more than two to one.

He points out that "extensive areas available for the occupation of the white man are but few. Asia has vast empty tracts of good land in Southern Siberia climatically suitable for him." The author, therefore, thinks that, as a result of restriction of immigra-

* *The Menace of Colour: A study of the Difficulties due to the Association of White and Coloured Races, with an Account of Measures proposed for their Solution, and Special Reference to White Colonisation in the Tropics.* By J. W. Gregory. With Illustrations and Maps. Seeley Service & Co. 12s. 6d. net.

tion into America from Eastern Europe, a great increase of white (Slav) population along the line of the Siberian railway is probable. Yet these areas are open to Southern Asiatics and Mongolians. If Europe is to populate Southern Siberia it must be quick about it. The spaces that, at first sight, at any rate, are suitable for Europeans are, in fact, very restricted. The European race may hold the southern part of the South American continent and a few colonies further north, "but it has no chance of permanence in most of South America." In Asia (apart from Siberia) the efforts of the white man will be restricted to specialist work. In Africa "the ultimate supremacy of the Negro over most of the Continent appears inevitable; and the retention of the political authority of the white man in the Union of South Africa appears to depend on the establishment of some system of segregation by which the white artizan may be secured comfortable conditions of life." Australia can justify the White Policy. North America is in the actual grip of racial interactions, though it is essentially a country suited to the white man. The white race is, then, not over-provided with suitable accommodation outside Europe, but Professor Gregory carefully examines the question of the possibility of permanent settlements of white peoples in the tropics, and the evidence that he adduces is hopeful. The issue, however, is rather economic than one for medical science. Can the European with his standard of life compete with the coloured races with their standard of life? In Cuba the white Cubans are apparently increasing in numbers faster, and are physically doing better than the coloured population, but it may be that there are special conditions that make it unlikely that this advantage could be secured in Africa or in Asia, or even in South America.

Professor Gregory discusses at great and necessary length the Negro Problem in America, and those that desire to know the details of that problem set forth in judicial fashion should turn to this book. The negroes have made "conspicuous intellectual progress"; they are capable "of marked intellectual progress in a suitable environment." The negro is still, in the Southern States, in a special and inferior status, but, in fact, the large migration of the negroes to the Northern States as a result of the war and of the immigration legislation, is putting the Southern States in a difficult economic position. "The ultimate issue of the Negro problem in the States may be the establishment, in consequence of the development of a large Negro-Latin population, of a south-eastern union, and of perhaps other autonomous groups each with such special legislation as may be adapted to its particular ethnical problems and circumstances." But the ultimate political future of the negro in the States may be very important. It is possible that the

negroes might, "as a third political party, determine the United States policy." The whole question is one of extraordinary difficulty, and may well harden Australia in its insistence on a White Policy for that Continent. The same problem does not occur in South America. There is no colour prejudice in the Southern Continent, "an intermixture of Indian blood is regarded as no social disadvantage." Latin settlers in North America may, therefore, solve the negro problem there after many decades.

Professor Gregory declares that "Some system of segregation is morally justified by the existing reservation of large areas in South Africa for exclusive occupation by Negroes." The white man is practically excluded from Basutoland and, in these circumstances, "it would appear not unfair that white labour should be given a privileged position in other areas" by reserving certain trades and employments for white workers in the highlands and western districts of South Africa, while making more extensive restrictions in favour of native labour in the eastern districts. Some such balanced plan, indeed, seems necessary if the white population is not to be submerged and South Africa lost as a home for the European.

* * *

SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE.*

Mr. H. W. Garrod has done useful work for the student of nineteenth-century literature in his judicious and judicious introduction to the outstanding poems and some of the disappointing prose of Coleridge and to the essays of the poet's perhaps too generous contemporaries. Samuel Taylor Coleridge was an amazing person, hardly less amazing than his portrait in Christ's Hospital would indicate. Born at Ottery St. Mary, in 1772, he was educated at Christ's Hospital, became a Grecian at that notable school, passed to Jesus College, Cambridge, where he won the Browne Gold Medal, enlisted in the 15th Dragoons, was bought out, returned to Cambridge, and became a Foundation Scholar of Jesus, left without a degree, lived in Bristol with Southey, lectured, wrote, became a Unitarian minister, after various adventures settled in the Lake District and became intimate with the Wordsworths, travelled a good deal, lectured in many places, lived an uncentred life, and depended a good deal on many literary friends. As late as 1828 he was travelling with the Wordsworths in Germany. He

Coleridge: Poetry and Prose. With Essays by Hazlitt, Jeffrey, de Quincey, Carlyle and others. With an Introduction and Notes by H. W. Garrod. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d. net.

died, after a life of endless talk and reading, in 1834. It was an unsatisfactory life. His marriage was not too happy. His brilliant son, Hartley, was a failure despite his Fellowship at Oriel. The poet's best work was perhaps his early work.

He was well-known in literary circles when he joined with Wordsworth in the volume, *Lyrical Ballads*. The "Ancient Mariner" first appeared in this volume. Mr. Garrod affirms that "nearly all of what is supreme in Coleridge's poetry was written when he was with, or near, Wordsworth." That great poet seems to have added to the restless, unstable personality of Coleridge enough ballast to make him reach and remain at his highest powers for a sufficient period to produce great results.

It is clear enough on the facts that Coleridge, though he had a rare and wonderful mind, was unstable and not wholly reliable. His brilliant conversation, despite its almost intolerable range, was a connected whole. "I can assert," wrote de Quincey, "upon my long and intimate knowledge of Coleridge's mind, that logic the most severe was as inalienable from his modes of thinking as grammar from his language." Hazlitt regarded his poetry as inferior to his conversation. The extraordinary learning that was poured out in his tireless conversational lectures was absent from his prose. "Hardly a gleam is to be found in it of the brilliancy and richness of those stores of thought and language that he pours out incessantly, when they are lost like drops of water on the ground." Hazlitt, indeed, considered that had he "not been the most impressive talker of his age, he would probably have been the finest writer." His range of thought and knowledge, on the estimate of his contemporaries, exceeded that of any man of our race, and certainly it is not necessary to place Macaulay in a separate category. Wordsworth spoke of him as the most wonderful man he had ever known. Pater regarded him as "the perfect flower of the romantic type." Yet, somehow or another, he impressed one at least of his contemporaries, and certainly he impresses Mr. Garrod, with a sense of insincerity. Yet Lamb could write, "He was my fifty years old friend without a dissension" of his old schoolfellow. Schoolboys are rarely mistaken in one another. Mr. Garrod writes:

Perhaps, indeed, the grand failure of Coleridge was the failure to be completely honest. He was completely honest neither with himself nor with his work. When he was honest with his neighbours, it was not from principle, but by a flair which he had for grandiose behaviour. If his best work came from his connection with Wordsworth, it was because here he made contact with an astonishingly matter of fact honesty; which he was able to recognise, let it be added, not as an ornament or attribute, but as the essence, of Wordsworth's power as a poet.

These are hard, too hard, sayings. It seems more true to say that when talking becomes a disease—as it undoubtedly did with Coleridge—sophistry and self-deception and all the evils of satisfied vanity are the products of that disease. A perpetual talker becomes unconsciously dishonest to himself and to his work. Perpetual talk in a very gifted man is a form of laziness and self-indulgence. It is a substitute for laborious writing which needs checking and authorities at every turn. The probable truth about Coleridge is that he was at the bottom a somewhat lazy and self-indulgent man who disliked hard work, and found an outlet for his amazing and fruitful mind by means of his peculiar gift of verbal exposition. That gives a reasonable explanation of his failure to produce sustained and complete work. Macaulay was almost as brilliant a talker and he was probably not intellectually more judicious than Coleridge; but he was not afraid of giving permanent form to his opinions. He challenged the world with downright written advocacy, and therein showed that his moral honesty was supreme, even if his opinions were one-sided. Coleridge took no such risks. He was far too lazy, self-indulgent, and self-converted.

Yet, strangely enough, while Mr. Garrod attacks his honesty and sincerity, yet he regards Coleridge, in at any rate certain respects, as a greater poet than Wordsworth. "In the quality of wonder, indeed, Coleridge was easily pre-eminent; and his great examples of the quality—the 'Ancient Mariner,' 'Christabel,' 'Kubla Khan'—are work beyond Wordsworth's range." This is a strange view. Probably Wordsworth and Browning are the two greatest poets of the nineteenth century. That view seems, ever more and more, likely to be the final view, though there are some who still claim pre-eminence for what Wordsworth called the "pretty" verses of Keats, and some (on nobler grounds) for the swift splendours of Shelley. The claims of Coleridge to poetic greatness are really based on poems that are wonderful because they appeal to that sense of the unknown, that desire to grasp the elusory which is deep-rooted in the human heart. Coleridge had a bizarre magic that seems to bring the something that underlies all superstition into close touch with the mind. That it was a superb achievement no one can deny; that it was a *tour de force* one must suspect; that it was within the range of Wordsworth or of any of the absolutely first rank poets to secure the same class of effect is undeniable. Wordsworth did it repeatedly, but, as it were, did it in the light of common day. He brings the mystery of things to our human cottage-door. Shakespeare, when he chose, did what Wordsworth did, but also, when he chose, did it in Coleridge's way. The knocking at the gate in "Macbeth" is one among many instances. Browning repeatedly achieved the same result both

in Wordsworth's way and in Coleridge's way. "When Roland to the Dark Tower came" is an example of the latter way. Yet this is not to say, it is, indeed, to insist, that Coleridge had the qualities of a very great poet and has some of the achievements of such a poet to his credit. The sadness of it all is that Coleridge never brought his harvest home:

And I the while, the sole unbusy thing,
Nor honey make, nor pair, nor build, nor sing.

* * *

IRISH VERSE.*

An anthology of Irish verse is bound to be disappointing, since "so little of value was written in English before the nineteenth century." The real charm of an anthology of English verse is to be found in the lyrics and sonnets of the earlier periods. Of the writers of these periods we have in this collection Jonathan Swift (1667-1745), William Congreve (1670-1729), Thomas Parnell (1679-1717), and Oliver Goldsmith (1728-1774); and from Congreve, at any rate, we get something of the latest echoes of the greatest English period. When Congreve sings:

Fair Amoret is gone astray;
Pursue and seek her, ev'ry lover;
I'll tell the signs by which you may
The wandering shepherdess discover,

there is still a faint echo of Elizabethan music. Swift (essentially Irish, as Congreve is not) has no music at all; Thomas Parnell recalls the melodious periods of Thomas Gray, and in his "Night Piece on Death" there is, indeed, a foreshadowing of the immortal Elegy:

Those graves, with bending osier bound,
That nameless heave the crumbling ground,
Quick to the glancing thought disclose
Where Toil and Poverty repose.

Goldsmith had his own note, with perhaps a touch of Irish feeling, but conveys nothing of the old literary tradition.

We must turn, then, to the men and women of a century later to gain the true Irish melody. Thomas Moore (1779-1852) uses Irish themes, but an Englishman as well as an Irish immigrant to England could have done the same. Yet "The harp that once through Tara's hall" strikes its note in many an Irish heart. Mrs. Alexander (1818-1895) is, perhaps, more essentially Irish, and William Allingham (1824-1889) is Irish indeed. "Abbey Asaroe" is true Irish poetry that no Englishman and immigrant in England could have written:

* *A Golden Treasury of Irish Verse.* Edited by Lennox Robinson. Macmillan. 7s. 6d. net.

It looks beyond the harbour-stream to Gulban mountain blue;
 It hears the voice of Erna's fall—Atlantic breakers too;
 High ships go sailing past it; the sturdy clank of oars
 Brings in the salmon-boat to haul a net upon the shores;
 And this way to his home-creek, when the summer day is done,
 Slow sculls the weary fisherman across the setting sun;
 While green with corn is Sheegus Hill, his cottage white below;
 But grey at every season is Abbey Asaroe.

Allingham's "Sad Song" could have been written by no one save an Irishman:

Why dost thou, weeping,
 Stretch forth thine arms in vain?
 It breaks thy sleeping;
 Oh, drop into trance again.

The profound melancholy of his mind is knit to a weird Celtic music. It is the same note that is sounded by Dion Boucicault in the song of the emigrant peasant-woman who hears the calling of her dead child from the land of sorrows. Lady Dufferin's famous "Lament of the Irish Emigrant," beautiful though it is, seems artificial beside the pang (there is no other word) of Boucicault's verse. This really terrible note is sounding through Miss Emily Lawless' poetry. "After Aughrim," is fierce poetry. Ireland is muttering of her heroic sons, "cast forth like rubbish from my shores":

She said, "I stayed alone at home,
 A dreary woman, grey and cold;
 I never asked them how they fared,
 Yet still they love me as of old."

* * *

She said, "God knows they owe me nought,
 I tossed them to the foaming sea,
 I tossed them to the howling waste,
 Yet still their love comes home to me."

Never was the brooding Gaelic spirit, with its sense of sin, of remorse, of hopelessness, better limned. Miss Lawless more nearly depicts the infinite sadness and innate revolt of the Irish spirit than any other Irish writer, and we are not forgetting Mr. J. M. Synge and Mr. W. B. Yeats.

Of the art of Mr. Yeats there can be no doubt, and he presents a vivid picture of Irish scenery and Irish people:

The wind has bundled up the clouds high over Knocknarea,
 And thrown the thunder on the stones for all that Maeve can say.
 Angers that are like noisy clouds have set our hearts abeat;
 But we have all bent low and low and kissed the quiet feet
 Of Cathleen, the daughter of Houlihan.

The sadness of things is, of course, present to Mr. Yeats:

Come away, O human child!
 To the waters and the wild
 With a faery, hand in hand,
 For the world's more full of weeping than you can understand.

For Mr. Yeats, Easter, 1916, meant that "a terrible beauty is born." Ireland had undergone a fundamental change. Yet the Irish heart knows quite well that Southern Ireland cannot change, that the Celtic melancholy is the unchangeable thing. *And the tall reeds sigh as the wind doth blow.* Mr. Yeats tells the child dancing in the wind of the hopelessness of things. Even "the Man who dreamed of Faeryland" has found "no comfort in the grave." Mr. Synge does not make us more cheerful. Successful love ends with death's failure. As Miss Nora Hopper sang, "He follows after shadows, the King of Ireland's son."

Much of the verse collected here is from the pens of Irishmen who have become English in tradition and manner of life. Emily Brontë, Aubrey de Vere, Arthur O'Shaughnessy, Lionel Johnson, Herbert Trench, Edward Dowden, are English poets of Irish stock. They have the Celtic melancholy, but so had Keats, the Cornishman. A good many of the lyrics, the majority of them, might appear, though they rarely reach the standard, in any English anthology. The translations from Erse are on a different footing. Sir Samuel Ferguson, Mr. Douglas Hyde, Lady Gregory, J. C. Mangan, and others, reflect with great skill the profound melancholy, the frequent hopelessness, the occasional humour, of modern Erse poetry. Mr. James Stephens gives some charming passages—"Peggy Mitchell," from the Irish of Raftery, stands out like a red rose about a grey thicket of sadness—and Mr. Padraic Colum has both achievement and promise.

There are roses and possibilities of infinite beauty in Irish literature. Ireland has the most charming folk-lore in the world, while her folk melodies are endless and exquisite. The true literature of Ireland is yet to come, and will grow in peaceful days out of folk-lore and folk-song. This Golden Treasury, patiently collected by Mr. Lennox Robinson, owes too much to second-rate English models.

J. E. G. DE M.

LORD KELVIN.*

This charming sketch of a most lovable personality, Lord Kelvin, makes the reader acquainted with the man as well as the

* *Kelvin the Man*, a Biographical Sketch by his niece, Agnes Gardner King. Hodder & Stoughton Limited, London, 7s. 6d. net.

VOL. CXXVIII.

great scientist. William Thomson was born in Belfast in 1824. He was very strictly brought up, as was the manner of those days, but the hard discipline to which he had to submit made a man of him, and he was ever grateful to his beloved nurse for all she had instilled into him in his early years. William Thomson's mother, Margaret Gardner, was a highly-cultivated and beautiful woman. She died when William was only six years old, leaving six other children, two of whom were infants. Lord Kelvin's father was a man of remarkable talents. He came of the fine old stock of Scottish Covenanters who fled to the North of Ireland in 1688, and there settled and founded new homes.

Professor James Thomson succeeded, by his own exertions, in becoming a student in Glasgow University, where he greatly distinguished himself in mathematics and other studies, and later wrote many educational books. Notwithstanding all his activities he found time to educate his children. He rose at four in the morning to carry on his literary work and devoted his evenings to the education of his children. Under his tutelage lessons were a pleasure, never a task: the children, being more than ordinarily gifted, craved knowledge and delighted in its acquisition. William, Lord Kelvin, to the end of life declared himself to be a student, was proud of the title, and always felt the deep debt of gratitude that he owed to his father, of whom he ever spoke and wrote with intense affection. His academic achievements at Glasgow and at Cambridge (he was second Wrangler and first Smith's Prizeman) were due to his father's thorough teaching.

Miss Agnes Gardner King, in this book, has taken her readers into her confidence and given them "Kelvin the Man" in good earnest; revealing the humility which always accompanies true greatness. He was as simple as a child, notwithstanding all his great achievements, and untiring in the patient working out of his experiments. Years might elapse before he found what he sought, but he was never daunted in his quest by apparent failure. A man of the keenest observation, he was always employing and adapting what he observed to the matter he had in hand. If it were tides or waves he was studying at the time, he would note the motion of the tea in his cup caused by a certain movement of the spoon, or the circles made in the water by ducks when swimming. He was ever finding something new in the most ordinary occurrences, always observing and always learning.

The sounding machine, which was one of his discoveries and has done much to make navigation safer and easier, illustrates his practical outlook.

Formerly it was necessary to stop to take a sounding. Lord Kelvin, however, discarded rope for the sounding-lead, and used piano

wire, provided with a device which gave the depth by showing the pressure of air in a tube. Thus soundings can be obtained when proceeding at full speed. A friend finding him surrounded with piano wire asked what sound he was trying to produce. "The deep C," was the quick reply.

Lord Kelvin's interest in electricity began as early as 1848. He felt its immense possibilities for usefulness. Sir J. J. Thomson says, "Modern telegraphy, telephony, and broadcasting depend upon a result published by him (Lord Kelvin) in 1853." The difficulties of the Atlantic cable were overcome by Lord Kelvin's instruments which made long-distance telegraphy possible. The mirror galvanometer was the means by which the faintest possible electric current was able to respond. The author of this "Life" thinks that this was her uncle's pet instrument. The first message which rang across the Atlantic on August 5th, 1858, was "Europe and America are united by telegraphic communication. Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good-will towards men." The excitement of the success was intense. The expedition had started on May 29th, 1858, and 340,000 miles of fine wire were used in the construction of the first Atlantic cable, "enough to go thirteen times round the world, and considerably more than would be needed to reach the moon!" Miss King describes the scene when the first message came through most vividly, and the awful and terrible fear that the storm which the vessel encountered would have sunk her and destroyed all hope of success. The injury to the cable was great, but it was proved beyond question that a practical cable could be laid to America and telegraphic communication secured as the result of Lord Kelvin's strenuous efforts.

Lord Kelvin was twice married. His first wife was Margaret Crum, of Thornliebank. They were married in 1852. Throughout her life she was a great sufferer, and died after seventeen years to the great grief of her husband. In 1874, Lord Kelvin remarried. His second wife was a Miss Blandy, of Madeira. There were no children by either marriage. He was devoted to his nephews and nieces, as this book testifies.

Honours were showered upon him from all quarters. It was on New Year's Day, 1892, that Sir William Thomson received the Peerage. He took his title from the beautiful little river Kelvin which flows past Glasgow University. He lived a long, laborious, and honoured life, and died at the age of 83 years, with faculties unimpaired, loved and cherished by all with whom he came in contact. His faith in God was never shaken. All his wonderful discoveries in science only seemed to bring him nearer to the Great Artificer of the Universe. "His work was to him

a kind of worship," and if he ever felt a sense of failure it was because his ideal was too high for attainment in this world. The advance of physical knowledge since his time—especially the new knowledge as to his beloved Atom—would have delighted but not surprised him. What would he have said to the foolish trial which has lately taken place in Tennessee on the subject of evolution!

Sir Donald Macalister, Principal and Vice-Chancellor of Glasgow University, writes an Introduction to this sketch. The illustrations are interesting, as they connect the outward and visible with the inner man.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL LAW.*

In this well-established annual, for the most part from the pens of English students of International Law, there are thirteen essays on outstanding problems as well as notes on current subjects (such as the submission of treaties to Parliament before ratification), a record of decisions, opinions and awards of International Tribunals during the year 1924-25, reports of decisions of national tribunals involving points of international law, reviews of books, a bibliography, and, finally, a summary of events from May 1st, 1924 to Feb. 28th, 1925. The volume is well-planned, excellently edited, and has (an important matter) a sufficient index.

It is, moreover, of practical value. The main criticism is that in several of the articles the realities of things are not faced, and this involves the danger, exemplified by the war of 1914, that finespun webs of ingenious theories are swept away with the first whiff of war and the general conception of law between nations is discredited. Dr. P. J. N. Baker, the New Cassel Professor of International Relations in the University of London, and a member of the editorial committee responsible for this Year Book, in a very lengthy and elaborate article, discusses the proposal that Great Britain should accept the obligatory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice in international disputes of a legal nature, by making the optional declaration provided by Article 36 of the Statutes of the Court, and suggests that "the British Government could rightly co-operate with other governments in giving obligatory jurisdiction to the Permanent Court under Article 36 of its Statute without fear that by so doing it would bring injustice either upon itself or upon the other members of the community of states." Such a proposal is not within the range of practical British politics, for the simple reason that public opinion in this country and in our great Dominions over-

* *The British Year Book of International Law*, 1925. Sixth year of issue. Oxford University Press. 16s. net.

seas would not entrust the future of the British Empire to the decisions of an International Court, which, though admirable (and it is most admirable), is young, has, necessarily, few precedents, and has yet to secure absolute independence of the forces that may play upon the members that constitute it. If Great Britain were to give its adhesion to the obligatory jurisdiction of the Court the fact would at once imperil the unity of the Empire, since the Dominions would be certain to repudiate that jurisdiction. Slow progress is the only path. As legal questions arise the various Governments concerned will consider whether it is possible to place the issue in the hands of the Court. Professor Baker considers that he has swept away Dr. Westlake's objections to a system of compulsory arbitration. Perhaps it would be possible in the seventh issue of this Year Book to secure an opinion of Lord Balfour on this point, and if Signor Mussolini also could be induced to express an opinion in the same issue the question would be raised from the region of speculation to the region of fact.

Another article that seems to neglect realities is Dr. J. M. Spaight's paper on "The Doctrine of Air-Force Necessity." Dr. Spaight presents the view that

air-force necessity permits the destruction of *non-military property only when non-combatants in the vicinity have at least the opportunity to provide for their safety*, and that attack upon such property is absolutely banned when it must involve necessarily the sacrifice of innocent life. How exactly air forces will succeed in complying with such a restrictive rule, whether it will involve their attacking the property in question only under certain favourable conditions, in what precise manner they will ensure that the material or physical destruction does not involve loss of citizens' lives, need not here be considered in detail. It is enough to say that, given the rule, air power will find the means to observe it. It will do so the more readily because, in point of fact, it will see no advantage in attacking the kind of property (citizens' dwellings, retail shops and the like) which can only be destroyed at the price of heavy human losses. Air forces will seek bigger game—the kind of property the destruction of which must have an important repercussion on the whole fabric of national life and business. But that is just the kind of property in regard to which measures of life-saving can be most readily organised.

We have quoted Dr. Spaight at length because it is this sort of sophisticated thinking that tends to blind men's eyes as to the horrible reality of war. Let us assume, what is a fact, that airmen hate the horrors that they must inflict. Let us assume that the "Ban" to which Dr. Spaight refers is actually formulated by the League of Nations. That is as high as the case can be put. The League forbids the airmen to do what they naturally hate doing, namely, the showering of bombs on densely populated areas. The aspiration is admirable but the assumption involves the rule that

such areas shall not be attacked from the air at all, and thus involves the conclusion that "the nerve-centres of which armies are the extremities" are immune from attack. Yet Dr. Spaight's whole argument turns on the proposition "that it is folly to kill soldiers, the tens of thousands of them, and greater folly still to kill civilians, who must always outnumber the soldiers, when a war can be won by striking at the nerve-centres of which armies are the extremities." During the late war civilian London hummed with innumerable munition factories, the organisation of the war was carried on in the very heart of a metropolis numbering millions of civilians, while the links of the continent ran through the thickest areas of civilian population. That was equally true of Paris and Berlin. The German Air-Service was quite right in attacking London, on Dr. Spaight's own showing. Let us face realities and say boldly that the developments of air-force must make war so disastrous a thing from the point of view of civilisation that some alternative to war in the settlement of disputes must be found. This is what nations are slowly feeling towards and half a century of peace may give us this alternative. Compulsory jurisdiction is no alternative. Indeed, the very fact of compulsion might provoke war and would provoke it if quite conceivable conditions arose.

In contrast to these well-meaning and attractive but dangerously impracticable essays are several papers of a statesmanlike character. Mr. P. E. Corbett provides an admirable analysis of the essential nature and actual sources of international law, Professor J. L. Brierly deals with "matters of domestic jurisdiction" and insists that "domestic control of immigration, naturalisation and the like, will be in no sort of danger if it will cease to shelter itself under a mischievous phrase, whether it be sovereignty, or independence, or domestic jurisdiction, or whatever the next catchword may be, and claims the right to exist on its own merits." This attitude is welcome. International lawyers, and, indeed, students of jurisprudence generally, are too much under the dominion of words and very frequently mischievous words, though it is desirable, with great respect to Professor Brierly and incidentally to Professor Jenks, to regard "sovereignty" as an essential thing and not merely as a catchword.

Mr. Malcolm M. Lewis contributes a powerful and very practical article on "The Treaty-making Power of the Dominions," a subject that calls for close consideration at the present time, since the British Empire is a League of Nations in being. Mr. W. E. Beckett's paper on "The Exercise of Criminal Jurisdiction over Foreigners" is a very valuable discussion of a vexed and difficult question, and will have permanent value; while Dr.

A. D. Macnair's brilliant essay on "So-called State Servitudes" is of the first importance, and places this whole and very difficult subject on a scientific footing. The volume is one that will raise a good deal of useful discussion, and Sir Cecil Hurst's attractive suggestions for the formation of an expeditious court dealing with private international claims should foreshadow early action on this subject.

J. E. G. DE M.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Sir J. J. Thomson delivered on May 7th last the first Fison Memorial Lecture, taking as his subject "The Structure of Light," now published.* This annual lecture has been founded in memory of Alfred Henry Fison (1857-1923), the eminent scientific lecturer, whose capacity, wide humanism and personal charm had stamped his personality on his own generation. The Master of Trinity's lecture represents the latest thought in one of the branches of physics in which Fison made his mark. The problem of the nature or structure of light has received three or four successive solutions, if we include Sir J. J. Thomson's latest theory. Newton himself set forth a corpuscular theory of light, but he held that the corpuscles were only a part of light and that the ether, as well as the corpuscles, formed an integral part of it. The immediate successors of Newton held that the energy in the light was carried by small bodies, shot out by lucent bodies and travelling through space at the rate of 180,000 miles per second. This view appeared to be established by the mathematical conclusions of men like Laplace and Poisson, but at the end of the eighteenth century this corpuscular theory was attacked by Thomas Young and the French mathematician, Fresnel, who founded the undulatory theory, namely, that light consists of waves spreading through the ether. "No theory had ever survived such searching tests as those to which the undulatory theory had been exposed up to the end of the last century." Yet the theory began to break down at the end of the nineteenth century with the discovery of X-rays, since these rays eject electrons from bodies on which they fall. The undulatory theory, moreover, is inconsistent with the change of the colour of light as temperature changes. Planck showed that the energy in the spectrum of a hot body was atomic, and not continuous. "All the optical effects point to the undulatory theory, all the electrical ones to something like the corpuscular theory." Sir J. J. Thomson endeavours to reconcile these views. He conceives of light as a ring travelling unchanged in size and shape but surrounded by waves excited by the vibrations of the ring, their wave-length being equal to the circumference of the ring. This is the Newtonian theory in terms of modern physics, a theory of a dual structure of light, one part similar to that postulated as the undulatory, and one similar to that postulated by the corpuscular theory. It is a remarkable conclusion. The fourth edition of Mr. R. A. Houston's excellent *Treatise on Light*† provides the analysis necessary for approaching this new theory of the structure of light.

* Cambridge: At the University Press. 2s. 6d. net.

† Macmillan. 12s. 6d. net.

The remarkable discoveries recorded in Volume III, Part I, of *The Transactions of the Cardiganshire Antiquarian Society* as to the survival of the numerals of a pre-Welsh or Goidelic language, are being extended. These numerals were discovered in use, that is to say, in spoken form, in South Cardiganshire south of the line of the Cerdin and Llethi rivers, where the Wês dialect of the Welsh language is spoken. In July, 1923, Mr. David Thomas, after long investigation, secured seven records of these strange prehistoric numerals. The fifth version was supplied by an old man of 96, who stated that in his youth it was his custom to count the sheep and cattle at his home by means of these numerals. This list, from one to twenty, is as follows: ên, dor, tar, cwar [quar], cwî (qui) sych, sôch, nych, noch, de, inde, dorde, tarde, cwarde (quarde), cwîde (quîde), sychde, sochde, mychde, nochde, chwî. Dorchwi, tarchwi, cwarchwi (quarchwi), cwîchwî (quîchwî), represent forty, sixty, eighty, and one hundred respectively. These numerals differ materially from the Brythonic numerals found in Cumberland and other English counties. They belong to the Q and not the P Celtic tongues. Eighteen further versions have been discovered, and there are more possibilities. Are any phrases of the old tongue left?

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Mr. D. H. Lawrence in "Movements in European History"* gives an illustrated edition of a work published in 1921. It carries the reader through the various great movements in Europe from Roman days to the unification of Germany. The book is an attempt "to give some impression of the great surging movements which rose in the hearts of men in Europe, sweeping human beings together into one great concerted action, or sweeping them apart for ever on the tides of opposition." The earlier European movements, such as the Aryan dispersal, are also of this type. There are many and excellent illustrations.

* * *

This South African Story,† by the author of "God's Stepchildren," is a curious study of character and of human contrasts. Mary Adams, with foolish social ambitions, rejects the addresses of a worthy Boer farmer and marries, not for love, but for social ambition, a young, and, perhaps, not less worthy Englishman, Elliot Glen. After some years in England, where a boy is born, the pair return to the South African veldt country and, despite Mary's airs and graces, her husband is employed by Brandt van Hardt, who in the meantime had married an excellent, practical girl, Emma Page. Elliot, while out on the veldt with his boy, accidentally shoots him, and, as his wife was about to have a second child, hides the fact and says the child is lost. The tragedy, and the final revelation of the truth to Mary, gives scope for the drawing of contrasts in character, and brings out the essential goodness of Brandt and Emma and Elliot, and the awakening, through love of the second child, a girl, and the memory of dead "Jackie," of Mary's soul.

* Oxford University Press. 8s. 6d. net.

† "Mary Glen." Constable. 6s. net.

CONFLICTING TENDENCIES IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND:

- I. EVANGELICAL: By the RT. REV. E. A. KNOX, D.D. (formerly Bishop of Manchester).
- II. ANGLO-CATHOLIC: By the REV. PROFESSOR GOUDGE, D.D.
- III. MODERNIST: By the REV. HENRY D. A. MAJOR, D.D.

I.

"SEEK in the broad places (of Jerusalem), if there be a *Man*." The words, though not strictly applicable, haunt us in our effort to present Evangelical tendencies within the Church of England. They gather up and focus in one centre the various features, doctrinal, historical, and social, which constitute the strength and weakness of the Evangelical revival and present movement as one of the religious forces of Anglicanism. They account for its power and its unpopularity. Unpopularity is a mark of which no religious cause need be ashamed, so long as it is not incurred by disregard of truth or lack of charity. Evangelical teaching "seeks for the *man*," that he may set himself right with God, and then proceeds to place him in right relation to the Church and to the world. It has no use for any inverted or altered order of dealing with these relationships.

Evangelicalism seeks for the *man*. In the highly artificial world of the later eighteenth century it laid hold of the truth underlying the dynamic phrase, "All men are equal." The watchword of the French Revolution became in the hands of the Evangelical leaders the fundamental conception of a right relation between God and man. "All men are equal before God," all alike are lost sinners without power to save themselves, until they are brought to see themselves as God sees them, and also to see God as He has revealed Himself in Christ. It was for this levelling tendency that the early Evangelicals were hated. They insisted, rightly or wrongly, on the depravity of human nature. Learning, culture, wealth, rank, even moral and religious attainment were mere appanages and adornments which they ruthlessly tore away, until the true man, the soul, as it stands before God, was reached—reached, not through the confessional or other human agency, but through conversion wrought by the illuminating power of the Holy Spirit of God.

The distinctive feature of Evangelical teaching is this, that it relates the whole spiritual life, so far as it is true life at all, exclusively to Divine action and Divine indwelling. We must "eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood," or else we have no life in us, and this eating and drinking are continuous and un-

broken acts of the soul, and every breach of that spiritual connection is a separation from God, and so long as it lasts, a state of sin. This is the individualism with which Evangelical teaching can fairly be charged, the direct and unmediated relation between God and the soul of man.

It is here that Evangelicalism comes into conflict with what we may call for convenience the Catholic tendencies in the Church of England—not without protest against the misuse of the word Catholic. The Catholic holds that God has appointed only one way of right relation with Himself and that is through the Church. Out of compassion He may suffer other ways of approach to Himself to produce spiritual results, but there is only one right way, and that is through the Sacraments of grace ministered by priests who can trace their commission for this purpose, through episcopal ordination, to the authority given by Our Lord to His Apostles. It is no purpose of this article to criticise this theory but only to point out its sharp antagonism to the Evangelical. For that antagonism is one of the difficulties at the root of the present revision of the Prayer Book. Evangelicals are charged with intolerance because they resist changes which are intended to give the sanction of the Church to Catholic teachings. Our objection is that the Church would stultify itself by doing so. "Out of the same fountain would be proceeding sweet water and bitter."

We do not deny that saintliness of life, heroic self-sacrifice, and zeal for the conversion of the world have been found under Catholic teaching. We know that on many vital Christian doctrines Evangelicals are in agreement with Catholics Roman as well as Anglican. We are not insensible to the devotional influences exercised by architecture, music, and ceremonial. But devotion is very far from being the whole of religion. It is an element which is shared with pagan cults. The mystery religions were probably intensely devotional, and used many of the aids which Catholicism uses. It is not devotion that distinguishes true religion from false; it is the object of devotion, the Being Who is worshipped. The Evangelical finds in Catholic worship the worship of a God Who has placed between the human soul and Himself not only a priestly hierarchy, but also a cloud of intercessors, a Virgin Mother, who may be seen (as in Boston parish church) enthroned in glory above the crucified Christ, a God Who requires to be put in daily remembrance of Calvary, by a perpetual presentation of sacrifices offered by earthly priests on countless altars, a God Who is nearer to us when the consecrated Host is within the Tabernacle than when it is not there, a God Who regards the sum of many finite righteous deeds as equivalent to Infinite Righteousness. The Evangelical does not dispute the

devotion, the sincerity, the attainments of a Catholic life, but he cannot worship the God Whom the Catholic system presents to him.

Lack of space compels us to deal briefly with the conflict between Evangelicalism and Modernism. The fact is that on this subject Evangelicals are divided. There is a liberal wing which accepts what it believes to be the assured results of Higher Criticism, on the ground that proven facts must be admitted, and that the Bible must not be made to do duty as a text-book of science or history. The conservative wing, believing that Our Lord has set his imprimatur on the whole of the Old Testament, stands by the Bible as a Divine revelation in respect of all its contents. All Evangelicals would unite in refusing to accept such explanations of the Atonement as that of the late Dr. Rashdall, or any treatment of Our Lord's Personality which emphasised His Humanity to the derogation of His Divinity. Still, on the whole, the disunion of Evangelicals in this field decidedly weakens their conflict with Modernism. The conservative Evangelical is, however, more opposed to the extreme Modernist than he is to the Catholic. There is between these two a great gulf set which cannot be bridged, so distinct are their conceptions of God.

This account of conflicting tendencies is incomplete without some examination of the attitude of Evangelicals to social problems and to the doctrine of the Church. On both these points our individualism is said to have put us out of harmony with the age, and to doom us to decay as a religious force within the Church of England. We are supposed to have been so much concentrated on our salvation from hell as to have had no thought for the miseries of the world around us. Thackeray is never tired of jibing at the luxury and fleshly comforts of the Clapham World, nor Dickens at the indifference of the Jellybys and Stigginses to the poor at their door. The justification for these criticisms (for they were not without justification) was, in fact, the formalism towards which all religious movements degenerate, and to which ascetic revivals of religion are specially exposed. It is easier to conform to the inhibitions of Puritanism such as Sabbath-breaking, card-playing, and dancing, than to submit one's whole life to a Puritan renunciation of the world.

But the very hatred which Evangelicalism invoked was, in fact, a testimony to its social activity. It has been well said about it that "justification by faith was the essential doctrine of its adherents, but they were before and above all the party of good works." It would have been pleasant, had space permitted, to recall the eloquent testimony of Dr. Fairbairn, in *THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW* of March, 1890, to the social achievements of the Evan-

gelicals of the Church of England. That testimony was reprinted in his *Catholicism, Roman and Anglican* (pages 291, etc). He concludes with the words: "Happy will it be for Anglo-Catholicism, which we may, in contradistinction to the Evangelical, term the ritual and sacerdotal revival, if, once it has run its inevitable course, men can trace but half as much human good to its inspiration."

To Dr. Fairbairn's enumeration of the campaign against slavery, the reform of social morals, especially among the rich, the Factory Acts, prison reform, and missionary enterprise of Evangelicals at home and abroad, might have been added the building up of the British *Raj* in India on principles of justice and humanity—largely the work of Evangelicals in the Army and the Civil Service—and the steadfast protest against exploitation of uncivilised races by British commercial rapacity, against opium trade in China, alcohol selling in Africa and against wholesale massacre of the native races of Australia and Polynesia.

The chief social work of Evangelicals to-day is carried on in the densely populated parishes of our large cities. Sunday Schools, Bible classes, open-air missions still continue their search for "the man" that they may set him right with God. The Evangelical has more sympathy with the outcast, the degraded and fallen, than with the well-to-do preachers and promoters of class warfare, whose promises of Utopia can never raise the lowest strata of humanity, can never restore the marred and almost obliterated image of God in the soul. This is the work that Christ can do, and these workers know by experience that He goes about doing it still.

But what is the Evangelical doctrine of the Church? or have we any doctrine of the Church at all? It is the answer to this question which will bring the divergences within the Church of England most clearly before the minds of ordinary Englishmen. Our answer to this question is in the well-known words: "Where Christ is there the Church is, and where the Church is there Christ is." This coextension, if we may so call it, of Christ with the Church forbids us to identify the Church of Christ with institutions, which are not the less human because they lay a claim, which history does not endorse, to Divine origin. Their exclusiveness is at once the condemnation of their pretensions. We dare not exclude any one whom Christ does not exclude, nor include any one whom Christ does not include. Nor is it for us to divide "the tares from the wheat." We believe that ours is the true Catholicity, since it enables us to claim as members of the one Holy Catholic Church all in whom the Spirit of Christ dwells.

But this faith is not inconsistent with loyalty and obedience to the government of local Churches in which "the pure word of

God is preached and the Sacraments are duly administered according to Christ's ordinance." We recognise "the authority of the Church to decree rites and ceremonies that are not contrary to the Word of God," and we hold wilful disobedience to that authority to be a serious offence. The English State, when it rebelled against the Papacy, claimed the right to deal with Church property, and sanctioned the Book of Common Prayer as the one and exclusive form in which public worship was to be administered, and it is on condition of conformity to that Book that every minister of the Church of England is admitted to Holy Orders, and receives his status in the Church and his emoluments. To those conditions Evangelicals have been absolutely loyal. They have not been indifferent to their Churchmanship. Their two great Societies are Church Societies. They accept all lawful episcopal control in the administration of those Societies. They impose, as conditions of membership, no other tests than the Church imposes—so much so, that there is a tradition that some Tractarians once joined the Church Missionary Society in the vain hope of capturing it. It is contrary to all Evangelical tradition to make light of Church authority or Church membership.

For that reason the progress of Prayer-Book Revision is watched by them with the keenest anxiety. Their principle of obedience makes the decisions reached more fateful to them than to the Catholic. They are anxious on two grounds.

The first is that their history has steeped them in dread of profanation of the Sacraments by formalism. They regard the two Sacraments ordained by Christ as Divine means whereby the union of Christ with His Church is quickened and confirmed in those who by faith are one with Him, Divine means also, whereby the fellowship of the faithful with one another is spiritually cemented. At the time of the Evangelical Revival Baptism was still used as a form of birth registration; the Holy Communion was still used as a test for some forms of office. Charles Simeon's conversion was due to his alarm at being suddenly called upon to qualify for his scholarship at King's College by communicating. Their reaction against this degradation of the Sacraments was intensified by the too common abuse of them as bare certificates of salvation. In the protest against this abuse Evangelicals were supported by the best religious thought of the eighteenth century, by William Law, by Bishop Wilson, by Dr. Johnson. But the abuse died hard. It was the survival of the idea of grace conferred *ex opere operato*. Our grave concern now in Prayer-Book Revision is lest the reinstatement of "hearing Mass" should lead once more to the desecration of the holy ordinances, and, still worse, to a false security in the efficacy of

solemn rites to produce spiritual results where spiritual life does not exist. To us the High Mass without communicants is an appalling travesty of the institution of Christ.

Our other reason for anxiety is lest the Church of England should make herself responsible for alternative doctrines that are really irreconcilable. If the Church were to decide on accepting "Catholic" teaching as its doctrine, great as our grief must be, still we could respect and love the Church even though we could no longer exercise our ministry in it. A far greater anxiety is raised by the proposal that the Church should make itself responsible for inconsistent doctrines, and should treat the holding of one or other as a matter of personal preference. Our Churchmanship is far too loyal to let us accept such a position with indifference. There may be good reasons why a Church should allow to its members great latitude of doctrinal belief, good reason why it should use its powers of expulsion sparingly. But for us the primary duty of the Church is to make its formularies a consistent exposition of what it believes to be the purport of Divine Revelation. A Church which seems indifferent to inconsistency in doctrines of fundamental importance has forfeited its *raison d'être*.

We have refrained from comment on the now admitted desire of a portion of the clergy to restore the Church of England to the Roman obedience. Bishop Gore, who confesses that such clergy are to be found, maintains that the number of these extremists is small. We have taken his word for it. It is evident that this body, whatever its numerical strength, stands to the Anglo-Catholic organisation in the relation of the Minority Movement to the Trades Unions. It has captured the organisation, and it is not disowned by the majority. Whether Bishop Gore's advice will displace it from that position remains to be seen. Nor have we commented on Bishop Gore's "terms of settlement," since he admits that no one but himself is responsible for them. He cannot fail to be conscious how little they will do to restore the confidence of Evangelicals, nor can he hope that they will be accepted by them.

Since the Church of England is a national Church, the nation must decide on the value of retaining in that position a Church torn by such conflicting tendencies, a Church which, if it teaches inconsistently, will have abdicated its office as spiritual guide of the people. The Church of England reckons on its parochial Church registers about 3,000,000 adults, who include, or should include, all the adult communicants. Numerically, by its own estimate, it is a very small section of the nation. The nation has confided to it great privileges and large possessions on certain understandings expressed in the Prayer Book and XXXIX Articles.

When the Church Assembly comes forward with a proposal to revise these, it cannot be treated as a purely domestic concern, nor can the nation overlook the sharpness of the antagonisms prevailing within it. What will the nation say?

At this stage it is impossible to forecast the answer, because we do not yet know the proposals which will be submitted to it. Assuming, however, that the Measure for Prayer-Book Revision contains an alternative Communion Service framed to satisfy Catholic opinion, and authorising a Liturgy which, by use of Catholic vestments and ceremonial, will provide for a sacrifice offered by the priest through the consecrated elements, Parliament as adviser of the Crown will have to decide whether such provisions are in accordance with the King's oath "to maintain the Protestant Religion as by law established." The question will pass out of the region hitherto debated, which has been that of securing congregations against forms of worship disagreeable to them, while allowing clergy to indulge their Catholic proclivities where such proclivities are acceptable. This has, to all intents and purposes, been the issue hitherto debated in the Church Assembly. But when the Measure comes before Parliament it will come before the guardians of the rights of the nation as a whole. Parliament may be, and is, an assembly ill-qualified to debate theological issues. On the other hand it is competent, as the Church Assembly is not, to pronounce an opinion on the desire of the nation as a whole to throw its weight into the scales of Protestantism or Catholicism. It is competent, as the Church Assembly is not, to review the whole question of dealing with the vast revenues of the Church for the national benefit, as, for instance, the gain or loss to the nation of continuing the use of them to a Church torn by conflicting tendencies, and presenting for the last half century the scandal of inability to control its own clergy.

It will, no doubt, be argued that the proposals of the Church Assembly will make the restoration of order comparatively easy, because greater elasticity will make room for devotional expression of doctrines that have long been held and taught by Anglican divines. The Catholics will not desire to be law-breakers when the law has been so altered as to make their practices legitimate. The whole value of this argument depends on the coherence of the Catholic party. Will the proposed changes cover only such forms of worship, as, for instance, Bishop Gore approves, or will they cover also those of which he disapproves? The latter alternative is, indeed, improbable, for the Church of England would then be committed to sheer Roman Catholicism. On the other hand, if the advanced wing of the Catholics stands condemned by the

decisions of the Church Assembly, will the Bishops really take steps to eject and deprive them? Laws are of little importance unless they are enforced, and enforcement of Church law in an episcopal Church rests with the episcopacy. But each Bishop is in the administration of his own diocese independent of his brethren. He may defer to their opinions or he may not. The irregularities of the Church of England have been largely due to the refusal of some Bishops to enforce the law while others attempted to do so. What guarantee can the Bishops offer that, when the law is altered, all the forty Bishops both present and future will uniformly insist on obedience to it? No such guarantee is possible. There will be Bishops who will not put the law into force, either through indecision and weakness of character, or through sympathy with the law-breakers. This view is not mere pessimism. It is simply the history of the last fifty years read into the future, history which legislation cannot affect, because the absolute coherence of the Catholic system has nullified, and must always nullify, arbitrary delimitations of the sphere of its adoption as a faith.

It has been necessary to devote some space to consideration of law-enforcement, because it is the principal ground on which a return to Catholic forms of worship is defended. It has been necessary to show that the promises of better order are illusory. That which a few years ago was a Romeward drift has now become the force of a strong current of Counter-Reformation. The current is so strong that the Bishops have not attempted to define Anglican doctrine, though that would seem to be the most obvious prelude to changes in Anglican worship. Pilots who cannot even set a course to the vessel under their charge are not likely to save it from the rocks.

If, however, Parliament listens to these promises, and consents to the Measure of the Church Assembly, there is no doubt that the position of Evangelicals in the Church of England will be considerably weakened. From being, as they have hitherto believed themselves to be, the truest exponents of its doctrine, they will become a *licita religio*, a minority tolerated but frowned upon, and, as the Catholic system develops in the Church, a minority whose position will become insupportable. Whether they are driven to secession or not, they will be, at best, aliens within their old home, at worst, exiles from it. They can expect little sympathy, since some Bishops have already declared that they are prepared "to face a split," in order to recover Catholic teaching in the Church. Some such fate as this may be in store for those whose teaching revitalised, at the end of the eighteenth century and beginning of the nineteenth, a moribund Church, and from whose

homes a very large percentage of the Catholic leaders have derived both natural and spiritual parentage.

On the other hand, it is quite conceivable that England may refuse to maintain a de-Protestantised Church in the unique position which the Church of England now enjoys. If so, disruption seems to be an inevitable consequence of disestablishment.

Except from a Catholic point of view it is hard to believe that the spiritual life of England will be promoted by restoring the Mass at the price of disestablishment and disruption. It is equally improbable that Catholics will accept any change short of restoration of the Mass. What will the nation do?

E. A. KNOX (Bishop).

II.

ON the title-page of our English Prayer Book these words are found: "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England." The Sacraments belong to "the Church," the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Creeds. But our "use" of them belongs to the Church of England. There is an universal element and a variable one; and the existence of the former is entirely compatible with the existence of the latter.

Now it is in the clear recognition of this distinction, and in the emphasis placed upon the universal element, that the distinguishing marks of Anglo-Catholics are found. Sectional titles have always an arrogant sound; but they should be regarded simply as pointing to the truth which those who bear them are specially concerned to maintain. Sensible Evangelicals do not claim that they alone value the gospel, or sensible Modernists that they alone are acquainted with modern knowledge. Sensible Anglo-Catholics, in their turn, so far from denying the Catholic position of other English Churchmen, strongly maintain it. Strictly speaking, it is not the individual who is, or who can be, Catholic, but the Church; and, unless all members of the Church of England possess the Catholic status, not one of them can do so. Indeed, to be an Anglo-Catholic is in no way inconsistent with being an Evangelical, or with a full acceptance of the modern outlook; it is inconsistent only with that insularity in religion which will presently be deprecated. But it is none the less plain that Anglo-Catholicism is causing alarm, and needs explanation, to many people of goodwill; the "Call to Action" published some months ago showed this. It is, however, not easy to give this explanation briefly. Anglo-Catholicism contains many elements, and what is true of one is not necessarily true of another. To demand

that a large body of Englishmen should "agree upon their principles, and define them so as to disown extremists" is not reasonable. Englishmen are no logicians. They seldom distinguish their principles from their subordinate beliefs, and generally mean by their principles the points to which they attach most importance. Just because of that free inquiry and discussion which pervade the Church of England, every so-called party has its sections and subsections, which shade off, not only into one another, but into other so-called parties generally contrasted with it. The present writer has no commission to speak for any one but himself; and, though he knows Anglo-Catholicism from within as those who signed the "Call to Action" do not, he can only speak the truth as far as it is known to him. He will not apologise for Anglo-Catholics; Catholicism is the historic religion of the Bible and the Church. But he will try to explain their position, as far as the limits of his article allow.

Now the charges of our brothers are of several kinds; but what in our general attitude seems most to puzzle and distress them is that we appeal to "the Church," a "nebulous something" as they think, which "exists only in our imagination," rather than to the traditional teaching and practice of the Church of England. In view of the fact that they say the Creed with us, we find this description of the Church not a little surprising. Anglo-Catholics mean by the Church simply what the Bible and the Creeds mean by it. They mean the "people of God," the visible body, or society, which God has chosen to receive His teaching, to enjoy His peculiar rule and blessing, and to attract the world to Him by the holiness, the beauty, and the joy of its corporate life: and its historic existence seems to them one of the plainest facts in the religious history of the world. It was not Our Lord who founded the Church, though it was He who refounded it, and made it by the gift of His Spirit what it is to-day. Before Our Lord came, the Church was found in Israel. Far indeed was the Church then as now from being all that it was meant to be. To take but one example, its visible unity was for long as completely destroyed by the breach between Northern and Southern Israel as it is to-day by the breach between East and West. But to the eyes of the prophets Israel was none the less one people. Now it was into this Church that Our Lord was born; and throughout His life on earth He was as essentially a Churchman as the prophets before Him. It was to Israel, to the Church, that the Lord's ministry was devoted; and if He had to turn at last from the many to the few, and rebuild the Church on the "rock" of the faithful remnant, it was because Israel, as a whole, had proved to be shifting sand. But it was the Church, and nothing else, that He rebuilt.

No New Testament writer supposes the Church to be a new institution; it is simply "the Israel of God" reconstituted, united to God through Christ by the Spirit, and with its gates thrown open to all nations of the world.

It is undoubtedly to this Church, the home of the Spirit, in its wide extension in time and space, and not specially to the Church of England, that Anglo-Catholics appeal alike in matters of doctrine, of morals, and of worship. Nationalists in religion they cannot be; for it was nationalism which crucified their Master, and the Church is supra-national to its heart's core. We love our country and our countrymen, we hope, no less than others love them; but we cannot say "Dear city of Cecrops" instead of "Dear city of God." We do not even desire not to be Englishmen, or men of the twentieth century: but we do desire to correct the spirit of every place and age by the Holy Spirit of God, and we think that the mind of that Spirit can best be known by learning what in the thought and practice of the Church all down the centuries has been at once most nearly universal and most widely fruitful in good. That common mind we find pre-eminently in the Bible; and modern scholarship in our judgment gives the strongest support to the "Catholic" interpretation of it. Modern scholarship has itself entirely destroyed that conception of the Church as an invisible body of true believers, which was so widespread in the sixteenth century; and it is dealing almost as hardly with the characteristically "Protestant" interpretation of St. Paul. Even those who themselves repudiate St. Paul's sacramental teaching now often recognise that the "Catholic" view of it is substantially correct. We cannot, however, to-day isolate the Bible. The Bible is the Church's book. It was out of the life of the Church that it arose, and by that life that it is best understood. Thus Anglo-Catholics do not, in fact, seek for the mind of the Spirit in the first century alone. They look to the Creeds, to the Councils, and to the Liturgies of the Church both in East and West; to the writings of those Fathers whom the Church in East and West has declared by her reverence for them to have best expressed her mind; and to that great commentary on the Bible which the Church's undying life supplies. Of course, such appeal to the Church must be a critical appeal, and it is not all Catholics who remember this. The stream takes its colouring from the country through which it flows; and the broad stream of Catholic life carries down much which is in it but not of it. Though the Holy Spirit never leaves the Church, He can only enlighten it as the Church itself desires and seeks and welcomes His teaching; all mechanical theories of inspiration and infallibility founder upon that rock. But even an uncritical appeal to

the mind of the Church is better than no appeal at all, and the merely individual or national outlook which is thus left undisturbed.

We have now reached the question at issue between ourselves and our brothers, and can explain the contrast between Anglo-Catholicism and what in this connection we may call Anglicanism. The Anglican here in view begins and ends with the mind of the Church of England. If in his reading he goes outside England, it is generally to the critical writers of Germany, men frequently even more narrowly national in their outlook than he is himself, and far less in touch with the life of practical religion. Thus he loses sight of the unity which the Church retains in spite of its divisions. He thinks only of "our" Church, or of the Anglican "Branch" of the Church; he comes to regard it, much as a Congregationalist regards his own local Christian community, as a "going concern" independent of all other Churches. By a "loyal" Churchman he understands one who accepts without question what he thinks to be the mind of the national "Branch," and by a "central" Churchman one at the moment near to its somewhat peripatetic centre. Now nothing is easier than to make fun of this kind of Anglicanism, but let us rather seek to understand it. The English Reformers of the sixteenth century had no idea of founding a new Church, nor do our formularies show a trace of the belief that they have done so. But our position and our education for the last four centuries have inevitably produced an Anglicanism of this kind. Between us and our brothers of the Eastern Churches there has flowed the "salt estranging sea"; while the attitude of the Roman Church towards us has made it impossible to feel our unity with it nearly so strongly as our separation from it, and has itself produced, so far as it exists, that belief in the divisibility of the Church with which it charges us. Indeed, it has helped to produce something far worse, the detestable controversial "history" and "theology" which are a disgrace to both Churches, and out of which we are even now only beginning to rise. Instead of caring only for truth, and seeing that there is no more sense in talking about Anglican or Roman history and theology than there would be in talking about Anglican or Roman mathematics, we have been alike chiefly interested in defending whatever "our own Church" may happen to have said.

It is Anglicanism of this kind which is the one thing to which the Anglo-Catholic is irrevocably opposed. Intelligible as it is in view of past history, it is high time for us to outgrow it. Anglo-Catholics no more believe in the divisibility of the Church than the prophets or the framers of the Creed believed in it. Of course, they reject the Roman claims, and all that depends upon

their acceptance; their continued membership in the Church of England constitutes a daily rejection. But they reject these claims because in their judgment Scripture, theology, and history alike force them to do so, and not because they differ from Rome for the sake of differing.

Now will not our brothers "yet consider it again?" Englishmen have never been remarkable for their patient attention to the thought and practice of other people. But in many things, notably in science and in historical investigation, our special gifts have enabled us to make a splendid contribution to the life and culture of the world. Have we made any contribution of equal value to its religion? If so, when? Is it then reasonable to decry the appeal to the common mind of the Church as an appeal to a "nebulous something" which "exists only in our imagination," and then to appeal instead, as is done only too frequently, to "English" moral, intellectual, and devotional standards, which turn out on investigation to be merely those customary among the tiny minority of Englishmen who have attended one of our great public schools? Have we no sense of humour? What would that great Catholic, St. Paul, say to us? "Was it from you that the word of God went forth? Or came it unto you alone?"

Thus far for ideals; but now we must turn to facts. Our brothers seem to be afraid of an approaching tyranny; and they really believe many of us to be unfaithful to our obligations as clergy of the Church of England.

First, it is said that the Anglo-Catholics desire to dominate the Church of England. If this only means that we desire that all our brothers should share our outlook, we do desire it. But if it means that we wish in any way to coerce them, the charge has little foundation. It is true that, though Anglo-Catholics are as a rule friendly to Evangelicals, there are some Anglo-Catholics who speak of Modernists with as much bitterness and want of discrimination as that with which some Modernists speak of Anglo-Catholics. If there were the smallest likelihood of their attaining power, Modernists would have cause for alarm. But Anglo-Catholics of this kind have little influence; and, if the danger arose of a suppression of free inquiry, like that which we have witnessed in the Church of Rome, the scholars and thinkers of every school of thought would act as one man to avert it. Strangely enough, however, the examples of our domineering temper offered in the "Call to Action" are of a different character. The chief outrage of which we are guilty appears to be that we have suggested the addition of two minor holy days to the Calendar. For some reason unknown this seems to be interpreted as an effort to foist upon the Church of England some foolish stories, with which the first observance

of these days was connected. What nonsense is this! On the sixth of January we observe the Epiphany. Are all who doubt whether the story of the Eastern sages is fully historical to be debarred from the use of the day to think of Our Lord as the desire of all nations?

Secondly, with regard to doctrine and devotional practice. No one suggests that Anglo-Catholics do not fully accept the Creeds; it is Modernists who come into question here. In the Church of England to-day it is hard to say with confidence what further obligations there are. The Articles, historically interpreted, present no special difficulties to Anglo-Catholics, as it would be easy to show in detail, if space allowed. But neither we, nor any other clergy of the Church of England, are bound to accept every statement which the Articles contain. Before 1865 it was otherwise; but the old form of acceptance was then altered, and nothing more than a broad and general assent to the Articles is now required of us. And rightly so. The advance of knowledge has not dealt tenderly with the ideas of the sixteenth century; and its elaborate doctrinal statements, whether Roman, or Protestant, or our own, are now largely out of date. Our critics themselves well know this, and do not think of being bound by the Articles; and yet some of them think it reasonable to condemn Anglo-Catholics on the ground of statements in the Articles, selected by themselves and interpreted by themselves. Broadly speaking, anybody who can sincerely say that he is neither a Socinian, nor a Pelagian, nor an Anabaptist, nor a supporter of the Roman claims, can surely give that assent to the Articles which is required. If the Church of England corporately demands more than this, it must tell us so, explaining what and why.

As far as private devotional practice is concerned, there is complete freedom in the Church of England. Roman books and forms of devotion are widely used by Anglo-Catholics; it is in the training of the devotional life that Rome is at its best. So with such devotions as the "Hail Mary," and other invocations of the saints. The Church of England, like the Church of the early centuries, rightly does not admit them to the public services of the Church. Though they are no more idolatrous than requests made to our living friends for their prayers, the basis on which they rest is too completely speculative for them to be forced upon anybody. But many Anglo-Catholics use them privately; and the "Hail Mary" has been given a prominent place at some Anglo-Catholic Congresses. These things, and others, in Anglo-Catholic practice—notably extra-Liturgical devotions before the Blessed Sacrament—are open to discussion; some of them perhaps to censure. But may we make one suggestion to our critics? It is that they

should discontinue the practice of making charges of superstition, materialism and magic without offering any serious arguments. An argument is an argument, and should be met. But an assertion is merely an assertion; and, when, though dishonouring to others, it is unsupported by argument, it is an offence against Christian courtesy.

Thirdly, we have to consider the public services of the Church. Here the *lex credendi* should, as far as possible, be the *lex orandi*; and where, as in the Church of England, the *lex credendi* is not at all rigid, there should be wide freedom in worship also. But the promise made by the clergy to use the form prescribed in the Prayer Book, "and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority," remains unaffected.* There are no forms of prayer outside the Prayer Book of which the Bishop has not the right to forbid the public use; and, if he forbids them, he is to be obeyed without question. As far as the knowledge of the present writer goes, it is only a tiny minority of Anglo-Catholics who dispute this; and he would like to assure those who call upon "loyal" Anglo-Catholics to deal with the so-called "extremists," that we are not silent on this matter, though, of course, we tell our brothers of their faults "between them and ourselves alone."

Is more asked of us than this by those who have signed the "Call to Action?" If so, we must speak plainly. The Church of England has no more entrusted to us the power to bestow her censures or to exercise her discipline, than she has entrusted it to the signatories of the "Call." But there is more that must be said. We find among the signatories, not only many whose services to the common faith give them the fullest right to our respectful attention, but also, to our great surprise, some of whom, whatever our personal regard for them, the same cannot be said. We find Modernists, who claim to hold their position in the Church of England while rejecting the plain meaning of the Creeds, and whose position has come definitely under the corporate censure of the Bishops of the Church. Now the present writer, for instance, has gone as far as he has found it possible to go in defending the position of these Modernists. But he regards their position in the same way that he regards the position of those Anglo-Catholics who, as it seems to him, refuse the canonical obedience which they owe to their Bishops. These as well as Modernists have a case; it turns upon

* The verb "order," like the substantive, has two common meanings. The primary meaning is to "arrange" or "regulate," and this is almost certainly the meaning of the word in the promise made by the clergy. The secondary meaning is to "command," commanding being one way of ordering or regulating. Compare Murray's Oxford Dictionary, s.v. Order (verb). Changes made in the services—and many have become customary since the war among all sections of the Church—are quite "in order," if they are perfectly well known and tacitly sanctioned by the proper authority. They do not require the Bishop's command; indeed, the Bishop probably could not canonically command them to be made.

the interpretation of the words "lawful authority" in the promise which they have given. He would not think of speaking of either group as "disingenuous"; that would imply a claim to be able to read the heart. But he has his own opinion, as all have, on points of moral theology and logic; and he regards the position of both as morally and intellectually untenable. If, then, he is asked to "disown" the one group, as well as to argue with them, what is he to do about the other? Modernists must not ask him, or any other "loyal" Anglo-Catholics, to adopt an attitude toward Anglo-Catholic "extremists" which they would resent if adopted toward themselves.

Finally, what of the future of the Church of England? It is a good rule not to prophesy unless you know. But this we may say—there is nothing inevitable. God has given to us a very wide freedom to choose between good and evil; and the future of the Church of England will be, not this or that, which we think that we foresee, but exactly what we all have the faith and love and wisdom to make it. But if our Bishops are to deal rightly with the situation, there must be no more "Calls to Action" like that which we have lately read. That "Call" contained passages of real force and beauty, describing, if not the Church of England as it has been in fact, yet that same Church of England as it might be, and as all Anglo-Catholics, we hope, are ready to help to make it. But it also contained passages bitter in tone, inaccurate in statement, and, above all, completely wanting in sympathy, and understanding of those who are assailed. Now these poison the atmosphere in which our Bishops' work must be done. Can we not all recognise two things? First, it is practically, as well as logically, impossible to separate worship from faith, or the restoration of discipline in the one case from its restoration in the other: and, till there is a clear understanding as to the limits of doctrinal freedom, there should be at least as great freedom in worship as that which is generally allowed to-day. Secondly, the time is not yet ripe for any exact definition of the limits of doctrinal freedom. Our faith rests upon facts of history, interpreted and applied by the Spirit of God, and, since neither facts nor their meaning change, there is a "faith once for all delivered." But far more things change than most of our fellow-Catholics recognise; and, if to such members of other great historic Churches we of the English Branch seem adrift upon an uncharted sea, that is largely because we have launched out into the deep, while they are still rocking in the "lazy locked lagoon." We are not adrift. The restatement of our faith, in view of modern knowledge, and in terms of modern thought, has made much progress. But it is not yet complete, and it must not be hurried. Perhaps if our brothers of different schools, who have signed the "Call," in their new association one with another,

discover that they have much more in common than they had supposed, it may occur to them that even "extreme" Anglo-Catholics may be not quite so foolish or wicked as fancy has painted them; and that they may even have something to say that is worth considering, and something to contribute that is worth having.

H. L. GOUDGE.

III.

TRUTH and comprehensiveness are the watchwords of the Modernist, and these determine his attitude to Prayer-Book Revision. In this he differs from Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics. What Evangelicals desire in the present conflict is to retain unadulterated and unshaken the Reformation Settlement. The only revision the traditionalist Evangelical is keen about is one which would definitely exclude from our Church services anything that supports Romanising tendencies and practices, such as were signalled out for condemnation by the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in 1906. On the other hand, Anglo-Catholics desire "Catholic enrichment" of the Prayer Book. The Reformers were too drastic and Protestant in their reformation of the services: they impoverished and mutilated them. In rejecting idolatrous and superstitious and un-Biblical practices, many beautiful and helpful things were lost. These things the Anglo-Catholic would restore: first, because of their intrinsic worth; secondly, because they would make the English Church more like that of Rome, and so assist reunion.

The Modernist is in sympathy both with Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics. He is with the Evangelical in his resolution not to go behind the Reformation: certain great principles were asserted then which are still valid, e.g., that the Bishop of Rome has no authority in this realm of England; that national churches have the right to settle their own polity and ritual; that nothing may be insisted on as necessary for eternal salvation which is not taught by the Bible. Also, certain great controversies were decided then which ought not to be reopened as there is no fresh evidence to warrant it, e.g., that Transubstantiation is philosophically false and practically injurious. The Modernist, equally with the Evangelical, is opposed to reunion with an unreformed Rome. Such reunion would separate the English Church from the great Reformed Communions and from the Orthodox Churches of the East, and instead of helping Rome to re-enter the comity of Christendom, it would only help her to maintain those anti-Christian elements in her polity and practice which some of the holiest and noblest of her sons have deplored. Such reunion would be a sin against truth and against love, and would close the gates of the future to the Christian Church. Hence, any form of

Prayer-Book Revision which has for its objective reunion with an unreformed Rome is one to which the Modernist is as strongly opposed as the Evangelical. On the other hand, the Modernist does feel strong sympathy with certain of the Anglo-Catholic demands, and would gladly see them conceded, provided he could feel that they were not strategic movements in a Romanising campaign, in which concessions are grasped simply as grounds for further agitation. That is the real difficulty. What renders the present situation so complicated is a lack of confidence in the fundamental loyalty of a number of the Anglo-Catholic party, and in justice to Evangelicals it must be added that it is no superficial view of the Anglo-Catholic movement and its history which gives ground for this suspicion. But the Modernist differs from the Evangelical in that he is willing to take the risk and grant a number of the Anglo-Catholic demands. It is quite true that a number of the things demanded have shown themselves liable to misuse, but in themselves they are not only unobjectionable, but even helpful, and, as Hooker has reminded us, *abusus non usum tollit*—misuse doth not take away the lawful use of a thing.

In this class comes the demand for the reservation of the consecrated bread and wine for the sick and dying. Reservation for this purpose is Primitive. It is described by Justin Martyr in his account of the Eucharist in the middle of the second century. Unfortunately, there is reservation for another purpose which crept in much later, namely, reservation for purposes of adoration. This is a practice unknown alike to the Reformed Communions and to the Orthodox Eastern Churches. It is peculiar to the Roman Church and its imitators. The strict Protestant would call it idolatrous; the student of Comparative Religion, fetishistic; the Modernist, sub-Christian. Plainly, reservation for adoration cannot be conceded; but reservation for communicating the sick and dying may be granted provided the strictest precautions are taken against misuse.

Again, the ancient prayer known as the Canon of the Mass is broken up into three prayers (the Prayer for the Church Militant, the Prayer of Consecration, and the First Post-Communion Thanksgiving) in the English Communion Service. Anglo-Catholics desire to see them reunited. The Modernist can see no valid objection to uniting the first two. The third is better kept as at present, but should be directed to be said at *all* celebrations with the Second Post-Communion Thanksgiving, thus providing that the whole ancient Canon is said at every Communion Service.

Many Anglo-Catholics desire the introduction of the *Epiklesis*, or Invocation of the Holy Spirit, at the time of the consecration of the elements. This is not a Roman, but an ancient Greek, custom. Its introduction would bring the English Church nearer

the Eastern Churches. It may be urged that the *Epiklesis* can be interpreted as favouring Transubstantiation, and will make the act of consecration the supreme moment in the English service. It need not do so, and the advantage of giving Anglo-Catholics what they desire and of securing closer relations to the Greek Churches makes the Modernist willing to support it.

Again, the Anglo-Catholics desire more opportunities for public commemoration of the dead than our present Prayer Book permits. They desire prayers for the dead in the Burial Service, and in the Communion Office. They desire the observance of All Souls' Day. Of course, there are dangers of misuse, especially in the direction of Masses for the Dead, but the Modernist feels the concession should be made. The thankful remembrance before God of the holy dead, and prayers for our friends and relations whom we can hardly think of in that way, are hallowing and solemnising practices: they remind us in a very real way of that invisible world, which we are ever ready to ignore, and of the fleeting character of our present opportunities for service here.

The Anglo-Catholics desire the restitution of Unction for the Sick. The custom is supported by the New Testament. The Modernist is ready to grant it, but, as in the case of all the other concessions to Anglo-Catholics advocated in this article, he believes that they ought only to be regarded as optional alternatives. The Evangelicals ought to have the right to retain the present Prayer Book, and only where the representatives of the parishioners are in favour of the concessions should it be lawful to introduce them—save in the case of the Unction for the Sick, which must depend on personal assent.

Other Anglo-Catholic demands seem to have little to commend them. They seem in many cases to be superstitious, provocative, pernicious, trivial, and would not only repel Evangelicals, but would also prevent the return of that great body of English folk who have forsaken the English Church services.

This brings us to the point where the Modernist differs widely from the stiffer Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics. He does not desire primarily a Prayer-Book Revision which is to preserve intact the Protestant Reformation, nor primarily a Prayer-Book Revision which is to bring the English Church closer to the Roman and Greek Churches; he desires primarily a Prayer-Book Revision which is to make our Church services more helpful and attractive, more inspiring and educative for the modern Englishman than they are at present. He wants not only a revised Prayer Book, but also a revised hymn book and improved moral and spiritual pulpit-teaching, but with the two latter we are not concerned in this article. It is clear to the Modernist that in some respects the doctrinal teaching of the

Prayer Book services needs revision. It is neither true to the Divine Revelation given in the teaching of Jesus Christ, nor to the Divine Revelation given by modern research. The Holy Communion service, by using the word *satisfaction* in the Prayer of Consecration, teaches the substitutionary or expiatory view of the Atonement—a doctrine as terrible as it is false. The *Quicunque Vult*, by asserting that they who do not think of the Trinity as does the composer of the Creed, "shall without doubt perish everlastingly," teaches an equally monstrous view of the Divine Nature.

Some of the phrases in the Litany, e.g., "be not angry with us for ever," have been composed under the influence of another conception of God than that of the Divine Fatherhood revealed by Jesus. The same is true of the maledictory Psalms. The Baptismal Service is based on the doctrine of Original Sin, and teaches that all infants are conceived and born in sin. This long, archaic, and artificial service needs a thorough revision which would make it brief, practical, and evangelical. This could be done without sacrificing any of its real beauties. The services for the Burial of the Dead, both on land and at sea, assume the resurrection of the body which is being committed to the earth or deep. A few alterations could easily remove all traces of this discredited view of the mode of the resurrection.

So, also, the Modernist desires to see the abbreviated form of the Decalogue and Christ's Two Commandments substituted for the present form of the Decalogue in the Catechism and Communion Office. The statement that God is "a jealous God" and "made the heaven and the earth in six days" is not one to be reiterated in modern ears. So also the Whitsuntide Preface in the Communion Office, which states that the Holy Spirit taught the primitive Apostles foreign languages, should be excised. The service for the Ordering of Deacons assumes a belief in the discredited doctrine of the infallibility of Scripture on the part of the ordinand. This should certainly be altered. The Marriage Service, it is felt, requires modernising.

It is amazing to the modern-minded man that the Church authorities can hesitate to revise these things; and that they should take some eighteen years considering them saps his faith in their intelligence and fundamental Christianity. The Modernist desires to see the omission of all repetitions in the services. Even where the repetitions can be justified liturgically, it is better to omit them. What has to be explained ought not to be there, e.g., the second half of the Invitatory at Mattins, "As in the provocation, and as in the day of temptation in the wilderness," etc. The Modernist wishes also to secure more reasonable variation in the services. It is a pity that Mattins and Evensong should both be constructed in the same way.

The Modernist also desires, besides excision and amendment, enrichment to meet modern needs. He would like a brief explanatory preface before the Old and New Testament Lessons. He would like a number of modern services and prayers both of intercession and thanksgiving, e.g., for international peace, industrial harmony, good harvests, social progress, sound methods of education, great literature, a growing sense of imperial responsibility, a right use of money, leisure, and privilege, etc. These additions need not be made compulsory. If they are there the bulk of the clergy will be glad to use them, and the laity equally glad that they should be used. The Modernist yields to none in his admiration of the English Book of Common Prayer. Next to the Bible, it is the most sacred book he knows. He has never handled any other Service-book, ancient or modern, which is equal to it. What it may be, even in its unrevised form, to an entirely modern-minded man, may be seen in Lord Courtney's *Diary of a Church-goer*. The revision which the Modernist proposes would do nothing to alter the fundamental character of the Prayer Book. The beauty, harmony, and richness of its diction, its wonderful phrases, which have an abiding place in English literature, would all remain untouched. Equally, its liturgical ideals, which differ on the one hand from Roman, and on the other hand from Puritan, ideals of public worship would be preserved. We desire not less art, but less archæology in our services. We desire more care and reverence in rendering them, especially the Services of Morning and Evening Prayer.

The question of ritual, music, and vestments are not unimportant. Here the Modernist is in favour of latitude. What is most necessary in these matters is good taste, good sense, sweet reasonableness. This will depend very largely upon the training of the clergy. The æsthetic standard is certainly rising, and among the more educated congregations there is a much keener appreciation of what is really beautiful and becoming. Neither Romanism, nor Protestantism, should rule here, but Humanism. Furthermore, local feeling must always be considered. Some services should be very plain: there is majesty in simplicity; others should be more ornate: dignified services are appreciated by English people when the ritual is English. Each service ought, if possible, to be "a well-balanced unity," full of life, skilfully appealing to the moral and spiritual nature of the worshippers and concentrating their attention for a brief period upon that unseen but ever-present God, Whose Name is to be adored, and Whose Will accomplished, not only during the hours of Public Worship, but in all the occupations and experiences of daily life.

HENRY D. A. MAJOR.

THE REFORMATION OF POLITICS.

THE State is a generally respected institution, but it evokes no affection. Nobody loves it, or invokes it in poetry, as men do their country or fatherland. Its name sounds dull and formal, its personal embodiments for most of us are magistrates and policemen, tax collectors and inspectors—unattractive beings, if not positively repellent. Apart from these fragmentary contacts, the State in normal times is an almost empty concept for the great majority of citizens. In abnormal times, such as war, when the State functions with high intensity, its methods of protecting life and property (its principal avowed objects) are neither so agreeable nor so successful as to evoke much esteem or gratitude.

The present attitude of most politically-minded persons in the Western World towards the State and its government is that they are a very disagreeable necessity—but more necessary than ever before. Conservatives feel that the State must exert itself more strenuously than ever to preserve social order and property from the new dangers of an unruly proletariat. Progressives of all grades now recognise that the State must play a leading part in putting political, economic, and other social institutions upon a better basis of operation for the common good. The old *laissez faire* attitude has virtually disappeared. Most of its surviving adherents present to-day the comic spectacle of men with two voices, one denouncing governmental interference with individual liberty and private enterprise, the other seeking subsidies, tariffs, or other public aids, to assist them in establishing profitable enterprises, or in securing foreign markets.

Every intelligent citizen is aware that his State has abandoned earlier restrictions and is engaging in many new activities. Of some of these he approves, of others disapproves but acquiesces. To a few he is positively recalcitrant. But in this country, at any rate, there has been very little endeavour to think out ahead the lines along which the new State seems to be moving, and so to help to make its movement more efficient.

Now we have come to a pass in human affairs when this task of political thinking has a peculiar urgency. We need, in Matthew Arnold's phrase, to "let our minds play freely upon our stock notions and ideas." And not only "freely," but with some exactitude. This is very difficult. For it is not only our political institutions that have lagged behind the requirements of our new world, but our political terms and concepts. Terms like Liberty, Equality, Sovereignty, Representative, Consent, need to be examined closely in the light of modern political requirements if we are to get order into our political thinking. But, even so, when we have cleaned, repaired, and sharpened our intellectual instruments,

the shaping of politics strong enough and pliable enough to co-operate with the swift transformations of economic and moral forces that constitute the new social problem for the civilised world, calls for an unusual equipment of intellect and knowledge.

Put otherwise, the problem is one of envisaging the State as a creative power using its distinctively political faculties to help man as skilfully as possible in making the best of his life in the material and moral environment in which he finds himself, and to help in adapting that environment to the better achievement of his purposes.

This freely creative conception of the State is the central thought in the remarkable book which Mr. Harold Laski has written under the title *A Grammar of Politics*.* Two separable, though intimately connected, purposes pervade his treatment. The first endeavours to indicate the changes and developments needed in the political institutions that comprise the State, in order to enable it to cope successfully with the new conditions of modern life and the new conceptions of the part which politics can and ought to play in that life. The second consists in an examination of the modern social system, particularly on its economic side, with a view to ascertaining and demarcating the particular tasks which laws and governments can profitably undertake in the control, regulation, or stimulation of such social activities as have hitherto lain mainly outside the recognised political field. In discussing these closely interwoven questions, "What are the proper functions of the new State?" and "What sort of a State is needed to fulfil these functions?" Mr. Laski shows not only rare skill and courage, but a well-balanced valuation of the political and non-political facts and forces. Strictly speaking, the two problems are so interdependent that no priority in time can be accorded to either. But Mr. Laski, rightly in my judgment, takes the political approach first. The wish for social reconstruction in our time has been too often conceived as a distinctively and almost exclusively economic one. The economic determinants have been too numerous and too arrogant in their claims to interpret history and prescribe policy. The cause of thoughtful and therefore practical reform has suffered proportionately. One of the conspicuous merits of Mr. Laski's book is the rectification of the intellectual balance. This virtue, however, like other virtues, has its cost. By obliging him to open his treatment with a close analysis of general political terminology and concepts, so as by anticipation to prepare our mind for the scope and character of the legal, constitutional and political reforms which his constructive policy requires, he makes a pretty rigorous demand upon the trained attention of his readers. This difficult

* Allen & Unwin.

task is rendered necessary by the obstinate survival of notions of absolute sovereignty that are incompatible with the rights of individuals, other non-political associations, and other States. The absolute State from which all personal rights emanate, and to which all subjects own unquestioned obedience, is found inconsistent with any real democracy, while its absorption of all power within the national boundaries and its refusal to submit to any external standards of conduct render internationalism in any effective form impossible.

In dealing with the relations of the State and the individual two conceptual difficulties arise, involving important practical issues. The idea of the social good is, for Mr. Laski as for most modern thinkers, fundamental. But there is for him no directly operative social or "general" will making for this good. The doctrine of Rousseau, of Hegel, of Green and Bosanquet, he will have nothing of. The social good consists in and emanates from the co-operative wills of individuals, each finding his own good in the common service:

"If man is to live in community with his fellows it is a necessary condition of his life that what he attains should at least, in the long run, involve benefit to others. Social good, therefore, seems to consist in the unity our nature attains when the working of our impulses results in a satisfied activity." (p. 24.)

In a following passage he emphasises thus this balance between personal and social ends:

"Social good is, thus, such an ordering of our personality that we are driven to search for things it is worth while to obtain, that thereby we may enrich the great fellowship we serve." (p. 25.)

The State is an organisation for enabling men to realise this social good. How far, then, may, must, and ought it to prescribe and impose upon the individual the part he is to play? In answering this question, Mr. Laski displays a streak of individualism based upon his powerful sense of ultimate individual rights in virtue of the uniqueness of each personality. There is no ultimate moral right in the State to exact obedience either from individuals or from other non-political associations. Each has its private domain of inalienable rights. This view evidently limits the powers and sanctions of the State. I do not feel sure that Mr. Laski, or, perhaps, anyone, can succeed in demarcating satisfactorily these limits. The general rule is that I should obey the law even if I disapprove it. But "in extreme cases I may decide that I shall disobey the law and accept whatever punishment it inflicts" (p. 33). This makes me the final arbiter in my own case. Perhaps this is inevitable, in virtue of the fact that what is unique in my personality cannot find adequate expression even in the best and most repre-

sentative form of outside tribunal. It is, of course, the familiar and important case of the conscientious objector. I am disposed to think that Mr. Laski does not make quite the best case for him. Take the case of one who from conscience refuses to fight for his country. The truth is, I think, that a law, or political power, so wholesale in its operation as to force any man to violate his conscience, is *ipso facto* or *pro tanto* bad, involving an injury to a citizen so grave as to outweigh any good which his unwilling aid may render. It is also a breach of equality, or equity, in that it makes an infinitely heavier demand from the objector than from the average sensual man who has no such scruples in killing his fellowmen. But if we say that in this, as in some other matters, the individual has rights which the State ought to recognise, it by no means follows that any permanent or lasting declaration of these rights is possible. Though "rights" are derivative from duties, as Mr. Laski recognises, in dealing with the State and its relations to persons and their other groupings, he is properly engaged in building these relations into a framework of rights. One passage will suffice to summarise his position:

"A State is a territorial society divided into government and subjects. It exists, it exacts authority, it claims allegiance, in order that those citizens may realise in their lives the best of which they are capable. To that end they have rights. These are defined as the conditions without which no citizen can hope to achieve the best that is in him. Obviously, therefore, rights are not the creatures of law, but its condition precedent. They are that which law is seeking to realise. Institutions are, then, bad or good in proportion as they fail or succeed in the promotion of the purpose of rights. At the back of those conceptions there is a view of society as a system of finite selves, each unique and precious by reason of its uniqueness. That self seeks embodiment in a society the cohesiveness of which endangers the preservation of its special individuality save as the maintenance of its rights enables it to carve out its own channel of expression." (p. 115.)

Socialism has suffered almost as much from attempts to give to society a vital being or personality, which it does not possess, as from loose economic doctrines about the nature and origin of property and value. Mr. Laski avoids much trouble by applying to political and economic proposals of reform the single practical criterion, its service in helping persons to realise their personality in and through their material and moral environment.

In discussing institutional changes he strips off the sanctity from the most venerable forms, in order to apply to them this high utilitarian test. In two long central chapters (entitled respectively, "Political Institutions" and "Economic Institutions") he sketches a full and fairly detailed policy for the new State, which, for courage, resourcefulness, fairmindedness, and knowledge may

rank as the ablest contribution in our time. In discussing the great controversial theme, the State's control of industry, he conveniently distinguishes three classes of industry. These are, first, certain industries of primary public importance and essentially monopolistic in their conduct. Monopoly is not here an epithet of opprobrium. Where competition survives in a fundamental industry, as in railroads or coal-mining, it is visibly wasteful and otherwise injurious, and ought in the general interest, both of producer and consumer, to give place to monopoly. But a private monopoly of this sort breeds abuses of its own. Such, in brief, is the argument for the nationalisation of industries thus urgently affected by a public interest. Though the public should be owner, there is no single simple plan of operating them. Management by representatives of the several interests involved, producer and consumer, local and functional, is a general formula, but of wide adaptability, in accordance with the special character of each industry or service. Though private profit is deposed from the seat of government, adequate incentives of gain, security, and honour can be applied to stimulate initiative and efficiency in the wills of the operators. Modern business organisation has plenty of devices against the mechanical inefficiency of central bureaucratic control. Another important group falls into two sub-groups; first, urgent industries which, like agriculture, are not essentially monopolistic, but where the public interest is great; secondly, certain manufacturing or distributive processes, concerned with ordinary conveniences or comforts, but not articles of vital importance. For the first Mr. Laski looks chiefly to the consumers' co-operative movement for their successful undertaking, though, so far as this country is concerned, co-operative agriculture awaits drastic reforms in land tenure and education. The second sub-group is committed either to the present form of joint-stock company, or possibly to some form of producers' guild yet remaining to be worked out successfully.

There will remain large fields for private enterprise and adventure, where State action will concern itself with securing standard conditions of pay, hours of labour, and the like, for workers, protecting consumers against extortionate prices or defective quality of goods, and taking its share of profits in the shape of taxation of profits.

Mr. Laski rightly assigns great importance to devising safeguards for the limited surviving Capitalism. Here he places himself in accord with tendencies already visible among certain liberal employers, a policy of concessions to workers and the public, taking shape in full publication of accounts, the placing of limits upon dividends, the sharing of any surplus with employees and

consumers, and the admission of employees to a voice in management. He sees, what most middle-class critics fail to see, that efficiency in industry hinges mainly upon securing the goodwill and personal interest of all the participants in the processes of production, and that the new sense of liberty and personal dignity, associated with political democracy, demands adequate expression in those activities which engage the ordinary man's powers in the search for a livelihood. It is this thought which Mr. Laski keeps constantly in mind. He seeks to associate the intelligence and will of as many active-minded men and women as possible in the processes of political and industrial government. This association cannot be made by the mere process of choosing representatives. Neither can it require that ordinary citizens or workers shall decide issues which involve expert knowledge which lies outside their experience. If self-government is to be real, it must imply some fairly regular participation in the activities that constitute government, whether in politics or industry. At present, the so-called democracy which the citizens of most Western nations are supposed to possess is almost as unreal as that which Capitalism denies to them as workers. The nature and causes of its unreality are obvious. In order to be a real citizen in a self-governing community two things are necessary, knowledge and some active function within reach. A great centralised machinery of government, concentrating initiative and power both legislative and executive, leaves to the ordinary citizen no function but that of an empty consent. Mr. Laski, adopting some of the language in which a remarkable American writer, Miss Follett, pleads the cause of "Creative Experience," demands a wide local and functional provision of opportunities for the ordinary man and woman to contribute to the general stock of will and knowledge by which government can be carried on. It is not merely or mainly a reform of old institutions and a weaving of new ones. In politics much decentralisation is often required, so as to adapt institutions more accurately to local variations, and to enlist the active interest which this evokes. But the reverse process of association or federation of local or sectional bodies for the better performance of their duties is not less essential. In fact, the supreme problem of social reconstruction consists in the failure of political institutions to keep pace with the ever-expanding areas and ever-complicating inter-relations of modern industry. A few electoral reforms, a few limitations of monarchical or oligarchical rules, some dilatory changes in local procedure, are contemptibly meagre provisions for coping with the astonishing transformation of the material and moral conditions of life wrought by machine-industry, rapid transport, world markets, and the vast reticulation of communi-

cations, commercial, financial, and informatory, that have made every man in a very real sense cosmopolitan.

This intricate interweaving of activities and interests on the economic side demands upon the political side a correspondingly elaborate process of adaptation. Democracy is often described as government by public opinion. But public opinion cannot rule directly, only through its influence on legislative and administrative bodies. If these bodies are too remote or too impenetrable, it cannot act at all. They must be near and accessible. This signifies a far more elaborate application of federalism than prevails at present, knitting up great varieties of little local or functional bodies into associations that cover wider and wider areas. At each stage and for each purpose Mr. Laski envisages the elected bodies kept in touch with public opinion by advisory committees, or other consultatory groups, possessing no authority other than that proceeding from their skilled service. Little stress is laid upon mechanical devices for rendering representation more exact. Mr. Laski has no use for proportional representation and the group system which is its inevitable sequel. He adheres to a two-party system under a responsible government, and dismisses, too summarily in my judgment, all such checks as the Referendum as disserviceable interventions of a crude electorate.

In his final chapter, treating of "International Organisation," he enters a survey so thorough in its handling of the numerous concrete issues which press for consideration, as to leave him little opportunity for discussing the distinctively moral problem of the education within each nation of a will to break the barriers of tight nationalism in thought and feeling, so as to bring the necessary volume of sympathy and active thinking to the service of effective internationalism. In his opening analysis, Mr. Laski clearly recognises the rightful limitation of sovereignty of a State in relation to other States, but as he elsewhere says, "The poison of Machiavelli is in our blood." How many even of the professed supporters of a League of Nations are willing to undertake to submit all disputes affecting all the vital interests of their country to an outside impartial tribunal? No government of a Great Power is yet prepared to take this first essential step towards placing the relations between States upon a plain basis of morality. Here is the great challenge to the enlightenment of public opinion. The sovereignty of the State in its external relations must disappear if the equal rights of States, as of persons, are to find expression in the largest form of federation under which each nation, preserving its unique character, shall co-operate with others, not merely for preserving the peace and justice of the world, but for the active promotion of the common good.

J. A. HOBSON.

THE SITUATION IN MOROCCO.

THE relations of Great Britain to Morocco have been entirely reversed since my first visit to that country in 1886 and my latest in July of this year. At the earlier period the Sultan ruled as an independent temporal and spiritual monarch over an aggregation of uncivilised tribes by methods and on principles which, though cruel and rapacious, were in accordance with national custom and tradition. Whatever internal discontent existed was due to uncertainty as to the direction of his cruelty rather than to its extent—to his leniency than to his vigour. Behind the Throne and supporting it against all comers, internal or external, was the British Consul-General, then Drummond Hay, paramount among the European diplomatists, partly, no doubt, by his personal qualities, but primarily because England, then as now, was professedly disinterested in the Moroccan inheritance. But our rôle then was not one of abstinence only. What we declined for ourselves, we withheld from others, with the result that whatever victims the vicious system of government might claim in its prisons, and whatever confiscations the greed or fears of the Ruler might inflict, the Moors were not unprosperous, were at peace; it was possible to traverse the whole country in safety under the guidance of one unarmed, if unpaid, soldier, and Tangiers was growing in wealth and commerce. To-day, by her own act, Great Britain has no authority, though she retains a little influence, in Tangiers, while in Morocco she has neither influence nor authority, and the Moor has no peace.

Why has the change of policy, with this result, occurred? The cause can be stated very briefly. England, France, and Spain are each vitally concerned in maintaining an unhampered entrance to the Mediterranean. England secured this by a fleet based on the impregnable harbour and fortress of Gibraltar. Spain endeavoured to counterbalance the power (and her loss) of Gibraltar by establishing on the coast of Morocco isolated posts and ports—and in 1859 had tried seriously, but unsuccessfully, to consolidate her power on the North African shore. France, urged partly by her real need of free ingress and egress to the Mediterranean, and partly by her search for that Colonial Empire to which Bismarck had committed and incited her, was trying to secure the Moroccan hinterland so as to contain the Spanish *presidios*, and to outflank Gibraltar. In 1904 British difficulties in Egypt were allowed to affect our attitude towards this strategical question—and vitally and injuriously to change it. To get rid of French, and, therefore, in practice of other European, interference in our control of Egypt, the then Conservative Government decided to throw over their long time ally

and protégé the Sultan of Morocco, to give the French a free hand to enforce on him such terms and relations as were suitable to their ambitions, and consonant with the existing Spanish establishments. Our naval necessities were to be secured by the creation of an international zone round Tangiers, and the neutralisation of a strip of littoral along the North African shore. Not a word was said to the Sultan of this virtual sale and barter of his territory and authority, and neither sovereign nor subjects had any notification of the partition of Morocco until France and Britain announced it to Europe.

There are some who still think the League of Nations superfluous and useless, but can anyone doubt that, if it had been in existence in 1904, the Sultan would have appealed to its authority for protection against an unjustifiable invasion of his independence, or that Geneva would have refused to sanction an agreement based on French covetousness and British weakness? Had the Tribunal existed, had the appeal been possible, and the verdict been such as experience has shown us it would have been, impartial, how many millions of money and lives would have been saved to Spain, France, and the Moors themselves? As, however, there was then no League to appeal to, the Anglo-French declaration of April, 1904, could not be challenged by Morocco itself, and consequently was followed in October by a Convention between France and Spain which recognised their mutual pretensions.

By 1906 the greed and alarm of Germany, to whom the secret clauses of 1904 and the Convention of 1905 had not been officially communicated, were awakened, and she procured the Conference of Algéiras, at which some thirteen European Powers assented to the virtual partition of the only African State, except Abyssinia, which retained independence. Having assured to themselves perpetual equality of treatment in the matters of transport, customs, and commerce, and asserted the nominal, while abandoning the actual, sovereignty of the native ruler, they legalised, if such a term can be properly used, the partition of Morocco. Had Germany at that time, or again in 1911, been animated, as she might well have been, by righteous indignation against an act of spoliation and invasion she would have stood on firm ground, and deserved and commanded the sympathy of all. But her anger was too plainly due to her exclusion from the plunder, and not to any ethical motive, and when compensation was proffered her wrath was assuaged.

Thus by 1912, when France made her final treaty with the Sultan, he had no longer any supporter, and had to get the best terms he could for himself. His country he could not afford to

consider. By this treaty the exact limits of the French and Spanish zones were attempted to be laid down, the right of France to sublet and of Spain to lease, the Spanish zone was admitted, and the Tangiers Enclave with its 200 square miles of territory and a population of about 80,000 was handed over to international control, though its administration was only "to be determined later." The Spaniards were restricted from alienating any portion of their zone which, if they abandoned it, was to be handed back to the French. Over all this heterogeneous territory and jurisdiction the Sultan remained a nominal suzerain. The French maintained, even during the Great War, their penetration into Morocco, and, on the surface at least, have been wonderfully and deservedly successful and have covered the greater part of their reserved territory with real marks of pacific occupation. The Spaniards have neither been as adroit nor as successful, and the result of nearly twenty years of warfare is a precarious hold on a narrow strip of territory along parts of the Mediterranean littoral—a conquest purchased at the cost of a national humiliation, mortality, and expenditure not often experienced by any country.

By 1923 the settlement of the form of International Government in Tangiers had become urgent, and Great Britain, France, and Spain took it on themselves to formulate a Statute of Government. Compromise must perhaps be the ruling principle of any international instrument, but it is not easy to understand how any self-respecting governments or individuals could have set their names to such a grotesque, inadequate, and unworkable Statute. Sovereignty is reserved to the Sultan, and authority functions in his name. His deputy, the *Mendoub*, presides over the meetings of the Municipal Council (glorified by the name of Legislative Assembly), the transactions of which are conducted and recorded in language which he can neither speak nor understand, and whose proposals he can neither initiate, modify, nor veto. The nominee of one out of the three dominating Powers, he dare not interview in privacy a visitor nor assume any administrative responsibility. If the Sovereign himself, suzerain of his own hereditary city, were to present himself at the gate of his own town, whose possession is confirmed to him by a European Conference, he would most certainly be refused admission, even if he had, which is most improbable, received permission from his master the French Resident-General to travel to Tangiers.

It may be reasonable, if once the present European control is admitted, thus to limit native authority, but the limitation is the symbol of African subordination, and is the object of native sympathy. The vices of the native government have been forgotten and swamped in concern for the degradation of the native State.

Here, as in Egypt, India, and Asia Minor, the question has automatically been raised as to whether civilised government is preferable to native government, when the former is of foreign origin and the latter is of indigenous growth. The answer is never uncertain, though it is often withheld, and in the long run, whether her intervention has been justified or not, whether her intentions have been selfish or disinterested, whether the administration has been pure and successful or corrupt and calamitous, Europe will have to renounce her self-imposed mission.

But let me resume consideration of international wisdom. The Legislative Council is nominated by the Foreign Consuls from amongst their nationals resident in Tangiers. To prevent the too active or intelligent use of its powers it is supervised by a Committee of Control, composed of the same Consuls who have nominated it. One would like to know who was the ingenious author of this scheme, and who were the wiseacres who accepted it. Some of the deputies, perhaps the majority, thus called into being are honourable men, left free to work for the benefit of their community, but it is quite certain that the rest are mere puppets on a string pulled by their creators. But even so, the native blood asserts itself. Native employees, though untrained, have been voted salaries by revolting native nominees equal to those of their European coadjutors, and no one doubts that, at any rate on this one point, replacement of the rebels would not result in any withdrawal of the scale of payment. Though the Statute of Government originated with Britain, France, and Spain, yet it is open to ratification by any of the signatories of the Act of Algeciras. As several Powers have refrained from ratification, there are eight vacancies in the Council of twenty-six members, and since certain measures can only be carried if agreed to by a fixed majority of the Chamber, the majority can only be obtained by reckoning as assentors all those who are absent because they may not be present, and who are not bound by the result of that which it is thus pretended they accept.

Gambling regulations and houses present great difficulties. Spain is sincerely desirous of preventing the continuance of a practice which attracts and ruins many of her officers, but if under present conditions she procured, as she could do, an ordinance for its abolition in Tangiers, such an ordinance could only be applied to British, Moorish, Spanish, or French subjects. Italians, Portuguese, Egyptians, etc., would conduct their gambling establishments unchecked and unregulated. The practice would remain, but the profits would have been transferred. The subject of currency has produced another compromise and yet another absurdity. In Tangiers there is a State Bank of Morocco issuing paper

currency and metallic currency, which is legal tender throughout the whole of the Sultan's dominions. Its supervision is international and its currency is at par. In the French zone there is also current a French Moroccan franc, specially minted in France, and of a higher exchange value than the French franc itself. In Tangiers this Moroccan franc is not legal tender, but may be tendered legally in payment of taxes. It has, of course, no currency in the Spanish zone. Similarly in this latter zone the Spanish peseta, minted and current in Spain itself, is legal tender, and in Tangiers may be tendered legally in payment of taxes, but has no validity in the French zone.

These absurdities which I have noted are the outcome of international rivalries and pin-pricking, and are due to the mixed jealousy or incompetence of Ministers or Offices. They retard the development of this international property, and they impoverish and embitter the commercial and political relations of its various owners. If Tangiers is ever to become what its geographical position and climate entitle it to be, a great international entrepôt and health resort, its governing Statute must be revised in accordance with common-sense and forbearance.

The sense of confusion, of loss, of growing poverty, of international failure experienced in Tangiers is reflected in the surrounding territory, whether neutralised or combatant. There has been attracted to the environs of the city a considerable number of refugees, drawn principally from the Riffis and the Anjera tribes, whose homes have been destroyed, and whose husbands or fathers have been killed and their lands ravaged in the fighting which is desolating the country. When they first began to arrive, the Tangerines, whose trade with the interior was still open, whose means were still considerable, and whose religion enjoins the relief of the destitute, gave considerable amounts in money and in kind for their shelter and maintenance. But as the numbers of the refugees increased, and the resources of Tangiers decreased owing to the interruptions of trade with the hinterland, the difficulty of meeting the vital needs of these poor people was very great. The official colony of foreigners was smaller and less wealthy than formerly, that part of it which was French and Spanish naturally refrained from assisting the foes of their own forces, and these sources of generosity and pity soon ceased to yield anything substantial beyond that required for the relief of local distress. Help has come from the Turkish Red Crescent Society of Great Britain, and so far there has been no actual death from starvation, though hunger typhus has been rife until recently.

The numbers thus affected are not large when compared with those in Asia Minor or Russia, but they constitute a definite

percentage of the population in the debatable lands of the Riffis. Akin as they are by blood and speech to the inhabitants of the international zone, these latter willingly give them shelter within the village bounds, and during the summer dry months this suffices. During the winter, however, cover must be provided for the many who have no longer a home, and this the already crowded huts of the peasantry cannot provide. I fear that unless international benevolence comes to their aid, these unfortunate victims of international ambitions will perish from privations. Two litres of flour a week is all that the present funds can afford to give any person, and that has to be divided amongst adults and children. The lack of clothing adds to the lack of food to produce disease and suffering in a multitude, who receive assistance, it is true, almost without gratitude, but who bear their sufferings and hardships without grumbling, and who on the slightest mitigation of their wants are ready to laugh or jest at any excuse. One hardly knows which excites the most wonder, their fortitude, their sense of humour, or their callousness.

Whatever may be their present condition, or their future, they are the product of French and Spanish ambition opposed to the national pride and patriotism of the Riffis. It matters hardly at all how and whence these Riffis originated, but, numbering some five or six hundred thousand, they now and for many centuries have inhabited a block of mountainous country some twenty miles by twenty-five, facing the Mediterranean, containing some fertile slopes and valleys and intersected by deep and narrow gorges of a kind especially favourable to the highland clansman of independent life and training, and especially exhausting and demoralising to the town or lowland half-trained recruit. On the southern and eastern slopes of this massif dwell tribes akin to the mountaineers, equally their domestic foes and their allies against the foreigner. Traditionally this highland region and community have paid lip-service to the Emperor of Morocco, especially as a spiritual head, but their tribute has been one of words and not of deeds, and only very exceptionally has the writ of the Sultan run in the Riff. When the French protectorate was forced on their nominal overlord it was no one's business to inquire or explain their state or extent of independence. It may be said with certainty that at that time no Frenchman or Spaniard protected only by the Sultan's safe-conduct would have ventured into the Riff, though the same guarantee would have taken him safely through any other corner of Morocco. With the Spaniards, the Riffis, in whose zone they nominally are, have kept up ceaseless warfare, and ultimately have driven them back to the sea coast. The struggle has been one of cruel loss and suffering to each side,

but the advantage has been strongly on the side of the Riffis and of their leader Abd-el-Krim.

This man, the son of a well-do-do petty chief, has consolidated the self-governing clans into a single nation, has armed them by capturing the guns, the rifles, the stores, and clothing of their foes, and has financed them by seizing the person and hoards of his principal native rival, Raisuli, at a moment when he had just received the latest Spanish subsidy. He has taught himself the art of war at the expense of his assailants, and he exercises a power over his clansmen unquestioned and complete. To assist him he has two or three native chiefs and relations of considerable ability, while the Riffis generally are admitted to possess considerable mechanical aptitude. He apparently owes little to the European adventurers who have deserted from the French or Spanish Foreign Legions to join his fortunes. The few German officers who have penetrated to his forces have helped doubtless to organise his means, his telephones and his roads, but their genius for planned advance and encounter can find no place in a country where surprise and mobility are the deciding factors in success.

Fortune has been kind to him. It is not given to every patriot to be opposed to a foe at once so venal and so stupid as to sell wholesale to their opponents the very weapons by which they themselves will shortly be opposed and destroyed. Even the pre-revolution cupidity of Russia only went the length of demanding a bribe before permitting the transport of arms to their own troops. It was reserved to the Spanish soldier to devise a system of bartering his own weapons with his opponent in the field. Abd-el-Krim was also fortunate in finding two great European nations with depleted treasuries and bulging arsenals, ready to supply for cash all that he needed to make war on their co-signatories to the partition of his country, and Hamburg and Marseilles can alike claim the honour and profit of keeping alight the torch of patriotism in Northern Africa. He has further been lucky in being able to take his enemies in detail, for while France laughed when Spain failed, Spain is not being very active, save in counsel, when French troubles are maturing. He operates from interior lines with a simple plan of campaign and with a unified command, his troops are seasoned and hardy, his commissariat is almost non-existent because it is almost unnecessary, and an ample harvest, added to successful raids, has filled his granaries to overflowing. These are the factors that make for victory in his newest struggle against the French.

Perhaps a word is required to explain why such a struggle has begun, and what is the declared French objective. Under the Treaty of 1912 the French boundary towards the north was "the

heights that command the Wergha." Now it is obvious that with the increase of artillery range, the heights that commanded the Wergha in 1912 are not necessarily those which alone command it in 1923 or 1925. Until 1923 Marshal Lyautey, the French Commander-in-Chief in Morocco, had been content with the boundary of the river itself, but in that year he pushed his advance posts across it up to heights in the Riff massif which commanded the river. In so doing he crossed the plain, of some fourteen miles width, between the mountains and the river from which the Riffs had for years been accustomed either by purchase or plunder to supplement their highland harvests. By the action of the French they were cut off from their supplies, besides suffering an unexpected occupation of their fatherland, which in all their history they have never been slow nor unsuccessful in defending. They flew to arms already so victorious against Spain, and in a brief campaign, the details of which successive French Governments have withheld from publication, they drove out the invaders with such substantial losses of war material of all kinds as to provide themselves with guns of large calibre, and ample supplies of rifles, cartridges, uniforms, and transport. More than one large French column was annihilated, and only a short time before I write a considerable *mehalla* of native auxiliary cavalry, whose picturesque appearance decorates the pages of *L'Illustration*, and whose ideas of warfare were as antiquated as their accoutrements, were caught in their bivouac and wiped out. Equally successful has been Riffi propaganda amongst the tribes behind the French boundaries. These in pre-occupation days had no alliance or friendship with the Riff, and have benefitted by the French occupation and protection, but they are Africans first and French protégés afterwards, and though some of their revolt may have been due to fear of Riffi raids, quite as much was it due to the wish to be rid of the foreigner, while settling later with the Riffi.

It cannot, I think, be too clearly understood that Abd-el-Krim's is not a "holy" war. It is a protest of local patriotism against intrusive aliens; it is hatred of French and Spanish, and not of Christians. An Englishman can penetrate to Riffi headquarters not because he is an Englishman, but because England has expressly proclaimed her intention to seek no territory in Morocco. The movement may become a religious instead of a national one, but it is most improbable that it should do so. Meanwhile, French reverses have shaken their domination throughout North Africa. Tunis, Algeria even, have heard of disaster and the news has not been unwelcome. A French army of some 30,000 European and 120,000 native troops has been collected, and is strung out along the frontier of 250 miles, and based mainly on Wezzan and Ain

Aicha. The numbers are twice as great as those the Riffs can provide. These latter, with their allies, can dispose of some 100,000 men, who seem to be divided into three reliefs, one in the fighting line, and two resting or ploughing. But the season for campaigning is short, as either excessive wet or heat limits the strength and endurance of European recruits. If the French are successful they gain the ground the enemy stood on overnight, they bury a greater or lesser number of tribesmen, and their "objective" is attained. If the Riffs are successful they obtain the war material for another month's conflict and have stirred up every malcontent in North Africa.

Thus the struggle sways backwards and forwards, a question of attrition in which, strangely enough, the larger nation has most to lose. Only the continuous employment of very much greater forces will procure a French victory, and the French Government is not in a position to impose taxation on the electorate, or to call up reserve classes from the peasants. There are reputations to be lost but not to be won by the French soldier, there is money to be spent but no territory or commerce to be gained by the French politician.

What is the alternative for France and Spain to a desultory and expensive continuance of the present stalemate? Surely a reconsideration of their own position in Morocco, based on the fact of partial but considerable failure. It is probable that pride will prevent either of them making or even receiving satisfactory overtures or terms of peace. But fortunately the League of Nations now exists whose non-existence, as I believe, permitted this whole trouble to arise. Is it beyond the power or the duty of some member of the League to point out Europe's interest in healing the wound which has sapped Spain's vitality and is draining France's strength? The technical point that Abd-el-Krim is a "rebel" is lost in the material fact that he is a successful one, and that vain-glorious bulletins are no substitute for surrendered territories or abandoned munitions. If Europe will get down to facts she will find that the Assembly at Geneva affords an opportunity of healing a sore that is fast developing into a cancer, and that it is an act of friendship and not of jealousy to suggest a remedy to the sufferers, by referring to the League terms for settlement between the three combatants.

CHARLES HOBHOUSE.

IRELAND: AFTER THE STORM.

THE mood of Ireland may perhaps be described as one of chastened cheerfulness. We have, of course, our professional pessimists who cannot know a moment's joy so long as a Governor-General assents to the Bills of an Irish legislature in the King's name, or the ladies who still sigh for the vanished pomps of the Viceregal Court. In Belfast, too, there are those that will never sleep quietly in their beds so long as there is a Pope in Rome or Papists in Ireland. But the generality of us, while not without more or less cause to grumble at this or that, admit that things might be—and have been—worse with us. We remember how near Ireland came to anarchy in the years that followed the Great War, and are profoundly thankful to be done—for ever, as we hope, certainly for some time to come—with the shadow of the gunman.

From the county I know best all military outposts have now departed; and four or five unarmed civic guards are found enough to keep order in wide areas policed in the old days by thrice the number of the R.I.C. The Northern Government, it is true, still retains in its service not only the Ulster Constabulary, but a formidable array of armed "special constables," and is likely to do so as long as grants-in-aid are forthcoming from the Imperial Exchequer. It is probably cheaper—and less troublesome—to pay the men in this way than it would be to throw them upon an already overcrowded labour market.

For the truth is that here, as in Great Britain, our anxieties are not so much political as economic. Two exceptionally wet seasons in succession have hit agriculture hard; and, for the first time for many years, bank deposits, contributed mainly by the farmers, have not merely ceased to grow, but have diminished. Bad times in Great Britain, together with some depletion of stocks, are probably responsible for a sudden drop in the exports of cattle, and this again, on top of compulsory reduction in rates, for a heavy decline in railway receipts. The Great Southern Railway, formed by amalgamation of all the chief lines in the Free State, was recently obliged to draw upon its capital reserves in order to pay its preference dividends. The Great Northern is in somewhat better case, but even it has suffered greatly; and the shares of both companies are, in consequence, much depreciated. This causes anxiety and loss since, apart from all other considerations, many trustees and many more small investors are affected. Add to this, that the trade of Dublin, long harrassed by civil war, is again threatened by the internecine disputes of orthodox and Larkinite Unions; that in Belfast the linen trade alone has over 20,000 unemployed on its lists; that the unemployment benefit

fund of Northern Ireland is overdrawn more than £3,000,000 sterling; that neither Great Britain nor the United States offer their old welcome to migrants or emigrants; and it will be plain that, both north and south, as well in the countryside as in urban areas, the problem of how to earn a living becomes increasingly urgent.

Happily there are some—as yet faint—signs of improvement. The shipyards are moderately busy, Harland and Woolf having just completed the largest motor-ship afloat and having, it is understood, other large orders in hand. The linen trade has, perhaps, passed through its worst moments. There is every promise of a really good harvest. And, finally, labour and capital seem to be more inclined than hitherto to take counsel together in their common interest.

Moreover, it must be said that in grappling with its share of economic trouble, the Free State Government is showing its wonted vigour. The public buildings destroyed during and after 1916 are at last being rebuilt, though the plans (alas!) do not appear to contemplate the restoration of the dome of the Customs House, the noblest monument of eighteenth-century Dublin. Some real progress, too, can, after so many delays and disappointments, be reported in the solution of our Housing Question. Treasury regulations, unsuited to the country and to the times, completely frustrated the good intentions of 1919; nor were the earlier experiments of the Free State itself much more fortunate. Our latest Act—that of the present year—looks like operating much more successfully. Free grants, varying from £45 to £100, are offered to those erecting new houses or reconstructing suitable old ones, whether the site be in town or country and whether the builders be private persons, public utility societies, or local authorities. There are no restrictions on sale or letting; and the regulations relating to plan and construction are few and easily understood. As a consequence of this simplicity, whereas more ambitious and expensive schemes have failed dismally, it is already certain that the full sum available during the twelve months indicated in the Act (£300,000) will be required. A society has been formed in Dublin having as its purpose the provision of houses for ex-officers of the British Army; another, for members of the Irish Union of Distributive Workers and Clerks; a third, founded some years ago by a public-spirited parson, has already many houses to its credit and is intent on providing more. Nor is municipal housing neglected, since the Dublin Commissioners are pushing on the work taken over from the Corporation with great energy. Nevertheless, we have still a long road to travel before the 20,000 new dwellings which Dublin alone requires can be provided.

In addition to State-aided house-building we have the promise of a big scheme of main-road improvement, towards which the Irish Treasury will contribute over a period of years a sum equal to the average amount expended by local authorities. Then there are drainage and land improvement schemes, the experimental sugar-beet factory which a Belgian firm, encouraged by a Government subsidy, it about to establish, and Siemens' grandiose project for carrying electric light and power from the Shannon into every corner of the Free State. The two proposals last mentioned, though pushed through Parliament without much difficulty, have encountered a deal of criticism, partly on technical grounds, partly because of the heavy initial expenditure involved, but perhaps chiefly on account of the high-handed fashion in which the Government has chosen to dismiss any alternative suggestions for reaching an end universally desired.

Our young Ministers, endowed as they are with the major virtues of imagination and courage, still sorely lack certain minor gifts essential to democratic leadership. Perhaps because they have yet to meet effective Parliamentary opposition, most of them are far too much inclined to treat even honest and well-informed critics in the temper of a dyspeptic schoolmaster. Three examples of this may be given, since they are concerned with controversies of which a good deal is likely to be heard in the near future. The first relates to the teaching of Irish; the second to facilities for divorce; the third to the study and practice of medicine.

It was to be expected that a generation nourished on the ideals of the Gaelic League should, on attaining to political power, strive to re-establish the Irish tongue, if not as the prevailing speech, at least as a serious rival to English. To this end two ways were open. They might have followed with vastly increased resources and prestige the persuasive methods which had already given admirable results, concentrating, perhaps, upon the production of a growing class of serious scholars. Or they might endeavour to reach the goal more quickly by making the study of Irish compulsory in all State schools. Unfortunately—as many think—the Government has chosen the second path. Each year National school-teachers, many of them elderly persons, are obliged to spend the greater part of their holidays in painfully acquiring what can in most instances be a mere smattering of Irish, which smattering they in turn must try to impart to their pupils. It is said that neither Irish nor any other subject is as well taught as before; and it is only too certain that, since public compulsion began, private enthusiasm has sadly declined.

The denial of all facilities for divorce, in spite of impassioned opposition by Mr. W. B. Yeats in the Senate, is, perhaps, a matter

of less consequence; for such facilities as hitherto existed were small. Divorce Courts have never been established in any part of Ireland, the only remedy being by way of Private Bill, an elaborate and costly business. Now inasmuch as it is quite certain that no Divorce Bill would have the smallest chance of passing through the Irish Parliament—popular sentiment being what it is—it might be supposed that the Government would have been content to let well alone, or at most by a simple change in Standing Orders to ensure for any such bills a more than formal consideration by each House on first or second reading. Instead, they have preferred to raise the issue in such a manner as immediately brought them into conflict with the President of the Senate and caused them to appear (I believe quite wrongly) as gratuitously invading a fundamental right of the non-Catholic minority.

The third issue seems likely to prove by far the most serious in its effects both on the fortunes of the Ministry and upon the social life of the country. Hitherto control both over the education of medical students and over qualified practitioners of medicine in all three kingdoms has, of course, been in the hands of the British Medical Council, upon which Ireland is duly represented. It is not denied that, from an Irish standpoint, the arrangement has many advantages. Of the students who yearly qualify in the medical schools of our universities, not more than some fifteen in a hundred have been able to find work at home. The great majority have either obtained practice in Great Britain or have found employment in the medical services of the Army or Navy or of the Government of India. For all such posts our young doctors are eligible by virtue of their place on the General Register.

But if, as the Ministry desires, this Register is abolished, so far as the Free State is concerned, eighty-five per cent. of our students must either abandon their chosen careers or pursue their studies elsewhere. Nor is this, as Ministers affect to suppose, merely an unavoidable hardship which the medical profession must be content to suffer in the cause of national dignity. For it follows that our schools will no longer be able to maintain their present standard of efficiency and that our hospitals, now not over-staffed, will lose the services of most of the students and younger doctors. Such, if I apprehend it correctly, is the case presented by an almost unanimous profession and backed by a great body of lay opinion. To say the least of it, one would have expected such a case to be met by reasoned argument. But so far the spokesman of the Executive Council has contented himself with curtly announcing their decision as final and irrevocable, and with bidding their opponents not to waste time in seeking to alter it.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Ministry, having been obliged to govern with a high hand throughout a time of grave peril, and having found its most arbitrary acts approved by a country that desired nothing so much as the restoration of public order and private security, has got into the habit of taking assent for granted, and is surprised and angry if that assent is not always forthcoming. Thus much quite avoidable friction ensues; and the very real services which President Cosgrave and his colleagues have rendered to us all tend to be forgotten.

Another cause of mild discontent is the fiscal policy to which the country is gradually finding itself committed. Until the other day Irishmen took little heed of tariff controversies. Such public opinion as existed was vaguely Protectionist. History recalled the destruction of Irish industries in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, their partial restoration by the care of Grattan's Parliament, their feebleness when left to face without support the competition of powerful rivals. On the other hand, the long political alliance between Irish Nationalists and English Liberals had not been without some influence on economic thought; nor had the apposite case of Free Trade Denmark. An inquiry, instituted by the Government in 1922 into the state of urban industry, produced much evidence adverse to Protection; while a simultaneous commission on agriculture reported in a similar sense, on the ground that, Ireland being an exporter of foodstuffs, "any measures which tend to increase the cost of the produce of the land will reduce our purchasing power abroad and be prejudicial to the country's trade." The Commissioners added that "apart from very exceptional cases"—subsequently defined as "operations of a special experimental character, which it is unreasonable to expect private capital to finance in the early stages, such as the growing of tobacco and sugar-beet, the manufacture of industrial alcohol or the reclamation of boglands"—they did "not favour subsidies, grants, bounties, guaranteed prices or any such measures of direct assistance" to agriculture.

Nevertheless, Ministers appear soon after to have made up their minds to experiment with protective duties, which duties have gradually increased in number so as to cover, among other things, boots and shoes, chocolates, motor-cars and their component parts, wooden furniture, bedsteads, and ready-made clothing of every kind. This departure has undoubtedly been justified, in so far as it has led to the establishment of several new factories and to the extension of some already operating in the Free State. But since in none of the trades affected is the output as yet nearly sufficient to meet the home demand, it has also occasioned much vexation, partly through increased prices, but much more by

reason of the delays imposed by the Customs barrier. Those who live by the land—that is to say, much more than half the people of the Free State—are especially aggrieved; and farmers are naturally beginning to call out for duties on imported flour, oats, and barley. Thus Ireland, like other countries, finds the appetite for Protection grow with what it feeds on. It is only fair to add that the very poor are for the time being probably better off on the balance by reason of the abolition of duties on tea and other common articles of consumption not capable of being produced in this country.

I have left myself little room in which to treat of political issues. But this is the less regrettable, inasmuch as at the moment interest in these—at least as they have hitherto been conceived—is all but dead. Mr. Devlin's appearance in the Belfast Parliament has brought a certain liveliness into that assembly and indicates the beginning of a forcible, if as yet minute, Opposition. But the Republicans, both southern and northern, still sulk in their tents. Only at long intervals does Mr. de Valera utter a plaintive moan or Miss MacSweeney send a shrill cry across the Atlantic. At the recent urban and county elections ratepayers' candidates frequently won on the slightly silly but significant cry of "no politics." Fewer and fewer electors take the trouble to vote at all, and I shall be agreeably surprised if the Senate Elections, now impending, show more than a thirty per cent. poll. In local government areas the substitution of nominated commissioners for elected councils is commonly applauded.

Such being the atmosphere, the verdict of the Boundary Commission is awaited with languid interest. Partition is an affront to national feeling, and the Border, wherever drawn, must always be a vile nuisance, especially to those unfortunate enough to live near it. But since nobody now supposes that the Commission can abolish either, we have, most of us, made up our minds to make the best of a thoroughly bad job. The Free State has bound itself beforehand to accept whatever modifications may be made. Belfast, on the other hand, still waves an occasional flag and repeats "Not a foot of ground—not a slate from a Derry roof!"—but the districts most intimately concerned are taking things quietly. Here is what a prominent Ulster Unionist—one of those chosen to represent his party at the Convention of 1917—had to say to an Orange gathering in County Monaghan on the last twelfth of July:

"We are here to celebrate the July anniversary without let or hindrance, and I know of no Protestant who is restricted or hampered in the slightest degree in carrying on his ordinary avocations, provided he obeys the law. Peace and order prevail, and the law is

impartially administered. Someone might say I am unduly flattering the Free State, but I am only voicing the minds of the Protestant people by saying they had a right to be thankful and to be fair and honest with those in authority."

The fact is that life is much of a muchness on either side of the border. It is true that the Northern Government has not imitated its Southern neighbour in proclaiming a political amnesty and that it has shown itself much less generous in the gift of State appointments to its opponents and in nominations to its Second Chamber. But, I repeat, we are now chiefly concerned with bread-and-butter problems. Taxation is roughly equal in the two areas, cheaper tea and sugar in one being about balanced by cheaper clothing in the other. If the Boundary Commission can contrive to abolish some of the more pressing economic absurdities of partition—such as that which cuts off the City of Derry from its wonted markets in County Donegal—we shall be grateful. Much more than this few of us, I fancy, expect. The great boon of a re-united Ireland must be sought otherwise.

To sum up. We are neither particularly prosperous nor particularly proud of ourselves these days. We begin to find that English rule, however rightly abolished, was not, after all, the root of all evil, nor Irishmen invariably endowed with a double dose of primæval virtue. We suspect that we have a deal of hard work before us if we are to make Ireland what we all desire; though we naturally prefer that some class to which we do not happen to belong—politicians or priests, or farmers or business men, or artisans or labourers—shall be the first to set a good example.

On the other hand, we—in the Free State at least—see opportunities which were not open to us under the old régime, of which opportunities rightly used the national recognition and public support of the Abbey Theatre is a small but pleasing example. We are making many experiments and we are bound to make many mistakes. But I am sure we shall win through.

HUGH A. LAW.

THE LIBERAL PARTY: WHAT SORT OF FUTURE?

I WILL not discuss the question as to whether there is a future for the Liberal Party. There *must* be a future, although the prospects may not be bright for a long time to come, although none of the recent by-elections point to it, although members of the Party may have to be patient while they see their principles exploited by others, and even although Liberals should never again attain a majority in Parliament. May one who has sat in Parliament, who has contested several elections and taken part in many more, who has all his life supported the party propaganda, express his own view? One who always invites expression from the variety of people with whom he comes in touch; who is independent but who realises the value of services rendered by those who cannot be independent; who is genuinely grateful for what his leaders have done, but who does not base his belief in Liberalism merely on the present day, and who regards leaders and followers alike in any day as trustees for great principles.

What may be called the official and "thick and thin" elements in the Party are endeavouring to convince the country that the difficulty is already over, that all will soon be well. This is partly because optimism is always considered good policy and partly because to talk of a rosy future is one way of applying a sponge to the personalities, the inconsistencies and the indecencies of party history during the last few years. This is a simple process, too simple for those whose heads are not easily turned, who, unfortunately, have longer and more persistent memories or a more obstinate propensity for facing facts. They would gladly forget controversies; they perhaps never indulged in personalities, and may never have been in the happy position of regarding either side as entirely free from faults, or in the stern nature of things ever expected them to be. They had their preferences, and their objections may have had all the deeper root because they were calmly expressed. They fear a general oblivion which would mean lessons unlearned, recurrence in a very short time of some of the old troubles, and a perpetuation in the very act of denial of much of the old system.

Is it not better at a time when Party prospects are gloomiest, and when, therefore, the smallest injury can be inflicted by outspokenness, to probe the facts, to ascertain what were the real reasons for many of the rebuffs and discomfitures of the past few years? Matthew Arnold, writing to a lady correspondent after the great Liberal defeat of 1874, said: "What a beating it is! You know that Liberalism did not seem to me quite the beautiful

and admirable thing it does to the Liberal Party in general, and I am not sorry that a new stage in its growth has commenced and that the Party should be driven to examine itself and to see how much real stuff it has in its mind and how much clap-trap." Clap-trap did not die in 1874. Even the war has not killed it.

Easy-going people are content with explanations which are designed to satisfy all schools of Liberal opinion, but which contain only half-truths; for example, that war is always disastrous to the Liberal Party, or that because of the recovery of the Party at the General Election of 1906, as though out of the depths, if things are left in certain hands, Liberalism will rise again. Such calculations omit the all-important factor of the new Party which has detached so many supporters and so much enthusiasm, which has now had the status of office and Opposition, and which, as well as the Government Party, has to be dislodged before Liberalism can come by its own. It may not be recalled that in the early years of this century the Liberal Party, though out of office and favour, was agreed to have amongst its leaders the ablest group of men in the country. Now that it has been long out of office and many of its old leaders have gone, its potential ones are not so easily recognised.

Those who hesitate to take ready comfort, to put a gloss on defeat, or accept consolation from the absence of Proportional Representation, do not by any means despair of the future of Liberalism. Those who reject the more plausible arguments and do not rally to the expedients of the day ought not to be regarded as other than well-wishers and sound co-operators in the movement for the firm re-establishment of Liberalism. To them it appears that the first essential is a better understanding of principles, and, rather than an increase in the professional element or an addition to existing machinery, more encouragement of the voluntary army, so that there may be more competent and energetic members of the Party prepared to contend with their opponents on either hand and to make an effective appeal to those sections of the electorate with whom the Party machine has failed for many years. They conceive that the present Government must in the course of time make many mistakes, and, even if it does well, make many enemies; that the present Labour Party, with its own acute divisions and inconsistent creeds, may fail as an Opposition as it failed as a Government; and then, if the Liberal Party is worthy, the time will come when it will draw to itself the Radical elements in Labour and the Free Traders and genuine social reformers in the Conservative Party. Hostility to the Government and recollection of what Labour has been in Opposition and in office may induce the electorate generally once more to give its confidence to the

Liberals. The present supreme need is that Liberalism in misfortune should use that period of misfortune as a means of recovery of itself and of public confidence.

Liberalism has suffered undeservedly and from the confusion of the times, a confusion which has played into the hands of the other parties. Mr. Baldwin has frankly admitted that he is the exceptional man to whom a second chance has been given. The Labour Party are not so frank with themselves or with the public, but they must know that many of their victories have been due to the support of extremists whom they cannot control. Although Liberalism has been the first to suffer from the confusion of the times it may not be the last to recover. Sooner than is to-day anticipated the country may be glad that as an alternative to the present Government it can look elsewhere than to those who formed the last.

While Liberalism has suffered undeservedly, would it not be honest to admit that it also has itself to blame for some of its reverses and for much popular misunderstanding? A party cannot expect to command public favour when leaders speak and write about one another as has been the case, and when there has been little charity amongst followers. It cannot be imagined that the public will believe that all this is of the past so willingly as those to whose present advantage it is that reconciliation should appear complete. Even if statements are effectively cancelled by those who made them they will be re-issued by those who are interested in keeping them alive. Then, again, it was widely felt in the Party itself that inquiry into methods was long overdue, and there was blank misgiving when a belated inquiry was committed to the very people who had themselves been largely responsible for the past conduct of affairs.

No one can pretend that the lessons of the war have yet been taken to heart by the nation. The Liberal Party may also fail to learn if attention is solely given to those who believe in reiteration, in advertisement, and in methods which, they do not see or want to see, are either discredited or unsuited to the times. It is some excuse for a sponge being applied to the past that the riot of personalities was almost as prominent in the other parties as in the Liberal Party. But it is early days to pretend that differences have entirely disappeared, or that there is no fear that the sort of compact arrived at will not only throw a cloak over the position but will provide a shelter for much of the officialism and many of the actual officials which, and who, have been partly responsible for those inglorious times. Before a wide public, or even the rank and file of a Party, make financial sacrifices they are justified in requiring more than mere assertions that past mistakes will not be

repeated. The demand for economy and efficiency and reorganisation is always easy and popular, but the practice is sure to produce hardship. We see this in the constant call for the reduction of Government establishments. A Party organisation has its honest and industrious paid officials who cannot be summarily dismissed. These difficulties must not be underrated. And yet leaders continue to go, members of Parliament fail to secure re-election, all sorts of efforts and rebuffs have to be experienced by those who are the backbone of the Party, and the official brook goes on for ever, with "chatter, chatter as it flows." New methods cannot be carried through if in all the organisations the old officials are retained.

The permanent official is not to be objected to merely because he is paid; that would be a mean and contemptible objection. But while others come and go and give a part of their time he is always on the spot, and he may, by misdirected energy, sloth, obstinacy, or sheer inability, all consistent with an honest belief in himself and his own importance, render the whole effort ineffective. The inclusive term of abuse is "the old gang," and there is a wide suspicion to-day among independent members of the Party that "the old gang" has still a very considerable hold, and will have the opportunity of strengthening that hold in proportion as fresh money comes into the fund. Searching questions are left unanswered, and mere statements instead of business-like safeguards as to "democratic control" are forthcoming. Whatever "democratic control" may mean—and it has many meanings for various people—it would be very difficult to provide it for the nice purposes of party organisation. Democratic control is not consistent with the expert party management which wins elections. Democratic control cannot be set over headquarters' selection of candidates. Democratic control by means of delegates may be a simple method of securing the will of the few. The sort of democratic control which should be encouraged in politics is in the constituencies themselves. Mistakes must be tolerated and wisdom cultivated there through the patient methods of consultation and advice. The farther one gets from the assembly of electors meeting to discuss the interests of their own constituency, the adoption of their own candidate and the formation of opinion there, the farther one seems to get from the real hopes of democracy. The most invigorating evidence of public spirit is often to be found in the village.

In the new plans laid before the Liberal Party we already see the federations attempting to play the larger part, headquarters desiring to get the funds into their own hands, the creation of a large number of new jobs and the resort to a great number of methods

for which the end is supposed to justify the means. In London, where for many years, and particularly the last few years, Liberalism has been at its worst, Liberal organisation has lamentably failed to use its opportunities. The independent second line of representation provided by the London County Council has been demolished, but only by one-quarter of the electors troubling to vote, amid the unconcern of those who had accepted responsibility for London Liberalism.

There is a future for a Liberal Party, but not as a mere "stunt" party. Enduring success does not lie in that direction, and there is a real danger that the Party may die out for want of capable exponents and wise organisers, as well as of leaders. The age of its prominent members to-day is high, and it is not easy to see a true succession coming from youth. There is an ungraciousness which refuses to welcome and admit new and younger colleagues, and there is, in the case of a Party which has been many years out of office, a difficulty in recognising the claims and status of those who have grown up since, who have never held office and who perhaps have never been in Parliament. But, on the other hand, there is sometimes a haste to give prominence to the young and untried, in times of difficulty when tact and guidance are more than ever needed, and it is not always realised that the best in youth, as in all ages, is often unaccompanied by push and has to be led out. All parties have suffered from the exuberant incursions of those who, intent upon their own career, adopt a party before they have had time to look round, who, while they are in it, commit the party to all sorts of extravagancies, and who leave it in its reverse when it suits their own advantage, after having been brought to public notice and perhaps given office through the opportunities that party has afforded. But risks must be run and should be run in giving youth its opportunity.

A party in difficulty should look not only to its own followers or to the hope of calling back those who have deserted it. Regard must be had to the opinions held by the crowd, by the indifferent, the uninterested, and especially the newly-interested. At none of the recent elections has the electorate polled anything like its fullest, and none of the three parties has ever got to a real knowledge of the larger electorate, male or female. Great numbers are not thinking seriously about any of the political parties. To many of them perhaps it is the easiest reflection that Liberalism is a thing of the past, something which has dropped into history; and history is never a favourite study with the bulk of people. The dogmatic or self-satisfied attitude of some Liberals may give offence. In the *Conversations of Hazlitt with Northcote*, the former says: "If any-

thing could make me a bigot it would be the arrogance of the free-thinker; if anything could make me a slave, it would be the sordid, sneering fopperies and sweeping clauses of the liberal party."

If the country is to be turned by the mistakes of the other two parties to the Liberal Party it must be in the hope of a Liberal Government. At the last two elections there has been no such hope. There must be before the country a party of principle and policy, with sufficient candidates to carry a majority. There must be concerted leadership where there is none to-day; a devotion to principles instead of a resort to expedients; a coherent policy in the place of a mixture of views which even when they are reconcilable do not present any body of opinion that can be recognised by the country as the peculiar attribute of a great party. "No man can act with effect, who does not act in concert; no man can act in concert, who does not act with confidence; no men can act with confidence, who are not bound together by common opinions, common affections, and common interests."*

Minority has never been an incurable defect in any party. Unpopularity is of the time, and the very fidelity to a cause out of favour is the passport to confidence in the future. The world needs Liberalism even where it cannot bring itself to trust in it. Our country and the British Empire can only go forward through Liberal institutions. The merely temporary successes of other methods on the Continent are renewed demonstrations of the need for patient confidence and trust in the people. This country remains instinctively Liberal, and a Conservative Government can only hold office by doing Liberal things. The time will surely come, if Liberals are true to themselves, when it will be seen that the consistent Liberal policy can only be had from those who have professed and who understand Liberal principles, and who through their associations are prepared to carry them into action. But this time will not come by waiting, and an opportunity suffered to escape at another election may pass for ever. Liberal members there will continue to be; Liberal representation throughout the country, rising and falling from time to time; Liberalism in defeat and even in insignificance still making its peculiar contribution in Parliament and in public life. This much is certain because of local and personal effort and witness, and because you cannot kill the spirit. But something much more than this is demanded, and the present generation will fail of its duty if it does not struggle eagerly to secure it.

"Every honourable connection will avow it as their first purpose to pursue every just method to put the men who hold their opinions

* Burke. *Present Discontents*.

into such condition as may enable them to carry their common plans into execution, with all the power and authority of the State. As this power is attached to certain situations, it is their duty to contend for these situations. . . . Such a generous contention for power, on such manly and honourable maxims, will easily be distinguished from the mean and interested struggle for place and emolument."*

"The very style of such persons will serve to discriminate them." Note that. Not even in Burke's time was it so important as it is to-day. Written down, as we have been, and on Bentley's principle as we alone can be, by ourselves, it is more than ever necessary that we should cultivate this "style." The country should be able to regard Liberals, and I believe it can, as especially a body devoted to principle and seeking the public interest, whether the public realises that devotion or recognises that interest at the time or not. Liberals must be distinguished for the study of those problems which vitally affect the employment and welfare of the people and for steadfast adhesion to those principles in politics and economics that make for freedom, for the development of popular institutions and of industrial enterprise. It is in this way, and in this way only, that the Liberal Party can recover its position in the nation's eyes, and that there can be any hopes of a Liberal Government supported by a Liberal majority in Parliament.

A MEMBER OF THE LAST PARLIAMENT.

* Burke. *Present Discontents*.

ITALY IN THE LEVANT.

A LINE of small cargo steamers maintains a weekly service between Italy and her outposts in the *Ægean*. Reviving a mediæval tradition these ships sail from Venice, though to-day the flag they fly is the Italian tricolour instead of the Lion of St. Mark. The winged lion, cut in stone, greets them from the fortress of Corfu, the first Greek port of call, and, if they pass through the Corinth Canal, Venetian battlements look down on them from the top of Acro-Corinthus. The Corinth canal is at present only passable by small steamers and is closed during the hours of daylight for dredging, owing to the frequent landslides. It is too narrow and the sides are too steep to be used safely, but there seems little prospect of immediate widening, although it is believed that the Trieste Lloyd line would be willing to assist in such an operation in order to save the long and usually bad passage round Cape Matapan.

The twelve, or rather thirteen, islands of the Dodecanese belong to the Sporades group and lie off the coast of Asia Minor. They were occupied by Italy during the war with Turkey in 1912. As one steams eastwards across the *Ægean* the first of these islands to appear is Patmos, the most north-westerly of the group. It is a high, bare-looking island crowned by the great white monastery of St. John. On a nearer approach the monastery is seen to be surrounded by a fair sized town spread out on the upper slopes of the hills. The houses, like the monastery, are all white. A smaller monastery commemorates the residence of St. John, but it is not seen from the south. The weekly steamer does not call at Patmos, and the Italian authorities there sometimes make a difficulty about landing without written permission from the Governor at Rhodes.

Leaving Patmos to port the steamer heads direct for Leros, whose craggy outline soon rises out of the sea ahead. The longer island of Calymnos shows further south. It looks at first like part of Leros, but presently a narrow channel is visible between them. The entrance to Porto Laki, the chief harbour of Leros, is between two high crags which jut out from the main mass of cliff so as to form natural breakwaters. The entrance is wide and deep enough for the largest warship, and inside there is a magnificent haven surrounded by low hills. A number of houses are dotted along the water's edge, the most imposing being the residence of the Commandant. The inevitable mediæval castle crowns the highest point to the north-east of the harbour. Out of sight on the east coast of the island is the principal town. The population of Leros is small.

On leaving Porto Laki the ship turns south, passes under the

wicked looking crags of Cape Angistro, and, crossing the entrance into Leros channel, steams down the west coast of Calymnos. The limestone cliffs are high, bare and rugged, and except for the flocks of rock doves there is little sign of life on this part of the coast. There are, however, scattered patches of corn. The rocky islet of Telendos is passed, and then, reaching the south-western point of Calymnos, the ship turns east leaving a low level island, Nera, on the starboard hand. Cos is now visible as a long, low neck of land to the south-east with mountains at either extremity. On the horizon to the south-west can be faintly seen the hills of Stampalia (*Astypalæa*), the most westerly of the Italian islands. It is divided into two hilly portions connected by a narrow isthmus. The population is about 2,500, mostly Greeks. The town of Calymnos lies on the hills above a bay on the south coast of the island. The anchorage is open to the south-east, but there is a mole for the protection of small sailing craft. Although still known, as in antiquity, for the excellence of its honey, Calymnos is now chiefly famous as the headquarters of the sponge industry. The men of Calymnos are for some reason the most expert sponge fishers in the Mediterranean. Their vessels set out in May, taking the major part of the able-bodied male population, and scour the seas for sponges as far as Crete, Sicily, and Tunis. Neither Sicilians nor Arabs can compete with the sailors of Calymnos as sponge divers, and at any time of the year that one calls at Calymnos one is sure to take off a shipment of white cotton bales which the sailors toss about with astonishing ease. These are sponges destined for any part of Europe or America. Probably a group of people will also be observed washing sponges on the shore.

The town at the water's edge is called Scala. It presents a curious appearance from the water as, apart from the mosques and churches, it consists entirely of small, flat roofed houses, built on one pattern. They look like squared blocks of stone with holes cut into them for doors and windows. Many of the windows are in fact merely holes, owing to a local custom in pursuance of which a man builds a house, complete except for the windows, as a dowry for his daughter. The bridegroom, when found, glazes the windows and colour-washes the walls. A great many houses seem to be in the unfinished state, awaiting a suitor for the destined mistress. The monotonous scheme of architecture is somewhat relieved by the varied colours of the occupied houses and the domes of the mosques. These also are painted bright colours, one dome being a blue which rivals sea and sky for brilliance. Several Christian churches appear to have been built since the Italian occupation.

On leaving Calymnos the steamer proceeds east, keeping close

to the southern shore of the small Italian island of Kappari (Pserimos) to avoid the shoal water off Cos. This northern shore of Cos is flat and is the most fertile part of the island. It is covered with fruit trees, including mulberries, as there is considerable production of silk. The silkworm from Cos, described by Aristotle, was probably a relation of our oak eggar moth, as the true silkworm was then unknown. Vines and corn grow between the fruit trees. At the eastern point the land runs out in a long spit. On this a row of windmills stand. These are built of stone with a circular wooden framework for the sails. The sails consist of narrow triangular strips of canvas, eight completing the circle; they are furled along the framework when the mill is not in use. In a breeze, with all the sails set and turning, a row of windmills look like so many great white flowers with revolving petals. As one passes Kum Point, where the windmills are, the mountainous coast of Asia Minor opens up ahead and the town of Cos appears to the south. The boat swings to starboard to her anchorage off the town, and as she does so the town of Budrum (Halicarnassus) becomes visible at the head of a bay on the mainland. On a promontory at Budrum is a castle built by the Knights of St. John. The town of Cos is dominated by another large castle, also built chiefly by the knights, but partly by the Venetians and others.

The population of the town is at present largely Turkish, and the bazaar is typically Asiatic in appearance. Craftsmen ply their trades at open booths, the fez is generally worn, and men sit in cafés smoking hookahs or playing a kind of backgammon. Vines are trained across the street in some places. On the quay boat-builders are busy, and the lagoon under the walls of the castle is crowded with small sailing ships painted in bright colours. From the walls one may see the wide sweep of mountains on the mainland running out to the north and east, with the hills of Calymnos to the north-west. Immediately in front of the castle doorway and bridge is the famous plane tree under which Hippocrates is supposed to have lectured on medicine in the fifth century B.C. Drawings of the tree of the sixteenth century certainly represent it in the same condition as it is to-day.

After leaving Cos the ship proceeds south across the gulf of the same name to Cape Crio (Cnidos) at the head of the Doric peninsula. Leaving the small island of Nisero and the larger one of Piscopi (Tilos) on the starboard hand, the vessel has the island of Rhodes ahead to the south-east. The island of Symi, also Italian, lying between two headlands of the Doric peninsula, is left to port, and, rounding Kum Burnu or windmill point, at the north-eastern end of Rhodes, the vessel arrives in the early morning off

the fine old city, which still preserves from the sea much of its mediæval grandeur.

The morning sun shines on bastion, keep and battlement, the visible sign of the long occupation by the Knights of St. John. But within the old walls many mosques and minarets now appear marking the Turkish dominion since the great siege of 1522 by Suliman the Magnificent. On this occasion a few hundred knights, representing Italy, Provence, England, Spain, and Auvergne, with some 5,000 followers, were besieged by a Turkish army of 100,000. After a desperate resistance the town was surrendered with honours of war, the knights being allowed to leave with the remains of their own fleet. One of the conditions of the surrender was that Rhodes should not be subject to Turkish taxation. This promise was observed throughout the four centuries of Ottoman rule, but, unfortunately for the inhabitants, it lapsed on the occupation by Italy in 1912. The walls, which still enclose the town, come down to the port and are prolonged into the sea on the moles to the east of the two harbours. Both are small and unfit for large ships. The most northerly, Porto delle Galere of the knights, is of ancient construction. The entrance was left silted up by the Turks, but the Italians have dredged it so that the harbour is now serviceable for small craft. The tower with a light, at the northern end of the old mole, is called by the British Admiralty, "St. Elmo," but by the inhabitants, "St. Nicola." According to one tradition the Colossus stood near this tower, or actually astride the harbour entrance. The local boatmen have, however, transferred the legend to the southern, or commercial harbour, and say that the Colossus had one foot near the Tower of St. Angelo on the east and the other near Arab's Tower on the west. Arab's Tower was half destroyed by an earthquake in 1864 as was the Colossus itself in 224 B.C. A third tradition is that the Colossus stood in Trianda Bay on the north of the island, where the earliest settlements were. It is at Ialyssos on the hills above Trianda that the most ancient Mycenæan relics are found.

Rhodes is the largest and most important of the Dodecanese islands and is the seat of the Governor. It is forty-two miles in length and seventeen miles across at the middle, the widest part. The most fertile portion is the level strip from the town of Rhodes past Trianda Bay and along the north-western coast. This district is covered with olive, orange, and lemon groves. Corn, figs, melons, apricots, almonds, and many other fruits are grown, and in the neighbourhood of Rhodes market gardens are being developed with improved systems of irrigation. Jaffa oranges of phenomenal size are grown at Lindos on the east coast. There is no doubt that Rhodes has hitherto been under-developed. The land

was parcelled out among Turkish beys who took half the value of the produce, leaving half for the peasant cultivators. The population are easy going and are satisfied with a sufficiency for their immediate requirements. The coming of the Italians has caused a great demand for labour for public works. Peasants have left their holdings in many cases for more remunerative work in the town, and the landowners find a difficulty in working their property. It is expected that there will be room for a good number of Italian settlers, but these are not being encouraged to come before local conditions are improved, particularly as regards a water supply for the town and better port accommodation.

Water is still being brought to Rhodes in the old Roman aqueducts from the hills. Shafts were sunk by the Roman engineers in the hills four miles outside the town and these were connected by subterranean galleries. The water collected in these galleries was brought down to Rhodes in earthenware pipes. These have never been replaced and are now, of course, broken in many places, so that surface water percolates after rain. A modern water supply is one of the tasks to be undertaken by the Italian administration, in connection with a sewage system. The streets are kept clean and the leading hotels are generally reported to be so. A large new hotel on the most luxurious lines is being built on the sea-shore to the north of the town by the Association of Italian Hotel Keepers with the assistance of the Government and the Trieste Lloyd Company. It is intended primarily for rich Egyptians and Syrians who use Rhodes as a summer resort.

Owing to the Etesian winds which blow from the north regularly in summer, this island is never oppressively hot. It is proposed to build small villas in connection with this new hotel in which the families of the clients can be kept in their customary seclusion, while the clients themselves lead a European life in the hotel, where there will be a casino and all the advantages of civilisation. Many other new public buildings have been completed, including several barracks, a large girls' school, an officers' club, and a church dedicated to St. John. These have been built, as the hotel will be, in a style in keeping with the mediæval Gothic or Turkish buildings. The officers' club, with bold arches on narrow columns, is a particularly striking piece of work.

One of the most pressing works is the improvement of the port. At present ships have to lie off the harbour, and during the strong east winds in winter they are unable to discharge cargo. Plans have now been prepared for the widening and lengthening of the quay on the east of the commercial harbour. The new quay will be 320 metres long and have a depth alongside of twenty-eight feet. It will be built on ferro-concrete piles and is to be com-

pleted by the middle of next year. The mole will probably be extended from the Tower of St. Angelo northwards. This will enable two moderate sized steamers to use the port at the same time in all but the worst weather. Without waiting for the completion of the port, a new fast thirty-hour service between Brindisi and Rhodes is being inaugurated.

It is said that there will be no difficulty about marketing vegetables and fruit from Rhodes in largely increased quantities, because the Greeks, who were formerly the market gardeners for Smyrna, have now gone away, and the Turks do not understand the work. Smyrna has, therefore, a great need of fresh vegetables. At present the weekly Italian steamer, after leaving Rhodes, proceeds to Smyrna, usually with a cargo of oranges or other fruit or vegetables in season.

A visitor to Rhodes cannot but be struck by the lavish way in which the administration is being run. The number and scale of the new buildings are impressive, and the appointments of the museum of antiquities, housed in the old hospital of the knights, would be envied at the British Museum. Excavations are being vigorously carried on, and every detail has been well thought out in the display of the relics, even to a small garden crammed with brilliant sub-tropical flowers. On the bare hillsides near the town notices can be read: "Reafforested land: no grazing." Wholesale destruction of timber on Rhodes, as in so many other parts in the Near East, has tended towards greater extremes of temperature, lessened fertility of surrounding soil, and, in the low lying grounds, to the formation of marsh, with consequent malaria. Reafforestation is, therefore, a very beneficent work.

It is evident that the Italians are doing their best to make Rhodes a model colony. It is visited by people of many nations, and, lying so close to the coast of Anatolia, it is well within sight of the people of the mainland. One is constantly told that the island itself is a small affair. "What is Rhodes compared with Cyprus?" an Englishman is asked, and he is reminded that Cyprus has recently been declared a Crown Colony, an event hardly remarked in England but the cause of much comment and heart searching in such places as Rhodes. The islands of Crete and Madagascar are also compared with Rhodes to the disadvantage of the last. One constantly hears that the soil of Rhodes is very poor in comparison with that of the mainland. Two men crossed to Anatolia last year, acquired some olive groves, and with primitive pressing machinery netted a small fortune. They returned again this year with better machinery expecting to make a large fortune. Tales like these are current in Rhodes. Everyone is convinced that there is wealth untold in Anatolia awaiting exploitation. But the Turks are not

know, the reforms that Richard Seddon and his followers instituted some decades ago were considered then impossible and dangerous. Compulsory arbitration, equally compulsory cutting up of big estates, old age pensions, the eight hour day—all commonplaces now—were then considered as inviting disaster. National bankruptcy was confidently predicted, yet the party went on. It is this adventurous and progressive spirit which in New Zealand to-day seems completely lost, though perhaps only temporarily so. It would be wrong to affirm that the Reform Party has done nothing to add to this list of benefits. On the contrary, old age pensions have lately been increased, blind pensions (civilian) on a liberal scale have lately been awarded, while there are also the pensions for widowed mothers, something on the line of mothers' pensions advocated in Great Britain. Many other necessary reforms in industrial and agricultural life, such as Seddon had planned to carry out, have, however, been refused.

As a consequence of this almost sudden stop in a small nation's progress, we notice in New Zealand what American visitors call the phenomenon of the double strata. Utopian conditions, startling as compared with England, and more especially with the United States, are to be found in certain departments of working life, such as those which Seddon "seddonified," so to speak, in our Golden Age. Side by side with these occupations, belonging to the same class of people, are the social strata which, either he had not time to deal with, or which, owing to their nature, and especially to our changed financial terms, could not be "seddonified" once and for ever. Some draw the line of demarcation between town and country; one American visitor made a point regarding the tremendous difference between the hothouse life of law-sheltered factory and shop girls, with their basic wage and short hours, and the excessive toil exacted from country women and domestic servants. The difference, however, does not really lie in sex or in rural conditions. There is no doubt that the old moral force, the old humanitarian spirit of our country, could make conditions equally prosperous all through, for the difficulties of to-day are really less than the difficulties and opposition confronting the reforms of some decades ago.

Will that spirit reawaken at the next election, and battle against the tendency to "keep in power the party that is in power just because it is in power"? For good and for ill New Zealanders have very little of that feeling which regards politics as a game, which sometimes animates the Englishman to "give the other party a chance" or to allow the under dog to have his turn. If our people at this coming election turn against the party which has held sway for so long, it will not be the mere force of reaction,

less strong here than in England. It will not even be the failure of Mr. Massey's housing scheme, though our house shortage has been as great as any in older countries. It will not even be his opponents' contention that, a farmer himself, he has considered too much the interests of the farmers, who are a powerful and wealthy body here, while the interests of the poor elector and the city worker have suffered. Our land laws, which tended to State socialisation under the great Liberal leader, certainly need most drastic changes, for to-day, so the Opposition puts it, "land is merely handed round from one person to another like so many parcels, the agent and speculator, but never the worker, getting the benefit." To-day the agricultural labourer approximates more to the condition of his Victorian forbear than he has ever done in New Zealand's history, and, as regards the cities, there is the rise of slums which "ought not to be in a new country," but which, in spite of this oft-quoted bromide, certainly existed in still earlier days before the old-time Liberals' improvements. All these charges are brought against the Party in power at present, and are made much of by their opponents. They will have some force at the election time, but in themselves they will not be sufficient to turn the Party out.

What may weigh against the Conservative Party is the undoubted fact that when a Government has been long in office it has a tendency to lean rather too much to officialdom. This tendency is not less in a new country; it is really greater, chiefly because the masses of voters are not afraid of a peril which they consider as threatening only "old and effete" countries. Their danger, they are led to think, lies in too much individuality turning into licence, too little regard for the restraints of what otherwise would be called "red-tapism." Therefore, though they may vaguely resent certain ideals affecting their own department, they do not see a false ideal arising which imperils them as a whole. It is the newly-arrived immigrant who sees this most clearly, and who, in indignant letters to the papers, while admitting many advantages, asserts that "New Zealand is the most unfree colony of all and far below the Homeland in true love of liberty." The fact that he often instances merely our lately passed compulsory voting (really compulsory enrolling) Bill does not deprive his strictures of a certain sting. Other thoughtful people are seeing that this danger results largely from ever-increasing officialdom. Proportionately, we have more permanent officials than any other country. Under the long sway of the present Government officialdom has tended to secure too much power, a power the more malign as a narrow seniority rule allows officials to rise in spite of the fact that they may have used their power unwisely, or even

to delude the public. There is no need to delude the public so very much, as it is helpless in any case.

According to those who know, this canker affects every department, not greatly or deeply perhaps, but certainly widely, and with signs of greater evils to come. It has delayed the progress of our railways—these being here a State monopoly—and it has affected education, which the State here controls far more than in England. Thus, at the moment, one State Department is endeavouring to abolish the matriculation examination tests in such a way as will put the Universities quite in its power. Again, institutionalism is spreading to an absurd extent. Flagrant attempts have been made in one or more State Departments to pass laws which would enable them to enslave for years boys and girls who have committed most trifling offences. Such boarded-out boys and girls would make excellent workers on farms where cheap adult labour is still somewhat difficult to obtain! Even the good laws which the Reform Government has passed are being nullified through the arrogance of those little-known officials who have yet such tremendous power. Old age pensions, as already mentioned, have been increased, but there seems to be an unwritten law that recipients are to be deprived of them on small provocation, as shown in a very harsh sentence passed lately upon an old couple found to have made some mistake in their claim. As regards the blind pensions, again, there is a regulation that this is not available if the afflicted person "has rich relations." The well-known fact that these pensions so far have been very little claimed is no doubt due to colonial pride at having good faith questioned, a pride upon which officialdom often counts. Another symptom is the recent narrowing of our jury system, which is considered an attempt towards doing away with that system altogether later on. It is in the Public Service directly, however, that interference with true liberty is to be expected. That Service has, in fact, almost the secret and irresponsible power ascribed in Eastern countries to the hareem, a power accentuated when there is an aged and weary Sultan on the throne.

Such a Sultan is the present Massey Government, and when its retention in office is considered at the polls, the fact that it has thus yielded to permanent officials only theoretically responsible for their actions will have some weight. There will, however, be no animus or bitterness, largely because such failure is considered to be a natural result of too long continuance in office.

Considering that Labour Parties all over the world are understood to favour State interference, it might seem as if such a party were the last likely to be favoured here, where officialdom has got out of hand. As a matter of fact, however, the public are

inclined to argue that, as we have State control already and nothing will alter this, we may as well set over our officials a body of vigorous and sane men who, having State control as an ideal, will do their best to make the ideal successful. Not only consciously, but subconsciously, such men, if honest, must strongly desire that State ownership, combined with the highest practice of individual liberty, shall be an example to the world. Consequently, they will take measures to keep officialdom in its proper place. In such a work the Labour Party would have the interest of our little nation. The more middle-aged would remember the glow of enthusiasm that was felt when Seddon put forward ideas then new to the world, while the young would feel a natural animation, though without that stimulus of memory which gives their elders hope for the future. I am not myself a Labour partisan. I should regret a victory that would leave out of power for ever that brilliant financier Sir Joseph Ward (Liberal leader formerly), and I consider the Liberal Party has many real reforms to offer. I cannot help feeling, however, that if the Labour Party came into power the result would be a wave of interest and enthusiasm that our country badly needs. In New Zealand, we have always had to "religionise" our politics. We have always had to feel that Christianity, as someone put it, "should get on to our statute books." Whenever we have felt this glow we have done well; whenever we have let it die out, as of late years, we have fallen behind other nations. With a new, young, untried Party in power, I believe we should get it back.

The fact that some of the planks of the Labour platform are very drastic will not greatly retard the Party. We were formerly accustomed to modify State socialistic legislation if it did not work, and this gift will come back to us. It is not likely that the Labour Party will abolish the Upper House or put shipping under State control, extend the referendum overmuch or institute a five days' working week for all. These and other ideals are parts of its programme, but are not likely to be attempted all at once. It is possible that the small farmer will be helped by improved land legislation, that the backblocks (our slums, as it were) will be aided, that the right to work will be recognised, and that our country will cease to be a patchwork Utopia, its occupations and strata that have been neglected showing sometimes a worse condition than in England. Our Labour Party's platform is the platform, members inform us, of Labour Parties throughout the world, but, should it come into power or even rise to official Opposition, it is probable that its members will insensibly follow the late Mr. Seddon's footsteps in a very important point: they will walk away from theories and consider only

what is beneficial to the people of this country, having regard to conditions specially affecting it.

Drawn from all occupations, some shepherds, some ex-miners or farmers, these seventeen Labour representatives, under their leader, Mr. Holland, have made a favourable impression both in private and platform life. Their views are varied. Some of the prominent speakers are men of education and attainments. One or two were once known as *Clarion* vanners in the old country, while others have experienced life in Australia, that land of vigorous individuality. Henry Holland himself is a poet, who lately published a book of verse which Opposition papers favourably reviewed. New Zealand, as I have already indicated, needs people in power who can imbue our politics with a poetic or religious element. There is always something romantic in a Labour Party coming into office, men of a class or type who formerly had no chance. In our case, as in our former Golden Age, the genius of commonsense will probably blend with their enthusiasm, and so help us to become once more the country seeking to be a true Utopia.

CONSTANCE CLYDE.

THE FALLACIES OF CURRENT CANCER-RESEARCH.

OF all the painful afflictions which beset humanity none is more worthy of careful and truly scientific study than the large group of diseases classed under the comprehensive term "Cancer." Yet, as matters stand, none receives less; even at the hands of that profession which is universally supposed to devote itself to research for the most approved methods of curing—if possible, of preventing—those ills which necessarily follow a breach, voluntary or involuntary, of Nature's supreme laws regulating our health.

When this is so obviously the case—and who can doubt it, possessed of the most superficial acquaintance with the world's modern literature?—it can hardly be wondered that the lay press continuously teems with resounding reports of medical "discoveries" which prove on examination to be the merest clap-trap; with stories of "problems to be solved," which have no existence save in the fervid imagination of the writer; with glowing accounts of "advances in medical science": where to the initiated everything betokens retrocession and degradation rather than anything in the nature of progress or of higher enlightenment.

Having spent a considerable portion of my life in the study of cancer from every conceivable point of view; having made highly important discoveries, not only tending to elucidate its complex phenomena, but also to procure far greater efficiency in prevention and in successful treatment than it had ever previously received; having placed these phenomena and their gross causation and development—I may not speak of *final* causes—upon a more truly scientific basis than had previously been witnessed; I am now moved to submit some criticisms of what passes for "Cancer Research," and I shall venture to expose flagrant mistakes which, in my very humble opinion, make successful inquiry fallacious, if not altogether impossible.

To begin with the cardinal error of all, "cancer" is not a single and solitary disease; it is an extensive department of disorders, in fact, a perfect legion of such. The last treatise on the whole field which has been published enumerates ten primary kinds, or *genera*, and some twenty-five secondary varieties counting as *species*. The clinical and pathological phenomena of the kinds differ widely, often *totò cælo*. So also do their causes. For example, Epithelioma, Epithelial Cancer, derived from epithelial or epidermic cells, is the typical "cancer" of the male sex. It is invariably generated by mechanical friction or irritation—by causes purely local; whereas Carcinoma, the cancer of glandular organs

the phenomena of "Jensen's tumour" differed widely from those of human malignant deposits. But the fact, such as it was, furnished workers in the laboratory with a novel industry. Our Imperial Cancer Research Fund, for instance, has been working on this line ever since, without adding to our knowledge a single novel fact.

There is every reason to believe that Jensen's neoplasm in dogs, falsely assumed to be malignant and analogous to the human malady, is really caused by a parasitic fungus analogous to actinomycosis, the Ray Fungus, which infests cattle. It occasionally attacks human beings, and once I had a case under my care. It develops in the lower jaw, and for many years it passed as a Sarcoma, closely resembling that in physical appearance. But one day somebody conceived the brilliant idea of subjecting a thin section to microscopic examination, when the real character promptly became apparent.

But recent "Cancer Research," loudly trumpeted abroad by Press organs of all shades of opinion, discussed at influential congresses, and procuring for its authors the personal favours of Royalty, has, in popular phrase, gone "one better" than any preceding. Previous experiments dealt only with mammalia, and mostly with the higher orders of these, down to the ubiquitous rat. Now we are gravely asked to talk of "cancer" in mice and also in fowls. We might as well suppose it in an earwig. We are assured that immunity from "cancer" has been attained in mice by inoculation; and that is held before our eyes as a radiant vision heralding a similar event in man. Viewing the facts above detailed, the vast gulf lying between all disease-manifestations in man and those in the lower animal creation, and the entire immunity of the latter from human cancer, can anything be more absurd, and more palpably opposed to science? It reeks of commercialism and of that alone.

This very notion of "immunity" from disease, attained by any path save that of healthy living, is a preposterous error abandoned by prominent scientists such as Sir Almroth Wright. Even in contagious or infectious maladies, no such fact exists or is artificially procurable. People contract measles and scarlatina over and over again; a second attack sometimes immediately following on the first. The same thing happens with smallpox. In the bad old days of the latter, there is a recorded case in which a doctor caught the fever every time he was called in to see a patient—ten or a dozen times in all!

The third fallacy we find underlying these investigation schemes is the inordinate respect everywhere paid to the germ theory of disease, and idolatrous worship of the purely hypothetical "patho-

genic microbe." That is now an obsession universal in the laboratory. If you cannot detect a germ it must still be there all the same, only, of course, it is ultra-microscopic. I note that recent investigators prefer rather to speak of a "virus" than of a micro-organism. I rather imagine that the whole conception of germs as disease-generators must be on the wane even there. Be that as it may, there can be no question that numerous highly-educated doctors, who have carefully studied the matter, have arrived at the conclusion that the germ theory of disease has no rational or scientific foundation and is merely a passing "stunt"—to be classed with those dead fashions of the past, bleeding and mercurial salivation for certain familiar maladies. They point out that no bacillus, bacterium, or coccus, has ever been definitely proved to be the *vera causa* of any human disorder; that every one of those micro-organisms put forward as a cause of some specified ill has been subsequently demonstrated to be a perfectly normal and ordinarily innocuous inhabitant of the body; that no pathogenic organism has ever been isolated from the air; that it is practically impossible under ordinary circumstances to isolate any "germ" from the disease-virus in which it is found; that when, in rare cases, this has seemingly been done, as after many successive "cultures," the microbe, *per se*, has invariably failed to convey the specific disease; that numerous conscientious investigators, experimenting on their own persons, have then swallowed or otherwise introduced the supposed bringer of death, and have experienced no harm whatever.

In the "nineties" of the last century, Koch, of Berlin, discovered what he affirmed to be the "causal germ" of Asiatic cholera. Our Dr. Klein, a rival investigator, was sceptical. He deliberately swallowed a wineglassful of the "pure culture" of Koch's comma-bacillus; and went on his way rejoicing, in order to conduct further investigations in India. Some years later, Dr. Thresh, of Malvern, a noted medical officer of health, accidentally drank a glassful of diphtheria-bacilli in mistake for water. He was not happy for a day or two, but no health disturbance ensued. In America many workers have done similar things with like effect—or rather, absence of such. It is particularly noteworthy that no causal micro-organism has hitherto been discovered under conditions which might reasonably be assumed extraordinarily to favour detection; such as the virus of Jennerian vaccination, always with us, always remarkably plentiful. (There are, by the way, some thirty distinct varieties of virus thus used; but the Legislature, in its wisdom, has never told us which is the genuine, or at any rate the best, article.) No specific microbe has been found in smallpox virus. Some twenty years since, the Gold-

smiths Company offered a big reward—£1,000 I think it was—for such a discovery. It was never even claimed. Bogus claims on behalf of other "causal organisms" have been sufficiently numerous, because this way huge commercial profit lies. Our last Royal Commission on Vivisection demolished large numbers in which medicos had previously, and on apparently good grounds, placed full faith.

The hypothesis of "ultra-microscopic germs"—microbes which elude the microscope and pass through even the porcelain filter—is now perpetually invoked by the unsuccessful researcher. It brings no evidence in support. It will hardly commend itself to anyone accustomed to handle scientifically the modern microscope, with all those wondrous powers of magnification and illumination which have been added in the preceding generation. On the face of the matter the hypothesis can only be deemed by every reasoning person a rather paltry excuse for failure, and a somewhat feeble last endeavour to prop up a decaying and well-nigh impossible theory. Whatever the ultimate fate of the now so popular "germ theory of disease," no medico conversant with "cancer" will dispute that such an explanation should have been the last invoked to account for its appearance. Between the phenomena of all maladies plausibly ascribed to a micro-organism and those of malignant new-growths a vast gulf lies. For one thing there is always contagion, or suspicion of it, in the former. In the latter there is none. No husband ever contracted cancer from his wife, or *vice versâ*. The fallacy of the asserted "cancer houses," which were supposed to convey contagion to successive inmates, was long since conclusively disproved.

If only these investigators who profess to be conducting research on cancer, would take the trouble to study the authoritative literature on the subject which has previously appeared they would be saved flagrant waste of time and many errors. As I have already stated, the precise causation of every species has long been demonstrated. But they require to consider the topic comprehensively, and on broad general lines. Monographs are plentiful and are very largely useless. The majority treat of cancer solely from the point of view of the operating surgeon. They mostly ignore its etiological laws. I may mention that, with monographs by the thousand, only two comprehensive Treatises covering the entire field of malignant neoplasms have yet been published.

Diet has lately come to the front as an asserted causation-factor. With the exception of alcohol, no food-substance can be credibly shown to exert influence in that direction.

But mere negation is objectionable, and no right-minded person would seek to demolish a long-established system without indica-

ting what should take its place. This Cancer Question is a terribly serious one. The mortality throughout civilisation annually increases by leaps and bounds. Savages are all but exempt. And although our mortality returns are large, they are unquestionably understated. Nobody likes the term used for relatives if it can be avoided, and doctors comply with their wishes. Also, they commonly themselves overlook internal cancers, only to be authenticated by autopsy.

Thus I may, without offence, mention a fact of common knowledge: that the great Gladstone unhappily succumbed to a sarcoma of the upper jaw. Sundry members of our Royal Family have fallen victims to the dread scourge, which carried off Napoleon and several members of his race. The Duchess of Kent, the unhappy Empress Frederick, the late Duke of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha may be thus enumerated. It was not without lively personal feelings on the matter that the late King Edward proclaimed that anybody discovering a cure would be rewarded by a statue in every capital of Europe.

And yet no form of cancer is in any sense inherited or hereditary. The existence of a supposed Heredity-element was long since disproved beyond all question by my published analysis of 1,075 cases. No malignant growth ever appears without the previous operation of an adequate cause, usually obvious and ascertainable. There is no constitutional taint. All forms are at first purely local and of limited area, no multiple deposit ever arises in the first instance. All external, and many internal, are readily curable within certain well-known time limits; and are ordinarily so cured, provided that one or two essential conditions are, and can be, complied with. Everything here depends upon prompt recognition and decisive action.

The primary step which, I submit, should be taken by the community is a radical reform in the constitution of the General Medical Council. That powerful body has never done its work well, has always been most unsatisfactory to most of the profession it is supposed to represent, and is now thoroughly obsolete. It should be replaced by one adequately representing experienced doctors' opinions, and combined with strong authoritative influence from the outside. Then we might reasonably hope for a judicial medical legislature, competent to deal, on the one hand, with problems of professional education; on the other, with general questions of health enactment vitally affecting the whole population.

The second very urgent need of the times is an improvement of the existing system of medical education. This received a fatal blow from which it has never recovered, in the early "forties" of the nineteenth century, when apprenticeship was abolished.

Aspirants had to serve several years in the surgery of a general practitioner before they began to "walk the hospitals" and prepare to pass examinations. The method made them familiar with derangements of the human mechanism as these occur in the homes of the people, and as the majority will encounter them in future practice. Whereas, as every not-too-youthful practitioner will tell you, you see in educational hospitals only selected cases of disease; widely different from most of those you will eventually have to diagnose and to treat. Nothing can bring back the old system—humorously, but very graphically, depicted in Albert Smith's *The Medical Student*; but a fairly efficient substitute for its manifold advantages could and should readily be devised.

Then, when we turn to cancer, steps should be taken to ensure a genuine and really practical training, so that the doctor may learn promptly to recognise it when he finds it, and then decide on the best treatment to be pursued. As matters stand, there is no provision whatever for this. The education of the student is wholly academic; for all practical purposes is simply *nil*. The fault might be subsequently remedied in after life, as are many others less important. But the worst feature of this case is that the doctor, once engaged in practice, feels no need to do so. As an average rule, *me teste*, he meets with a cancer case only once in several years, say four to five. Then he at once—supposing people of means, the poor hardly count—invokes the opinion of a consultant, whose knowledge, like his own, has been acquired mainly from books and for the purpose of passing examinations, and whose interests manifestly lie in the direction of conciliating his own good wishes. The net result can be imagined. At the best, considerable delay is involved; and no human ill more imperatively demands speedy recognition and action than does an incipient cancerous growth.

The hospitals specially dealing with malignant developments are at present quite outside the pale of the medical curriculum. I would most strongly urge that the facilities for practical study they afford should no longer be neglected. Further, viewing the rapid annual increase in the mortality statistics—and there cannot be any question that this mortality is largely preventable, whatever people's views about the disease itself—I would make the regulation that no diploma qualifying to practise should be granted unless the aspirant has undergone a special examination in the complex questions which abound in cancer, and displays an intimate knowledge of the valid scientific work done in this connection. An official treatise dealing solely with this extensive department of medicine and surgery should be issued; and the learner obliged

to assimilate its precepts. Thus, and thus only, can the plague be stayed. Thus, and thus only, can the growing mortality be arrested—by *proper education of the coming race of doctors*; education at present so glaringly defective and deficient.

We continually hear of "Cancer Problems" to be solved. Practically none such exist. The precise causation of each variety was long ago ascertained beyond question, and definitely formulated. The name even of the drug (specially termed by the ancients *Divi donum*, the "gift of God"), whose administration potently checks the growth of chronic kinds of cancer, even procuring the absorption of very extensive external deposits—so forming a fair approximation to the desired "medicinal cure"—is familiar to all medical practitioners; although it must be painfully confessed, first, that few dream of using it for that purpose; secondly, that when they do prescribe it, and that mostly for other objects, they prefer the alkaloidal constituents beloved of their chief ruler, the wholesale manufacturing chemist.

Pope has told us that

"The proper study of mankind is Man."

Human cancer can only be studied, whether clinically, microscopically, or pathologically, in the human species. Any so-called "research" in realms beyond this is egregious futility, and nothing more. Before, however, it is sought in anyway to increase knowledge and cast light upon dark corners, the "man in the street" would assuredly say: "You should first digest the knowledge already acquired, and procure its diffusion in the proper quarters. Then onwards; but not till then."

HERBERT SNOW.

THE NEXT STEP IN EDUCATIONAL REFORM.

THE indifference of politicians to educational reform, which is but a reflection of the general attitude of the electorate, has long been a source of amusement or discouragement to reformers. Education debates in Parliament are scantily attended, unless some other interest, like that of religious controversy, goads the listeners. The financial burden involved in a large measure of educational progress does not seem to bring any immediate return to the taxpayer. Thus the claims of education are scantily dealt with by Government and Parliament alike, and few but the teachers complain.

Yet it is true that to-day a wider circle than formerly do care for educational reform, are interested in adult education and willing to support a general forward movement, while the urgency of the national economic situation may make even statesmen realise the closeness of the connection between the defects in our system and the education of our youth.

Facing the huge burden of unemployment, the country may at length be willing to adopt remedies for the wastage of the life-resources of the people that is going on continually because the education of our children is so inadequate and incomplete. Of our million-and-a-quarter unemployed, many thousands are girls and boys or young people who might have been usefully continuing their education; while the places of many others have been taken by children who should be still at school.

The grave effects of juvenile unemployment on character are becoming increasingly recognised. It is responsible for general deterioration, and in many cases for offences leading to imprisonment. If it is bad for the adult worker to be unemployed for long periods, it is worse for the lad, who has no home occupations to claim him, no allotment to look after. Many, it is true, are helped to pass through this difficult time by membership in a club, but even the boy officer in a club is less energetic and less effective in his work when unemployed, and the same is the case with the evening continuation classes. In the case of voluntary adult classes, the experience of the W.E.A. shows that attendance is better and interest keener when full time or even overtime is being worked, than when a large number of members are working only part time or are actually unemployed. The worried mind seeks distraction rather than education. It is only natural that the juvenile student, too, should become irregular and half-hearted in his class work when he is unemployed.

In 1919 a number of unemployment training centres for boys

were set up to deal with the special problem of post-war conditions, and in London and a number of other large towns they were started again nearly three years ago. But these centres are only compulsory in the case of boys between sixteen and eighteen in receipt of out-of-work benefit; boys under that age, or boys over sixteen who have not qualified for benefit, need not, and usually do not, make use of them. They give the lads who go there something to do; the courses of physical training have improved their physique, and there has been a general improvement in morale, particularly where handicraft work and organised games form a special feature. But they are carried on in temporary buildings, and the personnel of the classes is constantly changing, so that any adequate organised education is impossible.

Local education authorities should be empowered to enforce the attendance of children at school after the age of fourteen years, unless they are satisfied that they have obtained the offer of employment or will be usefully employed at home. They would thus simply continue at their former school, where, although they would drop out from time to time as work was obtained, the effect on the class would be totally different from that on the class in the present unemployment centres, which has no nucleus of permanent students. A small maintenance bursary, whenever necessary, should, of course, be granted.

But the problem which we have to face to-day is far wider and deeper than that of a slight extension of the school age. What is needed is a readjustment of our whole national system of education, so as to give to the majority of children the effective opportunity of training which at present is denied them. Unless a child is blind, deaf, crippled, defective, or epileptic, or else exceptionally clever, we do not make general provision for his education to continue beyond the elementary school. A generation ago a few fortunate scholarship winners were able to obtain this privilege; gradually the scholarship ladders have been widened and increased, but they still only make provision for a minority. Thousands every year compete in vain for free places in the secondary schools, while the children of richer parents are able by the payment of a small fee to gain places which in many cases they could not have obtained on their intellectual merits; such children receive an education whose cost is largely borne by the public funds.

In 1919-20, as was pointed out by the Departmental Committee on Scholarships and Free Places (1920), 11,134 children in England and Wales were refused admission to secondary schools because of the lack of free places, and 10,076 children more because of the lack of accommodation. The census of 1921 shows a juvenile population of 1,446,593 boys and girls between the ages of four-

teen and sixteen. In 1924 there were stated by the Board of Education to be 298,745 children between these ages in full-time attendance at schools falling within the jurisdiction of the Board, without counting those in private schools, and 157,708 over fourteen. Of these last, 10,383 were over fifteen. In the same year there was a total of 360,301 registered pupils of all ages in secondary schools, and a total of 136,890 free places, while 40,152 places were taken by (fee-paying) children under eleven. There were then 146,008 defective and invalid children unable to benefit by ordinary school education, but the total accommodation in the special schools provided for them amounted only to 40,596 places.*

It will be seen from a consideration of these figures that about one in every ten of the children of England and Wales between the ages of fourteen and sixteen is now receiving education in a secondary school, though a large number do not stay to complete their course. Although the number of free places has more than doubled since 1914, the demand continues to increase. In 1923-24 there were 22,475 children† in attendance at voluntary day continuation schools, and many of these would undoubtedly have been going to secondary schools had free places been available.

In 1918, Parliament passed an Education Act which provided the framework of a national system of continued education for all boys and girls up to the age of sixteen, and ultimately of eighteen years, while at the same time local authorities were given the power, with the approval of the Board of Education, to raise the age of compulsory attendance at school from fourteen to fifteen. Then came the post-war wave of reaction, and in the name of economy the progress of this great national educational reform was largely stopped. It could not have happened if economy had been regarded in terms of human life, or if there had been an electorate that thought of education as the nation's best investment.

The London County Council, which had taken the lead in applying the Act, carried on day continuation schools for the children of London from January, 1921, to July, 1922, attended by 50,000 young persons. The authorities in outer London did not fall into line, with a result that London parents complained that the places which their boys should have taken were filled by younger outsiders from Greater London. Had other areas accepted the powers of the Act, London electors might have groaned and put up with it, but the Progressive Party stood almost alone in wholehearted support of the continuance of the system, and they were swept under in the County Council Elections of 1922. The compulsory

* For the above figures, see Memorandum on the Board of Education Estimates, 1925-26, pp. 17, 22, and answers to Parliamentary questions, August 6th, 1924, and March 9th, 1925.

† Answer to Parliamentary Question, March 12th, 1925.

classes ended in July, 1922, and the voluntary day continuation classes which replaced them now number regularly only somewhat over 5,000 pupils.

To-day, Rugby is the only instance of an area in which the local education authority is carrying out the compulsory continuation classes under the Fisher Act. It has probably succeeded owing to the situation of Rugby, at a distance from any other large town, and the fact that there is little juvenile unemployment there. It is already possible to note important results from what has been achieved. In the opinion of the organiser, Mr. P. I. Kitchen, the first condition of an extended school period has been, for at least forty per cent. of the children, to produce a new atmosphere which will destroy the sense of previous failure and provide a new incentive to improvement. The curriculum comprises science, English handicrafts, arithmetic, French, music, art, and physical training, together with shorthand and typewriting, and needlework, laundry, and cookery for girls. Sports are encouraged, and there are orchestras for boys and girls and a girls' dramatic society. The forms elect officers of their own, who unite to compose a boys' and a girls' school council, with various committees. In the evenings there are gatherings of Scouts, as well as games and other activities. There is an active parents' committee, and pupils are encouraged to join the technical school at the conclusion of the continuation course. It would appear that one of the best results of such an education will be to train children for a better use of leisure, a point on which our national system is most deficient.

How is it that what is done at Rugby should not be attempted elsewhere? Unfortunately we have to face not only the ingrained conservatism of parents and electors, and the opposition of narrow-minded taxpayers. Many of the most earnest reformers are inclined to turn away from a national system of compulsory day continuation classes because they fear that it will stand in the way of a general raising of the school age to sixteen and of secondary education for all. This is a great ideal, but it is admittedly one which can only be realised gradually; such a whole-hearted advocate as Mr. R. H. Tawney proposes to approach it by a ten years' programme. So far, only three education authorities have decided to raise the school age to fifteen, and the experiment is so recent that it is hardly possible to judge it by results. The Fisher Act proposed that compulsory classes should at first extend to children of sixteen, but that in seven years' time the age should be raised to eighteen, and when once a national framework of classes has been built up this extension should be comparatively simple, and it ought to be possible to attain it without waiting for seven years.

It is surely reasonable to look forward to a steady and even rapid extension of secondary education by the increase both of schools and free places and the provision of further maintenance bursaries, and at the same time to urge that the largest immediate educational reform can be obtained by the general adoption of the compulsory day continuation classes of the Fisher Act. I believe this to be the urgent need of to-day. Such classes can be wide enough to include both technical and humane studies, and the man in the street can grasp their practical utility. Before we can hope to have a satisfactory system of universal secondary education we must have an immense increase in the number of teachers, and it is essential that the quality of the staffs should not be lowered. There must be a far wider variety of type among the schools and classes than has yet been attained, and the freer and simpler arrangements of continuation schools may prepare the way for such a gradual development. The day continuation school offers opportunities to those scholars, not confined to any one social class, who do not make progress in the ordinary secondary school; they may be dull at book work, but if given the means of making things for themselves they may prove their worth. The continuation school is in constant contact with the outer world, and its pupils are saved from the abrupt plunge from school life into industry; while transference from the elementary school to the continuation school comes at the psychological moment when fresh hope and endeavour are stimulated by the new responsibilities which come as a boy begins to earn his living.

Meanwhile, we must aim at securing the largest possible opportunity of development for the greatest number of children. This will surely be attained in the speedy adoption of a general system of compulsory day continuation classes, with the option left open to those local education authorities who desire it to raise the general school leaving age to fifteen. Owing to the drop in the birth-rate during the war years the pressure on school accommodation is less than formerly, and in the initial stages use could be made of temporary structures and of buildings already available. Before long, temporary accommodation would give place to more suitable permanent buildings, built in such a way as to be worthy of their place in the civic life. We must hope to group around the continuation school the activities of voluntary workers among boys and girls.

The carrying into effect of this system ought to be followed up by expediting the arrangements of the 1918 Act for extending the age of attendance from sixteen to eighteen, and the experience of the London continuation schools points to the desirability of a longer period of instruction than 320 hours in the year or eight

hours a week during the school term. Though a half-time system may not be immediately attainable, it would ultimately be more convenient for industry, as well as educationally more satisfactory. Local education authorities might, in the meantime, be allowed to increase the hours of attendance up to half-time. In any case, we ought to put an end to the present system of dual control, by which some authorities have elected to maintain juvenile employment exchanges and after-care work under their Education Committees, while others, like London, have handed over their responsibilities to the employment exchanges and the Ministry of Labour. The supreme responsibility for after-care of the juvenile population ought clearly to rest with the Board of Education and the local education authorities under it, though it should be possible to associate the officials of the employment exchanges and their advisory committees with the local arrangements. If this were done, the educational work of the present juvenile unemployment centres would, of course, tend to be more efficient.

How, then, are we to make the first advance to a general system of day continuation classes? Obviously, they can be most readily organised in urban areas, while in some cases in rural areas the difficulties are very great. In the county of Westmorland, for instance, with its 110 elementary schools containing some 5,400 children, the population is so situated that sixty schools have an average attendance of less than fifty per school, and ten schools an average attendance of under ten in each school. Many other counties contain thinly populated regions and lonely, hilly country, in which other methods must be adopted than those suited for a closely settled district or for town areas. It may, therefore, seem advisable for an earlier date to be fixed for urban areas and for a greater elasticity of arrangement to be eventually left to rural districts.

In a purely agricultural county it might be possible to arrange for short courses to be held during the winter months, and eventually for rural high schools to be developed after the example of Denmark. An inspiring vision of what could be done for English rural education through the development of village centres of higher study has recently been given us by Mr. H. Morris in his memorandum on *The Village College*,* in which he pleads for the development of a rural type of secondary education, to which the elementary schools would lead up, senior schools serving the district adjoining, being so located as to be reached by the pupils by walking or cycling or by means of motor omnibuses. The senior school would, in a number of cases, form a part of the "village college," with its hall and library and rooms for advanced educa-

* Cambridge University Press. 1924.

tion as well as for recreational purposes, while the whole group of activities carried on in the village college buildings would form a centre of social and intellectual life for the district, with evening lectures and classes for adults, together with technical agricultural courses, a resident warden being headmaster of the school and in general charge of the institute. It is shown that by means of ten such village centres, provision could be made for the transformation of rural education in Cambridgeshire; and it is surely possible along similar lines to build up afresh the educational life of rural England, giving a new hope and a new meaning to the education in village elementary schools, and helping to revive the life of the countryside.

In classes for adult education it is possible even now to transcend the miserable social and economic distinctions which separate us and still mar our educational system. Scholarships and free places to secondary schools have broken down some of the social barriers that separate the children of the well-to-do and the children of the people. But more than this is needed. The distinction between elementary and secondary education is not really an educational but a social distinction. The natural age of transition from the primary stage of education is not fourteen, but much lower. Hence, on educational grounds we may welcome the recent extension of senior schools and central schools, grouping together children of eleven years and upward from neighbouring primary schools, always provided that every effort is made to make the education they receive as good as that of the secondary schools, and that every encouragement is given to an increasing number of children to continue their education to the usual secondary school age. Unless this is our recognised aim, the central school may give an advantage to individual scholars, but it gives only a second best.

Many reformers urge the abolition of school fees in secondary schools as one of the next steps to be achieved. The strongest argument in its favour is that it would help to remove snobbishness among the scholars. On the other hand, in a time of financial stringency we cannot readily dispense with the money help which these fees provide, and in some cases, at least, the payment of a fee may encourage greater effort to make the best of the advantages provided. It would seem to be more important at present to concentrate effort on seeing that provision is made to prevent the shutting out from secondary schools of poor children who, but for their poverty, would have been able to benefit by them, and to this end it is important that fee-paying pupils should pass the same entrance examination as free place holders. There is no excuse for our continuing to allow places in secondary schools to be refused to abler children whose parents cannot afford a fee,

while they are accorded to the less qualified children of such parents as can pay it.

But reform of secondary education must go far deeper than increase of buildings and free places. What is urgently needed is a wider variety of types of schools, a far larger use of handicraft work and opportunities for training of hand and eye. Hitherto, apart from a limited number of trade schools, commercial schools, and junior technical schools, which tend to err on the other side in the direction of over-specialisation, the newer secondary schools have been far too much of one type, based on town life and book knowledge, and turning out pupils who have had few opportunities of manual training and are most of them destined to take up "black-coated" jobs in trade and commerce. The indefinite extension of such schools would be a mistake. If we are to become again a nation of pioneers, our education must be more creative. There is scope for experimental schools, conducting much of their teaching in the open air and in the school workshop, and especially in country districts do we need a type of secondary school where a large part of the teaching would be carried on outside the walls. Before the war, in Hungary, there was a widespread system of open-air instruction for boys and girls in country schools. To-day even in Poland there are a number of simple agricultural schools where boys and girls between fifteen and eighteen get not only a certain general and literary instruction but also specialised agricultural teaching and practice.

To sum up, what we must aim at is to secure at the earliest possible moment a general measure of compulsory continued education for children between fourteen and sixteen and, at an early date, eighteen, with the option in rural districts of short continuous courses for fixed periods, instead of part-time classes throughout the year; and at the same time an extension of the scope of secondary schools, both in the nature of their training and in the amount of free places provided, so that no capable child shall be shut out by poverty from the opportunity of higher education; while the child who is not adapted to book learning should have the chance of self-development in other ways. We must meet the needs of the country and the needs of the town. Fuller education may transform the life of the countryside; it may also transform the leisure, if not the work, of the town dweller. Modern industry means for thousands of workers a single monotonous and mechanical task; if our civilisation is to live, we must see to it that education gives the worker the training and the interests which may, at least, transform his leisure and make him something better than a cog in a great machine for the creation of wealth, which neither he nor others are able to use aright.

T. EDMUND HARVEY.

DANTE AS A POLITICAL THINKER.

AS Dante seems to have lived in an ideal world in the realm of love, so also he lived in an ideal world in the realm of politics. The generally accepted political doctrine of the Middle Ages was lofty in conception: its fatal defect was that, in practice, it had never worked and never would work. Mankind was regarded as a single community, comprising two organised Orders of Life, the spiritual and the temporal—the universal Church being the visible expression of the spiritual and the universal Empire the visible expression of the temporal. Gierke in his *Political Theories of the Middle Age* has shown how the conflict between this duality and the theoretically requisite unity was "the starting point for speculative discussions of the relation between Church and State. In some higher unity reconciliation must be found: but over the nature of the reconciling process the great parties of the Middle Age fell a-fighting."

Dante expounds this old doctrine with great clarity and force in the *De Monarchia*. He deals with it as one who yearned for peace in a world torn by incessant wars between States, and by feuds between factions; for justice to restore order and make possible a free and reasonable life in civil society. He seeks the solution of the world's troubles in a return to correct political theory—not, be it understood, in mere lip-service thereto, but in its immediate practical application. The misgovernment of divided Italy was in large measure due to the exercise by the Papacy of temporal dominion, which had contributed to corruption and simony in the Church, and to endless intrigues for the furtherance of worldly ambitions and personal interests. It was not moderation or self-imposed restraint that prevented the Papacy's usurpation of the temporal order from being complete. But all such usurpation was a clear departure from political orthodoxy. Dante was a loyal son of the Church and full of veneration for the spiritual office of the Supreme Pontiff. The measure of his reverence for that office was the unfathomable depth of his indignation against the men who degraded it. One example will suffice to illustrate the point. St. Peter, who, notwithstanding the joy and peace of Paradise, exhibits a very human and terrestrial wrath, is made to say:

"He who usurpeth upon earth my place, my place, MY place, which in the presence of the Son of God is vacant, hath made my burial-ground a conduit for that blood and filth, whereby the apostate one who fell from here above, is soothed down there below."

This is certainly strong language, but not stronger than the degradation of the Papacy merited. Dante's wrath was directed

not only in general against the personal unworthiness of the Popes, but, in particular, against their pretensions to powers which, according to theory, should be vested in a supreme temporal ruler—the Emperor. The latter point, which he makes again and again, may be illustrated by a single passage from the *Purgatorio*:

“O Italy! thou slave! thou hostelry of woe! ship without pilot in the tempest rude! No Queen of Provinces but a house of shame! . . . See thy sons, how one with other ever is at war, and those whom the self-same wall and moat begird gnaw at each other's lives. Search, wretched one, along thy sea-bound coasts, then inward turn to thine own breast, and see if any part of thee rejoice in peace. Of what avail Justinian's curb of law, with none to bestride the saddle except to shame thee more? Alas! ye priests, who should be at your prayers and let Cæsar sit in the saddle, if well ye understood the word God hath written to you, see how the steed hath grown vicious, for not being corrected by the spurs since ye placed your hands upon the reins.”

The reference to Justinian is significant. Dante also makes Justinian speak for the Roman Empire in the *Paradiso*. He had a wholesome conviction, shared still by all except the impatient school of political thinkers, that sound law, the power to enforce it and a general respect for it, are a good basis for civilisation. This thought permeates his conception of Empire.

It has been well said by Professor Huizinga, in his recent study on *The Waning of the Middle Ages*, that “to understand the spirit of an age it is not enough to know only its real and hidden forces: we must know also its illusions, its fancies, and its errors.” The illusions woven in the fourteenth century and long afterwards around the whole subject of the Roman Empire were many. Great, indeed, as it was in its best days, it was never so great, or so excellent in its functioning, as the thinkers of the Middle Ages were pleased to imagine. Time had cast a glamour over it, and the minds of men were still held captive by its prestige. In the fourteenth century the political power of the Emperor had been virtually non-existent for centuries, and the bid made by the Papacy for temporal as well as spiritual dominion was due, in part, to this very fact. Yet the Empire still existed in theory. As the late Dean Church said, “it was the last greatness which had been seen in the world and the world would not believe that it was over.” How true this is may be gathered from the fact that the tenuous ghost of the Empire figured ineffectually on the stage of European affairs till it was at last laid to rest five centuries later.

Now, one of the interesting things about Dante's attitude is that while, on the one hand, he appears as an Imperialistic reactionary harking back to a system which had in effect already passed

away, on the other hand he presented his case with a single-minded prophetic fervour, looking forward to a world-wide State immeasurably superior to the old Roman Empire at its best, a State which should achieve a unity such as the Roman Empire had never in fact achieved, based on the intelligent consent of the governed rather than on force of arms. Peace was to be universal and justice to reign supreme—justice centred in the hands of an ideal Emperor free from greed, free from worldliness and ambition, and actuated only by zeal for the welfare of humanity. It was a beautiful dream, so right as to the ends desired—Peace, Justice, Freedom; so wrong as to the means by which those ends could in practice be secured: a beautiful dream, but clean contrary to the spirit of the time. Moreover, the dreamer failed utterly to recognise the significance of the fact that the freedom he desired was already being slowly developed on quite different lines—not only in Italy, but in Europe generally—by the growth of national States (sometimes quite small States, but with the potentiality of combining where their interests were sufficiently the same), which tended to be in practice more and more independent of a centralising temporal authority.

In passing, we may note that Peter du Bois, writing about the same date in support of Philip the Fair against Pope Boniface VIII, has a scheme for a universal *French* rule as the best thing for the world. “For,” he says, “it is a peculiar merit of the French to have a surer judgment than other nations, not to act without consideration, nor to place themselves in opposition to right reason.” There are probably men of other nations even now who, in their inmost hearts, would agree to this proposition—with the solitary substitution of their own nationality for “French,” so hardly does the idea of crude Imperialism die. And we may at least recall similar claims put forward more arrogantly by Bernhardt on behalf of Germany in 1911.

It is to Dante's credit that he believed most fervently in his theory and was even ready with his man for the ideal Emperor. It is generally agreed that the *De Monarchia* was inspired by the high hopes he held of Henry VII of Luxembourg, who was, indeed, willing enough to secure for himself any glory and power that the position could be made to yield, but who would have thanked Dante for nothing for the kind of Empire he designed for him. One of the most curious and pathetic things in the history of Dante, the passionate lover of freedom, is his outburst of anger and indignation against the Florentines when they (rightly, as we should say now) resisted Henry's attempt to exercise his theoretical dominion over them. Their very natural resentment of the intrusion on their liberties of this German prince seemed to Dante

an impious crime against the Lord's Anointed. "But you," he says, in *Epistle VI* "to the most infamous Florentines,"

"who transgress divine and human law, whom a dire rapaciousness hath found ready to be drawn into every crime—doth not the dread of the second death pursue you? For ye first and alone, shunning the yoke of liberty, have murmured against the glory of the Roman prince, the king of the world, and the minister of God, and on the plea of prescriptive right have refused the duty of the submission which ye owed, and have rather risen up in the insanity of rebellion!"

Turning now to the arguments of the *De Monarchia*, we shall probably agree that its first book, which considers the question, "whether empire or monarchy is necessary to the world for its well-being," is the only one that still has political significance. Dante's statement of the goal of civilisation does not belong to any particular age or period; that is to say, it is a statement with which philosophers of this or any other age might agree. "The work proper to the human race, taken as a whole, is to keep the full capacity of the potential intellect constantly actualised, primarily for speculation, and secondarily (by extension, and for the sake of the other) for action." He explains that:

"the speculative intellect by extension becomes the practical intellect, the end of which is *doing* and *making*. . . . There are things to be done which are regulated by political wisdom, and things to be *made* which are regulated by art. But they are all alike handmaids of speculation as the supreme function for which the Prime Excellence brought the human race into being."

Here, surely, is a noble view of civilisation, and one that compares favourably with views too commonly expressed to-day, from which one might infer that the goal was nothing more than the general increase of material prosperity. The philosophic splendour of the treatise as a whole is due to the fact that the high level indicated by this keynote, struck in the opening chapters, is maintained throughout. We might express the same idea differently to-day, but there is something attractive about the compactness of Dante's way of putting it. "To keep the whole capacity of the potential intellect constantly actualised" is, to borrow the grudging compliment of a tag of St. Augustine's, "a convenient phrase, though it be from a poet!" Marsiglio, of Padua, who wrote the *Defensor Pacis* shortly after Dante's death, expresses a like idea rather more simply. He lays down that the State exists in order that men may *live well*, which he explains as "having leisure for liberal tasks, such as are those of the virtues of the soul as well of thought as of action."

Dante's next point is that in order to attain the goal of civilisation, universal peace is necessary.

"Since it is the fact that in sedentary quietness the individual man is perfected in knowledge and wisdom, it is evident that in the quiet or tranquility of peace the human race is most freely and favourably disposed towards the work proper to it (which is almost divine, even as it is said: 'Thou has made him a little lower than the angels'). Whence it is manifest that universal peace is the best of all those things which are ordained for our blessedness. And that is why there rang out to the shepherds from on high, not riches, not pleasures, not honours, not length of life, not health, not strength, not beauty, but peace. For the celestial soldiery proclaims, 'Glory to God in the highest; and, on earth peace, peace to men of good will.' Hence, also, 'Peace be with you' was the salutation of Him Who was the salvation of man. For it was meet that the supreme Saviour should utter the supreme salutation."

Here, again, the modern thinker, though he would probably omit the particular form of its religious accompaniment, is in entire agreement with the idea that universal peace is essential to the realisation of all the various possibilities of humanity. With the horrors of the recent war still in our minds and its sorrows in our hearts, with the memory of the savage and the brute in man breaking through our normal restraints in ways we had hardly thought possible, with the fear that another war might mean the virtual extinction of our civilisation, are we not all of one mind on this point? Our conviction, held vaguely before the war by most thoughtful people and commanding, at least, the intellectual assent of the philosopher, has been driven home by vivid realisation of the very same evils that wrung the heart of Dante six hundred years ago and gave such depth of feeling to his appeal. For he, too, knew well the sufferings and wrongs inflicted by war and was himself a victim.

Dante's third point is that, to secure and maintain this universal peace,

"There must be one guiding or ruling power. And this is what we mean by monarch or emperor. . . . The human race is most one when it is all united in one, which cannot be save when it is subject to one prince. . . . Between any two princes, one of whom is in no way subject to the other, contention may arise, either through their own fault or that of their subjects, as is self-evident. Wherefore there must needs be judgment between such. And since the one may not take cognisance of what concerns the other, the one not being subject to the other (for a peer has no rule over his peer), there must needs be a third of wider jurisdiction who, within the compass of his right, has principedom over both."

It is clear that the essential *idea* of Dante's Imperialism, as distinct from its *form*, is the need for a supreme, impartial, unifying and co-ordinating authority whose judgments all kingdoms

would obey. Writing in the Middle Ages, it was inevitable that he should visualise this authority as a single person, an ideal Emperor. But are we not now (following almost precisely the same train of thought) seeking to establish just that sort of authority in the Council of the League of Nations? The dream of the fourteenth century poet is being dreamed again—is, indeed, taking shape—but in modern instead of in mediæval terms. It would no doubt be a surprise, and possibly a shock, to Dante if he could see the particular form in which the great idea is at present striving for realisation; but similarly, if we could see the form it will have attained six hundred years hence, we may well imagine that that would be a surprise, and possibly a shock, to us. Dante, though he recognised the lack of homogeneity in mankind, did not take it into account in his scheme. We, dealing with the application of the idea as a matter of practical politics, are obliged to face the difficulty of uniting for common action nations who differ in their degree of development and in their standards of justice and equity. We can but work up to the limits of our vision, and be thankful that the results already obtained by the League of Nations—incomplete as it at present is and groping its uncharted way—are such as to justify the idealism that gave it being. We are obliged to proceed in a spirit of faith—of faith in humanity which is the first essential in the equipment of a political thinker who is to be a true servant of mankind, and which Dante possessed in measure that would put most of us to shame.

AMBROSE PARSONS.

FEMINIST PHILOSOPHERS AND THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE.

IN a recent number of *The Labour Woman* by a writer known for her researches into the history of trade unionism for women, there appeared an attack upon certain persons who are characterised as "armchair philosophers" and "middle-class feminists" because they, not being industrialists, point out the danger in an international system of protective legislation based on sex alone, such as that foreshadowed by the Convention carried at Washington in 1919, prohibiting the night work of women in industry.

It is the purpose of this article to examine the matter at issue. A word first about the epithet "middle-class." It was, I believe, Mr. Philip Snowden who pointed out, on the occasion of a similar criticism, that Karl Marx was accused by contemporaries who disagreed with him of being "middle-class" and, therefore, an untrustworthy guide for the workers. But the workers decided otherwise, and in these latter days we have seen the British Labour Party follow the Continental example in recognising that the worker by brain is a good ally for the worker by hand. Mr. Webb, Mr. Bertrand Russell, Mr. Brailsford, Mr. Pethick Lawrence, Mr. Bernard Shaw are not least among those who have worked out a philosophic basis for the Labour Party of to-day. And a word about "philosophers," the word of Anatole France: "It is aspiration which creates life, and the future takes pains to realise the dreams of the philosophers."

If some of the women Labour leaders would cling less tenaciously to the past, it would be well. With a few honourable exceptions, such, for example, as Mrs. Swanwick in her *Women and the Socialist State*, there is all too little creative thinking among the group who control the destinies of the industrial women of this country, and they, like their predecessors have been curiously timid in their attitude towards those who have tried such thinking.

Nearly twenty years ago, as Miss B. L. Hutchins mentions with approval in her *Women in Modern Industry*, a certain Frau Braun of the German Labour Movement "saw the danger of the Labour woman being caught into the feminist movement and withdrawn from her natural place as an integral part of the Labour movement itself." And to-day, the excellent Frau's fears find expression in many a solemn official warning issued to the Labour women. Yet a Labour woman in the Woman's Movement is as "natural" as a Labour woman in the Labour Movement. The woman's movement has been her friend. It has won for her the right to vote and to sit in Parliament and on municipal bodies; it has won the rights of the woman doctor, the woman lawyer, the woman magistrate and policeman, the woman factory inspector; it has

fended off again and again the State regulation of vice and all that that implies of the degradation of working-class womanhood; it has won equal rights for women in the League of Nations; it has won for the working woman a thousand liberties.

And in the meanwhile there have been some great events. The International Labour Organisation (Part 13, Treaty of Versailles) has come into being, and every problem of woman and her work, which troubled us as a nation, has increased a thousandfold in significance. For the I.L.O. seeks to standardise conditions of labour throughout the world, not only for the men it understands but for the women whom no one understands. Legislation, whether for one nation or for all nations, can do much for the worker, but the measure of the good it can do if based on sound principle is the measure of the harm if based on the shifting sand of false principle. The world has not got used to women even yet! To apologise for them, to pretend they are not there, to attempt by custom, by law and by religion, to over-sex half the human race in a way that no well-bred animal is ever over-sexed, seems as far as it has got at present. The traditional view may be summarised as follows: the woman worker, whether housewife or wage earner, is weak and unskilled and cheap. She is worth little and gets little. As wage earner she is out of place. She must not blackleg the men, but neither must she claim to benefit by the men's organisation. From the employer's point of view she is tolerable only because she is cheap, from the governmental point of view she is less to be feared than the men, and, therefore, more negligible.

The philosophy of the woman's movement is not based on these views. It holds that some women are thus and thus and others quite otherwise. It is careful not to repeat the mistake of a certain curator of the Zoological Gardens, who, having been informed that owls liked the dark, kept them in the dark. His successor, finding that his owls seemed a little apathetic, determined to experiment. He introduced light cages. The owls cheered up—at least, most of them did. In the result it was found that some owls liked the dark, and some liked the light. The myth of owlish weak eyes and passive disposition was no more.

In the Home Office Report on the Substitution of Women in Non-Munition Factories (1919) we read:

"There was comparatively little substitution in the textile trades. On the other hand, when, owing to the increasing pressure of national emergency in the later stages of the war, women were brought—frequently with reluctance on the part of the employer—into certain trades and occupations which from the nature and conditions of the work are held in normal times to be quite unsuitable for female labour, they often did remarkably well."

Let us consider the implications of such facts. A restrictive law here or there in a backward country may do no harm, it may do a little good; but if the I.L.O. should seek to ameliorate the lot of woman by an elaborate system compounded of philanthropy and dragooning, instead of throwing open to her ever wider opportunities, it will prove no blessing to her in the long run, however attractive, even to the oppressed woman herself, may seem any temporary alleviation resulting. Mrs. Maud Swartz, the indefatigable secretary of the New York Woman's Trade Union League, writing in *The International Woman Suffrage News* of May, 1921, pleads for the Washington type of convention, thus:

"As industrial workers we have practically no future. We are 'hands,' and for lack of education, environment, the very necessities of industry, the vast majority of us will remain hands. . . . We are good workers, faithful and honest and too obedient, and then—we are cheap."

So bitter an experience as that of Mrs. Swartz commands respect, but it must not condition the future of women bolder than she.

This question of restrictive legislation is no longer a matter of trade union regulations, or of a law here or there in some small American state, driven by the "free contract" clause in the American Constitution or by special immigration problems to confine restriction to one sex. It has become a matter of world-wide concern, for it must be clearly understood that the conventions passed each year by the International Labour Conference are intended to be ratified by all the States of the world, and certain "sanctions" are named enforceable against a State which, having ratified, afterwards defaults.

Restrictions affecting women immediately before or after childbirth, whether desirable or not, come under another category than the night-work restriction based on sex alone; for the maternity convention may quite reasonably be viewed as based on occupation—a woman having assumed the responsibility, at a given time, of maternity, as a soldier or a judge assumes occupational responsibilities.

And this word occupation brings us at once to the feminist position, that restriction be based, not upon sex, but upon occupation. Mrs. Sidney Webb puts it admirably in her Minority Report of the War Cabinet Committee on Women in Industry (1919):

"In the interests alike of maximum productivity and race preservation, it is imperative that a national minimum should be prescribed by law and systematically enforced, in respect, at least, of rest time, education, sanitation, and subsistence, in which national minimum there should be no sex inequality; and that the present unsystematic, uneven, and patchwork provisions of the Factory, Education, Public Health, Insurance, and other Acts, in which the policy of the national minimum has been so far empirically embodied, urgently need to be replaced by a comprehensive codifi-

cation. . . . These legal minimum conditions of employment and unemployment should be identical for men and women."

This is the essential basis for international legislation.

Among those who recognise that Mrs. Webb's is the only scientific method, there are many who remain uneasy about the fate of exploited women caught in the mesh of the industrial system. They still desire to offer them the traditional "half-crown and a flannel petticoat at Christmas" type of consolation. Let such take courage. The application of Mrs. Webb's principle would, in fact, give a true and permanent protection to vast numbers of industrial women, for it has been frankly admitted again and again, by the most ardent advocates of protection based on sex, that many men support such legislation in many cases because they thus "behind the petticoats of the women" (*sic*) secure a measure of protection for themselves.

But millions of unprotected workers may gain protection for themselves and for the race by another means. One of the menaces threatening the whole future of the industrial classes is the exploitation of children and young persons. While these have to toil long hours in "juvenile" and blind alley trades, how can they acquire the physical, moral, and intellectual equipment essential for all who have the laudable ambition to control their own destinies? Miss Alice Henry (*cp.* her early work *Women and the Trade Unions* and her 1924 *Women and the Labour Movement*) speaking of the female workers in the factories and department stores of U.S.A. says, "the majority of the workers are still at the play age." And what is true of U.S.A. is, as regards cheap labour, in part true of Great Britain. The problem of the young person should be dealt with, not by legislation for adult women or for "women and children," but for young persons. In Irene Osgood's admirable *Report on the Economic Effects of the War upon Women and Children in Great Britain* (1919), she gives a mass of evidence regarding the evil effects upon boys of bad labour conditions, by night and by day, causing them to "look dull and spiritless."

We hold no brief for night work. It is disagreeable for all concerned: if a woman does it, it is trying for her; if a man does it, it is trying for his wife. But some night work there will be so long as there are the young and the sick, so long as the insatiable curiosity of the scientist makes him or her love to look at the moon and the stars. Some regulation of night work is desirable, based on the nature of the work.

The Washington night work convention of 1919 included in its scope not only industrial, but also commercial occupations. A favourite argument of those who maintain that women who are not themselves, at a given time, industrially employed have no

right to press their point of view in regard to the I.L.O. conventions, is that these conventions apply only to industrial women. Yet already, in 1919, appears this word commercial. We are authoritatively informed that it was included in error. If this is so, our contention is reinforced—in affairs affecting the economic status of women, ceaseless vigilance is the price of freedom. Oppressed industrial women who believe that their way of salvation lies along the path of restriction are entitled to their opinion, and we do not seek to minimise the importance of the fact that of the very small minority of industrial women in all lands who are organised, a majority (including those organised with men) have declared this to be their belief. But other women, who do not so believe, cannot remain indifferent. The thing grows.

Let us leave Washington and pass to the 1921 I.L.O. Conference at Geneva, which dealt with the conditions of the agricultural worker. Though eleven countries sent representatives to the women's congress which met also in Geneva, the presence of women at the general Conference was not warmly encouraged. It was courteously pointed out that "women's questions" were not on the agenda. Yet at this Conference the Washington prohibition was recommended to extend to the woman in agriculture. The care of stock is an agricultural matter. The young lambs bleating on the hillsides are far removed from the roar of machinery in a big factory. The problem they present is a different problem. It is a problem of life. During the war, one of the striking successes of the land women was their tender and skilful care of the young and the sick among animals. Perhaps a young or sick animal is not so wholly unlike a young or sick human being as some of those male legislators imagine who ordain confidently that "woman's work" includes scrubbing stone steps, and hanging over the wash-tub, and fetching water from the well, and spending sleepless nights with a sick child or husband, but that it is man's work only to tend the little sick or baby beast. Oh, dogma of "man's work" and "woman's work," what crimes are committed in thy name!

There is hope that, with the aid of enlightened public opinion, the philosophic principle will prevail. The I.L.O., like the League of Nations itself, was born of parentage deriving from an outworn state of society. There is hope that it may outgrow any tendency towards reaction. The principles laid down in the Treaty of Versailles, on which the I.L.O. is based, contain no hint of sex legislation, protection is mentioned, but it is protection of the worker regardless of sex. In the I.L.O. office at Geneva there are those in high positions who recognise that, in the present day, "the regulation of night work is a social and economic question in which the sex of the worker is only a minor consideration" (I quote from a personal letter dated from Geneva last March). The Inter-

national Congress of Working Women held at Washington in 1919 urged the prohibition of all but "necessary" nightwork for men, and British Labour women have taken a similar line from time to time. The principle of non-differentiation has much lip service, in spite of the undercurrents of male trade union opposition.

Olive Schreiner, in her classic *Woman and Labour* (1911), speaks for all forward-looking women:

"In a million new directions, forms of honoured and remunerative social labour are opening up before the feet of the modern man, which his ancestors never dreamed of; and day by day they yet increase in numbers and importance. . . . In our woman's field of labour, matters have tended to shape themselves wholly otherwise. The changes which have taken place during the last centuries, and which we sum up under the compendious term 'modern civilisation,' have tended to rob woman, not merely in part but almost wholly, of her ancient domain of productive and social labour; and where there has not been a determined and conscious resistance on her part, have nowhere spontaneously tended to open out to her new and compensatory fields. It is this fact which constitutes our modern Woman's Labour Problem. In the future that higher and more socialised human race we dream of can only come into existence because both the sex forms have evolved together, now this sex and then that, so to speak, catching up the ball of life and throwing it back to the other, slightly, if imperceptibly enlarging and beautifying it as it passes through their hands. . . . It is because so wide and gracious to us are the possibilities of the future; so impossible is a return to the past, so deadly is a passive acquiescence in the present, that to-day we are found everywhere raising our strange new cry—'Labour and the training that fits us for labour.'"

Add, and the freedom and the courage, and we have in Olive Schreiner's words a safe guide for the I.L.O.

Visionaries the women of the Woman's Movement may seem. Yet for nearly a century they have gone from strength to strength, not in an increasing alienation from man, but in a increasing comradeship. The movement is, we will not say revolutionary, but in a high degree evolutionary. It builds for the future.

These things, which loom so large to the politician or the trade unionist of to-day, will be forgotten. What will endure and will grow is the striving towards a humanity of larger stature, wherein each man or woman, no longer suffering a stern repression of nine-tenths of their faculties, is free to develop as nature meant. It is for this the feminists plead, that those who take upon themselves the responsibility of shaping the future of the woman worker on a world-wide basis, shall remember that every woman, of this generation or of generations to come, has something big at stake, and that only in a perfect solidarity of all workers by hand or by brain can the gigantic task be accomplished.

A. HELEN WARD.

A PLEA FOR JAMES II.

HISTORICAL studies seem to the ordinary man of culture to run in cycles. First one century and then another is brought into the limelight; new facts are thrown on to the stage or the whole piece is viewed from a new angle, and in either case confusion seems to result. The attention of English historians seems lately to have turned again to the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and we have the books of Mr. Keith Feiling and Mr. Ogg to remind us that our own schemata for those times may fit the facts but badly.

It is not easy, however, to find acceptance for new theories. The ordinary man wants his history and, indeed, all other branches of philosophy to have the fixity of mathematical certitude. He does not realise how easily a false impression can be gathered even from a sincere study of the facts, and how necessary it is that judgments should be constantly revised to see that prejudice is eliminated. I once heard a distinguished professor of history maintain in all seriousness that of all the Tudors only Henry VII and Mary were distinguished by clemency to their opponents. To many this might seem mere paradox, but it forced his listeners at least to consider again their habitual judgments on sixteenth-century politics, and in so doing to revise many estimates they had previously accepted without reflection. It is time, I think, that the English world of culture began to apply a similar process to much of the history of the seventeenth century.

It was unfortunate that the revival of historical studies in England in the early part of the nineteenth century was due to men who, though highly cultured, were imbued with the current Whig doctrines. Macaulay and Hallam, even Lingard to some extent, could not rid themselves of the prejudice that all progress in English social life, all sound development of the political institutions of their country, had been achieved by those who resisted the Governments of their day, and even by those who rebelled against them. Only in recent years, practically in this twentieth century, have historians begun to react against this theory. They have discovered that such a theory will not fit the facts, and so, one by one, the estimates of the great turning-points of our history are being revised. In the hands of the professional historian this is slow work. He is necessarily a specialist, and limits his attention to the narrow field of years which he has chosen for investigation. But enough has been achieved to make the cultured man realise that the ideas and work of the great Tory Party, that party of Englishmen who have at all times been willing to concede a general support to the King's government and to monarchical

tradition, cannot be dismissed as based on mere sycophantic time-serving. Such was the attitude taken by the Whig historians; such is the prejudice of our historical education. If, however, we are to understand the story of our nation aright we must suppress the prejudice and remember that the attitude of such an ancient, cultured, and capable section of the nation cannot lightly be dismissed, even though we think it wrong.

The crux of the problem is the Revolution of 1688. The Whig historians termed it glorious, later they found for it other terms; always they retained a simple faith in its political wisdom. Modern Tories—who have always been too apologetic, as though they should be ashamed for their past history—have concurred in the estimate of their opponents, and some have consented to date their own party existence from the time of the younger Pitt. A healthier, or at least a more historical, spirit is now prevalent, and they seek to claim descent from the supporters of the monarchical government of the Stuarts. But in doing that they must at least take account of the attitude to the events of 1688 and '89 which was held by Tories nearest to that time. Swift, and those for whom he wrote, are not by any means prepared to admit the wisdom or the glory of the Revolution. They accepted it and its consequences—for politics, after all, are a matter of practical prudence and not of doctrinaire theorising—but they have nought but shame for the part their fathers played in the Revolution; they have little but regret that events were allowed to happen as they did. Now Swift was not only one of the greatest writers of English prose, not only a great Tory philosopher, but also a supremely honest and clear-sighted man. It would be as well, then, in the interests of history, as well as of a right understanding of Toryism, to attempt to obtain an honest setting, free from Whig prejudice, of the reign of James II.

There are three points to which attention should be directed: the personal character of James II during his reign; the methods which he used; the policy which he sought to establish. The first of these has been the object of many historians who have tried to blacken James II with accusations of excessive cruelty and of subservience to a foreigner, Louis XIV. With regard to both charges we must, for a final judgment, await a more careful and impartial examination of the evidence. Burnet, on whose reports we have still in large measure to rely, was not only prejudiced—no man can help that—but was writing with deliberate purpose to decry a political opponent. Sunderland too, we must remember, was too treacherous to be worthy of much credence. But even now an interim judgment on James II must be much more favourable than the Whigs have, in the past, allowed.

The standard cases of cruelty occur in connection with Monmouth's rebellion and with Monmouth himself. James II, we are told, feasted his revengeful eyes on his manacled nephew and foe, Monmouth, to whom he had accorded an interview but whom he had no intention of sparing. It is true, indeed, that the interview took place, and that James had no intention of pardoning his nephew. But it should not be omitted that Monmouth had not only tried to dethrone James, but had publicly announced his intention of pursuing him as "a mortal and bloody enemy," and to endeavour to "have justice executed upon him." Furthermore, it should be remembered that Monmouth had been condemned to death by the legitimate tribunal for dealing with such cases of treason, and, finally, that the interview was not sought by James, but reluctantly granted at Monmouth's special request. If Monmouth's execution were unjust, then so has been that of every treasonable rebel ever executed in England; and most Governors of England would have refused even to see such a villain, far less admit him to plead for pardon.

The executions which followed Monmouth's rising are a more serious count. Here we are concerned with the cruelty of Colonel Kirke and the savagery of Judge Jeffreys. But if James was a villain to employ Colonel Kirke before the latter had shown his lust for blood, what can we say of William III, who employed this man after his murderous exploits? It is not certain yet how far Jeffreys was urged on by James II in his severities. There is evidence both that James was the instigator and that James disapproved. The latter is on the whole more reliable evidence, but we must hold a King responsible for the acts of his judges unless he punishes them thereafter. Even so, however, there are many points which should not be forgotten. So far as I am aware, no person was executed or punished under Jeffreys who was innocent of complicity in the rebellion. Secondly, the executions which he ordered were far less numerous and indiscriminate than those which had been practised by, say, Henry VIII and Elizabeth against the rebels of their time. Thirdly, the ordinary course of law was followed instead of the "lynch law" methods practised in those earlier reigns. We can, then, reasonably conclude that James II was not transgressing the bounds of contemporary morality (in cases of rebellion), and it seems certain that the bulk of the opinion of England endorsed his severity on this occasion.

As regards France, there is little need to point out nowadays that the interests of England were by no means bound up with the humiliation of France, which was the object of William III and his allies. Nearly all Europe, including the Catholic Empire and Spain, were, with the approval of the Pope, allied against France.

England had nothing to gain by joining that combination, since her chief commercial rivals were the Dutch. Probably the wisest plan was to remain neutral, and this seems to have been the chief aim of James II's diplomacy. Certainly he was by no means subservient to Louis XIV, as is admitted by creditable historians of all religious beliefs.

But only a very superficial and foolish student limits his attention to the personal character of rulers. A wiser man knows that most contain a mixture of good and bad always difficult to dissect, and most of all in cases which have aroused controversy. We turn, then, to the second point of our inquiry—the methods by which James II set about his task of government. In this case, the most usual charge is that of unconstitutionality. This charge is in almost every case unhistorical. The Declaration of Rights, which embodied the Whig theory of government, certainly stated that many of James II's methods were illegal at the time of their enactment. But, as Maitland long since pointed out, an Act of Parliament, though good law, may embody very bad history, and in this case it certainly did so. The dispensing power, as James II exercised it, was not clearly illegal, for many judges, indeed most, accepted it, and that alone was at the time the test of its legality. The pardoning power was, and remained, legal.

Furthermore, it should be remembered that the Revolution forms a watershed in English constitutional history. After that time the legality of an unusual governmental act requires as a rule to be proved. The Declaration of Rights (and the Act of Settlement) practically rule out all monarchical discretionary authority; if anything other than routine power is required, it must be sought from Parliament. Of course, such power was necessary, and so the Mutiny Bill was passed to allow the maintenance of a standing army, and the Habeas Corpus Act was often suspended to enable order to be maintained. But before the Revolution the discretionary power was understood to be vested in the Government rather than in Parliament. At least, such was a theory widely held and, in that time of transition, it could not, any more than the opposing system, justly be called unconstitutional. The need for such discretionary power is clear from the subsequent behaviour of Whig Governments, and the fact that James exercised it rather than Parliament is only symptomatic of the far different theory of monarchy then accepted. That he exercised it wisely may well be doubted; that he was unconstitutional because he exercised it cannot, I think, be seriously maintained.

His methods are, secondly, attacked on the ground of his precipitate attempt to introduce Catholicism into England. Here, again, as in so many other questions which arise in this reign,

the matter of discussion is obscured by Whig historians. James was not attempting to introduce Catholicism, or even to re-introduce it, as though it was entirely dormant or dead. There was a body of native Catholics already in existence, and there was a larger number who, being enamoured of Catholic civilisation, were prepared to embrace that religion. To these James II, himself a convert to Catholicism, desired to extend his protection. He wished his Government to protect his Catholic subjects as well as those of other creeds. If he had the further desire of converting his subjects to his own faith, he certainly abandoned the direct way of doing it. Though his position as King enabled him to exercise tremendous influence over the Anglican Church, which accorded to royalty an ecclesiastical power of indefinite extent, James nevertheless made over the exercise of this power to a commission which consisted of Anglicans, and on which a number of Anglican prelates sat. The other means which he took depend so much on the nature of his policy that we can pass straightway to the consideration of our third point.

It is admitted nowadays by all serious historians* that James II was honestly desirous of establishing toleration in his kingdom for all folk who would live at peace with their neighbours under his rule. Whether he began with this intention or was converted to it only by William Penn, with whom he became intimate in the second year of his reign, we are not sure. Certain it is that James held it firmly till his dying day, and advocated toleration even when, in exile and a dependent of Louis XIV, it was not to his advantage so to do.

This fact is acknowledged, I say, by reputable historians. The import of James II's policy is less often realised. We must try to put ourselves back into the position of a cultured man of 1685, ruling out of our consciousness all the events which have occurred subsequent to that date. Such a man would know that the religious quarrels of the sixteenth century had found a working solution by identifying the religion of the people of each State with that of its ruling family. And, although in many countries there existed a minority who differed from their monarch in religion, our cultured man would know that the main tendency of European peoples was still to the enforcement of a uniform national worship. He would know that in France these dissenters—in this case the Huguenots—were originally given cities of their own with complete facilities for worship and for civic life by the wisdom of Henry IV. The statesmanship of Cardinal Richelieu had preserved this religious independence even though the Huguenots joined in a traitorous revolt against the Crown of France and were defeated. Now,

* Cf. H. W. V. Temperley in *Cambridge Modern History*, Volume 5.
VOL. CXXVIII.

in this very year, 1685, the ruler of France was reversing the policy of his grandfather, and instead of treating his Government as the protector of all Frenchmen who were willing to live in peace he was insisting on uniformity in religious matters from all his subjects, and in doing this he was supported by the bulk of his subjects.

In England, the Government had, during the previous hundred years, always identified itself with one religious group. It is true that in origin this religious group was the creature of the Government. I do not mean that the actual doctrines of this group were defined by the Government, for that would be to assert what is contested historically. But all admit that the selection of these doctrines as tests of membership of the State Church was decided by the action of the Government; those who wanted other doctrines to be chosen were forced by the Government to submit. Nor was this identification merely one of patronage with regard to ecclesiastical property. Not only were the churches and their revenues bestowed only on members of the Anglican Establishment, but civil pains and penalties were enforced against the dissenters therefrom. As regards the Catholic religion, which was, after all, the ancient faith of England, those who held it publicly had first been treated as traitors, but were in these latter days treated as habitual offenders, who could be mulcted of their property almost at will. The worship of Protestant Nonconformists was, like that of the Catholics, proscribed as a danger to the State. Those professing either the Catholic faith or any Protestant dissenting creed were excluded from the army, the universities, and the administration.

Many, indeed, of these regulations were of recent origin. The religious hatreds of the sixteenth century had died down, but they had been whipped up in order to prevent the normal enclosure in English public life of Protestant and Catholic dissenters. Nay, more, with regard to the Test Act, which excluded Catholics from administrative work, the agitation which had brought this into being was notoriously the work of those who desired in all ways to incommode the King's Government. At the same time it had become perfectly clear that in Scotland many Presbyterians, in England the Catholics, and most, at least, of the Protestant dissenting bodies, formed groups of citizens who, if not in the main stream of the national tradition, were at least law-abiding and could easily be assimilated to the national life.

James II's intention, undoubtedly, was to secure the nullification of the policy represented in the Test Act and in the Clarendon Code. Actually he did not go as far as this, but he did not conceal his intention. He wanted, in other words, to make the test of civil employment, of a full share in English social life, not the adherence to a particular creed but the willingness to accept the

traditional government of England. The reason of his desire was not, of course, that on which nineteenth and twentieth century toleration is based. Men now think that religion is of such slight effect that it can as a practical question be ignored. In the seventeenth century it was not possible so to argue. Despite this, however, James claimed that men of all these various religions of England would loyally accept the rule of a peaceful Government, even though they differed in religion from the governors. Was it incredible? The answer may be sought in the behaviour of the English Catholics under Charles I and Charles II and of the French Huguenots under Louis XIV. Every argument against James II's theory is an argument for the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, an argument against allowing Catholics to live under Charles I and Charles II. The only difficulty in the way of accepting James II's policy was the fact that no ruler in Europe had been large-minded enough to see its force. James II was great enough to do so.

The defence of James II is not so easy when we come to the means by which he tried to secure acceptance of his policy. He was unsuccessful; pragmatically, then, we may say that the means chosen were unwise. But this is very different from saying that they were utterly foolish, or illegal, or bad. We must remember again that before the Revolution of 1688 all initiative in policy was expected to come from the Government. Many measures of Government activity were begun before being laid before Parliament, which was thought of rather as a criticising and improving body than as one where preliminary discussion took place. So it was not to be wondered at that James dealt separately with the army, the universities, the corporations. In Scotland, of course, where his authority was wider even than in England, he inaugurated his policy at once, and it met with acceptance from the Presbyterians and the bulk of the people, whom it released from the control of the Anglican section.

With regard to these lesser corporations of the State—the army, the municipal bodies, the colleges—where the King tried to inaugurate his policy, we are told that his attitude was grossly unfair. It is difficult, in the absence of statistics, to say whether this was really the case. The number of Catholics and would-be Catholics was underestimated by the Whig historians; they were numerous enough a few years later to enable Walpole to secure from them a fine so large that he could remit practically a year's taxation of the country. It seems doubtful, too, whether James tried to secure places for them on these corporations out of proportion to their numbers. In what he did, however, he was undoubtedly attacking what some Anglicans regarded as their vested interests. This objection would have to be surmounted in any case if the policy

was to succeed; James believed that, once inaugurated, its obvious merits would secure a general acceptance. Certainly he did not allow sufficiently for the fact that the habits of a generation (i.e., since 1660) gave to this Anglican attitude a sanction to which, in theoretical justice, it might not be entitled. It was on the point of this neglect that the Pope himself warned James that his measures were precipitate even though well-intentioned.

The last incident of the reign—the reading of the Indulgence in Anglican churches and the Trial of the Seven Bishops—was a clear instance of this. We must remember that the doctrine of royalty then taught as religion by the Anglicans practically made the Establishment the mouthpiece of the Government. There was no vehicle more suitable for the inauguration of a policy. We must remember, too, that the address of the Bishops, though respectful and reasonable, was, as a matter of fact, sold in the streets of London before James could consider it, and was used to stir up political opposition to his Government. But, when all is said, the trial was due chiefly to an obstinate refusal to retrieve an initial mistake.

This incident, however, was clearly no first cause for a revolt against James II's Government. He had even respected the law and its course, and there is no reason to suppose he would have refused obedience to the judgment of the Court. He had imposed no restraint on the publication of religious pamphlets, and his reign had been the heyday of free religious controversy; there was no likelihood that he would have altered in that respect. Above all, the insufficiency of this as a pretext of rebellion is shown by the action of the Bishops who refused to accept William as their King. It is doubtful, indeed, how much popularity that extremely astute prince received at the beginning of his reign. His expedition was conducted with consummate skill, both military, political, and propagandist, and it was to this rather than to the voice of the people that he owed success.

What, then, must be the final judgment on the reign of James II? He failed as a King, it is true, and his failure in the long run involved that of the Tory Party. Swift and Bolingbroke had to accept a self-contradictory political theory and one therefore bound to fail. But this King, so typical of Toryism in many ways, and so hated by the Whigs, had been big enough to conceive and brave enough to attempt a policy which was in the true line of national and European progress. In him, at any rate, the Tory Party can claim not only to have been the source of sane and successful reforms, but of a policy which, though not successful in its day, was eventually to command the allegiance of all cultured men and wise statesmen.

W. E. BROWN.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE SAKLATVALA TERROR.

THE lonely Communist who represents North Battersea in the British House of Commons has suddenly found that two continents are frightened of him. Who shall say henceforth that the forces of international diplomacy are cynical or even sophisticated? Mr. Saklatvala, who has been sitting at Westminster and exerting as much influence on affairs as any village kitten, and who outside the House has been engaged in the innocuous pastime of grumbling with torrential facility about everything in general, has been taken seriously. He was to have gone to America as a member of the British delegation to a meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union to be held in Washington and in Ottawa during October. Several members of the British delegation, as a protest against his inclusion in the delegation, decided not to travel to America. If the secession movement had gone full circle and all the members but the Communist had resigned, the comic result would have been that, in order to show that Mr. Saklatvala was not representative of British opinion, he alone was left to represent British opinion. Sir Robert Horne conspicuously maintained his sense of humour and of dignity by arguing that Mr. Saklatvala's presence made it the more, not less, necessary for sensible British subjects to go as well, so as to give intelligent Americans at least a chance of discovering that there are others besides Communists in the British House of Commons.

Sir William Joynson-Hicks, however, who is driven as mad as any bull in a Spanish arena by the sight of red, took a heavy and painful view of Mr. Saklatvala. He allowed it to be known that he had been caused much concern by the prospect of Mr. Saklatvala's visit to America, and on his way to Balmoral Castle as the King's guest he gave a very sad interview to the Aberdeen *Evening Express*, saying: "I have no power to stop Saklatvala from going to America. I only wish I had such power. But I have not got it, because he is a British subject. If I had the power, I would soon stop him." By way of consolation, however, he announced that he would make several speeches in October dealing with the Red Campaign—a promise which the Moscow extremists will joyfully welcome. Seriously, ought a British Cabinet Minister to spend so much of his thought, time and energy in advertising the idiotic aspirations of Moscow?

Mr. Kellogg staged the next scene in this comedy by announcing in Washington on September 16th that instructions had been telegraphed to London to revoke the passport *visa* granted to Mr. Saklatvala, adding that "I do not believe that we should admit

foreigners to the country to preach anarchy." Could there be a more glorious tribute to the obscurity of Mr. Saklatvala? Mr. Saklatvala is misunderstood. He is not an Anarchist. He is the very opposite. He is a Communist, one who, if he stands for anything coherent, stands for a State organisation of all property and of all the amenities of life, down to the last toothbrush. The average intelligent person measures progress and civilisation by the extent to which he is free, that is, by the extent to which his individuality can have play. The Communist would abolish all individual initiative and all individual property, and would make the State into a sort of pernicketty governess over all its citizens, both in public and in private life.

Anarchist indeed! The capitalist who realises that the only tolerable life is a life of freedom and personal initiative is a thousand times nearer the Anarchist ideal than the idiot who wants to nationalise everything. No country in the world has as much experience or evidence for judging Communism as has Great Britain. No country has ever been so near to Communism in practice. The extent to which the British Government in our time confiscates the private property of its citizens is something grotesque, unparalleled in the whole world's history. In Russia they confiscated everything at a swoop and killed the goose of the golden eggs. In Great Britain, with a refinement of ruthlessness, the Government confiscates year by year about a quarter of the citizen's wealth, leaves the struggling citizen another twelve months to recover, then bleeds him again. And the capital levy, which in the form of death duties cheats our survivors of our estate, is the crudest Bolshevism. And for what purpose? To pay for the State enterprise of the Great War, which was the very essence of Communism, even to the point of nationalising human life. Mr. Saklatvala, who would carry this fetish of patriotism to even greater lengths, is a dangerous man; but do not let us whitewash him by calling him an Anarchist.

THE ENTENTE, THE DEBT AND THE PACT.

The month of August has kept up its reputation as a season of prolific diplomacy. There is no doubt that when the House of Commons is away, the diplomatist will play. Certainly no other month can compare, in its record of diplomatic activity, with that of August. This year both M. Briand and M. Caillaux came to London and engaged in important conversations with Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Churchill. Last year there was the important Reparations Conference which produced the Dawes Scheme. In August, 1923, the alarming Curzon-Poincaré duel took place which culminated in the British White Paper of August 12th, and which nearly broke the Anglo-

French Entente, or what was left of it. In August, 1922, there was a London Conference on reparations which ended in a violent disagreement between Mr. Lloyd George and M. Poincaré, and which was part-precursor to the French occupation of the Ruhr. In August, 1921, there was the Paris Conference on Upper Silesia at which Mr. Lloyd George and M. Briand could agree only to disagree and to dump their disagreement on to the League of Nations. In August, 1920, one of the Hythe Conferences took place, and on August 14th of that year the Little Entente was founded.

August, 1925, then, has lived up to its reputation. M. Briand and M. Caillaux came to London separately and discussed what were technically separate subjects; but there was an interesting interplay between the two. M. Briand reached London on August 11th, had conversations with Mr. Chamberlain on the 12th and 13th, and went back to Paris on the 14th. The main point of the conversations, and of the agreement reached, was recorded in this part of THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW last month. It was on the basis of that agreement that M. Briand wrote the French Note to Berlin in answer to the German Note of July 20th. The answer was communicated to the German Government by the French Ambassador in Berlin on August 24th, and the text of it was issued for publication in all countries in the morning papers of August 27th. One of the striking features of the French Note, and of the stage thereby reached in the relations of Germany, France, and Great Britain, was the recapture in some measure of the courtesy and friendliness which had characterised those relations in 1924, and which had been ruffled during the early part of the present year. One remembers with something of a shock the tone of the communications which passed between London and Paris in 1923, when the unquiet and unhappy spirit of M. Poincaré hovered over the abyss and forbade any impulse anywhere towards friendliness or common sense.

The French Note of August 24th, in its first paragraph, revealed a progressive state of mind in its authors: "The French Government. . . are glad to realise that the German Government are as anxious as they are themselves to see the peace of Europe based upon an understanding." The Note, therefore, confined itself to remarks on three essential points raised in the German Note of July 20th, and ended with an invitation to the German Government to enter upon the final negotiations. "Such (ran the last paragraph of the Note) are the preliminary explanations which the French Government have to offer. They are tendered in all sincerity, and their purpose is to remove all possibility of misunder-

standing. The French Government, in agreement with their allies, have now the honour to invite the German Government to enter into negotiations on this basis—negotiations which they for their part earnestly trust will result in the conclusion of a definitive treaty."

The three points dealt with in the French Note were those which were commented on somewhat severely in this section of *THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW* last month. The first was the too timid anxiety revealed in the German Note lest the proposed Security Pact should stereotype all the Versailles arrangements, and the veiled hint at a bargain over the Rhineland evacuation. It was, however, in a commendably restrained tone that the French Note pointed out the contractual nature of the Rhineland Agreement, and insisted on the binding nature of the whole Treaty of Versailles. Yet these distinctions are a matter of unsubstantial words only. The Versailles Treaty is as binding in that part of it which makes provision for subsequent revision as in any other part; and no doubt the Wilhelmstrasse is now fully alive to the two-handed implications of the Treaty and of the Covenant.

The second point was more important, and dealt with the German reservations about entering the League of Nations (see *CONTEMPORARY REVIEW*, September, p. 378). What the German Note of July 20th had said was that "Germany, as a member of the League of Nations, can only be considered as enjoying equal rights when her disarmament is followed by the general disarmament provided for by the Covenant of the League of Nations and the preamble to Part V of the Treaty of Versailles. Therefore, if the immediate entrance of Germany into the League of Nations is to be rendered possible, a solution has to be found to tide over the time till general disarmament has become a reality."

To that contention the French Note, as was to be expected, made the simple answer: "So far as they are concerned, the Allied Governments can only adhere to their former statements and repeat that the entry of Germany into the League of Nations under the same conditions as are prescribed for everybody, remains in their opinion the basis of any understanding on security"; and again: "It is not, in fact, from outside that a State can properly express reservations, which would thus assume the character of conditions; it is from within that it can submit its wishes to the council in the exercise of a right common to all the States members of the League." It is, however, a gratifying sign of the times that in the same breath the French Note declared that "The entry of Germany into the League of Nations is the only solid basis for a mutual guarantee and a European agreement." The Note is not signed by any name, but there will be no need for the future

historian who may quote that sentence to put a footnote explaining that M. Poincaré was no longer the Foreign Minister of France.

The last point answered in the French Note was the German reservation designed to limit the obligatory character of the German-Belgian and the German-French Arbitration Treaties in such a way as to make them conform to the treaties of arbitration which Germany has already concluded with some of her neighbours. Those treaties are worded in such a way as to limit the scope of the arbitration provided to non-political disputes, which are precisely the disputes most likely to lead to war. The Allied answer to this was unavoidable: "In the opinion of the Allies (ran the French Note), an arbitration convention thus limited, in that it would not apply to all disputes between limitrophe Powers, would not be of sufficient value as a guarantee of peace; it would still leave open certain opportunities for war. Our primary object is to render impossible, under the conditions formulated in the Note of June 16th, any fresh resort to war. We feel that this object can only be attained by means of some obligatory pacific settlement applying to all the issues which may arise. In our opinion, the principle of compulsory arbitration thus conceived is an indispensable condition for any pact of the nature proposed by the German Government in their Note of February 9th."

Then comes by far the most important passage in the French Note, the passage, to wit, which incorporated the agreement reached by M. Briand and Mr. Chamberlain on August 12th. What was to be the criterion which would bring the Pact into operation, or, in other words, would produce a state of war between the guarantor, Great Britain, on the one side and the aggressor against the demilitarised zone, either France or Germany, on the other? It was known that Mr. Chamberlain and M. Briand had on August 11th and 12th agreed on a formula whereby the guarantee would come into immediate operation in case of a "flagrant" aggression, the judge of the flagrancy to be the guarantor State, namely, Great Britain; but that in doubtful cases the League of Nations should first establish the fact of an aggression. It must be counted a good omen for Allied diplomacy that in the French Note the point of view thus agreed on was expressed somewhat vaguely, no doubt to avoid giving any impression that France and Great Britain had arrived at a common policy in advance of the meeting with Germany. To have given such an impression would, it is true, have been incredibly tactless diplomacy; but one must in these brittle times be thankful for small things. In the revelant passage of the French Note all that was said on this subject was that "It would not seem impossible to establish provisions adapting the operation of the guarantee (whoever be the guarantor and

whether the guarantee applies to frontiers or to arbitration) to the nature of the violation and to the circumstances and degree of urgency which might necessitate the immediate execution of this guarantee. In this connection an examination might be made whether some means could not be found of safeguarding the impartiality of the decisions come to, without diminishing the immediate and efficacious operation of the guarantee itself."

It was equally gratifying to find that the French Note tried to allay the unnecessary fear expressed in the German Note of July 20th lest coercive action could take place "without any regular procedure laid down in advance either by arbitral or some other international procedure." To allay the fear thereby expressed the French Note declared: "The apprehensions which the German Government betray on the subject of the guarantee of an arbitration convention will scarcely stand objective criticism. Under the system contemplated, the guarantor does not decide autocratically and unilaterally who is the aggressor. The aggressor defines himself by the very fact that instead of submitting to a pacific solution he resorts to arms, or violates either the frontier, or, in the case of the Rhine, the demilitarised zone. It is obvious that the guarantor, who will have the greatest interest in preventing such violations from whichever side they come, will, at the first sign of danger, be sure to exercise all his influence for that purpose. Moreover, it will be the business of the limitrophe States themselves to see to it that this system of guarantee, conceived for their mutual protection, does not work out to their disadvantage."

THE GERMAN ANSWER AND THE JURISTS' CONFERENCE.

The Allies were not content merely to deliver the French Note in Berlin. The French Ambassador suggested verbally to the German Foreign Minister that the legal experts of the four countries, Germany, Belgium, France, and Great Britain, should meet as soon as possible in London so that the German experts might fully explore the situation for themselves, find out exactly what was in the mind of the Allies, put questions, and generally investigate the legal and technical aspects of the problems which were being discussed. That suggestion fortunately was welcomed in Berlin, and, therefore, the German formal Note in answer to the French Note of August 24th was short and crisp. It was dated August 27th, and contained not more than 300 words. It acknowledged the French Note, declared that the German Government "entirely share the opinion expressed at the end of the above [i.e., the French] Note that a continuation of the correspondence is scarcely calculated to lead to further elucidation of the questions connected with the conclusion of a Security Pact, and in

their Note of July 20th they had given expression to the desire that discussions might be expedited as much as possible. The German Government, therefore, welcome the suggestion made verbally by His Excellency the French Ambassador. . . ." The Note added that the German Government "now consider it advisable to refrain from further written elucidation of these matters and from stating their views in regard to the observations made in the French Note."

The experts, Dr. Gaus for Germany, Sir Cecil Hurst for Great Britain, M. Fromageot for France, M. Rollin for Belgium, sat in London throughout the first week of September. Signor Mussolini created general pleasure by sending an Italian jurist, Signor Pilotti, to take part in the meetings, thereby raising the hope that Italy would become a signatory of the Pact. Signor Pilotti, it is true, took a tentative part in the work, his main object being to collect information for Signor Mussolini, and he went home at the end without being able to say whether Italy would be able to join in. None the less it indicated an improvement in the general prospect of peace in Europe that the nervous, uncertain, and harassed "strong man" of Italy had at last decided to take at least an academic interest in the proposed Security Pact. The experts who met at the Foreign Office were jurists. They approached the problems objectively. They were free from the humbug that always hampers the work of politicians, who in everything they do or say have one eye on their electorates. The jurists' atmosphere was frank and friendly. The men were well known to each other, respected each other professionally, and had complete confidence in each other. Questions were asked and answered without any *arrière pensée*, and with no object but to elucidate the business in hand and prepare the way for the unfortunate politicians.

Dr. Gaus, for instance, might put a question about the British attitude at a moment when Sir Cecil Hurst was busy with M. Rollin. Sir Cecil would unhesitatingly leave the answer to M. Fromageot, who knows Sir Cecil Hurst and the British view upside-down and inside-out; just as M. Fromageot would have no hesitation in trusting Sir Cecil Hurst with an exposition of the French view. Imagine Mr. Chamberlain leaving to M. Briand the job of explaining to Herr Stresemann the British view of the bilateral nature of the proposed Pact; or M. Briand allowing Mr. Chamberlain to explain the French attitude to the proposed German-Czechoslovak and German-Polish Arbitration Treaties! Why not? Because they dare not. Jurists dare. That is why the work done in London during the first week of September transformed the whole problem. The jurists saw such principles as that of bilateralism as matters of common sense and common justice, and

they discussed formulæ for giving effect to the principles without worrying about Nationalist prejudices in any country. At the end of their work they each reported the progress made to their Foreign Ministers, Sir Cecil Hurst and M. Fromageot going to Geneva for the purpose.

The result was that after a quick consultation between Mr. Chamberlain and M. Briand a new French Note was drafted which was delivered in Berlin on September 15th, the simple purport of which was to invite the German Foreign Minister to take part in a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the interested Powers. The text of the Note had not been published at the time of writing, but it was commonly understood that it was the hope of the Allied Powers that the meeting would take place somewhere in Switzerland sometime early in October. Whether Signor Mussolini will join the German, Belgian, French, and British Foreign Ministers is at the moment unsettled, but the hope that he will, grew apace as a result of rumours current during the League Assembly meeting in Geneva and inspired by himself.

At the beginning of August there had been some talk of M. Briand and M. Caillaux coming to London at the same time. M. Briand in the event came first, and went back to Paris with the agreement of August 12th in his pocket before M. Caillaux came—a sequence of events which need not have surprised us if we had remembered that, according to a very human feeling, France was keener on obtaining a British undertaking about the Security Pact than on paying the British debt.

M. CAILLAUX MEETS MR. CHURCHILL.

In pursuance of his herculean task of reducing the chaos of French finance and French credit to some sort of order, M. Caillaux came to London on August 23rd to engage in conversations with Mr. Churchill about the French debt to Great Britain. He was due to sail for Washington on a like mission on September 16th, and being endowed by nature with a realistic mind and a full measure of common sense, he was aware that the balance of advantage was in favour of exploring London before Washington. He had, at any rate, good reason to expect that Great Britain, who lost the Great War, would adopt a more chastened attitude than the United States, who won it; for the victor collects, and the vanquished pays tribute; and the vanquished are easier game. M. Caillaux had already hinted during the short time he had held office that the payment of debts was among his aspirations, and by repute he is enough of a financier to know that a country can afford to pay debts more than it can afford not to pay them.

It was clear that M. Caillaux would not have come to London

himself unless he had meant business, and he dotted the "i's" a little in this sense at the end of his first day's conversations with Mr. Churchill. When he returned to the French Embassy from the Treasury in the evening of August 24th, he declared in conversation that it would be "the bankruptcy of human common sense" if two such countries as Great Britain and France, which had fought together in the War, could not agree on a point of finance. Presumably to facilitate such an agreement, Mr. Churchill and M. Caillaux decided to talk in secret, and to prevent any premature leakage they met tête-à-tête. A dinner which was held at the French Embassy that evening was attended by Mr. Montagu Norman as well as by Mr. Churchill and Sir Otto Niemeyer. The presence of Mr. Norman, who in the past few years has been a prominent influence in New York, Berlin, Paris, and London during the long and tedious process of linking up America, Great Britain, and Europe in the work of financial settlement, was an eloquent indication of the range of the discussions.

After a second day of hectic conversations and effort, the negotiations appeared to have exhausted themselves and to be substantially over. Unfortunately, no agreement had been reached. M. Caillaux, however, agreed to postpone his return to Paris from Wednesday morning until Thursday morning, so that there could be an eleventh hour attempt to reach common ground. On the evening of the second day M. Caillaux was in a distinctly less optimistic state of mind. When I asked him if any agreement had been reached, his sense of humour (which is well developed) came to his rescue, and throwing up his hands with his characteristic vivacity he exclaimed: "There shall be no agreement! There are new proposals which I take to my people for them to consider. We have been talking, only talking. I am something of a financial expert myself, but not quite an expert, and we have simply been continuing our attempts to understand each other's point of view."

He spoke English, which he speaks well—having learnt it as a child—but not, of course, perfectly. When he said there was to be no agreement, what he presumably meant was that there had been no question of reaching a definite funding agreement, but merely of another exchange of view. It would perhaps have been mischievous to have recalled his own words of the night before when he said that his failure to reach agreement would be the bankruptcy of common sense. There was, too, a less buoyant optimism of tone in M. Caillaux's piano protestation on the second night, when in a somewhat defensive spirit he declared, "Politicians must be optimists or they are useless."

The burden of the second day's work included further conversations between M. Caillaux and Mr. Montagu Norman, a luncheon at the French Embassy at which Mr. Chamberlain and the United States Ambassador were new arrivals on the scene, talks between Mr. McKenna and M. Caillaux, a further interview between Mr. Churchill and M. Caillaux, and a dinner at Mr. Churchill's at 11, Downing Street. Perhaps the most interesting development of the day was the entry of the United States Ambassador into the business. It had been obvious for some months past that a tripartite method of approach to a debt solution would be the most business-like method, if only by reason of the fact that the British *pari passu* principle had already been made clear to the world. That principle would preclude any settlement or any payment from France to America which bore a greater relationship to the French liability than any corresponding French payment to Great Britain bore to the French liability to Great Britain. It could be satisfied if an understanding were reached in advance that the French funding arrangement in Washington would be based on the same percentage of interest as the London Funding arrangement. The United States Ambassador, however, could hold out no such hope.

The second day's work ended in a complete deadlock, Mr. Churchill holding out for an annuity of £16,000,000 a year, or about one-half of the strict French liability, M. Caillaux refusing to approach nearer than £10,000,000, or about one-third of that liability. M. Caillaux was adamant, said his last word, and prepared to go home. On the third day, therefore, a hasty meeting of the British Cabinet was called, and, ironically enough, Mr. Baldwin, who by funding the British debt to America two years ago was personally responsible for one of the important factors in the situation, was away at Aix-les-Bains, and the Cabinet had to be presided over by Mr. Chamberlain. What had happened was that Mr. Churchill had reported the deadlock to those of his colleagues he could get hold of, Mr. Chamberlain took a hand in the business, rang up the French Embassy, asked M. Caillaux to come and see him, and when he saw him invited him to suspend his judgment pending the sitting of the Cabinet which then began. As if to add to the importance of the occasion a man in Downing Street threw two bricks through the windows of No. 10, while the Cabinet was sitting, but it appeared that his motive had nothing to do with debts. After the Cabinet meeting Mr. Churchill saw M. Caillaux and explained that, having regard to the war friendship of the two nations and to the general desirability for a settlement of debt questions, the British Government was prepared to strike a mean between the Churchill figure of £16,000,000 and the Caillaux figure of £10,000,000, and to accept

£12½ millions net. By that new proposal the entire slate of the past few years was wiped clean. The Balfour principle of August, 1921, and the Churchill principle of February of this year were both erased. The British Government now asked that the French annuity should be paid wholly from French national resources, thereby throwing over the Churchill Note, and subjected the offer to the condition that the *pari passu* principle should be vindicated, thereby in effect throwing over the Balfour Note. I asked Mr. Churchill on the evening of that day if it was right to deduce that the Balfour principle was now abandoned, and he said it was, adding that the circumstances which had produced the Balfour Note had changed.

The point may be put in this way: by the Balfour principle we asked from Germany, France, Italy, and the rest the exact equivalent of what we have to pay America—say in round figures something over £30,000,000 a year. We are already receiving from Germany under the Dawes Scheme some £9,000,000 a year, and if all goes well the figure will be doubled later on. Under the Balfour principle that would leave not France alone, but France and Italy together little more than £20,000,000 to provide as an initial maximum, a figure which would decrease as the Dawes annuities increased. By the *pari passu* principle, on the other hand, Great Britain will not consent to accept from France a smaller percentage of annual interest on the debt to Great Britain than France may agree to pay America on her debt to America. Suppose—and the supposition seemed to be not completely divorced from affairs—that the United States Funding Commission refused to accept less than three-and-a-half per cent. on the French debt; such an event would bring into operation the condition attached to the British offer of August 26th to France, and by the *pari passu* principle Great Britain would automatically revise the two per cent. then offered into the three-and-a-half per cent. established by America. That would bring the French annuity on the 62 years' average to a figure in excess of what France would have to pay if the Balfour principle were the criterion.

An extremely interesting prospect opened. If the French Funding Commission in Washington accepts three-and-a-half per cent. as the funding basis of the debt to America, it automatically undertakes to pay Great Britain not £12½ millions a year for 62 years, but £22 millions a year for the same period.

If, on the other hand, the French Funding Commission succeeds in inducing the American Funding Commission to accept as the basis the two per cent. which Great Britain offered to France on August 26th, the interesting question will arise whether American statesmanship can continue to hold Great Britain to the higher

rate, in face of the often enunciated and palpably fair principle which must be accepted by all people of common sense, that a creditor cannot penalise a debtor who pays up promptly in favour of a debtor who delays payment.

On the evening of August 26th Mr. Churchill made an official statement, with which M. Caillaux concurred, as follows:

"The negotiations for the settlement of the French debt to Great Britain, which have been proceeding in one form or another since the beginning of the year, entered upon a new phase three weeks ago, when the Cabinet authorised the Chancellor of the Exchequer to propose to the French Government that the net obligation of France should in principle be halved. This would have involved payments by France of about £16,000,000 a year during the 62 years of the British debt payments to the United States of America. The basis of the calculations was, however, affected by the view which might be taken upon a number of disputable points of detail and certain counter-claims. Moreover, in accordance with the Chancellor of the Exchequer's correspondence with M. Clémentel earlier in the year, the British proposals contemplated a portion of the French payments being dependent upon the yield of the French share of the Dawes annuities.

"In response to this definite and detailed offer, M. Caillaux visited London. After repeated discussions, during which various alternatives were examined, he made the counter-proposal that France should pay in principle one-third of her debt to Britain by 62 annuities of £10,000,000 a year, the whole of which should be upon the responsibility of France. This proposition constituted a noteworthy advance on all previous tentative suggestions which had been put forward from time to time on behalf of France. Nevertheless, the gap between the British offer to remit one-half and the French proposals to pay one-third, although modified by the exclusion of all reference to the Dawes annuities, remained wide and unbridged.

"The position is, of course, further complicated by the impending negotiations for the settlement of the French debt to the United States, which is greater than their war debt to Great Britain. His Majesty's Government have from the outset made it perfectly clear that any arrangements must be governed by the principle so often declared that they must receive from France proportionate and *pari passu* payments to any she may eventually make to the United States in the settlement of her war debt. It would be no service to Europe, already so grievously stricken, if the sacrifices of one creditor of France merely conduced to the advantage of another. Any agreement which could be entered into between Great Britain and France at the present time could, therefore, in

this respect be only of a provisional character, pending the outcome of other negotiations.

"However, His Majesty's Government, deeply concerned in the general revival and appeasement of Europe, and finding themselves in the presence of a sincere and manful offer from the Ally with whom they have shared so many tribulations, felt bound to respond to the new proposals. They have, therefore, authorised the Chancellor of the Exchequer to offer finally, on their behalf, a settlement of the French debt to Great Britain on the basis in principle of 62 annual payments of £12,500,000 a year on the sole responsibility of France, subject to agreement being reached on various matters of detail, and subject also to the governing condition described above of the proportionately equal treatment by France of her creditors.

"M. Caillaux, while reserving his opinion upon these propositions, undertook to lay them before his Government."

The annuity of £12½ millions sterling would represent between 2d. and 2½d. off the British income tax, and the British taxpayer, who, having lent a sum of £600,000,000 to France has since been paying 7d. in the £ income tax to pay himself the interest on it (endurance, not intelligence, being our national characteristic), would be left to pay the remaining 4½d. on behalf of his richer war allies the French taxpayers. The *pari passu* reservation may, of course, make a difference, except in the remote contingency of America's accepting two per cent. from France.

In his official statement quoted above Mr. Churchill referred to "a number of disputable points of detail and certain counter-claims." The chief of them was understood to be the anxiety which has been persistently felt by M. Caillaux over the physical transaction of transferring a yearly sum of, say, £12½ millions from Paris to London. On that subject Sir Otto Niemeyer, Mr. Montagu Norman and Mr. McKenna were no doubt able to give M. Caillaux some sound suggestions when they saw him during the course of his London visit. The French argument was that France has no securities in London wherewith to pay, whereas Great Britain has abundant securities in America. That idea is wrong. We have no securities in America. We have investments, but the normal method of paying debts of this kind is by trade balances. It happens that the British imports from America exceed our exports to America, and far from being able to pay the debt to America by a trade balance, we have to make up a trade deficit and then pay the debt over and above. We pay it in cash. The position of France, fortunately for France, is different. France has a definite trade balance in this country, which would partly help her to transfer the annuities, and the rest she would

have to make up by the method which the poor nations such as Great Britain have to adopt, namely, by cash.

One of the minor difficulties, which, however, did not constitute this time a formidable *pons asinorum*, was the recurrent French worry about the £50,000,000 or so of gold that was deposited in London by France as part security for the loan of £150,000,000 made by the British Government to France in 1916. By the Calais agreement of August, 1916, the gold was to be repaid when the £150,000,000 French Treasury Bills had been redeemed; and by a revised agreement (December, 1919) it was not to be repaid until the whole French debt had been repaid. Even academically the gold deposit is effectively disposed of. Practically it was disposed of during 1917, when the whole of it was shipped to America by Great Britain. It is all in America except a shipload of some £3,000,000 which was sunk by a German submarine and salvaged a short time ago. M. Caillaux, however, showed himself much less inclined to worry about the gold deposit than any of his predecessors.

M. Caillaux enjoys a big reputation among London financiers and shares with M. Briand the knack of being popular with the people he negotiates with and even disagrees with. Witness what Mr. Churchill said of him on August 26th: "All these discussions, which have dealt with very difficult questions and very painful questions, have been rendered pleasant by the admirable spirit in which the French Minister has faced the facts of the situation and has treated his English colleagues. We have had to look at a number of very trying and awkward contingencies and propositions, but never at any time has there been the slightest failure of cordiality, goodwill, and loyalty. . . . I feel that there are great advantages in coming into contact with so strong and patient and courageous a personality. I am sure that nothing but good can come from the discussions which have taken place."

THE WEST AND THE EAST.

Steps have now been taken both to organise the Customs Conference in China and to deal with the Shanghai disorders and their irritant effect on Chinese relations with the West.

In the second week of September it was announced that Great Britain, the United States, and Japan had appointed their representatives to sit in the new tribunal which is to investigate the Shanghai events of May 30th, June 1st and 2nd. The names were: for Great Britain, Sir H. C. Gollan, Chief Justice of Hong-Kong; for the United States, Mr. Finlay Johnson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court at Manila; for Japan, Mr. Suga, Chief

Justice of the Court of Appeal at Hiroshima. Thus, after three months' mischievous delay, something convincing was about to be done. The main difference between the proposed new inquiry and that which was carried out by the Diplomatic Body in June is that the June inquiry was held in private, there was no attempt at cross-examination, and the Chinese representative persisted in raising wider and irrelevant issues. When, therefore, the burden of its findings was that Colonel MacEuan, the chief of the British Police at Shanghai—who, however, is the servant of the Shanghai Municipal Council, not of the British Government—should be dismissed, and the American Chairman of the Shanghai Municipal Council, Mr. Fessenden, should be censured, there was a case for a more judicial inquiry. That new inquiry will be conducted on ordinary judicial lines. Unfortunately, the Chinese Government, misunderstanding the reasons for a new inquiry and assuming that the findings of the first inquiry were suppressed because they were unpalatable to the British Government, refused to participate the second time, but it may be hoped that it will be impressed by the open and judicial character of the proceedings. There is no intention or desire in London to whitewash anybody or anything, although the three months' delay in starting the new inquiry must be regarded as a serious criticism on the Powers concerned. It is clearly the object of the three Powers to finish their investigations in Shanghai before the Tariff Conference opens in Peking on October 26th. If that object is achieved, the Chinese delegation may reasonably be expected to help sympathetically in the complicated business of revising the present tariff system in China.

The Chinese Tariff Conference has been fixed for October 26th. By Article 11 of the Washington Treaty of February 5th, 1922, signed by the United States, Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, and Portugal, it was arranged that a special conference to revise the Chinese customs tariff should meet in China within three months after that Treaty came into force at a place to be decided by the Chinese Government. The French ratification of the Treaty was deposited in Washington on August 5th and thereby, all ratifications being now deposited, the Treaty came into force. On August 19th, therefore, the Chinese Government, through her representatives abroad, informed the interested Powers "that they intend to have the special Conference meeting on October 26th, 1925, at the City of Peking" and invited the Powers to attend. In the same Note the Chinese Government stated that "on January 5th, 1922, at the seventeenth meeting of the Committee on Pacific and Far Eastern Questions of the Washington Conference, the Chinese delegation in giving their assent thereto [this is, to the Treaty] declared that

it was their intention to bring up again the question of the restoration to China of her tariff autonomy for consideration on all appropriate occasions in the future. In pursuance of the above declaration, the Chinese Government propose that the said question be also brought up at the forthcoming Conference, and expect that some arrangement will be made to remove the tariff restrictions hitherto imposed on China."

In effect, therefore, the Chinese Government proposed to extend the scope of the Peking Conference. Strictly the Conference was designed to increase the Chinese Customs tariff by two-and-a-half per cent., making it seven-and-a-half per cent., thereby adding some £20,000,000 to the revenues of the Central Government. At the same time "likin" or the internal customs were to be abolished, and thus the provincial administrations would be forced to orient more towards Peking. The talk of "abolishing" likin is as amusing now as it was a generation ago. Who shall control the provincial administrations, or anything, in China? None the less there is no harm in the attempt. Mr. Chamberlain on August 28th sent an answer to Peking which will come as a pleasant surprise to those who, encouraged by the Government's archaic attitude towards the Mosul question, have despaired of wisdom. After accepting the Chinese invitation to the Peking Conference, Mr. Chamberlain wrote: "With regard to your Government's intention of bringing before the conference a reconsideration of the question of tariff autonomy for China, His Majesty's Government are willing, either at the conference or at a subsequent time, to consider and discuss any reasonable proposal that may be made by your Government for a revision of the treaties on the subject of the tariff."

That statement revealed an important new tendency—nothing more than a tendency—on the part of the British Government to move with the times. In effect it meant that the British Government would be prepared to extend the scope of the Peking Conference and to consider, on conditions, the question of tariff autonomy for China. The conditions would be that the Chinese Government gave convincing proof that it could control China and could, for instance, prevent an abuse of customs autonomy in the form of the erection of tariff barriers designed to keep out foreign trade. On abstract grounds there seems no reason why China should not do as she likes with her own affairs; but no one wants to see more mischief in the world, or more unnecessary suffering, than we already have on hand.

GEORGE GLASGOW.

September 16th, 1925.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
1. REVIEWS	525
THE AGE OF PETRARCH; THE ROMANO-BRITISH ADMIRALTY; ROBERT MOFFAT, PIONEER; THE GREAT PLAGUE; PORTUGUESE POETRY; WEST HIGHLAND TRADITIONS.	
2. SHORTER REVIEWS: "The Quebec Act: A Study in Statesmanship"; "Gray's Inn and Lincoln's Inn"; "Further Reminiscences, 1864-1894"; "This Old Man"; "The Little Flowers of St. Francis and the Life of Brother Giles"; "Out of Court"	539
3. NOTICES OF BOOKS: "Wild Ceylon, describing in particular the lives of the present-day Veddas"; "Account of the Constitution, Administration, and Dissolution of the Congested Districts Board for Ireland from 1891 to 1923"; "The Anglican Revival: Studies in the Oxford Movement"; "Military Operations: France and Belgium, 1914"; "The Psychology of the Servant Problem: A Study in Social Relationships"; "Three Bachelors"	542

THE AGE OF PETRARCH.*

Canon Tatham, in this much-needed volume, endeavours, by the aid of a vivid picture of one great man, to give a sense of reality to the European half-century that fore-ran the Great Plague of 1347-9. In this way he hopes to create a real interest in the ages between the fall of the Western and the fall of the Eastern Empire, almost a millenium. That millenium ended with the Black Death, and the scarcely less black intrusion of the Turk into Europe as a permanent and unwanted member of the nations of the West. Towards the end of this period appeared an Italian, Francesco Petrarca, a Florentine, born at Arezzo, during the exile of his parents, on July 20th, 1304. Early the next year the mother and child were allowed to re-enter Florentine territory. The boy had his early education at Pisa, but at the age of eight he was taken to Avignon. The story of the early days gives Canon Tatham the opportunity of describing the struggle with the Ghibellines in Northern Italy, and the new home of Petrarch enables him to show us the Papacy at Avignon. The two pictures are characteristic of the terrible confusion in politics and religion that was the stamp of the end of the Middle Ages. Browning's "Sordello" helps the student to understand the social life of Northern Italy,

* Francesco Petrarca, the First Modern Man of Letters: His Life and Correspondence: A Study of the Early Fourteenth Century (1304-1347). Volume I, Early Years and Lyric Poems. By Edward H. R. Tatham. With Frontispiece. The Sheldon Press. 18s. net.

but he presents an earlier phase of the same confusion. In the days of Petrarch's youth, the world is marching towards the darkness that fore-ran the dawn, the darkness of the "Babylonish Captivity." At Avignon and Carpentras, Petrarch laid the basis of his vast learning, and we have here a picture of his home and school life. In 1319 he passed to the University of Montpellier, and here there is an opportunity to read something of the coming of Roman law in its Eastern guise to Montpellier and Toulouse. There the young man learned law, and perhaps learned to love literature as it was formulated by the Troubadours. In 1323 he passed on to the great law university of Bologna. His life there enables Canon Tatham to give us a picture of Italian university life, with its close study of canon as well as civil law. Petrarch may have been taught by Cino da Pistoia, the poet and friend of Dante. Petrarch in later years declared that his seven years at Montpellier and Bologna were "wasted rather than spent," but there is the probability that the stern course of study was by no means useless. It was the mental training that he needed, and he admits that he mastered the rudiments of law, and his teachers admitted that the student showed much promise. He was destined for letters, but his achievements show the signs of thorough mental training.

After he left Bologna he was at Avignon and became the friend of Giacomo Colonna, a fellow student, the third son of the Count of Palestrina, and the fact proved a turning-point in Petrarch's career. These were days when the poet was building up the groundwork of his literary future by the study not only of the Latin classics, but of vernacular poetry. This fact gives Canon Tatham the opportunity of discussing the merits and achievements of the Provençal and Italian poets, who were the fore-runners of Petrarch. The chapter will be attractive to many readers. Petrarch fully recognised that Dante was pre-eminent in vernacular poetry, and he placed after Dante, Cino. Petrarch himself was certainly influenced by Cino, though his own genius gives him his own place.

The story of "Laura" follows: the woman to whom he devoted his poetic genius for more than twenty years, from the day when he first saw her on April 6th, 1327, in the church of St. Claire, till the day she died, April 6th, 1348. Who was she? Was she Laura de Sade, who died, probably of the Black Death, in April, 1348, or was she Laura de Noves? This curious literary problem is discussed at length. The shadowy figure may have been as illusory and yet as real as Dante's Beatrice; a poetic, spiritual passion for a real individual, married or unmarried, may underlie the whole strange story. It is impossible to forget that both Dante and Petrarch lived in the days of the Troubadours when

such things were possible, were blameless, and were the source of nominal inspiration of superb poetry. It is almost a shock to turn from the "Canzoniere" to the days of travel, from 1330 to 1337. This faithful lover was ever on the move from Vaucluse to Avignon, from Parma to Verona and Padua, from Milan to ambassadorial work. He loved the road as much as he loved song and letters, and here again is a feature of the times, something, indeed, that gives a certain sense of modern things in the life of a singer and scholar, who sang and thought on the road of mediæval life. This book, learned and enthusiastic, gives a picture of an age that, despite a decadence that was inevitable, had a freshness that defied and still defies the darkness and the plague that environed it.

THE ROMANO-BRITISH ADMIRALTY.*

Mr. Winbolt, of Christ's Hospital, is to be congratulated upon the wholly admirable piece of spade-work which has revealed on the cliffs of East Wear Bay, at Folkestone, a Roman building, palatial in its size and amenities and apparently unique in its use. No villa has ever before been discovered on the Kentish coast from Reculver to Romney Marsh. It was a coast that needed defence. It is in this area that there were the forts or ports of Reculver, Richborough, Dover, and Lympne, all linked up by Roman coast roads and with Canterbury. "Between Walmer and Hythe this grassy slope was practically the only place where for pirates or an enemy of Rome an inroad on the lowlands and sheep-pastures was at all feasible, or where the strong positions of Dover or Lympne could be turned." What, then, was the building which strenuous work in 1924 has revealed? Was this the place for a pleasure villa or a mere civil residence? That it was a residence, and one on a great scale, became evident. There had been two villas, an earlier villa which, prior to the year A.D. 100 or thereabouts, had been inhabited by Britons, and a second villa (comprising the first much enlarged and a second block) which had been inhabited by Romans from the beginning of the second to the middle of the fourth century. The position of this great building, containing more than fifty rooms, is important, since it may explain its use in Roman times. It looks south-east, straight at Boulogne. From the courtyard and from either wing two sea-bays are overlooked, and ships making the Channel crossing can be seen entering Folkestone and Dover. The cliff in Roman times ran down to the sea in a grassy slope for half a mile. There was

* *Roman Folkestone: A Record of Excavation of Roman Villas at East Wear Bay, With Speculations and Historical Sketches on Related Subjects.* By S. E. Winbolt. With 21 Plates, numerous Illustrations in the Text and an end paper plan. Methuen. 8s. 6d. net.

a plentiful fresh-water supply; a Roman road was within half a mile; great cornlands lay behind it, and it is subject to brilliant sunshine. What sort of a villa was this standing on the only danger-point of the coast and yet within sight of the scene of many a Roman sea-fight? The remains show that it was not a military or naval station or signalling station. It was a palace. Mr. Winbolt's theory in broad outline is that it was, if not the Roman Admiralty for Britain, at any rate the residence of a Roman Admiral.

After A.D. 43 this British residence may have been requisitioned by the conquerors, who, not as a rule displacing the big landlords, considered this position important for keeping a vigilant eye on the Straits and on the only feasible landing place between Walmer and Hythe. Its convenience for an admiral of the British fleet would be obvious. So the buildings were perhaps assigned to the Port Admiral of Dover, or to an admiral holding the joint command of Dover and Lympne; and they served till about A.D. 100, when it was decided, with the aid of a detachment of the corps of British marines, to enlarge and remodel the admiral's quarters (Block A), and add an annexe (Block B) for his chief-of-staff. . . . There is no proof of the surmise that Carausius and his lieutenant, Allectus, lived here, but, on the other hand, there is no proof that they did not; and there is some historical likelihood that they did. While Carausius was master of Britain, he was master also of Boulogne, and for a year or two after his usurpation he may well have lived in a residence better adapted to a close surveillance of the naval activities of Boulogne than any other in this country. It is not known when he lived in the south of Britain.

So Mr. Winbolt plunges into one of the thorniest problems of Roman Britain, the question of the British Fleet, *Classis Britannica*. First of all, what is the evidence, other than the attractive and suitable site, on which this suggestion is based? The coins give some help. There are British coins for the earlier period. This evidence shows habitation in the first and second century and the third century to the decade before the date of the campaign against Carausius. Then there is a gap for forty-five years (A.D. 275-320), the date of the reconstruction of the system of maritime defence. Then there are fourth-century coins to the year 368, when Count Theodosius, the great father of Theodosius the Great, reconquered Britain. Thence there is silence. Most of the pottery is of the mid-second century. The principal evidence is the discovery of seven tile stamps bearing the mark of *Classis Britannica*, the British Fleet. Such stamps have also been found at Dover, Lympne, Pevensey, Boulogne, and Desures. The round tile stamps are peculiar (at present) to Lympne and Folkestone. A Folkestone tile gives the actual name "*Clasis Brit.*" The spelling is either provincial or an abbreviation (possibly indicated by a dot),

due to lack of room on the mould. There seem to be no other "finds" that suggest a naval base, but the position, the size of the villa, and the tiles provide sufficient material for an attractive argument.

Now what, in brief, is the history of this so-called British Fleet? Caius Cæsar apparently determined the base, Gessoriacum, the present Boulogne. The second Roman invasion of A.D. 43 probably used the same base for the landing at Rutupiaë, the present Richborough. The Romans must have kept the Continental route open. Tacitus first uses the term *Classis Britannica* in reference to the rising of Civilis in A.D. 70. He says that Civilis "feared that the fourteenth legion, in combination with the British Fleet, might harry the coast of Batavia." Agricola certainly made great use of his fleet, and it was apparently always based on Boulogne. Stray scraps of information show that the fleet was a permanent institution. An inscription shows that it was in existence in A.D. 245. In the second half of the third century it was certainly operating from Boulogne in the work of clearing the Channel of pirates. Carausius, possibly an Irishman, was a leader of this fleet and, turning pirate, made Boulogne his centre, crossed to Britain and proclaimed himself a co-emperor with Maximian and Diocletian, and held this position from A.D. 287 to 293. In the latter year, Constantius decided to clear the usurper out of Boulogne, but, in fact, he fell at the hands of one of his officers, Allectus, who assumed the purple and reigned for three years. Constantius, with a fleet presumably launched from the recovered Boulogne, dodged the fleet of Allectus in mists off the Isle of Wight and reconquered the island. The British Fleet, commanded by Allectus, must have had some other headquarters, and it may well have been at Folkestone. Constantius made Boulogne his headquarters. Here, in A.D. 306, he was joined by his son Constantine, and the two undertook a campaign against the Picts. Constantius Chlorus died at York on July 25th, A.D. 306, and there Constantine the Great was crowned.

Did the *Classis Britannica* survive this date? We hear no more of it by name, unless some of the stamped tiles can be dated later. The general view has been that the Fleet, which seemed a danger to the Empire, was disbanded, and the famous Ports or Forts of the Saxon shore substituted. However, Professor Oman and Professor Bury both assume that it still existed, and did important work in the fourth century. Latinus Pacatus Drepanius, writing in A.D. 388, tells the tale of the expedition that Count Theodosius, the father of Theodosius the Great, launched from Boulogne to Richborough in A.D. 367. At that date Britain was in a state of absolute chaos, and Nectaridus, the commander of the coast-line,

had been slain. Theodosius reconquered and reorganised Britain. If the *Classis Britannica* was still based on Boulogne there is no reason to suppose that it had been disbanded. In fact, Theodosius used it, or some fleet based upon Boulogne, to suppress the pirates at the mouth of the Rhine. The real point is whether it can be called a British Fleet. It was apparently a Continental fleet used to control Britain, and was for that reason called the *Classis Britannica*. In the days of Allectus, when his fleet was cut off from Boulogne, it was really British. But if the fleet was normally used for the purpose of retaining Britain within the Empire, it had to have British ports for landing troops and refitment. It is suggested by Mr. Winbolt that "it operated mainly in the narrow seas between the Wash and Portsmouth on the one side, and the mouths of the Rhine and Seine on the other," in conjunction with the well-known *Classis Germanica*, or Rhine Fleet, instituted by Augustus. It certainly was carrying out this joint work in the days of Count Theodosius. There is, therefore, every reason to suppose that the *Classis Britannica* was at work so long as Boulogne was the base, but that in the fifth century it was merged in the *Classis Sambrica*, with its base at Etaples. The only question that is in dispute is as to the date of the survival of the name. If we can tell when Gessoriacum (which seems to have been called Bononia by the time of Constantius Chlorus) ceased to be the base, the end of the *Classis Britannica* can be determined. The problem is not likely to prove insoluble. We have dealt with only one aspect of a book that discusses with great human interest various problems of the obscurest British period.

J. E. G. DE M.

ROBERT MOFFAT, PIONEER.

Robert Moffat was a gardener of virgin soil, a pioneer, one whose spade-work should be known to all interested in missionary endeavour, which should mean everyone, since Christianity spells civilisation, and the world owes much to those pioneers who, leaving country and home ties, go out to lands unknown to Europeans and proclaim the Way of the Cross to races just emerging from the lowest type of humanity.

Africa is deeply indebted to Robert Moffat, by reason of his untiring efforts to understand and be understood by the various races and tribes with whom he came in contact, and through his knowledge of their different languages and the reduction of these languages to writing. His translation of the Bible into the Bechuana tongue

* *Robert Moffat: One of God's Gardeners.* By Edwin W. Smith. Literary Superintendent of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Student Christian Movement, London. 5s. net.

was the steady work of a lifetime, and, as the author of this "Life" says, "It is a monument to his industry." Moffat spared no pains in obtaining the nearest possible translation. He lived for months at a time amongst the natives, where he heard no other tongue than their own. He learnt their language, and on his return to his station was able to preach to them in their own tongue the wonderful works of God.

Robert Moffat was born in East Lothian in 1795. Of his father not much is known; of his mother little beyond the fact that she came of a godly Scottish family, distinguished for a piety that she passed on to her children, and through them left her mark upon the world. She imbued them with missionary ardour in their early years. When Robert first left home, at the age of fourteen, his mother besought him to read the Bible daily, and he never forgot the promise which he gave her. Doubtless, it was this early study of the Bible which inspired and made possible in later years his work of translation of the Scriptures.

His apprenticeship to physical gardening ended when he was eighteen. He then obtained work and a home with a nursery gardener named Smith of Dukinfield, spending the week-ends with the Rev. William Roby, of Manchester, who became much interested in the lad, and furthered his ardent desire to become a missionary. At first the Directors of the London Missionary Society declined to accept Moffat's offer to work in the mission field abroad. Robert had never been to college, and the only preparation of a literary kind was the instruction he had received from his friend Mr. Roby. Robert soon became attached to his employer's daughter, Mary—from her early youth she was full of missionary zeal—so the young couple had much in common. They were engaged to be married; at first her parents withheld their consent, but later, they agreed to the marriage, and she followed Moffat to Africa, whither he had been sent by the London Missionary Society in September, 1816, and become his wife and true helpmeet in all his labours. Their daughter, Mary, married David Livingstone, and much interest is added to this narrative by the connection of the Moffat family with the great explorer, whom Moffat first met in London in 1840. In the December of that year the young medical student, David Livingstone, set sail for Africa, taking with him the first five hundred copies of Moffat's Bechuana New Testament. It was by Robert Moffat's advice that Livingstone advanced into unoccupied ground, where no missionary had ever been, namely, the vast plain of the north, "Where I had sometimes seen, in the morning sun, the smoke of a thousand villages."

The personality of Robert Moffat is the outstanding feature of this book. By it, and a faith that never faltered, he overcame

obstacles which to an ordinary mind would have appeared insurmountable. He was a man without guile, and simple as a child. His transparency of soul brought him through many an *impasse*. Moral and physical courage never failed him, and it was by these attributes that he laid the foundation of Christianity in Bechuana-land. Amongst the great translators of the Bible he naturally takes his place—a place peculiarly his own. He was essentially a pioneer, a seed-sower. "Who loves a garden, loves a greenhouse too." "None greater, none holier than he," declared General Smuts. He was happy to the last, among his trees and plants in his beautiful garden at Leigh, in Kent, where he died at the advanced age of eighty-eight years on August 9th, 1883. The author is, indeed, to be congratulated on this interesting life of "one of God's Gardeners."

S. DE M.

* * *

THE GREAT PLAGUE.*

Mr. Walter George Bell presents in this book an authentic and life-like account of the Great Plague and the terrible sufferings endured in the year 1665 in London and its outskirts. Defoe's *Journal of the Plague Year* is now superseded by a historical narrative, with elements of actuality that the romantic journal is now proved to have lacked, which is a valuable addition to the history of the time. In reading this book, which is a fully documented survey of that awful visitation, the wonder remains that exaggeration was possible. The bare facts, unmixed with the romantic personality of a novel, stand out in lurid light, which only the greater flames of the conflagration of 1666 could exceed.

The Great Plague in the City may be said to have begun in July, 1665. There had only been three deaths in the first four months of the year, forty-three in May, in June 590, and the mortality rose in the four complete weeks of July to 5,667. This is a low estimate, as there is little doubt that a number of deaths, attributed to other diseases, were in reality due to plague. The pre-plague mortality averaged 205 weekly, whereas, in the week ending July 25th, 1665, there died from other causes 628 persons. In "The Chart of Mortality in the Great Plague in London, 1665-6," the peak of the curve rose in early September to 6,988 credited to the plague for one week, almost a thousand a day! There were hopes that with the declining heat of the summer relief would come, but the bill of mortality for the seven days from September 12th to 19th broke the record. The figures for those seven days were 8,297. Of

* *The Great Plague in London, 1665.* By Walter George Bell. John Lane. 20s. net.

these, 7,165 were attributed to the plague, in a city already depopulated by flight and pestilence by one-third. From August 22nd to September 26th the five weeks' bill of mortality records 32,332 deaths due to plague. The author of this book says, "The figures given fell far short of the truth—at least that each man knew well." No record was kept of the Quakers buried "in their gardens," and Dr. Nathaniel Hodges estimates the deaths that week in September to have exceeded 12,000. The loss was in fearful proportion, yet, "in these dark days the people would not deny themselves hope." Signs and portents were recognised and clung to; the return of the birds to the Palace and Abbey of Westminster was hailed with delight, for their departure was deemed a bad omen. From this date onward the plague diminished. The fall was rapid in October, and in the following March, 1666, it was, practically over as an epidemic, although it continued in London on the smallest scale until 1679.

The origin and sources of the plague are traced by Mr. Bell in a most interesting manner. It was not till 1894 that the bacillus of plague was discovered during the Hongkong epidemic by the Japanese doctor, Kitasato. Plague was found to be a disease of rats communicated by fleas of infected rats to man by means of inoculation due to flea-bites through the skin. Nothing was known of the rat contagion by the medical authorities during the Great Plague. No attempt at rat extermination was initiated, although dogs and cats were destroyed by thousands. The black rat, i.e., the English rat, is a migrant from the East, the ancestral home of plague, and this variety was prevalent in the towns in the Great Plague. It was displaced by the introduction of the brown rat, brought to England early in the eighteenth century by the shipping. The black rat is rarely found now in this country, but is the common rat in the houses and huts of the natives of India, and there lives and breeds in close proximity to man. The classical age seems to have had some glimmering of the truth. The figure of Apollo Smintheus, the sender of plague, is represented with his foot upon a rat; and Mr. Bell also gives a reference from I Samuel, vi, to mice as the source of plague.

The Great Fire of 1666 destroyed five-sixths of the City of London. Curiously enough, the flames never reached the parishes of Stepney and Cripplegate where the mortality was largest, and they were left unimproved; yet epidemic plague never occurred again in London or England. Although it is impossible to disassociate the Great Plague and the Great Fire, Mr. Bell suspects that it was not alone the better conditions and sanitation which raised the masses of the poor to something akin to civilisation, but the disappearance of the black house-rat coincident with the

arrival of the large brown sewer-rat. Be what it may, the Great Fire, destructive as it was, cleared the way for a new city, whose foundation was built on the dead bodies of the plague.

There were bright spots of heroism in this plague-stricken city of London. Noble men and women, cleric or lay, stuck to their posts and chief among them were the Nonconformists, who risked life and all they held dear for their fellows in distress. One passes by with a sigh those who, thinking only of their own safety, fled before the peril as a stubble before the wind, not leaving a wrack behind in the form of money to procure the common necessities of life and food for their poorer brethren at a time when unemployment was rife and plague in every poor quarter. Reading between the lines of this awful visitation, which the population regarded as "The Hand of God" rather than human neglect of the laws of decency and civilisation, the marvel remains that law and order was to a certain extent maintained, and that revolution did not finish the work which plague had begun.

No great personality arose during this period to deal with the terrible conditions prevailing, and the mind stands amazed at the ignorance of the medical profession and authorities in insisting on houses being closed as soon as the plague appeared within their walls, and by this means exposing those not already affected to the sure contagion of the dreaded epidemic. There appeared to be none endowed with the common sense, which is the heritage of knowledge, to grasp the situation. Even the singer, John Milton, and others were mute, and those who should have been leaders of the people—as only poets can—had deserted the city. The plague had hardened their hearts and made them dumb and deaf to the call of humanity. It is easy to pronounce judgment on the past from our knowledge of the present. But all may learn from the past; and be thankful for the better and cleaner conditions that are ours to-day.

It was in September, 1665, that the Court moved to Oxford, a lead to Parliament. It was a strange contrast to "the desolate plague-stricken capital, wherein Albemarle, almost alone, was supporting the burden of government." A gay city indeed was Oxford at that time, with its balls and entertainments. The Commons made ready their Plague Bill, but it did not pass, the Lords not agreeing that their houses, if infected, should be shut up. Parliament was prorogued on November 1st, "having passed no Act for dealing with the plague, having contributed nothing." Nearly one hundred thousand souls had perished in London alone. "To man's ignorance Nature is inexorable in extracting the penalty" is the conclusion of the whole matter.

Mr. Bell has produced a most interesting book in a vivid and

concise form, though its pages run to 374. The subject is so large, and the evidence for the authenticity so fully given, that less would have been impossible. The thirty-three illustrations comprising contemporary prints, plans, and drawings, are very helpful to the right understanding of these times.

PORTUGUESE POETRY.*

Mr. Aubrey Bell's wide and special knowledge of the history of Portuguese literature makes him the ideal selector for this admirable anthology of Portuguese poetry of the past eight centuries. The history of literature in Portugal is a singularly interesting one, since apart from the obvious reactions of French and Italian literary movements upon it, it contains, in every age, reflections of that folk music which is the true product of Portuguese nationality, of the country people of whom little is heard in the rather sad modern history of Portugal, but who are, when all is told, the real manifestation of Portugal as a separate nation. When, in the black days of the Moorish reaction, at the end of the eleventh century, Portugal emerged as a separate kingdom under Henry of Burgundy, civil war among the Christian powers in the great Peninsula slowly led to the aggrandisement of the new state, which captured Lisbon from the Moors in 1147, and attained complete independence of the other Peninsula States in 1179. That independence, despite the absence of any definitive natural frontier, has been maintained, save for an interval, from 1580 to the present time. The very existence of Portugal is the leading instance of Spanish particularism, which to-day is showing new developments. Portugal was the southern part of the old kingdom of Galicia, and the Portuguese tongue is really Galician, and as a dialect of Latin stands probably closer to the classical tongue than any other Romance language.

The true basis of Portuguese literature is the indigenous folk poetry of Galicia. Other literatures offer no parallel to those strange, exquisite *cosantes*, and yet strangely enough it was left to the nineteenth century to rediscover in the records at the Vatican those delightful vestiges of mediæval song. The earliest examples date from the twelfth century but the vogue is far older, and they are essentially Celtic in spirit and are framed as dance-songs, pilgrimage songs, shepherds' songs, and even boat or sea songs. They were written and sung by all classes, and this book opens with one of them, a *Cantiga de amigo*, from the pen of King Sancho I.

* *The Oxford Book of Portuguese Verse: XIIth Century—XXth Century.* Chosen by Aubrey F. G. Bell. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 8s. 6d. net.

This form of song received almost a new vogue in the days of King Dinis (who died in 1325), it being grafted on to the Provençal song that the King and his father, Alfonso III, had learnt to love in France. When King Dinis died the Portuguese troubadours had lost their master and the school faded away, "but a thin aftermath of Galician song continued in Spain up to the very threshold of the Renaissance." The dying away of national poetry seemed to coincide with the decay of national life. Spanish influence became predominant in literature, but the Portuguese *Romances*, though based on Spanish models, had as their note the Celtic melancholy of the Portuguese nationality.

The revival of Portugal with the great events oversea of the early sixteenth century once more awakened popular poetry, and a new vogue arose that reached the Court and adorned the plays of Gil Vicente and inspired that great poet, Francisco de Sá de Miranda. This poet has even to-day a European reputation, and when he died in 1557 Portuguese literature had found a great standard of achievement that Luis de Camoens was destined to enlarge. His *Os Lusíadas* is the national poem of Portugal. Mr. Bell considers that Vicente is "Portugal's most national poet," but he admits that the achievements of Camoens give him the first place in her national literature. When he died in 1580, he had created a national impulse that still survives, and modern poets "can still seek in him an impulse to fresh hope and effort."

The long period between the days of Camoens and the early nineteenth century had many striking figures, but the real revival came in the days of our own romantic revival. That revival in Portugal gathered force during a whole century, and to-day "a goodly foison of Portuguese poets confronts us in the twentieth century." The peasant poetry is still a deep source of inspiration, and not the least of the warm hopes that exist in this country for the future of a wonderful and fruitful land lies in the efforts of modern Portuguese scholars and poets. The future should be bright when there are many singers in a land of beauty and of infinite possibilities.

* * *

WEST HIGHLAND TRADITIONS.*

Mrs. K. W. Grant, in this very attractive volume, does a good deal to recreate the Highlands of seventy years ago, and links up in a convincing manner the Western Highlands with the Norse peoples who conquered it. Many legends and stories that she sets forth are, however, essentially Celtic and Gaelic folk-lore, and

* *Myth, Tradition and Story from Western Argyll*. By K. W. Grant. Illustrated. The Oban Times Press, Oban, Argyll. 10s. 6d. net.

those who are interested in finding in traditional stories the links between different branches and different immigrations of the Aryan stock into the British Isles will find material here on which to reflect. Mrs. Grant has told many stories in Gaelic, but she feels that her own people have adopted to so general extent the tongue of the south that she is here appealing to a larger audience than those who are fortunate enough to speak and read the musical Gaelic tongue in its various dialects. Her musical Proem to the book is very charming:

How shall the tales of Gaeldom be told in the tongue of the Angles?
How shall the thought of the Celt be framed in an alien language?
Like figures half-hidden in mist, of aspect huge, undefinable,
Loom out the thoughts of the Gael when awkwardly uttered in
English.

Springing with footstep elastic, marching to musical measure,
Flash forth image and metaphor gaily in resonant Gaelic:
Free as her torrents impetuous, grandly sublime as her mountains,
Deeply poetic and strong is the ancient language of Albyn:

Vain were the efforts and fruitless, to write of the Highlands in
Gaelic,
Even the dogs and the kyloes respond to the tongue of the Saxon!

The study of Gaelic as a spoken as well as a literary tongue needs to be kept alive, and, to be frank, Scotland in the last half-century has not done all that she could have done to second the efforts of practical Gaelic scholars such as Mrs. Grant.

The picture she draws of Appin seventy years ago is a strange one, full of charm and of the weird imaginings—and perhaps more than imaginings—that are associated with the Highlands. In those days "mystery and wonder still brooded over the dark ravines and overshadowed the green glades, as the dim radiance of the train-oil crusie left unlighted corners of the house, which we feared to pass lest there might be a brownie or some kindred uncanny shape lurking there unseen." Are all the water-kelpies, the water-bulls, the mermaids, the glastigs gone with the snows of seventy years? They are about still if we have the eyes to see them, and Mrs. Grant here supplies the eyes. The glastig, or woman-demon, must certainly be pre-Celtic. The fear of women, the memory of some immemorial matriarchal stage in human development, belongs to the very earliest peoples, and the glastig is the nearest survival of the fear that has come down to us in our storm-girt isles. Scotland has more than her fair share of the devils that belong to the fore-runners of the Mediterranean race. The fear of such things was common in England as well in early days. The pre-Norman legislation, Danish as well as Saxon, continually tilted against devil-worship, and the witches of later

VOL. CXXVIII.

times were the successors of those women priestesses of a Devil Cult who dominated islands on the coast of France before our era. The glastig is the spiritual counterpart of an heredity that goes deep into the backward of time. Appin, seventy years ago, held the faith entire. The people were of the soil. "Their grandfathers had fought for Prince Charlie"; their tongue was Gaelic, and the Gaelic names of places had a meaning and the Gaelic names of men were chapters in a deathless history. The very words have a warmth. The word "woman" is cold or even rude in English, and the word "used by our Saviour to His mother seems to an English ear lacking in affection, or warmth; in Gaelic it is not so, being the precise mode of addressing their parents used by our young people." Seventy years ago "horses alone among the lower animals were spoken to in English. Horses might happen to be sold to strangers and taken to districts where Gaelic was unknown, so they required to know English." The food was of the soil: "oatmeal porridge night and morning; home-baked bread, consisting of oat-cakes and scones of various kinds; eggs, milk, fish, and soups were their simple and wholesome fare." The neighbours worked together and formed one great family. It was an age of nicknames and ready jests and delightful credulity. Fairies were seen and described, and Second Sight was by no means uncommon. Peter Thompson, who witnessed Culloden, died about 1850, so that persons now living knew one who saw that famous fight.

Mrs. Grant mentions one remarkable land custom which must be associated with the coming of the Celts, the Goidelic Celts. It was a form of the well-known English heriot, but with a difference. The laird claimed on a landholder's death the best cow in the widow's byre, "thereby coming under the obligation of educating and otherwise attending to the upbringing of her youngest son." In England there is no duty attached to the seizing of the heriot—a custom that dies with the present year. In the old Scottish heriot we see mingled with it the right of ultimogeniture, which in its earliest form represented the custom of succession in the Goidelic peoples. The Irish law on the subject is well known, though the intricacies of the succession into the 17-group has not yet been explained fully.

Mrs. Grant's picture of the Appin of seventy and more years ago is full of detail and is a record of great value, and she has secured the recollections of a peasant woman, Kate Thompson, who was born as long ago as 1774. Her mother's family had been armourers and silversmiths for seven hundred years. Her picture of eighteenth-century peasant life in Lorn must be unique, but Mrs. Grant does not tell the reader where she got the record,

A picture is reproduced of the smithy of the hereditary smiths, at Barachastalain, Glenorchy. It is, perhaps, as weird and wild a spot as Scotland can or could show. There is no end of the material in the book that tempts the quoter. The Norse nature myths are full of interest, but the records of the notable families of Lorn will move even more deeply many Scottish people. The book ends with some delightful stories in English, and they will make the reader think that English is no such bad tongue after all, though two of the stories are about the black business of Glencoe.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Professor Coupland, in the substantial volume entitled *The Quebec Act: A Study in Statesmanship*,* explains in full detail "how it happened that, when the thirteen southward colonies severed their old standing ties with Britain, the great colony in the North, very recently acquired and by conquest, not by settlement, continued in its new allegiance." The problem that English legislators had to face was how New France could "be smoothly fitted into the same political fabric as England Old and New," when there were fundamental differences in the people, differences of tongue, faith, customs, and government. The problem was solved, and, in a sense, the chance lost in 1776 was given back, "a chance to build on the ruins of the British Empire a greater, a better, and a more lasting British Commonwealth." Professor Coupland discusses successively the French-Canadian question; the work of the first and second Governors of Quebec, James Murray and Guy Carleton, who carried out the earnest and wise policy of conciliation laid down in 1763; the Quebec Act of 1774 passed in the teeth of popular opposition and of the invective of Chatham. George III was obstinately in its favour. He said: "It is founded on the clearest principles of justice and humanity, and will, I doubt not, have the best effect in quieting the minds and promoting the happiness of my Canadian subjects." It is true that the Bill was detested by the Southern revolutionists, but "it was not the decisive factor in the outbreak of the American Revolution. . . . Without the Quebec Act they [Lord North and his colleagues] would still have lost the thirteen Colonies. With it Canada, at least, was saved." There was a crisis to follow. American propaganda prevented the Canadian-French from supporting Carleton in the struggle with the invading revolutionists, but they would not co-operate with Washington, and in the darkest days with Montgomery and Arnold before Quebec, the last British stronghold, the *habitants* did not rise and the crisis was overcome. It returned in 1812 and was again overcome, as was the last crisis of the rebellion of 1837-8. The federation of 1867 carried out the Georgian policy of 1774, which to-day and every day is more and more justified.

Dr. Hugh H. L. Bellot has added to "The Little Guides" a most interesting volume dealing with *Gray's Inn and Lincoln's Inn*,† illus-

* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d. net.

† Methuen. 6s. net.

trated by Mr. James Williams. The work is intended as a complement to Dr. Bellot's *Little Guide to the Temple*. The work was written in the spring of 1914, but the War has delayed the publication till now. The fact has had this advantage that the Guide has been brought up to date, various works having been published dealing with the subject in the ten years that have elapsed. After an introduction which gives a brief and attractive picture of the life of the two Inns and of great figures such as Thomas Erskine, a detailed account is given of Gray's Inn and Lincoln's Inn. Dr. Bellot is of opinion that Gray's Inn "is at least of equal antiquity to that of any other Inn, and as a legal institution, retaining its original habitation, probably the most ancient." In the year 1311 we hear of a Bench of Gray's Inn. Dr. Bellot describes in detail the buildings of the two Inns, and indicates some of the notable figures. They are not all lawyers. At No. 24 Old Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, William Kinglake, the historian, had chambers. He began as a conveyancer, but eventually devoted himself to history. Lord Cairns had chambers in 5 New Square. Lord Salisbury regarded him as equally eminent "as a statesman, lawyer and legislator." The late Professor F. W. Maitland shared chambers in No. 3 Stone Buildings. William Pitt from 1780 had chambers at No. 4 Stone Buildings. He was Treasurer of Lincoln's Inn in 1794. There is a sundial on the west front which bears the legend, *Qua Redit Nescitis Horem T. R. Honble. W. Pitt 1794*. So we pass from name to name and staircase to staircase in these famous haunts of learning and nurseries of great builders of law and history. The public should be very grateful for this book.

* * * * *

These *Further Reminiscences, 1864-1894** by the Rev. S. Baring-Gould will be welcome. He died before the volume went to press, but it is good news that he had completed his autobiography, which will prove a useful footnote to the inner clerical and social history of the past half-century or more. Perhaps the most useful part of the present publication is the collection of folk-lore material. The volume begins with Mr. Baring-Gould's ordination in 1864 by the Bishop of Ripon. He took up his work as a curate at Horbury, then a centre for the manufacture of shoddy clothing. Mr. Baring-Gould writes drily, indeed brutally: "I generally meet with shoddy now in sermons of clergy who neither read nor think." His first vicar, John Sharp, had swept away the high pews and had drawn the factory hands into the parish church as early as 1834. He was a fore-product of the earliest Oxford awakening. The book is full of pen-pictures of men and places at home and abroad, and reveals the man while he is revealing many aspects of the Victorian age. The stories of Archbishop Temple are amusing, but there is a bitter note over most of the stories in the book and the comments on them. That is the sad part of an entertaining and informative compilation.

* * * * *

This Old Man,† by Miss Gertrude Bone, is a dear old man, and this sketch of him is an exceptionally true piece of characterisation. The story is nothing in itself, but it portrays with fidelity the simple atti-

* John Lane. 16s. net.

† Macmillan. 6s. net.

tude to love and life held by country folk to-day as in past ages. The elemental passions are for all time. Any one acquainted with rural life will at once be struck by the naturalness of the dialogue. The writer must have drawn from life. The smallest details are depicted from close observation. One might compare this little book with a Dutch masterpiece. It is alive, and the verisimilitude of country cottage life. For instance: "He went downstairs. The daylight was now in the room, a grey light which dulled the candle flame. John blew out the candle and poured a cup of tea for himself. He drank it with a sucking noise, then swilled out his cup in a basin of water and went outside again. The pony heard his footsteps and began to paw the floor of his stable." Chekov could not have described the scene better. The old man's talk with his pony can be heard as well as read. Another John, the carrier, in *The Cricket on the Hearth* comes to mind, with a difference. "This Old Man" is the dominating character in this little story, which is concerned with a wood-carver and his young wife. "The Stranger" who comes to his cottage has constituted herself the wood-carver's patron. Her brother had left a fund in her hands for the encouragement and help of promising artists who satisfied the judgment of a certain art professor, and the wood-carver was her latest prodigy. The story is strung together with a silken thread in the very slightest manner, and one gathers the trend of it from the conversations held by Helen Ross, "the Stranger," with David the wood-carver. Helen sees with greater insight than the husband the depth of character of the young wife, and she endeavours to open his eyes which are closed to all except his art. His wife's outward beauty appeals to him, and he passes by her inner purity of soul and questing spirit. The Baby Johnkin comes and reveals more by his inarticulate coos than aught beside, and art finds a fresh channel of interpretation and of hope.

We leave "this Old Man" still "picking his way" with regret. There is much pathos in his simple faith when he mourns the loss of the wife who was hands and feet to him. "What I understands of it I believes in. I picks my way among it a little and I judges from things I sees. But I believe in Mary, though she've gone." . . . "Hadn't had nobody to tell him things—only Mary," and Mary was gone.

* * *

*The Little Flowers of St. Francis and the Life of Brother Giles** has been rendered into English verse by James Rhoades. There is so much poetry in the prose of these Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi, that it seems almost unnecessary to render them into verse, but, if it makes them better known to the general public Mr. Rhoades will have been justified in his effort. The author has kept very closely to the original text, and doubtless there are many readers who will find it easier to memorise in verse than in prose. Six hundred years have come and gone and still God's Saint Francis of Assisi holds his own. His days on earth were comparatively few. He lived from 1182 to 1226 but "the world still holds him dear." "Sweet St. Francis of Assisi, would that he were here again," sings Tennyson. It is the visionaries—as men call them—who convert the world. And never were they more needed than to-day. St. Francis learnt that preaching must be the outcome of prayer, and so his was a preaching Order. To be alone with God was his soul's delight. In his preaching, he so fulfilled the law of love that

* Humphrey Milford. 2s. net.

all creation were his brethren, and the birds and flowers his sisters, and in that love he showed forth the love of God. "Wherefore your Creator loves you much, since He has bestowed on you so many benefits, and, therefore, beware my little sisters, of the sin of ingratitude, and study always to please God." The two short poems which preface this translation will be much appreciated by those privileged to know both Perugia and Assisi. We quote a verse from "At Assisi."

"To stoop in self-abasement to the earth,
Not to need happiness, to shun no pain,
In weakness to find strength, in losses gain,
All things in nothingness, and wealth in dearth,
Yea, and by daily death win spirit birth—
The vision of the Unseen to sight made plain.
Saint of Assisi, though men doubt the same
This was thy wisdom, this thy glorious worth."

Sir Francis Newbolt, K.C., in a volume entitled *Out of Court*,* discusses at great but interesting length the grotesque legal errors that Anthony Trollope committed in *Orley Farm* and *Doctor Thorne*. The first story not only shows that ignorance of the law which is allowed to no man except a novelist, but presents a criminal procedure that Trollope either constructed for himself or drew from an ignorant reading of old criminal trials. Sir Francis laughs at the objection some novelists have to taking legal advice. The criticism, of course, has not universal application, but in this essay some glaring current instances are adduced. The skit will do good if it induces novelists to work out their legal problems with the aid of a solicitor or barrister friend. Fortunately, the law is not so asinine as the average novelist thinks, and many problems from the Law Reports would make quite good stories. In another essay Sir Francis gives a vigorous picture of the age when George I came to the throne. In many ways it was a horrible period in England as well as in France and Germany, and the essayist lays full stress on the bad side of social life. There was a good side. The religious efforts of both Dissenters and Churchmen were not by any means negligible. Scholarship survived despite the decay in popular education, and the spirit of the nation did not fail in those dark autumnal days.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Mr. R. L. Spittel in the volume entitled "Wild Ceylon, describing in particular the lives of the present-day Veddas,"† gathers together a great deal of information about that strange race the Veddas, who are in the next stage of social evolution to the Australian Aborigines. Mr. Spittel regards the Veddas as "an off-shoot of one of the wild, autochthonous tribes of India, who crossed over to Ceylon, in prehistoric times, when the two lands were one, and subsequently got cut off by the inroads of the sea. They appear to be very akin to the Gonds of India." Mr. Spittel visited the Veddas, among whom Professor

* Philip Allan & Co. 6s. net.

† Simpkin, Marshall. 12s. 6d. net.

Seligmann worked. They are not an attractive race in any outward way, and their habits are beastly. The hunting stories are excellent and the sorrows of wounded animals are emphasised. The story of the death of Mr. T. C. Wiggin, a forest officer, in the course of killing his thirty-sixth elephant, is almost an epic. The accounts of the Vedda peoples will prove of value. Mr. Spittel says that there are no pure-blooded Veddas to-day. Some Cingalese hold a different opinion.

* * *

A footnote to Irish history is contained in the "Account of the Constitution, Administration and Dissolution of the Congested Districts Board for Ireland from 1891 to 1923" by Mr. William L. Micks, who was the first servant and secretary of the Board when it was created to deal with the terrible conditions of the people in the Western part of Ireland in 1891, and who was the last member of the Board when the work was transferred to new ministries in the Free State in 1924. Mr. Micks describes the conditions that existed in the Western districts in 1891, what powers the Board had, the steps taken to improve the condition of the inhabitants of the congested districts in a period of thirty-two years. Mr. Micks claims that the Board carried out a great national work by means of wisely conceived and prudently executed schemes of Fisheries, Industries and Land Settlement. The new Government has admitted that this effort for Ireland was "efficient and lasting." The last adjective depends on the further efforts of the Free State.

* * *

This book, entitled "The Anglican Revival: Studies in the Oxford Movement,"† is by a foreign Lutheran scholar, the Rev. Dr. Yngve Brilioth, lecturer in Church history in the University of Upsala. The Bishop of Gloucester in his appreciative preface pays a tribute to Dr. Brilioth's fairness, to his detached view, and to his grasp of the mass of detail involved. The Bishop notes, however, that the author has overlooked the influence of the ethics of Aristotle on the Oxford Movement and the total lack of scientific teaching at Oxford in the period. The importance of the theme is undoubted: "The genesis and cause of the Oxford Movement will always demand and deserve careful study, for it was undoubtedly the greatest movement of religious thought of the nineteenth century, not only in England but elsewhere." This view of the Bishop of Gloucester, combined with his statement that he was able to get a clearer idea of the course of the Movement from Dr. Brilioth's account than he had obtained elsewhere, shows the real value of this attractive and well-written book. It is, perhaps, to be remembered that the famous Tracts were Newman's idea, and the association of Pusey's name with them was almost accidental, though, of course, he was a contributor.

* * * * *

We must record the issue of two important volumes of the History of the Great War (based on official documents and issued by the direction of the historical section of the Committee of Imperial Defence): these are "Military Operations; France and Belgium, 1914,"‡ compiled by Brigadier-General J. E. Edmonds, with maps and sketches compiled

* Eason & Son, Limited, Dublin. 15s.

† Longmans. 16s. net.

‡ Macmillan. 12s. 6d. net per volume.

by Major A. F. Becke. The first volume covers events from mobilisation up to the middle of October and includes Mons, the Retreat to the Seine, the Marne and the Aisne. The second volume completes the narrative of the operations of the British Army in the Western theatre of war in the year 1914 down to the close of the Battle of Ypres. It describes the loss of Antwerp and the great battles of Flanders: "La Basseé, Armentière, Messines and Ypres, which raged without a break from October 10th to November 22nd, 1914. . . . German superiority in numbers and metal was balanced by the high military qualities of the Allies." It is not possible here to enter into the details of these very valuable volumes but the narrative is not only authoritative and judicial, but gives a conception of war on a great scale that is probably not available for any earlier war.

* * *

In "The Psychology of the Servant Problem: A Study in Social Relationships,"* Miss Violet M. Firth (who was a lady gardener during the war and made "common cause with the kitchen" but all the time "realised the way the mind of my employer was working") sets forth her views. Her cure for all labour difficulties between the employed and employers is to add to wage and hour adjustments a new outlook on human relationships and the needs of the human soul. The prime factors of the servant problem are "the status of the worker and the attitude of the employer." Efficiency on both sides is surely also a prime factor. Miss Firth's main point is that there must be substantial grounds for the universal reluctance of working class girls to enter domestic service. There is a "sense of personal indignity" involved in the inferior status that is assumed to exist. "Middle-class women are rigorous in their enforcement of caste reverence." There is a good deal in Miss Firth's point of view; but, in fact, there are very many thousands of just-minded employers who provide happy and excellent homes for their maids.

* * *

Mr. John Oddy has written this novel, "Three Bachelors,"† with a spiritualistic theme, set in a somewhat melodramatic mould. Prisca Kurpatkin, the heroine, had fled from the Bolsheviks in Russia, where she had been engaged to be married to a Russian Count, Leo Walegrand. Her fiancé, however, had been captured by the Bolsheviks, and condemned to death, but she, and as it proved rightly, never believed that the tragedy had taken place. Prisca arrived in England, and took a tiny flat in a suburb of London, and awaited events. Leo in the meantime, out of love and anxiety to protect her from all harm in his absence, had given his soul to an Airedale dog, which was sent as a present anonymously to Prisca.

Their adventures, and those of Prisca's friends, especially when they travel to the Far East on Leo's track, are graphically told, and hold the reader. They ultimately find Leo, who, having lost his soul, had degraded himself and all those with whom he had been associated. Through Prisca's love and prayers his soul came back to him, and the mysterious Airedale expired at his feet. It is a fantastic and strange book, written with pathos and humour, and should attract a certain type of reader, the type that Lord Lytton once attracted in thousands.

* The C. W. Daniel Company, Graham House, Tudor Street. 3s. 6d. net.

† A. H. Stockwell. 6s. net.

THE NEW LAND REFORM PROPOSALS.

I By THE RIGHT HON. F. D. ACLAND.

II By HAROLD SPENDER, LL.D.

THE volume issued under the title of *The Land and the Nation* by a Committee of Liberal landowners, farmers, labourers, and politicians, over which Mr. Lloyd George has been presiding for many months past, can now be bought for a shilling. The report demands both study and thought. It has been condemned off-hand by many people who have given it neither. But the subject with which it deals is clearly of such deep importance to the nation that the only criticism which will count in the long run must be informed criticism by those who will take the trouble both to follow the argument upon which the report is based, and to show clearly at what points they find it unsound.

It cuts no ice, for instance, for *The Times* to call the policy obsolete, an adjective which seems more applicable to its method of criticism; or for the *Daily Herald* to criticise the policy as being pro-landlord at the same time as Dr. Addison, a Labour leader, criticises it as "nationalisation."

The argument of the report consists of four main propositions:

1. That if there is room for increasing, on an economic basis, both the output from the land and the number of persons settled upon it, it would be of very great service to the nation to increase them.
2. That there is ample room for improvement in both the above directions.
3. That the improvement cannot be brought about by any simple modification of our present well-established system, but demands drastic change.
4. That among several changes of system which have been proposed that outlined in the report seems most likely to produce the required results.

The first two propositions are clearly based on questions of fact, the last two are matters of opinion. It may be worth while shortly to review the facts or opinions upon which they rest.

1. We have about a million-and-a-third unemployed and no definite prospects of any great reduction of this terrible army. Its existence reflects the fact that our staple exporting trades cannot produce to their full capacity. This in turn causes us difficulty in paying for what we consume by what we produce. If this state of things becomes permanent it leads to national bankruptcy.

If these statements are true it seems obvious that it would be a good thing to produce more food (for which, unlike manufactures, there is always a market) here at home, as this would ease our trade

VOL. CXXVIII.

position; and to relieve town unemployment by giving men more chance of employment in the country. It seems, in fact, that we were wrong when, unlike other countries, we gave no thought to agriculture at the beginning of the agricultural depression forty years ago, but gaily turned our attention from the furrow to the factory, and, therefore, now that we cannot rely upon the factory automatically to secure for us national prosperity as heretofore, it seems wise to turn our attention back from the factory to the furrow.

2. As to the scope for improvement one can do little more than refer to the statistics collected and analysed in Chapter III of the report. To those who have been engaged in their preparation it has been startling to find how much Great Britain, which used not long ago to lead the world in agricultural production, is now outstripped by other countries. The most impressive figure, perhaps, is that relating to live-stock units (a scientific combination of cattle, sheep, and pigs) per hundred acres of land. Comparing England with the average of Holland, Belgium, and Denmark—countries, on the whole, with lesser natural resources and no greater human resources than ours—while we have in the last forty years shown a tendency to decline from thirty units per hundred acres, the increase there has been from a figure well below thirty to a figure well up in the forties. It is shown also that if we would reach the average standard of population in our rural districts which is reached in those countries, we could settle something like an extra million persons on the land. And the figures suggest that the main, though not the only, cause of our lower standard of production and population is that our peasantry is more nearly without effective access to land than that in any country with which we can fairly be compared. Figures are, of course, notoriously deceptive, but the large mass of them which are arrayed in the report, covering many aspects of the question, and all showing that we at best mark time while others pass us by, seem to make it clear that, if the first proposition is true that we *ought* to do better, so also is the second that we *can* do better.

And it is not only in comparison with other countries that we seem to fall short of what we might easily accomplish. There are a cloud of witnesses to testify that "safety first" has become far too common a principle of farming; that a landlord can now no longer afford to get rid of a bad tenant; that farms are bought and treated as amenities to play with; that the farmer condones his landlord's inability properly to equip the farm by improperly farming it; that uncertainty as to the future leads to under capitalisation in the present; that there is far too wide a gap, not only between the worst and the best, but between the average standard

and that which might quickly prevail were initiative to be encouraged by security and stimulated by a sound system of State credit.

3. We come now to the question whether any improvement in or modification of our present system can bring about what so far has seemed both desirable and practicable. In the first place, it does not seem very likely that any existing force or combination of forces will do much if things are just left alone. On the side of the landlords, though Lord Bledisloe, both by precept and example, has piped, his fellow landowners seem unable or unwilling to dance to his piping. On the side of the farmers, that powerful body, the National Farmers' Union, which might do so much to discourage bad farming and to encourage good, seems still to prefer the political to the practical side of its work. And the agricultural workers' unions—sadly too weak in any case—limit their effective aims to a policy, borrowed from the towns, which is concerned only with wages and hours. They have forgotten the lesson which they should have remembered from the time of that great pioneer, Joseph Arch, when those branches of the Union were the strongest and most permanent in which landholding by the labourers was made a primary object of their combined endeavours. They, indeed, seem to be too much dominated by men who lack the labourers' passionate love of the land, but have acquired in its place political Labour's dislike of smallholdings, a dislike which can only be based on the fear that secure possession of a piece of land is likely to lead to contentment.

But though things left alone seem little likely to improve, there are two modifications of the present landlord-tenant system which have been suggested as allowing of greater stimulus to production and closer settlement, while leaving its framework intact. One is the extension to farms of all sizes, and to England and Wales, of the Scottish small landholding system, under which a tenant is selected and a rent fixed not by the landlord, but by a public authority, the tenant once fixed having the right to devise to members of his family. The other is the statutory establishment everywhere of what is the custom in the Evesham and some other fruit-growing districts, under which the tenant nominates his successor, selecting presumably the man who will pay him most for the capital he has sunk in the land in the shape of fruit trees. Both suggestions are simple variants of the idea that you can expect the landlord to continue to do his duty in equipping the land with buildings, when you have made him merely a rent charger.* And on this point the unanimous opinion of those who know best

* In Scotland on the smaller holdings the equipment has very often in the past been provided by the tenant, and still is—so the difficulty does not arise, but this fact illustrates the practical impossibility of extending the system to the different conditions in England.

is simply that you can't. Both proposals also, though in different degrees, shirk the fundamental questions: Is the landlord still to be allowed to sell with vacant possession? If so, the scheme gives no real security. If not, it is considerably harder on the landlord financially than that of the Liberal Committee. Is the selection of tenants to depend upon a public authority or upon the highest bidding for the tenant right? If the former, surely the operations of the authority will be made impossible as long as they have both a landlord and a tenant to deal with on every question of equipment or credit. If the latter, there is obviously no guarantee against bad farming, for it is very often the man who loves amenity or sport and is careless of good farming, who will bid highest.

The lesson of Irish land legislation is very much to the point in considering both these schemes and any variants of them. It was that it was not possible to find any permanently satisfactory resting place upon the slippery slope of dual ownership. If, as all experience teaches, any such system must result finally in the disappearance of the landlord, it is better to make a clean cut than to embark upon them at all.

4. It is, of course, upon the idea of the clean cut with landlordism that the Committee's new structure is founded. In this it resembles both nationalisation and peasant proprietorship, which are put forward from different points of view, as being more effective methods to attain the desired results. They must be discussed below, as both are serious proposals based on a realisation that there is much that is wrong to be put right. Here it need only be said that the Committee's scheme is a direct cross between them. It is nationalisation in so far as it recognises the right and duty of the nation to resume the overlordship of the land, from which in legal theory it has never parted. It is peasant proprietorship in that it offers to a good cultivator complete security from father to son, without interference with his methods, or increase of his annuity payments, or any charge on his improvements.

But whether the landlord must disappear, as he must under any of these three systems, is, of course, a much debated question. Those who fix their eyes on the great services he has rendered and the great position he has enjoyed in the past, cannot conceive of the countryside with the landowner in the position he will have under the Liberal scheme, as well off financially as now, but relieved of any duties with regard to his agricultural holdings. He has done wonders in the past and has had a very small return for his money. Cannot he go on all right in the future? The answer is that the landlord-tenant system never works well except

under a very special combination of circumstances, and that when these circumstances have passed away it becomes an unnatural and debilitating system which ought no longer to be propped up. It worked well in this country when landlords had large means and were willing to spend them in return for their high position. It still works in some foreign countries, where, however, the landowner more continuously lives on his estate than here, and normally keeps the farmer's hours and does a farmer's work. It has crept in in parts of the United States, but is generally deplored, and constructive efforts are being made to get rid of it. It seems, indeed, only capable of producing the high standard of cultivation which the country now requires if the landlords were willing to be active, progressive, whole-time leaders, and had ample means to carry through an active progressive policy. Unfortunately, though there are, of course, many brilliant exceptions, they are not willing and they have not the means.

As to means, the incessant tale of estates sold is sufficient proof. As to willingness, one illustration must suffice. There is not a landowner who does not know that it would be a great benefit to agriculture in this country if we could establish a sound system of agricultural co-operation, both for purchase of supplies and for sale of produce through auction marts, bacon factories, dairying societies, and the like. There is not one who does not know that the success of such societies depends upon constant, careful watchfulness over the accounts and methods of trading, by the chairman and members of the committee. There is hardly one who could not have given the necessary time and ability to this work, or whose help would not have been welcomed by his tenants and all neighbouring farmers. But only a very small minority have taken up the work. And lack of means can be no excuse, for it is work that does not require money. It is merely lack of will. The landowner, in fact, no longer really leads.

Critics of the Committee's proposals have, however, urged that the landowning system is so fast falling to pieces that it is not necessary to hasten the process by any legislative interference. No one who has watched the break-up of an estate can agree. It is too often bought by speculators, and broken up with as little regard for the interests of production from the soil as is shown by a huntsman when he breaks up a fox. The system is undoubtedly dissolving: now only about three-quarters of our land remains under it. In another two generations the three-quarters may be reduced to one. But the country cannot afford two generations of agricultural chaos, nor can it afford to have the cultivator saddled with the sort of purchase price for his farm which the speculators exact from him.

More serious are the pleas for nationalisation or state-aided peasant proprietorship proposed by the Labour and Conservative parties respectively. It is a sign of loose thinking to make nationalisation a bugbear. It all depends what is meant by it. The State, in the various forms of the Department of Woods and Forests (which now owns only town land and farms, and no forests), the Duchy of Cornwall, the Forestry Commission, and the County Councils, is far the biggest landowner in the country, and the system which these different Departments pursue is not distinguishable from that which a good landowner would practice. But nationalisation as envisaged by the Independent Labour Party's Information Committee is a very different thing:

"Agriculture will be recognised a national service and the farm worker, instead of being a wage slave, will be the servant of the State. . . . In the future any farm worker will have the opportunity of rising from his own merits to the position of Director-General of Agriculture."

And the proposal at the Labour Party's Conference, at Liverpool, in favour of "large-scale State farming wherever practicable" seems to point in the same direction. These ideas are, of course, entirely different from those upon which the Liberal Committee's policy is based. The Committee believe that agriculture is about the last industry in which it would be a good thing to make the worker a direct employé of the State. They do not even go so far as to favour nationalisation in the sense practised by the State authorities mentioned above, under whose administration presumably when a tenancy closes a new tenant is selected and a new rent assessed by someone in a central office. The Committee not only proposes automatic succession from father to son at a fixed annuity, subject to good cultivation, but lays great stress on local administration, through county committees and district sub-committees, rather than central. They think, indeed, with some justice, that administration can be made simpler than at present. Many a farmer who has written to the papers in criticism of their scheme has assumed that there are no officials now, and that the scheme will mean hordes of them in the future. Both ideas are very wide of the truth. The ordinary farmer pays about a shilling in the pound of his rent for officials now: land agents, stewards, and their staffs. Their work is extremely uneconomic, because it is not aggregated in convenient districts. There seems little doubt but that, after the inception of the scheme, when the special tribunals necessary to assess net rents will no doubt cost money, the county authorities should be able to obtain better service for the same money, or the same service for less money, compared to the service obtained now.

Schemes for peasant proprietorship suffer from the same criticism as those for nationalisation, their vagueness. In fact, the Liberal Committee's scheme inevitably suffers because it, alone of all the alternatives before the country, is fully worked out—the others are in the main merely phrases. We shall no doubt have a scheme of assisted cultivator-ownership put forward soon by the present Government. It will be interesting to see upon which horn of a three-pronged dilemma it will rest. If the landlord is to get the full competitive value for the land and the cultivator is to pay it off by some system of annuities, he will very often have to pay more than a good cultivator, paying good wages, can afford. If the cultivator pays annuities based only on the agricultural value of the land, the landlord must receive much less than its full value. If, lastly, the owner is to get the full value, and the cultivator is to pay on the agricultural value, a very considerable subvention will be necessary from the Exchequer. Apart from these difficulties in the scheme, there are two which appear fundamental. No scheme of peasant proprietorship so far proposed contains effective safeguards against bad farming. Freeholders are often at present among the worst farmers. The landlord cannot easily afford to get rid of a bad tenant, but he still does it sometimes. Who would get rid of the bad peasant proprietor? Is it proposed to set up an authority with power to turn him out? If so, the scheme is open to the charge of "hordes of officials." Possibly even a stronger objection is that the more firm we make the grip of the present cultivator, the more difficult it will be for the smaller men to get any chance of holdings. It is folly to think that all that we should like to do to help smallholders can be done at once. It must be a progressive process in which only a few men can at all quickly get the full amount of land they would like. It is, therefore, very important that land shall steadily come in hand which under suitable circumstances shall go to small men—under the principle that he that has been faithful in a few things shall be made lord over many things. This is one of the chief merits of the Committee's scheme, for on failure of the family succession to a farm and on other occasions, land will come in hand, the preference in reletting going to the small man. But once an estate has passed under peasant proprietorship these progressive opportunities for the smallholder will disappear.

Is it too great a claim that if the arguments so far rehearsed seem to be sound the Liberal Committee's proposals hold the field? If so, we may conclude by rehearsing the main outlines of it. It is that as the landlord-tenant system has failed, the State should transfer all the tenant-held land to the present cultivators,

wherever they are good cultivators. The landlord shall be paid an annuity equivalent to the net rent which a good landlord would be making out of the land. The landlord will also receive the present building value of his land as it is realised. The farmer will pay the equivalent of his present gross rent, less the amount properly chargeable for repairs, maintenance, management, and tithe. The good farmer will have absolute security of tenure, at a fixed annuity, which he may devise on death to his descendants. He will be required to carry out all repairs and maintenance himself, and as he is the one man interested it is confidently believed that he will carry them out. The bad farmer, after opportunity of amendment, will be turned out. The functions of estate management, which are at present exercised by landlords, will be carried out by county agricultural authorities representative of agricultural interests in each district.

Adverse criticism there has been in plenty and much of it, by implication, has been dealt with above. May one personal experience be recorded on the other side? After an audience had listened in the open air to other Liberal speakers who did not deal with the land for two hours, the land question on the lines of the Liberal Committee's proposals was explained, which took a further hour. The proposals for helping small men were specially emphasised. Towards the end, a big man on the edge of the crowd, who had previously been hostile, again became vocal, but this time with enthusiasm. Finally, he almost projected himself after the speaker into the waiting Ford. "I'm a biggish farmer, but I'm a Conservative. Can't you join us with that policy?" "I'm afraid not." "Well," he said, "it's a terrible pity, because it's dead right, and you'll sweep the country."

FRANCIS D. ACLAND.

II.

AN EXAMPLE FROM IRELAND.

THE re-opening of the great English Land Question, most hardy of political perennials, in this year 1925 cannot fail to bring succour and advantage. It was, indeed, high time that the whole condition of our agriculture should pass through one of those great national inquests which are the steps in our national public education. We must all welcome, therefore, Mr. Lloyd George's bold initiative, both in his speech at Killerton Park and in the comprehensive and illuminating survey of the new Land Book, entitled *The Land and the Nation*.^{*} It is, indeed, nearly twenty years since we passed through the last great

^{*} *Rural Report of the Liberal Land Committee.* Hodder & Stoughton, London. 1s. net.

period of land agitation, which ended in the passage of the Small Holdings Acts (1900-6). We had some echo of the same strife during the great Budget struggle of 1910-11, and just before the war we seemed about to enter upon another period of Land Reform, ushered in by those remarkable Land Books which are still the best pre-war surveys of our extraordinary and complex land system.* But the war closed down all that reforming zeal; and since then we have been living on expedients and makeshifts, subsidies and controls, which have only deepened the darkness and sharpened the disease. It is high time that we should now return to a steady peace survey and discussion of our English land and the uses to which it is being put.

The anæsthesia which has fallen on the land question is not due to any improvement in the appalling condition of our countryside, but to the complete divorce between our modern town democracy and the land of their fathers. Except as occasional visitors and holiday makers, the great populations of our big towns now know little or nothing of the land or its problems. At the close of the last century a generation was still alive in the towns that could remember the land. Hence the intense interest of the old Radical Party in all such questions. But now the land question has drifted into the hands of the landed classes, who lack both ideas and influence with their rulers and masters in the great cities. The conclusions of the Land Committee are sufficiently grim. They find that our countryside supports fewer labourers than the present number of our unemployed; that it is producing less wheat than any other country of its size in proportion to its population; that it is producing even less meat, butter, cheese, and eggs than before the war. It is conclusively proved by this report that farm-land is shrinking; that our agricultural holdings are diminishing in number; that the housing of our country population grows steadily worse with the decay of their unrepaid houses. These are grave and even portentous facts, and call for the serious consideration of men of all parties. For here, indeed, we have a national question, too important to be the shuttlecock of faction. We must reform our land or perish.

A very grave aspect of our land situation is that while we have been going back other nations have been going forward. France and Germany have both increased their area of productive land. In England the temporary stimulus of war cultivation—when sixty per cent. of the land went under the plough—has already been more than lost. "In 1924 the arable area of England and Wales had sunk below pre-war level, and shows every indication of con-

^{*} *The Land.* Volume I, Rural. Volume II, Urban. Hodder & Stoughton, London. 1913-14. 1s. each volume.

tinuing to decline." But between 1918-25, not only in Russia, but all over the Near East of Europe, from the Baltic Sea to the Ægean, the old feudal systems of land tenure have been abolished, and the soil has been released for the worker. Meanwhile, in England alone we still bear this burden, and it drags us yearly nearer to the danger-line.

It is, indeed, very strange how in England all the successive waves of agitation have recoiled, broken and shattered, from the walls of this ancient castle of land privilege. There was the agitation of the 'eighties with its cry for three acres and a cow; the land tax agitation of the 'nineties; the small holdings victory; the Budget triumph; the great Labour swing into power. The feudal system has survived all these shocks. The land of England is still owned by a handful of rich people, perhaps even fewer than twenty years ago.

Not that the small holdings movement was entirely in vain. It created a small but solid and valuable class of yeomen, the only independent class to-day on the land. But the tendency towards accumulation working from the top has been stronger than the work of diffusion from the bottom. This tendency towards land-accumulation is inherent in the British race; it is part of our national character. It is the end towards which our national wealth, gathered in industry, directs herself. But it goes on in all countries. Rich men everywhere desire to possess the soil. It is the surest investment for their wealth; the most certain and lasting shape of power. In other countries, however, the law has embodied the national interest by placing barriers in the way of this accumulation. In France the Code Napoleon counteracts a process of land accumulation which is still going on all the time. In Germany the great Stein reforms had the same effect. But we do not require to go to Europe for our examples.

Perhaps the most vivid contrast in this respect is that between Great Britain and Ireland. Ireland has just passed through the terrible experience of two civil wars; and she has had to bear the drain of the appalling devastation, destruction of country houses and public buildings, that has accompanied those struggles. Travelling about Ireland since 1922 I have been amazed at the wanton destruction of property effected by the kind of irresponsible guerilla warfare that cursed Ireland for three years. Yet, in spite of all that, Ireland is now recovering rapidly. She has far fewer unemployed in proportion to population than we have in England and Wales. Her agriculture is flourishing; her trade is good. And why? Because in the course of the last two generations she has completely reformed her land system. It was part of the price that England paid for prolonging the Union for forty

years that Englishmen had to pay a king's ransom towards saving Ireland from her landlords. The new Government has completed the process. That half of the Irish landlords who refused to sell under the kindlier provisions of the Wyndham Acts are now being compelled to sell at fifteen years' purchase. The whole of Irish land will soon belong to Ireland. The work of agriculture in Ireland is now to be carried on by an independent yeomanry, sure of their tenure, relieved of the old tyranny of capricious eviction and exorbitant rents, and happily won over to the practice of co-operation. All this means a grave increase of competition for the English farmer, especially in butter and cheese.

The Irish land reforms included the labourer. No better Act was ever placed on the Statute Book than the Irish Labourers' Act, which gave to the underpaid Irish labourer, the serf of Ireland, the security of a good cottage and an acre of land. Travelling about Ireland, it has been my impression that no single reform has produced so great a social change; raising a whole class in one generation from deepest squalor and degradation to a high level of comfort. There is no greater social contrast than that between the mud cabin still surviving in the West, and the trim, neat little cottages of stone which have gradually covered all Ireland since the passing of the Labourers' Act. The English agricultural labourer has never sunk to the squalor of the Irish: I have never seen, as one often saw in Western Ireland in the 'nineties, an English labourer living in the same room with his pigs. But it has been for a century the gravest fault and injury of our English land system that the English agricultural labourer has been—and still is, in spite of the Wages Board—the worst-housed and the worst-paid of all our working-classes. The result is that his attitude towards our countryside is that of an animal in a cage. He escapes as soon as the door is left open. The raising of wages and improvement of conditions in our towns during this recent phase of change has led to a new migration from the land, still in full spate. However little they may recognise it, all classes on the land—as this book clearly shows—equally suffer. The farmer finds that he is short of labour. His production declines. The local demand for food diminishes. Human labour being the only real key that unlocks the wealth of the land, the whole countryside grows poorer for its absence. The landlord himself suffers perhaps most of all, for as the skilled labourers depart his rents diminish and his burden of rates and taxes increases.

I remember a little incident that occurred in a village in Berkshire. The people were nicely and comfortably imprisoned; there seemed no hope of escape. The farmers seemed to have an inexhaustible supply of cheap labour, the squire and the parson

seemed sure of a thoroughly submissive population of serfs. But at that moment there stepped in—the British Empire. Canada happened to be short of agricultural labourers. An active agent from the shipping companies invaded the villages—it was in the old days of cheap fares—and Hey! presto! the whole village disappeared across the seas. That could not to-day happen in Ireland. One result of the Irish Labourers' Act has been the cessation of the migration across the Atlantic of the Irish labourer. I am glad, therefore, that the Liberal Land Committee proposes to give a half an acre to every English agricultural labourer. Why not a whole acre like his Irish brother? Travelling in the West of England this summer I have been struck more than ever with the landless condition of the labourer. He seems to be losing the gardens he possessed. He keeps fewer pigs. Living on the land, he yet often has to buy his food. Is that true to-day of any other class of agricultural worker in the whole wide world? It is no longer true in Ireland.

The vital addition that the Land Committee makes to the ideas of Irish Land Reform is the new proposal of a "Cultivation Tenure." It is round this proposal that the battle will most hotly wage both in the shires and in the towns. The landlords are to be bought out. That seems now an inevitable part of any real scheme of reform. Many landlords will welcome the proposal, for they find themselves nowadays far too poor to be able to carry out their duties. Lord Salisbury told me some time ago that most of the landlords of Hertfordshire were living in the back rooms of their houses, some only in the kitchens. Whether it was wise policy, this scheme of destruction by starvation through taxation applied to a whole class still entrusted with grave duties, may well be doubted. But it is clearly wise now to complete the process—and as they are unable to perform their duties to place them kindly and mercifully on the shelf. In calculating the purchase money, deduction is to be made for expenditure on repairs, with a proportional allowance for past dutifulness; and that part of the present rent is still to be levied as a tax and spent on the farms by new public committees and authorities.

Thus far the scheme of reform bears the aspect of a Farmers' Magna Charta—and would, if it stopped at that point, have the effect of converting the English countryside into a paradise of yeomen farmers. But at this point the English scheme improves on the Irish. The danger in Ireland now is the undue power of the yeoman farmer. The Committee have clearly perceived that a mere transference of land to the farmers would hand England over from the unchartered mercies of a small set of irresponsible men to the equally uncontrolled charities of a larger set,

by no means necessarily better. Their terrible evidence as to bad farming collected from all parts of the country bears full witness to that fact. So they have revived and strengthened at this point a provision of war legislation only tentatively applied—the State control of cultivation. Good cultivation was the condition of the war subsidy. Good cultivation is to be in future the key condition of English land tenure. It is to be the new civic basis of land-holding. This proposal has already provoked much ribald laughter from the defenders of land privilege. But let us consider it. In the Middle Ages, as we all know, the condition of land tenure throughout England was the supply of soldiers in case of need to the King. That condition, having been abused by King Charles I, came to an end with the Civil Wars. No new condition, save a small tax, was enforced in its place by the landlord legislators of the Revolution. But now the State is to revive the condition in a new form. The notable change is that while the feudal tenure was that of defence, the democratic tenure is to be one of food. The change is not so great as many fear. For, as the war showed, food is, to England, the core of defence. The problem, then, is to establish a system by which the State may carry out this great new function of enforcing the need of adequate food in time of peril, revealed by the exigencies of the Great War.

The Land Committee find, indeed, no difficulty in showing that the present home-grown supply of food has sunk below the line of safety. The submarine and the aeroplane have made that change, and we should, indeed, deserve our fate if we did not recognise it in time. Nor is it difficult to point out the reasons for our low level of food production—large holdings, heavy charges, bad cultivation, poor transport, hatred of co-operation, the worship of sport. All these features of English land-holding are familiar to the students of our countryside—but in this Report they find their final confirmation. Scientific farming, indeed, has now become a condition of national existence.

I remember, in 1923, standing on a hill in Kansas State, U.S.A., and looking out over the fertile valley of the Mississippi, so splendidly cultivated, the granary of the world. I marvelled at the wealth of that land. We were being entertained at Orion, the hill of Kansas University, and we were asking what became of the University students. "They go back to the land," said the president. "What? University graduates?" "Yes. They carry all their knowledge back to their farms. We think no brains too good for good farming!"

That is it. "No brains too good for good farming!"

It is, of course, the hope of the Committee in suggesting this new "Cultivation Tenure" that they will draw this same class—

the university class—to the land in England. Not as “gentlemen farmers”—the curse of England—but as real, practical producers. By this reform they hope, gradually, to get rid of the old “rule of thumb” class of farmers who still for the most part control the agriculture of Central England. Rothamsted, and the splendid county council teachers organised by the Board of Agriculture, are producing some effect. The English farmers are beginning to listen and to learn. But if the Committee’s designs are to be effected, we shall have to contemplate a far more drastic and far-reaching extension of national scientific and practical agricultural training, from such enterprises as the high scientific school at Cambridge to the intensive daily drudgery of the Hadleigh Farm Colony. How are these reforms to be brought about? The present farmers will resist, and they will ally themselves to the landlords. The only proper tactics to produce so great a change will be to form a combined body of attack between the town workers and the farm labourers. For that purpose we require a stronger political combination than is at present in sight; and so the Land Report seems to add yet one more argument of irresistible weight for aiming at a combination of Liberalism with moderate Labour—a prospect now made so much more feasible since the Conference at Liverpool. That seems to be the only road to the achievement of these urgent reforms, without which there appears to be no prospect before us except the still steadier decline of our agricultural prosperity, till England becomes the helpless tributary of the food-producing countries. It will be worth a great effort to stay such a descent. For it means the loss of the liberties of England.

HAROLD SPENDER.

LORD GREY & THE PEACE OF EUROPE.

LORD GREY has written an illuminating book.* It is not only a document of the first importance for the history of Europe during the last twenty years. It is not only a statement of the aims of English policy which carries an irresistible conviction of its sincerity and truth. It is the story of a sustained and single-hearted effort to keep the peace of Europe in very difficult days, told with the most winning candour, and dominated by a determination to be fair. Critics there may still be who question whether Lord Grey’s policy was always the best calculated to secure his end. But very few critics who read these volumes, either in this country or in any other, will question his steadfast simplicity of purpose, his mastery of temper or his nobility of mind.

It is difficult not to linger for a moment on the biographical portions of the book. There is great charm in the story of the boy awakening rather late to serious issues, entering politics, hesitatingly enough at first, because circumstance and association made it natural and because to deny the franchise to the country voter seemed to him, characteristically, “unfair,” slow to make his maiden speech in the House of Commons which he was one day to hold and influence as few men could do, taking office half unwillingly, grudging the surrender of his freedom, and escaping with delight to the country at week-ends—walking over Lambeth Bridge at half-past five on the Saturday mornings and noting a thrush singing in a cage upon the way; then, resigning with his leaders in 1895, in the hope and intention of never returning to such servitude, caught back to power ten years later from his work as Chairman of the North-Eastern Railway which he thoroughly enjoyed, and unable to justify to himself or his constituents a refusal to accept the call to greater things. “It was the constituency that had kept us in public life.” All the world knows that Lord Grey made difficulties about joining the Government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman—needless difficulties, he came to think. Nothing in this book is more disarming, were there on such a point any critics to disarm, than the frankness with which the writer will admit an error, or, looking back on events, will pause to consider whether a different line of action from the line he chose might not have had more satisfactory results.

“It is necessary to have a clear opinion at the time as to what is right, and to act upon it, but when an affair is over and one’s own part is done, it is more interesting to put what is past to question in one’s own mind and to review it, than simply to defend it without question, as if one were no wiser after the event than before.”

* *Twenty-five Years, 1892-1916.* By Viscount Grey of Falloden, K.G. (Hodder & Stoughton.)

But once he had joined the new Government all personal difficulties disappeared. Lord Grey indeed might well claim that he proved the best of colleagues, scrupulously anxious to make sure that in speaking for the Cabinet he did not by an inch exceed the mandate given him, that in the case of a difference of opinion he spoke only what was agreed upon by all. He gave himself whole-heartedly to the work of his great office; critics too quick to accuse him of aloofness hardly realised how engrossing that work was. And he set himself quietly to convince the world that he "was not in pursuit of triumph or prestige for British diplomacy," but that Britain's one paramount interest was that peace should be preserved.

There are personal judgments in this book, none of course unkindly, on which many would wish to dwell. Lord Grey ascribes King Edward's influence largely to his capacity for enjoying life and to the "warm human kindness" which was "of the very substance of the man." But he finds no grounds for the view that British foreign policy was due to the King's instigation or control. "He not only accepted the constitutional practice that policy must be that of his Ministers, but he preferred that it should be so." There are notes on Mr. Gladstone—in force of character, energy and intellectual power together the greatest man in whose presence the writer ever stood; notes on Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's detached and shrewd perception of the weaknesses of other men, a perception which did not stop short of examining his own; notes on Mr. Asquith's gifts of equanimity and magnanimity, his unshaken courage in dark days.

"He was not disposed to go to meet the occasion and take it by the forelock, but when it came to him he faced and grasped it; and when a decision was taken there was no hesitation or compromise in announcing it, no wavering in standing by it."

There is a well-deserved tribute to Lord Haldane, a strong protest against the "intolerably unjust" demand made by the Conservative Party that he should be excluded from office when the first Coalition was formed: one wonders whether, had Mr. Asquith and Lord Grey both declined to serve on those conditions, the demand could really have been pressed. There is a tribute not less well deserved to Prince Lichnowsky for his hatred of the war and his efforts to avoid it. There is more than one tribute to M. Paul Cambon: "I felt safe with him . . . but now and then I felt that he would have liked a little more partisanship." There is a reflection, as inevitable as it is restrained, on the defects of some remarkable men who have great qualities. And there is always humour as well as tolerance in the story: one longs to make quotations which space does not allow.

The history of Lord Grey's administration is important not only for the events which led to war. It is of supreme importance for the issues which Europe has to face to-day. No man has been more insistent on the necessity of grasping the lessons taught us by the last few years. Even now, as he reminds us, it is doubtful "whether Europe is penetrated with a sense that war must be prevented in future, and that this must be the common purpose of all nations." No man regarded as an exponent of the old diplomacy has given such powerful help in turning the thoughts of the world to new ways of handling diplomatic issues, in giving shape and substance to ideals of arbitration which had seemed only dreams before. Whenever Lord Grey's record comes to be examined certain points stand out with luminous distinctness against the background of European scheming and intrigue. First, it is clear that it never occurred to him—never could occur to him—to be other than loyal and sincere. Diplomats trained in the school of Bismarck found it almost impossible to understand a Minister who made no attempt to conceal his purpose, to bluff, to bluster, to over-state his claims. His transparent honesty appeared to be the deepest guile, and his assumption that he might count on equal honesty in others sometimes confounded his opponents. "I did resent," he says once, "the levity and ease with which France assumed that we should not play the game." And the growing conviction in his mind that German policy could not be relied on, that it was based upon the belief that moral scruples did not count in international affairs, no doubt steadily weakened his hopes of ultimately avoiding war. Secondly, it is clear that throughout his administration he stood steadily for international good-will. It was the German policy to sow distrust: he found that forced upon his notice: but "to be indignant about it was to beat the air." Lord Grey went quietly on his way, trying to reconcile conflicting interests, to moderate immoderate demands, to show himself on every critical occasion impartial, unsuspicious, well-disposed. "I believe now what you have told me," said the Russian Minister Isvolsky to Count Benckendorff after an informal little dinner in Queen Anne's Gate: "these people are really friendly." Foreign Ministers might still be distrustful. But by 1913 the confidence of all the Ambassadors in London had been won. They had begun to realise his objects—"good faith and a living desire to keep the peace." Thirdly, when war came it was soon clear that this simple and disinterested diplomacy was of incomparable service to this country. If, in the difficult days of the blockade, the greatest of all neutral States became an active friend and threw its decisive weight into the scale of battle, that result was mainly due to the patient and inflexible consideration

for the rights of others on which, even in an hour of passionate excitement, Lord Grey was determined to insist. And fourthly, when the war ended it was clear that, though his hopes of avoiding the catastrophe had failed and his work had in a sense been shattered, his deep faith in the need of saving civilisation from such wars in future survived. No prejudice or pre-occupation of the old diplomacy has since deterred him from contributing all the great influence he possesses to building up a League of Nations to attain this end.

The distinction sometimes drawn between the old and the new diplomacy Lord Grey dismisses as of no importance. In a sense his own diplomacy in its conspicuous candour may be described as new. And it is, no doubt, true that changes of method will bring no safety with them unless they are "the outcome and expression of a change of purpose and spirit among nations." But there is more substance, we think, than he allows in the distinction between open and secret methods in diplomacy, between a policy frankly explained and admitted, so that a nation knows exactly where it stands, and a policy depending on secret treaties and agreements, which even under a Parliamentary system a Minister finds himself unable to avow. All the world of course is with Lord Grey in thinking that newspaper diplomacy, "sensation and *éclat*," would be a lamentable substitute for such diplomacy as his. All the world will agree with him that the quiet, reticent, deliberate work of many of the old diplomatists was often of great value to the cause of peace. But that does not quite dispose of the subject. The real issue is how far it is legitimate or safe for any Minister to pledge the nation which he speaks for to obligations which it neither knows nor understands. The Pact of Locarno has already won a memorable triumph because the nations believe, rightly or wrongly, that they have been admitted to the counsels of the statesmen labouring there. But if it were to be accompanied by secret clauses or agreements, committing us or other countries to obligations not publicly avowed, it would probably prove in the long run highly dangerous to the peace of Europe. If people feel that they are told the whole truth, they are satisfied. But if they suspect that part of the truth is being withheld from them, distrust begins.

Lord Grey's conduct of his great administration won wide and deep respect. But there was always some uneasiness in Parliament in regard to possible commitments which he might have thought it necessary to conceal. We think it is probably true to say that he could have quieted doubts and silenced criticism if he had taken the House of Commons into his confidence a little more. It is a difficult question how far this country was in fact

committed to an alliance with France in the event of war, by conversations of which neither Parliament nor, it seems, the Cabinet had been perfectly informed. Lord Grey found himself, on entering office, faced by a disquieting situation. At every point of our foreign relations we were met by a "groundswell of ill-will." France and Russia were consistently ungracious. We were compelled to depend too much on German support in any foreign difficulty, and Germany was only too quick to drive hard bargains in return. It appeared to the Foreign Secretary to be his duty to come to an understanding with France and with Russia, and who can doubt that in that view he was right? Some may think that in Morocco and in Persia we were a little too ready to ignore the susceptibilities of other nations or to dispose of rights which were not ours to give: and there is no doubt that the free hand which we gave France in Morocco soon led to dangerous complications there. But no one will question the skill with which Lord Grey effected his purpose, and as regards both France and Russia smoothed ill-will away.

But that was not all. France wanted not only a friend. She wanted an ally. Again and again in this book Lord Grey insists that we never promised France more than diplomatic support, that even in its fullest development the Entente Cordiale was never more than "a general diplomatic alliance with no new obligations, but with preparations for the contingency of a German attack on France." But the Entente led to naval and military conversations with French experts. Staffs met. Preparations for war were considered; and preparations of this kind, like growing armaments, tend to stimulate the idea of war. France suggested that Russia should share the conversations—naturally enough. So naval plans for co-operation with Russia had to follow. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was afraid that conversations of this kind might create at least an "honourable understanding." Mr. Asquith in 1911 thought them "rather dangerous." But once embarked on they were difficult to stop. And yet it can hardly be doubted that they created on the part of France, and not for the purposes of the Agadir crisis only, "an expectation of support." It is not clear that the liabilities which might result from these conversations were ever fully appreciated by the Liberal Cabinet. They were kept quite deliberately from the knowledge of the House of Commons. Supporters of the Government became uneasy. Did the secrecy in this case really pay? Parliament, says Lord Grey, cannot be told of military and naval measures to meet possible contingencies. Of course Parliament cannot be told the details. But was it wise to withhold from Parliament the fact that there existed communications of this

nature, which might lead our friends, though we did not intend it, to count upon our help in case of war? And when one finds that the existence of these conversations, though kept from Parliament, was known in Germany—Germany, Lord Grey admits, “may thereby have been led to think that British relations with France and Russia had an aggressive character”—one wonders whether a frank and open statement on the subject, such as the Foreign Secretary knew so well how to make, would not have lessened suspicion upon all sides. The weakest feature of secret diplomacy is that its secrets are so rarely kept.

These are very difficult questions, and there are other questions raised in these volumes to which, though Lord Grey treats them all with perfect candour, men may well give different replies. It is very possible to argue that, while the object of the Entente was peace in Europe, the growth of close relations between Britain, France and Russia, carrying with them support in diplomacy and plans for co-operation in the event of war, could hardly fail to breed apprehensions in a State like Germany, susceptible, self-conscious and armed to the teeth, and thus to precipitate the outbreak dreaded. It is very possible to argue—Lord Grey, we think, would argue—that, whatever our liability under the Entente or our special obligations towards Belgium, we could not in any case have refused to join in the war when it came, that we could not have stood by and seen France crushed, and that, had we done so, we should have found ourselves alone in Europe, at the mercy of a militarist empire inflamed beyond endurance by the triumph it had won.

“We could not have escaped that struggle between militarism and democracy by turning our backs upon the war in August 1914.”

It is even arguable, following this train of thought, though it sounds like German doctrine, that it may sometimes be necessary to wage preventive wars. The best answer to that plea is Lord Grey's own fine statement that “to make war until it is impossible to avoid it, is a crime.” These are all grave problems which no country has yet ceased to discuss. But it is of more practical value to consider how Europe can now profit by the lessons suggested in this book. We hope it may prove that open, straightforward and sincere diplomacy, which need not mean sensation or advertisement, has come to stay. We hope it may prove that some at least of the nations are beginning to grasp the truth that the spirit of militarism is the root of the whole evil, that armaments inevitably pave the way to war, and that war in future may mean the destruction of European civilisation. On the question of armaments no Government at present is giving a strong lead. On the absolute necessity of substituting arbitration for vio-

lence, a sense of security for an ever-haunting sense of peril, nothing can be wiser or weightier than the lead here given by Lord Grey. Experience has impressed upon him deeply the danger which an unbridled militarism involves. “It needs steadiness and strength” to preserve peace in a crisis. The Tsar was not strong and the Kaiser was not steady. But the Kaiser with his extraordinary effusions counted for comparatively little. The Ministers in power in Berlin and Vienna were not in fact in control of affairs. Von Jagow is alleged to have said that they were “machtlos” when the danger overtook them. The strings were pulled by the military element who had determined upon war. There can be no hope for Europe until nations realise, alike in Paris and Berlin, in Warsaw, Rome or Moscow, that to entrust their destinies either to professional war-makers, or to civilians basing their predominance on ruthless force, means the destruction of prosperity and freedom.

The Pact so triumphantly carried through raises problems far from simple. Separate pacts among the Powers, representing only certain interests, intended primarily to secure the fruits of victory or to stereotype groups and divisions made by war, might have proved disastrous for the nations. The success of the Pact now concluded will depend on the extent to which it proves compatible with the principles of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and a step towards establishing that general security which the Treaty of Mutual Assistance and the Protocol attempted to effect.

“There will be no secure peace till the Great Nations of the world have a consensus of opinion among them sufficient to inspire confidence that they will stand by each other to avoid, to suppress, or to localize and insulate war.”

The limitations of the Pact have elements of danger. We cannot bind ourselves never to consent to a revision of the Treaty of Versailles. The question of sanctions is full of difficulty. But the main object of the Covenant of the League is to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of the obligation not to resort to war. Arbitration is no longer a Utopian theory, but the only practical method of avoiding a catastrophe which is recognised as meaning probably “physical, moral, and economic ruin.” Even now war cannot unhappily be ruled out of human calculations. But it would go far if Great Britain, as Lord Grey has suggested elsewhere, would make a public declaration to the world that there are only two things for which henceforward we will pledge ourselves to fight. “The first is the defence of our own country if we are attacked, and the other thing is the Covenant of the League and the principle and practice of arbitra-

tion." The task which the League and the statesmen behind it are attempting, the task of creating a commonwealth of nations convinced that the salvation of the world depends on enthroning reason in the place of force, is perhaps the most difficult yet attempted by mankind. Yet the problem may not prove beyond solution if it be approached with the large faith, the patient, cool, disinterested sincerity which are so conspicuous in this memorable book. "The lamps are going out all over Europe," said Lord Grey to a friend in the Foreign Office in the dusk of Monday, the 3rd August 1914. It depends upon men who share his spirit and his temper whether or not they can be lit again.

CHARLES MALLET.

THE SIXTH ASSEMBLY.

THE Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations in September, 1924 decided on the erection at Geneva of a permanent Assembly Hall—very urgently needed—at a cost of four-and-a-half million Swiss francs (£180,000), and a committee of leading architects of different countries was appointed to draw up conditions for a competition for the design. When the architects met they felt strongly that the conception of the hall was inadequate, and commented on the fact that if it were built on the site proposed there would be no room for future enlargement. The project was therefore referred back to the Sixth Assembly, with the recommendation that eight millions, instead of four and a half, should be expended on the building. The whole question having accordingly been reconsidered, one of the more important minor decisions taken by the Sixth Assembly was that the new hall should be on the scale proposed by the architects, and should be erected on another site from that originally chosen, while, in addition, it has been resolved to build entirely new headquarters for the Secretariat adjacent to the Assembly Hall, provided the existing Secretariat buildings can be disposed of for not less than a reserve figure already fixed.

These decisions are manifestly of little general importance in themselves, but they illustrate well the spirit which pervaded the whole of the Sixth Assembly this year. It was not a spirit of adventure such as characterised the drafting of the Geneva Protocol twelve months ago, but rather a spirit of consolidation and the pursuance of a sound routine. The League is slowly striking its foundations deeper, just as it is deciding, without hesitation, to plant on a broader basis and on a more worthy scale its permanent home at Geneva. Those, if any there were, who went to the Sixth Assembly expecting something spectacular, came away disappointed. Those, on the other hand, who had murmured to one another in advance that the agenda of the Assembly was the dullest on record discovered that the business of the Assembly, even if it never went beyond mere routine, could be of considerable interest and importance.

The distinction of the Sixth Assembly was the absence of any particular distinction. No new members were admitted to the League. No excitement was manifested over the election of the six non-permanent members of the Council, for the six already sitting were, for special reasons, re-elected practically without opposition for another year. The meetings themselves were got through in three weeks, the shortest period devoted to an Assembly yet, but on the whole a period shorter than is quite desirable, as the indecent hurry of the closing days made clear. On the other

hand, the Assembly has never settled down more rapidly to its work. While there was, of course, a certain infusion of new blood, most of the delegates had attended an Assembly before and were well familiar with its ways. That knowledge of the Geneva mechanism, and, still more, the delegates' personal knowledge of one another, made for the confidence and firmness of touch which were, by common consent, the outstanding features of the Sixth Assembly. Another feature hardly less notable was the spontaneous resolve of almost every Foreign Minister in Europe to make his way to Geneva in September as a matter of routine. In 1924 it was the widely-announced intention of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and M. Herriot to attend the opening sessions of the Assembly that brought the chief representatives of other countries in a mass to Geneva. This year they came, as it seems likely they will now always come, simply because a Foreign Minister can no longer discharge the duties of his office effectively if he misses this opportunity of annual personal contact with men who hold like positions to his own in other States. Thus it was that side by side with Mr. Chamberlain and M. Briand there were sitting, when the Assembly opened, the Foreign Ministers of Belgium and Holland, of the three Little Entente States, of Poland and Greece and Bulgaria, of Switzerland and Austria and Esthonia and Sweden and Finland, while four or five Prime Ministers, including M. Painlevé, were also present in connection either with the Assembly or the Council. There can be no better testimony to the place the League of Nations has established for itself as an essential part of the mechanism of international relations.

Whether the routine character of the 1925 Assembly is matter for satisfaction or regret is no doubt an arguable question. At this particular stage in the League's history it is probably no bad thing that the public should be thus reminded of the place the Assembly properly holds in the League's constitution. Its function is essentially that of discussion. It initiates projects whose execution the Council, or some special body, will supervise, just as it initiated this year the proposals for a Slavery Convention or the holding of an Economic Conference. But the Assembly was intended above all things by its founders to provide a forum where the existing work of the future plans of the League can be discussed in all frankness and freedom, before an audience in which the disinterested element is always large, by men competent to criticise and qualified to suggest, and in an atmosphere of co-operation which allows criticisms to be framed, or suggestions to be rejected, without offence or acrimony.

There were special reasons this year why the Assembly should confine itself in the main to the work the League already has in

hand. It was meeting under the shadow of the impending discussions on the Security Pact with Germany. Hopes that those negotiations would move fast enough to permit of the admission of Germany to membership of the League while the Assembly was actually sitting had been disappointed, and it fell to Mr. Austen Chamberlain to appeal to delegates that nothing might be done or said at Geneva which would make the task of himself and his French and German colleagues more difficult when they met in conference a few weeks later. Such an appeal could clearly not be resisted. It meant, in a measure, blanketing the Assembly, for the very subjects, notably arbitration, which Mr. Chamberlain was most anxious should not at that moment be debated, were among those the Assembly itself was most anxious to discuss. But to leave them over for a year could have no fatal consequences, while to thrash them out forthwith, and possibly arrive at conclusions which might seem to Germany like pre-judging issues in which she was entitled to have a voice, would have been running risks no responsible statesman was entitled to court, and if there was anything conspicuous at Geneva this year, it was the presence of statesmen with a sense of responsibility.

The Assembly, indeed, did not ignore entirely those principles to whose discussions it devoted so many earnest sessions last year—Arbitration, Security, and Disarmament. In that field, indeed, it took a line a little unexpected. Though the Geneva Protocol was formally inscribed on the agenda, it had been generally assumed, particularly in Great Britain, that after the British Note of March there could be little further to be said. Mr. Chamberlain himself, who had, after all, never addressed the Assembly on the Protocol, very properly explained to it, in a speech which never put him fully *en rapport* with his hearers, what the British objections to the Protocol were. In spite of that there followed, in a series of speeches from practically every quarter of the Assembly, reaffirmations of faith in the Protocol, remarkable both in their number and their conviction. The British Empire may be satisfied as to the soundness of its own arguments against the Protocol, but the resolve of practically the whole of Continental Europe, and equally, though that is less important, of Latin America and of other non-European States, to work steadily for the Protocol till it, or something very like it, has been universally accepted, is a fact of which the British Empire, if it is to pursue a policy of international co-operation at all, will be compelled to take serious account.

This year, for reasons already stated, the Protocol was not discussed in detail. The formula "Arbitration, Security, Disarmament," was, indeed, in such constant use that it seems in a little

danger of becoming a cant shibboleth, though the insistence of French and other speakers that the steps of the process must follow the order of the words, and Mr. Chamberlain's "Disarmament through Security, Security through Arbitration," were put in a rather different light by Lord Cecil's declaration that arbitration must be not the foundation but the coping-stone. The Assembly, which conducts most of its discussions through the medium of its six Commissions rather than in Plenary Session, referred to its First Commission the general question of the Protocol and the coming Pact negotiations, ending by giving its blessing to the latter, and instructing the Council to examine the agreements which it was hoped might be concluded, with a view to estimating how far they contributed to the security of Europe. A report on that will be laid before the Seventh Assembly, which, if it is animated by the same spirit as the Sixth, will certainly insist in thrashing out once more, in the light of the situation then existing, all the essential principles of the Protocol. It looked for a moment during September as if the British thesis—a thesis into which the British Delegation seemed rather to have slipped than to have advanced with conviction—of the building up of a universal agreement by means of regional agreements, would find universal acceptance, but various speakers, notably Dr. Beneš and Count Apponyi, sounded a note of caution against any such conclusion, and the Assembly as a whole, while approving the German Pact negotiations as an essential and immediate step, cannot be said to have abandoned its conviction that a universal agreement like the Protocol is the best.

Of the Assembly's survey of the normal business of the League little need be said in detail here. The work is divided up among the six Commissions, to one or other of which consideration of every branch of the League's activity is assigned. Thus, in that important field of reconstruction which the League has made so largely its own, the Second Commission received full reports of the satisfactory situation both in Austria and in Hungary and of the successful solution by the Council of the difficulties that had temporarily arisen in connection with the Greek Refugee Settlement Scheme, owing to the arbitrary action of the Greek Government in arresting certain officials of the Refugee Settlement Commission on unformulated charges of peculation. The actual working of these schemes is in the hands of the Council, not of the Assembly, but the latter body heard with satisfaction of the decision taken by the Council a few days earlier definitely to abolish League control of Austrian finance within the next few months, the Reconstruction Scheme having so far achieved its object as to make the continuance of that temporary restraint on Austria's full financial independence no longer necessary.

As has been already said, the Assembly did not confine itself to passing in review the work the League has already in hand. At least three important tasks were initiated this year. One was the Slavery Convention, laid very unexpectedly before the Sixth Commission by the British Government at one of its earliest sittings. The original intention was that this Protocol, which consolidates and extends existing agreements for the abolition of slavery, should be put into final form in time for signature before the delegates to the Assembly dispersed. Time, however, was insufficient for full discussion, and in the end it has been decided that the document shall be referred to Governments for their observations, with a view to its final adoption at the Seventh Assembly. That will give time for a decision to be taken on the difficult question which so often arises in connection with such agreements, whether (in regard, particularly in this case, to such a matter as forced labour) high standards should be exacted which some nations would certainly refuse to accept at all, or a convention framed so moderate that universal signature can be counted on.

More ambitious than this British initiative was that taken by the French Delegation in proposing the summoning by the League of an Economic Conference, rather on the analogy of the Brussels Financial Conference of 1920, not with a view to passing resolutions or adopting conventions, but rather to thrash out, through free discussion by the highest authorities of the world, both official and unofficial, those economic problems which are a constant source of friction, and may all too easily be an actual cause of war between the States of Europe or, for that matter, of other Continents. Though welcomed by practically all other delegations, this proposal was received with considerable caution by the British, who took the view that notice ought to have been given before a proposal so important was brought forward. In the end, however, M. Loucheur and Lord Cecil, after a figurative embrace before the Second Commission, agreed that the Council, instead of being instructed definitely to summon such a Conference, should be asked merely to consider the desirability of such a course. There is, however, no question that at the December meeting it will be decided to go forward with the project.

A third and much-debated proposal was the demand of many delegations that, though it was manifestly out of the question to speak of a Disarmament Conference till further steps had been taken towards a solution of the security problem, at any rate the technical studies necessary before any practical scheme of disarmament could be formulated should be put in hand forthwith. Here again, it was the British who sounded a note of caution, on the not unreasonable ground that it was undesirable to raise false

hopes about disarmament when it was clear that nothing practical could be achieved at present. That view, however, having been put forward, no actual objection was raised on the British side to the decision which the Assembly subsequently took, that a strong expert Committee shall be formed at once to consider on what bases any practical scheme of disarmament should rest.

One other new proposal deserves at least a mention. That is the scheme for settlement of Armenian refugees in the Soviet Republic of Erivan, drawn up by Dr. Nansen and the experts who accompanied him on a visit of investigation to Erivan, undertaken at the instance of the International Labour Organisation. The scheme is dependent on the raising of an International Loan of a million pounds. The French were apparently disposed to give the project some Government support, but the British made it clear that they were not, and since the question was too complex to be solved during the three weeks of the Assembly, it has been referred to the Council with power to act.

Two general comments, though one is rather particular than general, on the Assembly as a whole seem relevant. One is based on the striking contrast provided by the French and British Delegations, both in their composition and in their general attitude towards the League. The French adopted, in a way to which no exception could be taken, a position of acknowledged leadership in the Assembly, and the British made no visible attempt in any way to emulate it. M. Painlevé, the French Prime Minister, came from Paris to attend part of the sittings of the Council and the opening meetings of the Assembly. The delegation itself was of a remarkably representative character. It included the Foreign Minister, M. Briand; M. Paul Boncour, the Socialist leader, who delivered what is probably the most brilliant speech any Assembly has ever heard; M. Loucheur, a former Minister, the recognised representative of "big business" and a great newspaper proprietor; M. de Jouvenel, a former Minister, a Senator, and the editor of the *Matin*; M. Léon Jouhaux, the Secretary of the *Fédération Générale du Travail*; M. René Cassin, the President of one of the chief ex-Service men's organisations; and a number of other Deputies and Senators. The British Delegation, even during the week while Mr. Austen Chamberlain was present, and still less after he had left Geneva, was in no way comparable with this. Practically all the French Delegates had been at Geneva before, some of them many times. Of the British, only Lord Cecil and Sir Cecil Hurst were in that position, and the latter, like Sir George Grahame, another British delegate, was in a strictly official position. The delegation was completed by two minor Ministers—the Duchess of Atholl and Mr. A. M. Samuel. The

general line taken by the British in various discussions was, no doubt, correct enough, though it was unfortunate that all along the line they felt it necessary to make various criticisms, mostly in deprecation of any extension of the League's activities, which contrasted pointedly with the progressive line regularly adopted at every point by the French.

There is, however, another side to that, for if the Assembly does not provide opportunities for legitimate criticism, half its value is gone. That, indeed, forms the basis for the other general comment for which there seems to be room. On the whole, the note of criticism was too little heard this year at Geneva. It is true that for the most part the League's undertakings are going extremely well and merely captious criticism would be properly resented as a waste of valuable time. Nevertheless, it remains true that no speaker did greater service to the Assembly than Count Apponyi, the veteran Hungarian politician, who, speaking in admirable temper, put frankly the attitude of a disarmed State regarding general disarmament and the attitude of a country, many thousands of whose former citizens live under alien rule, towards the League's handling of minority problems. It was, as more than one hearer soundly observed, the kind of speech that will be heard delivered in much more forcible language the first time a German delegation takes its place in the Assembly. All that need be said on that is that if the Germans state their views on such matters as mandates, or minorities, or the Saar, or Danzig, in the same spirit and tone as that adopted by Count Apponyi, there will be no need to regret their contribution to the discussions.

Familiarity may breed too much content. As the same delegates from different countries come to the Assembly year after year, and personal contacts develop into personal friendships, a spirit is generated which makes unmistakably for harmony and effective co-operation, but may, without much difficulty, engender at the same time a certain self-satisfaction and complacency. That is a danger against which the Assembly must be perpetually on its guard.

H. WILSON HARRIS.

THE PARIS PRESS AND FRENCH PUBLIC OPINION.

AMONGST other audacities Mr. Bernard Shaw has lately been inspired to inform the Parisians, through the columns of *Le Temps*, that Paris is both conservative and provincial. As M. Marcel Prévost was already engaged in demonstrating that the French capital is more moral and dignified than London, there may be no paradox after all. Certainly, with respect to its daily press, Paris is still to a great extent bound to what we consider obsolete forms and methods and in technical production it is manifestly of an inferior order.

Perhaps, one thinks, if Paris had to invent a journalism for itself, *de nouveau*, the result would be quite different, because the present format and topical incongruity of the bulk of its newspapers are simply an inheritance from the seventeenth and eighteenth century gazettes and the omnipotent and enduring official *Moniteur*. In consequence, such journals as *Le Temps*, *Le Journal des Débats*, *Le Figaro*, *Le Gaulois*, *L'Action Française*, *L'Eclair*, to name but these out of the twenty which compose the Paris daily press of opinion, are more closely akin to-day to the London critical weeklies than they are to *The Times*, the *Morning Post*, or the *Daily Telegraph*. It is only within the past twenty years or so that an entirely new press, a press of information, has arisen in Paris, inspired by American models; and this, of course, has not been without its effect on the older organs.

Professedly journals of political opinion, the papers I have named are also chroniclers and critics of literature, the theatre, and the fine arts. One's impression is that only reluctantly have they come to admit "news," that is to say, "reports of the crimes, violences, follies and misfortunes of mankind" as being worthy of equal and even superior space in the paper. This explains the mentioned incongruity of the front page, where a brutal murder or a railway accident or some sensational item from an American source is insinuated between a graceful article by an Immortal on "The Prose of Alfred de Musset" or the "Love-letters of Chopin" or the "Foreign Policy of Guizot," or perhaps a paper on "Some Women in the Romances of Pierre Loti." Close beside it one finds a rhetorical attack on the Ministry; an official communiqué relating to the taxes and half a column of amusing persiflage over a famous pseudonym. Is it surprising that one is occasionally reminded of what might happen, as the result of an amalgamation between the *Spectator* and the *News of the World*? In truth, such a newspaper is a medley from which even the trained reader finds it difficult to extract the intelligence he seeks.

I have lately heard this confusion commented upon by French journalists themselves; they ascribe it to the fact that Paris journalism is just now in a critical stage of evolution. The conductors of the older papers have not made up their minds what proportion of their readers demand opinion and what proportion require information. They prefer to postpone a more logical journalistic formula.

Meanwhile, the rapidly-growing change in the French public taste, habits, and intelligence, and the new activities and interests which have sprung up since the war, serve to make further inroads on the limited space of the paper, which rarely exceeds five pages of reading matter and is more often less. True, a certain number of new journals devoted to news-pictures and sport and the huge circulations of journals of *Le Petit Parisien* type, tend to relieve that pressure which the old-fashioned journalist resents. One of them said to me:

"Murders of insignificant people, burglaries, seductions, thefts, crimes of passion, are interesting if presented interestingly. But they are at bottom conventional and not really 'news' inasmuch as they have all happened and been described in detail by Balzac, Poe, Zola, Boisgobey, and a hundred other masters; so that people with a taste for that sort of thing may gratify themselves to repletion at the nearest library. Rochefort once thought of putting the leading crime of the day in the *feuilleton*. On the other hand, the changes and tendencies and discoveries of society are new and of enormous importance. The state of France, its political parties, its immediate future, its foreign relations, ought to be of vital interest to every Frenchman. It is the business of us, as journalists, to see that it is made so."

Naturally, this is pure didacticism; and the Paris editor is nothing if not didactic. So he expresses the dislike he feels. He tells the new journals of information that they resemble the Parisian of Gondinet, who was popular because he was non-committal. "I never express any opinion on anybody or anything. I find it useless. *C'est plus commode aussi et moins compromettant.*"

"Reporting, big or little," observes a writer in *Le Temps*, "has its interest, which can be considerable and exacts a real talent. But it can only rise to a certain level if the journalist is a man who knows how to write, see and think; and is not a mere recording instrument. And besides it is not enough to note events, he must explain and judge them, and this is the task of the journalist of opinion, who can claim as ancestors Chateaubriand, Paul Louis Courier and even Voltaire, their authentic patron. . . . Also, there is literary journalism which no more than the other sort is content to be a phonograph."

The Paris press of opinion, then, continues to be an institution, an establishment, almost a religion, with its high-priests in the line of succession from Prévost-Paradol, Girardin, Weiss, Ranc,

Hebrard, Rochefort, Neftzer, Albert Wolff, Arthur Mayer, Cornély, and the rest, who are looked upon by the people of other countries at least as expressing, by ritual and homily, a large, perhaps the whole body of French public opinion.

Before inquiring whether this is the case or not let me note a characteristic of the whole of the press of the capital. You will generally look in vain in the chief newspapers for that documentation upon which a reader may form an independent opinion for himself. *Le Temps* is the only journal which prints the debates in both Chambers in full, though not always punctually. Reports of speeches outside the Chamber are generally very meagre. Official documents, public meetings, legal judgments are briefly summarised or only mentioned indirectly. All this is inevitable from sheer lack of space. But the newspaper being primarily an organ of opinion, even the reporters are allowed to express their opinions on facts they know but which the public cannot know. Incidents, big or little, are tintured and transformed by the writer's or his journal's prepossessions. A Canadian *habitant* is robbed in Montmartre. The episode is narrated by *Le Journal* in the style of Xavier de Montépin; by *Le Figaro* in the mordant vein of Maupassant; the reporter of *Le Matin* converts the victim into a "gentleman-farmer"; *L'Intransigeant* treats the affair satirically, and *Le Petit Parisien* expresses a doubt whether this wealthy foreigner was really robbed, and if so, did not merit it by his folly. "These foreigners!" (runs the title of a cartoon) "Poor Paris, when can she be free of their company and be herself again?"

Now, while some of this is very unlike present-day English journalism, it is a good deal like what English journalism was a century ago, when the editorial "we" extended to police-court cases. The danger of this style of writing and its free handling of personalities is that innocent people are occasionally libelled or held up to ridicule, a proceeding which with us would very quickly land editor and publisher in the courts. But in Paris there is more latitude and (duelling being no longer in vogue) the person attacked can always fall back on the Press Law of 1881, which gives him a right of rejoinder equal in space to the length of the attack.

"The Paris press," declares M. Stéphane Lausanne of *Le Matin*, "translates public opinion; it does not make it. . . . It resembles Danton on a famous occasion. It summons to it the angry crowds; it harangues them; but it does not dictate their sentiments. It only interprets them. The press can increase, delimit or turn aside the torrent; it cannot create it. It has its source in the entrails and conscience."

Supposing this diagnosis true, the power to increase, delimit and turn aside public opinion is a very real power. Does the Paris press possess it? I am inclined to be doubtful. From a long-established newspaper, even under the régime of the signed article, one looks for a certain unity of policy and opinion. The name of the *redacteur-en-chef* usually printed under the title would seem to guarantee this. Yet the only journals wherein I find this consistency are *L'Action Française*, the Royalist organ, and the Communist journal, *Humanité*. Too often in leading metropolitan journals, when important events supervene, one is surprised, not so much by a certain tentativeness of treatment, or a certain ambiguity, but by an actual contradictoriness in two writers writing in the same issue, as if the attitude of the paper were not defined or its policy settled. The reader is left wondering which way the cat is going to jump. This trait of opportunism is now quickly recognised by French readers who, if they belong to a definite group of which this particular newspaper is the organ, have no objection to the editor's handling the subject gingerly until the opinion of the group leaders becomes known.

On the subject of foreign affairs the Paris press is accustomed to consider itself strong. Unquestionably there are writers on *Le Temps*, *Le Matin*, *L'Echo de Paris*, *L'Ere Nouvelle* and *L'Intransigeant*, to mention a few, who are particularly well informed on foreign affairs. Nevertheless the impression on the mind of the critical reader, and one confirmed by closer scrutiny, is that the journal is itself by no means well-informed. Many of the blunders of these very newspapers are elementary. Two years ago I compiled a list of geographical and political "howlers" in five of the leading Paris newspapers which would have shamed the rawest novice in Fleet Street. It is not only in simple facts and proper names (it is a trifle: but even as I pen this the current issue of *Le Temps* contains repeated references to Mr. Stanislaus Baldwin and Mr. L. St. Amery!) but in direct statements about foreign governments and institutions that the merest glance at *Whitaker* would have obviated. When it comes to British, American, Japanese, Indian, and Colonial politics and economics these references are far wilder and wider of the truth than would be tolerated by the readers of any small British provincial newspaper. These are sins in simple ignorance; in propaganda the errors are graver. Legends are repeated and assertions confidently advanced about the British Empire and America, about Germany, Italy, and other foreign countries, which, although appearing in different journals, bear such a strong resemblance to one another that one is forced to credit a common source, and that an official one. What is singular is,

considering the way the Paris press is quoted abroad, that it is apparently worth no one's while to expose these falsities. In London, if a libel concerning Hungary, Lithuania, or the Hedjaz appears in any reputable newspaper, the ink is hardly dry before someone conversant, generally at first-hand, with the facts, sends a letter to the paper denouncing the libel, and the letter is printed. Or if the importance of the subject warrant, the editor despatches a representative to interview one, two or half a dozen experts and the matter is threshed out promptly. Now, in such a case, the attitude of the Paris editor would be something like this:

"We printed the statement because it was interesting, made agreeable reading and accorded with our notions. It is no part of my business to stultify my own journal and in point of fact, my dear sir, our readers are theorists, logicians, and doctrinaires, when they are not devoted to belles-lettres, and do not care an aluminium sou whether the Imamate of Yemen is governed by an Imam or a Grand Duke, or that our article on 'Ohio Bigotry' was invalidated by the fact of Dayton's being in Tennessee. Whether General Garfield was assassinated in 1881 by a Frenchman, Jules Guiteau (as you state) or by a German named Zollgoth (as we stated), is void of practical importance, having served its turn and been already forgotten. Even our declaration that the State of Bavaria has, up to date, not paid a single mark on account of reparations, when as appears from the official figures, she has paid fifty million marks, was merely a rhetorical figure to express our contention that the total receipts from the Reich were inadequate."

A Paris journalist of opinion is, you perceive, no Gradgrind!

"A journalist," once more observes M. Lauzanne, "ceases to make journalism when he begins to make diplomacy." But the trouble is that the French journalist of every grade is nearly always making diplomacy. Propaganda seems to be the very gospel of his trade. Whatever the extent of his real knowledge on any subject he is forever concealing, restraining or manipulating it in order to serve some special interest, and above all, the special interest of his own country. It is this trait which not only makes it difficult for a foreigner to get at the truth of any domestic situation, especially if it has any bearing on external relations, but equally difficult for a Frenchman if he were obliged to rely upon the printed information vouchsafed him by his own newspaper. The bias of the Paris press, with a single exception, is so intensely national that their every comment is implicit with flattery of the *amour propre* of the nation, by an almost Thibetan instinct to throw dust in the eyes of the foreigner. Such intensity of patriotism, very admirable in the citizen, more properly belongs to the diplomat than to the journalist, at least in times of peace. The wholesale organised suppressions and secrecies of the classic Dreyfus case were ap-

parently forgotten long before the war. Other nations allow the free air to circulate even in international controversies: a wholesome sense of proportion is maintained. Eminent British and American journalists have occasionally been moved to utter things about national shortcomings and errors of policy and conduct, which, so far from involving them in ostracism have earned them increased respect. It is unhappily otherwise in France; the example of courage and real patriotism shown by M. Cornély and Anatole France in *Le Figaro* at the time of the Dreyfus affair was all but unprecedented. A quarter of a century has passed, and if one wishes to find a parallel to the outspokenness of those journalists one can only, very reluctantly, point to MM. Marcel Cachin and Doriot of *l'Humanité*.

It is in vain that the much-travelled and now converted M. Lauzanne exhorts his colleagues of the Paris press to remember that they should always be journalists—to see the truth steadily, see it whole.

"Do not forget that you cease to be a journalist when you make propaganda, even the most useful and noble of propaganda, the propaganda for your country. You cease, in fact, to make the photograph in order to make the pose. You cease to listen in order to speak. You cease to be marble in order to play with fire."

M. Lauzanne furnishes us out of his own personal history with a striking illustration of this ruling passion in the Paris journalist. In 1919 he was sent to interview Lord (Robert) Cecil on the subject of the new League of Nations. At the outset Lord Robert asked him how the French viewed the project.

The ordinary rules governing the interview constrained me to listen in silence while Lord Robert Cecil developed his thought. But I had, during two years and a half, been taking a bath of Anglo-Saxon ideology which had rather enervated my Gallic logic. A reaction of my good sense impelled me irresistibly to get up and shake myself, to let myself go. I, therefore, arose, seized Lord Robert's ideal by the throat and proceeded to maltreat it fiercely. I asked him, with misplaced irony, where were the moral forces which he had declared were "superior to physical force," when, in 1914, the German hordes were stamping through Belgium and France? What was his "world-conscience" then doing? And if, in 1918, there had not been the physical force of big guns fabricated wholesale by England and France, if two millions of American boys had not hurried over with the most formidable material of war ever seen, would not Belgium have been suppressed and England subjugated?

"Your English policemen," I concluded, "pass for the best in Europe, but permit me to observe that in order to repress misdeeds in the street they have something more than their moral force; they have their herculean bodies, about which there is generally concealed a revolver of the latest model."

If one reads this whole passage carefully, one begins to perceive the true mentality of the Paris journalist and the Paris press and its special outlook upon war, peace and the League of Nations. I do not think that to-day M. Lauzanne is really repentant. It would be quite useless to tell him that the conscience of the world *did* arise in its might in 1914; that it was that and not love of France which brought the British Empire and America into the war; that to-day the conscience of the world is more active and potent than ever and can exact penalties which the most ignorant and brutal aggressor will hesitate to face in future; useless even to remind him that the London policeman, frequently no giant and unarmed, does manage to preserve law and order simply by moral force. Lord Robert saw the futility of further argument with the Paris journalist. "I thank you for communicating your views," he remarked with irony, and rising courteously dismissed his visitor. And M. Lauzanne records this.

At the last session at Geneva of the League of Nations *Le Matin* was represented by M. Jules Sauerwein, than whom perhaps no writer on the Paris press enjoys a higher reputation for knowledge of foreign affairs. The French people have now become reconciled to the League of Nations (a reconciliation to which, however, the press has only slightly contributed) but the defeat of the Protocol seems inexplicable. Yet M. Sauerwein, being particularly well-informed, knows why the Protocol was unacceptable to us; he is also perfectly well aware that the British delegation from the beginning entered heart and soul into the adjustment of foreign differences though at the occasional sacrifice of its own interests. He could hardly have doubted the probity of Messrs. Chamberlain and Amery and the rest of the delegation, to whose earnest endeavours the leading French statesmen have paid tribute. Yet M. Sauerwein can report thus to his paper:

The British delegation acts, in every circumstance, as if it had received the general instruction: Weaken by every means the League of Nations, at the same time using it adroitly for the defence of British policy in Mosul and elsewhere.

Not content with having demolished the Protocol, England put an obstacle in the way of everything which can give the League efficacy or prestige. France, loyal to its line of conduct, preparing for disarmament while negotiating for security. . . . etc., etc.

It is amazing to what lengths self-deception and rhetoric can carry the ablest of French journalists! While the Caillaux debt negotiations were pending in Washington some thoughtless publicist or other said (perhaps not unpardonably), "Don't let us talk about the war. Let us talk business." The Paris press became at once very scathing lately towards these "Yankee salt-pork mer-

chants" whom they had so exalted eight years before. Even the *sauve* M. Léon Bailby, editor of *l'Intransigeant*, joined in the chorus:

To have supported the heaviest burden of the war, without which American commerce and the American fleet would to-day be at the mercy of Germany—that is nothing. To evoke our 1,500,000 dead is, to the American business man, bad taste. Dead men are not worth reckoning. They are not like the stocks that we must to-day pay in dollars four times their original price.

The famous Dawes plan! Dawes and Co., bankers, of Chicago—a city half-German. Come, let us talk of dollars! Let us have no further talk of a common cause, a common ideal, defended by men having at heart the same holy enthusiasm, . . . etc., etc.

Does this fustian carry any weight in France? Perhaps not; but it fans the flame of agreeable excitement which most Frenchmen like to find burning in their favourite newspaper. It has become a convention to have their pulses stirred and their resentments aroused. At bottom and in their sober moments I think they envisage international facts clearly enough—as clearly, indeed, as we do. Every Frenchman knows that if his Government is poor, France is rich. He knows that every industry in the country is sailing on a high tide of prosperity, that not only every Frenchman, but 2,000,000 foreigners, are employed at good wages to fulfil the orders that are coming in from all over the globe. But you would hardly gather this state of affairs from the Paris press.

Similarly, every Frenchman knows of the large fortunes made by contractors in the devastated regions. In fact, in the regions themselves one hears of little else. But do not expect to find in *Le Temps*, *Figaro*, *Le Matin*, or *l'Intransigeant* any allusion to the scandalous profits out of the sums allocated by Government for restoration. The other day the conspiracy of silence was rudely broken. M. Painlevé, the Premier, in a lengthy speech delivered in the South, declared that his Government was on the track of these shameless profiteers of the devastated regions. The whole Paris press was shocked. Not a newspaper (save, of course, the unspeakable *Humanité*) had ever mentioned such a scandal.

"Has M. Painlevé reflected?" asked *Le Temps*, "on the calumnies that this unlucky speech can produce in Germany, so prompt and so able to exploit our least imprudences? How could the orator appropriate these legends which have been created about the reparation of the ruins caused by the enemy invasion?"

The prosperity and, indeed, the rapacity of the French peasant and the connection of that class with the present cost of living in France is another *sécret de Polchinnelle*. The comparative failure of the recent domestic loan was due to the refusal of the *paysan*, in spite of all the appeals to his patriotism, to support it. But

not a word of this in the Paris press, from which you inferred from the reports of enthusiastic provincial meetings that the honest farmers were coming forward nobly with their savings. At last the patience of *Le Figaro*, which in the past has honourably distinguished itself by bursts of candour, became exhausted. It came out with a really terrible article from the pen of M. Gheusi, entitled "Gobseck aux Champs." Gobseck, it may be recalled, was a character in Balzac, a skinflint, an usurer, impervious to patriotism, shrewd and hard as nails. One recognised the type at once in the provincial profiteer who is only thinking of his corn, his swine, his oxen, and the prices he can extort from the townsman. It was a bitter article; it drew blood. The whole countryside was seized with resentment. Protests poured into the *Figaro* office; but one from the Marquis de Vogüé, who is president of the Société des Agriculteurs de France, and therefore official spokesman of the farmers, settled the matter. M. Gheusi was promptly thrown over by the owner of the paper, M. Coty; and two columns of retractation appeared in the front page, headed, "The Peasants of France should not be confounded with the Speculators."

Our collaborator and friend, M. Gheusi, published last Thursday in his journal, on his own initiative and on his own responsibility, an article entitled "Gobseck of the Fields," of which, the least we can say is that it represents only the views of its author, so much are the assertions contained in his diatribe against our peasants in obvious opposition to the *Figaro's* doctrine of social conservatism and economic defence.

For days all Paris was laughing; but the laughter of all prudent Frenchmen was in their sleeve and no echo was to be found in the Paris press.

In the recent bank strike, again, the sympathy of the public was from first to last with the strikers; but if any looked for any reflection of that sympathy in the press, any exposition of the justice of their demands owing to the prosperity of the banks and the great increase of dividends, they must have been imperfectly informed as to the financial independence of the newspapers of Paris. It is not necessary to press here any charges of venality against these newspapers, which were sufficiently pressed at the time of the *Matin* and *Journal* revelations, or even to mention it save as one source of their loss of prestige and influence. I have been informed that there is not a single Paris journal which is a paying property in the strict economic sense, and it is fair to infer that their staffs and news organisation must suffer in consequence. Indeed, the wretched pay of the Paris journalist is a standing temptation to venality, which he is not always able to resist.

Nevertheless, the Paris press continues to command the pens of many talented and forceful writers who accomplish much good and afford literary entertainment of a high order. Others are, however, rather essayists and polemicists than men with a wide outlook and a practical knowledge of affairs. Their provincialism—one dislikes to use the word, perhaps "narrow nationalism"—would be better—is at times exasperatingly on a par with that of the late Honourable Jefferson Brick, and the creed of the young gentleman who writes under the pseudonym of "Pertinax" daily proclaims itself.

The grace, the beauty, the virtues, the genius, the incomparable past of France, give umbrage to the Anglo-Saxons. Their greatest concern, since the Armistice, has been to prevent France from profiting by the greatness of her victory.

The views of such writers on cardinal themes—such as international relations—remain as unilateral and perverse, though less violent, as in the worst days of Rochefort and Drumont, and I find a general reluctance throughout France to consider them representative of French public opinion. That opinion is better reflected in the speeches of the more liberal French statesmen, publicists, and men of affairs; and even in recent French books and popular novels. The truth is, the Paris press needs more light and more air and breadth of view; and these it is now getting through the influence of the cinema, the increased circulation in Paris of foreign newspapers, and the establishment of the new journals of information, which, in the main, are content to give the news and let readers ponder quietly for themselves.

BECKLES WILLSON.

TURKEY UNDER THE NATIONALISTS.

TO a student who sympathised with many of the earlier claims made by the Nationalists, and to a man who has known Turkey from before the re-establishment of the Constitution in 1908, that country, which I re-visited in May and June last, provided contrasts and surprises which might not have been noticeable to the traveller who saw it for the first time. In some ways the situation is worse and in others it is better than one would have anticipated. There is no democracy or freedom, there is a centralisation which surpasses that which existed at the worst period of Abdul Hamid's reign, and Nationalism is more pronounced than ever before. On the other hand, the Government has a precise programme, which it is trying to carry out, and certain definite endeavours are being made to increase the prosperity of the people and particularly of those who go to make up the agricultural population.

In order to take an impartial view of the Turkish situation, which became entirely new after the Nationalist victory, it is necessary to remember three distinct developments or conditions. The Greek occupation of Smyrna in 1919 and the Treaty of Sèvres, signed in 1920, indicated the conditions which the Western Powers endeavoured to impose. On the other hand, the National Pact, framed by the Ottoman Parliament in January of the latter year, declared the terms upon which Mustapha Kemal Pasha and his colleagues were prepared to make peace. In 1923, when the Nationalists had defeated the Hellenic army and when the world was in urgent need of peace, the Treaty of Lausanne practically realised the programme of the Pact and gave to Turkey even more than she herself can have anticipated. These developments are largely responsible for the extreme Nationalism which now exists, for the overbearing attitude assumed by the Angora Government, and for the coldness, and, in some cases, the disdain, with which a visitor is treated. And then, whereas Turkey is now supposed to have an area of just under 500,000 square miles, which makes her more than twice the size of France, and a probable population of from 8,000,000 to 9,000,000 souls, the great importance of the post-war geographical change, of the policy of the expulsion of the Christians, and of the exchange of populations, is that at most 2,000,000 of the inhabitants are non-Turks* and that, therefore, for the first time in modern history, the ruling Turkish race is in an overwhelming majority in the entire country. Lastly, whilst this must be classed in a slightly different category, the new position of the foreigner, and especially of the foreign resident, has its influence, for, dispossessed of former privileges and not

* The largest part of this minority is Kurdish.

nearly so prosperous as in the past, his opinions must be accepted with reserve by those who desire to secure a correct and impartial impression of the situation as it exists to-day.

Bearing these factors in mind we come first to the conditions prevailing in Smyrna and Constantinople. Smyrna, which used to boast of about 250,000 inhabitants, and so much of which was burned in 1922, now has a population of only about 150,000 souls, and nothing whatever has been done in the way of permanent rebuilding. There are wonderful plans for the creation of a model city, with wide boulevards and fine public offices, but the scheme is altogether too extravagant. On the other hand, a considerable amount of business is still being done. The future of the city, therefore, depends largely upon whether the Government adopts a more modest programme before it is too late and upon the now increasing competition of the former Anatolian fruit-growers and carpet-makers, who have carried their skill but not their raw materials to their new Greek homes. With regard to Constantinople, the position is worse than that of Vienna, since in addition to its loss of commercial importance the removal of the capital to Angora has robbed it of its political supremacy. The population has declined from about 1,200,000 to about 800,000 inhabitants, the streets are much less frequented than in former days, and the city is suffering from the exit of capital from the country and from the departure of many of its better class residents. The port seems almost empty, and whereas shipping through the Straits has naturally declined owing to the present situation in Russia, the Turks have created difficulties for transit trade and they have abolished the bonded warehouses, established during the international occupation with the object of enabling goods to be stored free of duty until they were required for local use or for re-exportation to some neighbouring country.

In spite of these commercial disadvantages and of the future danger that the loss of Constantinople to some foreign Power is more likely now it is a provincial town and not the seat of Government, there is no doubt that, at any rate so long as the present political leaders hold the reins of Government, Angora will remain the capital. The Ghazi Mustapha Kemal Pasha and his chief lieutenant, Ismet Pasha, are reported to have a personal dislike of Constantinople, Angora is correctly held to be more easily defensible, and the Nationalists argue that the Government should be in direct touch with its own people rather than with the outer world. But the real reasons for the popularity of Angora are that the Government realises its inability to deal with the problems and difficulties which always exist and which may at any time increase at Constantinople, that it would be impossible for the

Ministers and officials to inhabit the shores of the Bosphorus without becoming influenced and tainted by people and conditions strongly opposed to the prolongation of the present régime, and that, once the administration were within easy and direct touch with European views, the policy and the doings of the Nationalists would be much more open to fair and unfair criticism than they are at the present time. From the international standpoint the position of the capital, which is entirely a matter for the Turks to decide, creates complications, since it is necessary for the foreign diplomatists to be in personal communication with the President and his Government. The Turks *profess* an entire indifference as to the whereabouts and domiciles of these representatives, but they have appointed an agent at Constantinople who, whilst he possesses no real authority, acts as a sort of link between the diplomatic world and the Foreign Office. The Powers, on their parts, have adopted slightly different attitudes, for while the headquarters of some of the foreign missions are in Angora, certain of the diplomatic representatives divide their time between that city and Constantinople, and others definitely reside in Pera, paying only occasional visits to the new capital. Each of these courses has its detriments, but once it was decided to appoint Ambassadors, instead of more junior diplomatists, who might have been expected to live in Angora, probably the best method is that pursued by the United States, and perhaps shortly to be followed by this country. It takes the form of the nomination of two senior Secretaries of Embassy, who do a month on and a month off duty at Angora, of the acquisition of a small house (for which land has been offered to us by the Government and which is essential in such a place) and of intermittent though pretty frequent visits by the American High Commissioner.

Unpleasant as is the experience, if one desires to understand the present political situation and to visualise the atmosphere in which the affairs of the State are conducted, it is necessary to spend twenty-five hours in covering the 350 miles which separate Angora from Constantinople. Nevertheless, sitting in an ever-stopping train and traversing the miles and miles of uninteresting, sparsely populated and semi-cultivated country, by which the new capital is surrounded, seems to enable one to picture and to understand the aloofness, the Nationalism and, in many ways, the patriotism, which emanate from Angora to-day. That place, which now has a population of at least 50,000 souls, is situated at an elevation of over 3,000 feet above the sea, it has a climate which is subject to extremes, and it is a hotbed of malaria. Constructed largely on the sides of a hill, the city is for the most part made up of native houses, among which are now dotted a few painfully

modern edifices, such as the Chamber of Deputies, the headquarters of the People's Party, which is now in power, and a half-finished building which is to be used as a governmental hotel. Accommodation stands at a premium and the place is greatly overcrowded, but practically no private building is in progress—a factor which seems to indicate either that the Government is anxious to keep the place in its own hands or that a lack of confidence in the future militates against individual enterprise. The hotels are beyond description, but the place is full of activity, and business is brisk.

The political and economic situation must be considered from the standpoints of the system and methods employed and upon the basis of the work which has, or has not, been accomplished. From January, 1921, until April, 1924, the Grand National Assembly was the only recognised representative of the sovereignty which belonged to the people, but in the last-mentioned month a Republic was established under the Presidency of the Ghazi Mustapha Kemal Pasha, who in a sense then took back some of the powers previously vested in the Chamber. At the present time, therefore, Turkey is nominally a thoroughly constitutional republic, provided with Ministers appointed by the President and with a Chamber elected by the people. In practice, however, the position is quite different for, whereas the Ghazi takes no part in Parliamentary debates, he is still the Chief of the People's Party, at the meetings of which he presides, and he is a veritable dictator whose wish and word are law throughout the country. Elections are held, but candidates are generally imposed upon their constituencies, and as laws are decided upon by the Party in power during its constant reunions, they actually come before Parliament for ratification rather than for discussion. Cabinets fall and Ministers go, not because they are outvoted, but at the wish of Mustapha Kemal Pasha, who rules with an iron hand. For example, whilst in the autumn of 1924 the Government of Ismet Pasha was replaced by that of Fethi Bey because the President thought it was time to try, or to pretend to try, a more moderate policy, last spring Ismet Pasha once more came into office because his predecessor was held to have been too lenient in his attitude towards the Kurdish Revolt, which was suppressed with great severity. When a crisis arises, or when the opposition shows signs of causing trouble or of gaining strength, legislation is framed which paralyses the efforts of the enemies of the Government. Thus in March a law for the maintenance of good order was passed and two so-called tribunals of independence were established. The excuse for this measure was the Kurdish Revolution, but its results have been the trials, and in some cases the conviction, of men such

as Hushein Djahid Bey, who is certainly a patriot, and the establishment of a state of terror which puts an end to serious criticism and which prevents the leaders of the opposition from receiving visitors, still less from expressing their views to any except their most intimate and reliable friends.

The atmosphere is interesting but contradictory. The extreme centralisation prevents anything of importance outside the capital from being done without the consent of Angora, and very little is initiated there until the approval of the Ghazi has been obtained. The President, the Ministers and the Deputies, especially the first-mentioned, have good salaries, but the local functionaries, including the Governors of Provinces, who used to be important people, possess little power and they are inadequately paid. All the officials, including the Ministers, are working hard and keeping long hours, and it is nothing uncommon for a Cabinet Council to last for many hours or for a Minister to remain in his office till 8 p.m. Everything which is foreign stands at a discount, the Government and its representatives are distinctly provincial and ignorant in regard to international affairs, and the importance of Turkey is enormously exaggerated in their minds. But with the exception of the Mosul Question, I did not find any desire for conquest or aggrandisement, and the Nationalists seem to be content with their present frontiers and to wish to live at peace with the world in general.

The Russian representative is an important personage, and the official relations between Angora and Moscow are correct if not cordial, because Turkey still has few real friends and fears her north-eastern neighbour. Germany is working hard from the economic standpoint, and she is still respected in the Turkish army. Whilst the supposed imperialism of Italy is suspected, there are outstanding financial problems with France, and the latter country certainly does not receive the gratitude to which she is entitled in view of her policy prior to the conclusion of the Treaty of Lausanne. The position of America, who has not ratified the new treaty of friendship and commerce, depends largely upon the attitude of the Nationalists towards education and towards all foreign institutions. Lastly, with regard to the British Empire, there was no doubt, even so long ago as June, that the Turks were determined to make a struggle for Mosul, and that if the decision of the League should go against them, they would employ any subterfuge as a justification for its non-acceptance. This attitude depends partly upon a self-created *amour propre* and partly upon political conditions. Thus the Nationalists regard the control of the whole of the Turks and Kurds in this area as essential, because they desire to avoid the danger of raids from

across the Irak frontier, because they fear the development of a sympathy for the Kurds of Turkey in Mesopotamia, and because they are anxious to avoid the creation of a situation corresponding to that which existed in Ottoman Macedonia before the outbreak of the first Balkan War.

From the internal standpoint, the Government is Nationalistic and anti-clerical to the extreme. Its Nationalism takes the form of attempts to get rid of all foreign influences, to hamper the work of foreigners in Turkey, and to prevent the importation of foreign goods even where these are practically necessary to the welfare of the people. Money is urgently required for the conduct of the State, but no attempts are made to attract foreign capital, because the Nationalists fear the conditions to be imposed and because they boast that sooner or later loans will be easy of acquisition. Every sort of difficulty is placed in the way of foreigners who have always done, and who desire to do, business in the country; all sorts of measures are taken to pry into such business, and during the summer a regulation was introduced under which all business men are compelled to become members of the Turkish Chamber of Commerce, the real, though not the avowed, objects of this measure being to enable the authorities to secure more control and to amass funds of which they are in such need. And, lastly, whereas Turkey is not in a position to manufacture many of the things of which she is in need, and whereas she may not openly raise her import duties for five years from the time of the signature of the Treaty of Lausanne, regulations are introduced which practically prevent the importation of such necessities as patent medicines, and which increase the prices of other things to an extent which seems distinctly contrary to the interests of the majority of the people. Anti-clericalism is applied not only to Turkish but to foreign institutions, and this policy is offensive rather than defensive in its nature, since, generally speaking, religious instruction in schools is not merely non-compulsory but forbidden. In addition to the abolition of the Caliphate, to the suppression of the Sheik-ul-Islam, and to the closing of many of the religious institutions, the religious Courts have been done away with and their work is now carried on by the ordinary tribunals. For the moment the Religious Law exists, but a scheme has been framed for its replacement by a modern civil code which will govern even such questions as marriage, divorce and inheritance, which have always been sacred in Turkey.

The above remarks, taken by themselves, would suggest a completely unsatisfactory state of things. But the methods of the East must not be judged by the standards of the West, and if one overlooks the system and ignores the facts that spying is preva-

lent, that corruption is common, at any rate among the minor functionaries, and that the majority of the Christians have been murdered or driven out of the country, then the Government deserves praise for its efforts in several directions. From every standpoint the army is a first care, but great attention is being devoted to the requirements of the peasant. Seeds, to be paid for after the harvest, are distributed, and the tithe has been abolished, and, in its place, there are an increased land tax and a duty upon products not used in the district of their cultivation. This, I believe, means a heavy loss to the exchequer, and it may increase the cost of living in the towns, but it relieves the farmer of taxation upon things for his own consumption and for local sale. And then, with the Ghazi himself an ardent farmer, an agricultural bank has been founded, great encouragement is given to the importation of machinery, and motor cultivation is the order of the day. Indeed, the enormous development which is taking place is proved not only by the number of tractors seen in the fields but by the fact that, whereas in 1923 only about 100 American machines were sold, during the present year at least five times that number will be imported by way of the port of Mersina alone.

For the sake of brevity commerce and public works may be discussed together. Ali Djenani Bey, the Minister of Commerce, recognises the necessity of capital, and a special bank has been established for the purposes of developing various industries. The Government is stimulating the production of cotton, and arrangements have been made for its grading before being placed on the foreign market. And then, in addition to the appointment of commercial attachés in several European cities and in New York, a special exhibition ship is to leave Turkey next April carrying various Turkish products, including minerals, fruit, and tobacco to be displayed at its various ports of call. Schemes are under discussion for the construction of ports at Mersina, Heraclea and Samsun, and for the irrigation of certain areas, which would subsequently be sold, and measures are being taken for the betterment of the railways and roads. The line from Haidar Pasha to Angora, which suffered severely during the Turco-Greek conflict, is in course of improvement, it is being prolonged from Angora to Sivas and Samsun, and a narrow gauge railway is being built to connect the Baghdad system with Diarbekr and Arghan, where there are valuable copper mines. Existing routes are being repaired rather than new ones constructed, and these are to form feeders to, instead of competitors with, the railways. In short, even if some of the schemes, such as those for the provision of the above mentioned ports, are premature and extravagant, the Nationalists are actually providing the people with certain benefits.

In a country where it would take years to bring public instruction into line with that of Western Europe, the requirements of education are a controversial matter. But Hamdullah Subhi Bey, the Minister responsible, who is perhaps the most thoughtful and up-to-date man in the Cabinet, recognises the necessities and difficulties of the position, and, on the whole, I think he is taking efficient measures to overcome them. There is a shortage of teachers and of scholastic accommodation, but normal schools for the preparation of instructors have been or are going to be opened in the large towns, technical teaching in agriculture and other things is to be introduced, and primary education for both boys and girls is to be carried to a point heretofore unthought of. But whilst Nationalism and anti-clericalism have certain excuses in present-day Turkey, the leaders of the Government should realise that the country has derived widespread advantages from the education given by countless foreign institutions, and that gratitude and latitude should be shown to those organisations. Thus even if it be legitimate to supervise the systems employed and to prevent the enforcement of religious teaching, especially for Moslems, annoyance and disadvantage can alone result from the imposition of Turkish professors, who often do not know their work, from interference with the everyday activities of such places as the Robert College and from the attitude assumed towards certain Roman Catholic establishments.

The budget may not bear detailed examination, the health of the nation requires more attention and the methods of the Nationalists leave a great deal to be desired. Nevertheless, if we remember that the present Government is a progeny of the Turco-Greek war and that it was and is essentially military in its nature, then it is clear that, as the original movement saved the country, so has its offspring done good work. Now that the revolutionary task is accomplished it might be better to introduce more democratic and everyday conditions. Public security, however, practically prevails, the country has been pulled together, and the Turks are showing themselves able to exist without their former Christian co-nationals. The political structure depends largely upon the personality, the reputation and the life of the Ghazi-President; disaster might follow any international entanglement or adventure and unforeseen complications may occur. But with the continued support of the army, the actual impotence of the opposition and an increased prosperity, there is nothing to hinder the prolongation of the present régime. Determination and force are respected in the East. Liberalism and fairness are often misunderstood.

H. CHARLES WOODS.

THE COMBATIVE INSTINCT AND THE ABOLITION OF WAR.

IN any discussion on the possibility of abolishing war two statements are almost sure to be made. Someone will contend that the combative instinct in man makes war an inevitable feature of human life, and someone else will reply that this is not so, because the combative instinct can find sufficient outlet in games and other more or less peaceful activities. Both statements make the now popular appeal to psychology, and both appeals are to a psychology that is rather popular than exact.

Certain loose and current notions about instincts in general are here inaccurately applied to the combative instinct. Many of the generalisations of popular psychology are based on an examination of one or two instincts only, and it by no means follows, as is so often taken for granted, that what is true of one or two instincts is true of all. It seems to be assumed that an instinct is a constant or regularly recurring and not entirely repressible craving for satisfaction of a certain sort, or rather, that it is a constantly active process that keeps accumulating energy which must every now and then be discharged in a certain specific activity. To this the advocate of games as a surrogate for war adds the theory of the psychoanalyst that instincts can be diverted from their natural outlet and "sublimated" into other activities.

Now there are some instincts of which one or both of these assumptions are approximately true. Hunger recurs and with cumulative insistence presses through various instinctive activities to periodic satisfaction. The need for sleep recurs with like insistence. The sex instinct in a somewhat similar way makes itself felt by an urge for expression either directly or by "sublimation." But with the theory of sublimation we need to be cautious. There are no doubt certain facts that seem to support it. Before psychoanalysis was a name to conjure with, Tennyson had written of a girl whose love

" Being rudely blunted, glanced and shot
Only to holy things."

But it is probable that what is attributed to "sublimation" is often better accounted for otherwise. For although some of the specific instincts seem to have a certain amount of peculiar and inalienable energy attached to them, there is also a great amount of general and undistributed psychic energy. And in many so-called cases of sublimation the truth of the matter may well be, not that a specific instinct, finding its proper door locked, seeks another outlet, but rather that the general energy of the person, blocked along the line of one instinct, flows the more strongly

towards activities connected with other instincts. If a man, failing to beat his enemy, runs away, we are not entitled to regard his flight as the sublimation of his combative instinct. We cannot even bring both under the instinct of self-preservation, for the combative instinct is, in its pure state, reckless of risk.

Moreover, we must note that, though some very important instincts are of this more or less constant or recurrent type, pressing with cumulative force for satisfaction, it is by no means so with all of them. These qualities belong particularly to the instincts that serve the normally constant or recurrent needs of life. Such instincts do not need any external circumstance to set them going, but rather take the initiative in seeking the occasion for their satisfaction. But there are instincts of quite another type, the activity of which depends upon the presence of some object not necessary for life's maintenance or welfare. This activity is necessary or beneficial only when their owner happens to be in the proximity of certain objects, and only then is the characteristic urge to activity set going. Most obvious of such instincts are fear and combativeness. Both of these are instinctive reactions to certain objects that are not always present, and in the absence of which it is no advantage for the respective instinct to be active. It would clearly be a disadvantage to any species of animal if, apart from the presence of an enemy, they were continually or periodically urged to fight or fly. On the other hand, it is essential that, if food or a mate do not happen to be present, they must be sought, and they will be sought with increasing eagerness till found. To argue from the one sort of instinct to the other is an absurdity that needs only a slight change to be visible. For to speak of the combative instinct as one that demands periodic activity in war is as absurd as to say that, because man has the instinct of fear, you must every now and then scare him into flight.

This conclusion is supported by observable fact. If an animal with strong combative instinct is kept for a long while without occasion for fighting, it is not found, when these conditions are removed, that he is full of bottled-up combativeness and explosively ready to fight at the slightest provocation. Rather, the reverse is the case. The more often a dog fights the more readily his combative instinct will come into play: keep him from the occasion, and the instinct will become less sensitive.

W. H. Hudson (*The Book of a Naturalist*, p. 206) records a striking instance of this. He was in London when, after having been in force for two-and-a-half years, the muzzling order was revoked. He expected that "all canines of a lofty spirit would go forth again like the Zulu warrior to wash his long-unused

weapons in an adversary's blood." But, as he confesses, he was wrong :

"Days followed and nothing happened. . . . Then, when nearly a week had elapsed, I witnessed a fine old-fashioned dog fight. . . . Other days and weeks followed and I witnessed no serious quarrel, and later it was so rare to see a dog-fight in the streets and parks, fights which one used to witness every day, that I began to think the new pacific habit had got a tighter grip on the animal than I could have believed. It would, I thought, perhaps take them two or three months to outgrow it and go back to their true natures. I was wrong again: not months only but years have gone by—fourteen to fifteen years—[he wrote in 1919] and the beneficent change which had been wrought in those thirty months of restraint has continued to the present time."

It would seem, therefore, that it is not the existence of the combative instinct in man that makes war inevitable but rather the possibility of war that keeps the instinct alive.

These considerations also suggest that it is inexact to speak of games as affording an outlet for the combative instinct. It would be truer to say that they are a discipline for its repression. The specific emotion of the combative instinct is rage: its specific aim is to destroy or incapacitate the opponent. From which it follows that whenever an outburst of the combative instinct occurs in any game, there is unsportsmanlike conduct. On such occasions tempers are lost, play becomes dirty, the referee is roughly handled, opponents are purposely injured, the unpopular side if it wins is likely to be mobbed. The player who intends to play a clean game must rigidly suppress his combative instinct. There is no doubt that the ruling motive in games in which one team tries to beat another is not combativeness but the love of glory, which is a compound of the self-regarding and herd instincts, the love of glory itself being tempered in the individual by the discipline of having to make his personal glory subservient to that of the team. But the love of glory finds its end in seeking the admiration even of its opponents rather than their hatred and fear, which is what the combative instinct seeks.

The fallacy that war is a necessary outlet for pent combativeness has probably received some colour from the fact that games are often obviously an outlet for pent energy and that they so often involve a contest. But games are merely the ordered outlet of general energies for which the serious conditions of life do not provide sufficient activity. The whole constitution of man has been evolved for more activity of the muscles and emotions than conditions of modern adult life usually afford. For these unemployable energies sport supplies a harmless and healthy outlet. So also, with children, the suppression of bodily movement in

school demands compensation in games. But this superfluity of energy is normally accompanied by an emotional quality that is the very opposite of combative. The good health of which it is a sign is generally attended by good temper and is thus free from the irritability that denotes a high degree of combativeness. The man of abounding energy is less likely to be quarrelsome than one of less vitality. We may also note that the energy that finds outlet in games of contest finds it as easily in sports of other sorts, walking, climbing, swimming, and games and occupations that are rather hunts than combats.

It is, no doubt, true that war may in some respects afford an outlet for energies of body and mind which the conditions of modern life do not always give in time of peace. It gives conditions of bodily activity and adventure that are absent from many livelihoods. But the energy so released is of a general sort not specially attached to any one instinct, and seems in origin to have nothing to do with the combative instinct, while its normal emotional quality would make it tend rather to any other outlet than war.

The justice of this conclusion is seen when we consider that it is not the most energetic races that are most prone to fight either as individuals or as nations. Of course, we are here comparing, not efficiency in war, but readiness to fight without compelling occasion. A nation with superabundant energy will naturally have an advantage in war, but there is nothing to show that it is more prone to fight than others. Indeed, very many of the races that love fighting for its own sake are in other respects indolent and unenterprising. Love of arduous and dangerous travel is an indication of the sort of abounding energy that might be expected to seek outlet in war, but this spirit is not found most frequently in the most warlike races. Few have in this respect excelled the race which the greatest of modern warriors called a nation of shopkeepers. Nor is readiness for combat, personal or national, any index of abounding energy. The quickness of the Southern European to use the knife does not prove his superior vitality. Willingness to fight on due occasion is an evidence of courage, and courage is an evidence of vitality, but proneness to fight on small occasion is an evidence of undue irritability and, therefore, of lack rather than of abundance of energy.

In this connection we must be careful not to confuse combativeness with persistence in the face of obstacles. For the combative instinct has been glorified as that by dint of which a man overcomes difficulties. If this were true, no instinct would be more valuable. But it is certainly not true. Every instinct of any strength will persist in face of obstacles. Any one who has

watched ants at work dragging home food will know the power in this respect that is exercised by the instinct that drives them. And the distinctness of the combative instinct from such persistence is seen in the fact that in some insect communities the warriors and workers belong to two different classes. A confusion has arisen here because of the incurable poetry of human speech: we can hardly speak of an obstacle without personifying it into an enemy. But to think that, because a man speaks of an obstacle as an enemy, he is, therefore, moved by the combative instinct is as stupid as to conclude that when a man says he loves a good potato he is moved thereto by the sex instinct. In the struggle against obstacles we have no right to think that the combative instinct is active unless we can see its characteristics—anger and a tendency to destructive violence.

There is a peculiar feature of the combative instinct which indicates that those who are easily provoked to fight are rather deficient in energy than otherwise. For this instinct, having been evolved to deal with vital emergencies, has a peculiar power of calling up the reserves of energy. In anger we are abnormally strong. Anger is thus likely to be induced by opposition which the ordinary supply of energy is not enough to overcome. So that the appearance of anger upon slight cause is generally an evidence of low normal energy. An allied fact is the ease with which anger is roused in connection with any point on which a man secretly feels himself to be inferior.

It is very clear from all these considerations that there is nothing but loose thinking and neglect of fact behind the argument that war is inevitable because the combative instinct must have an outlet. The combative instinct is one which is not normally active unless provoked. On the other hand, though war may be in some respects an outlet for general human energies, it is by no means the only one, and it is one from which abundant and pent energy, being a symptom of health and, therefore, a natural concomitant of good temper, is naturally averse.

But the argument for the inevitability of war as the result of the combative instinct may take another form. It may be argued: "Granted that the combative instinct is not a constant or regularly recurrent urge and does not normally become active unless externally provoked, still it is impossible to avoid occasions that provoke it, and, therefore, useless to hope that it will be inoperative; and when it becomes operative under certain conditions war inevitably results." But while it is probably true that in human affairs it is unlikely that we shall ever be without occasions that provoke the combative instinct, it by no means follows that such stimulation must inevitably issue in war. It is a very

common experience that the energy mobilized by anger can be harmlessly and usefully spent without resort to destructive violence. The combative instinct shows itself to be one of the most amenable to control and one which, despite the occurrence of occasions which strongly provoke its characteristic emotion, may be regularly arrested before it proceeds to its characteristic activity. To this many facts testify.

In the first place we may note that, even in the act of war itself, the combative instinct must be held under firm restraint or there will be no clean fighting. No other instinct is so inhuman. When the passion of it moves men they delight to wound and mangle and kill. Atrocities are natural to it. In default of armed opponents, it will, when once thoroughly roused, vent itself upon the unarmed, upon women and children, and upon works of art. So that, unless a fighting force is to be disgraced by its conduct, there must be constant control of the combative instinct under conditions in which it is most powerfully stimulated.

And however advantageous a strong combative instinct may have been in the struggle for survival amongst the brutes, human history shows that victory is to the race that has its combativeness well in hand. A race that is courageous and successful in war is by no means necessarily possessed of a proportionately strong combative instinct. The races that love fighting for its own sake are seldom politically important. Even in actual warfare the most valuable courage is the cool sort that does not need the support of anger: the typically combative courage is that which often shows itself in a rashness that leads to defeat. Another important point is that unless the combative instinct is capable of severe restraint no nation can have the unity which is strength. A hyper-sensitive combativeness has been the weakness of Ireland. It is probable that with the Romans the combative instinct was either less developed or more amenable to inhibition than with the Greeks. It destroyed the latter by the quarrel of Greek with Greek. Its tameness amongst the Romans is observable in the earlier days of the Republic by the rareness with which their acute civil dissensions came to blows.

In this connection confusion of thought will be avoided if we are careful to distinguish a fighting tradition from a fighting instinct, for the two are by no means the same. A fighting tradition may be found in most races at almost all stages of their development. A State in an exposed position is especially likely to cherish it. It may be distinguished from the combative instinct by the narrower range of its incidence. The fighting tradition affects only the warriors or the warrior caste or class, whereas the combative instinct betrays its presence in the quarrels of all castes

and classes alike. Generally the fighting tradition is found in closer alliance with pride and love of glory than with sheer combativeness.

The distinction between the tradition and the instinct brings us to the consideration of the difference of sex in relation to war. For the fighting tradition has been confined to men in a way in which the combative instinct has not, with the result that in the case of women we see this instinct existing and frequently provoked but rarely allowed to find outlet in war. Women are quite as quarrelsome as men, and where convention permits, they fly to blows (or their equivalent) as readily as men. Or, if we go back to still more primitive levels, we find no essential difference in the animal world. There, if the instinct is more developed in one sex than the other, it is because the one is more exposed to occasions where it is necessary. It is never more alert and terrible than when a mother guards her young. And this instinct persists in the women of to-day. During the Great War there is little doubt that it was as powerfully stirred in the women of all belligerents as in the men. Yet in the case of women it is, as a rule, permanently made to stop short of its natural violence, at least so far as war is concerned. Nor is this regarded as a hardship or as an undesirable repression of nature.

Other evidence that the combative instinct can be restrained in spite of acute provocation is found in a phenomenon that has been misinterpreted to give colour to the notion that the combative instinct is a continual ferment in human nature which gradually increases in pressure until every now and then it blows the bung out in war. There are individuals who are subject to fits of irascibility which seems to accumulate with increased tension until it discharges itself explosively. But what happens here is that the man, generally through ill-health, is in an abnormal state of irritability: some incident rouses his anger, but his pride or some other motive baulks it; this anger is slow to cool and quick to find fresh fuel, and so continues at increasing pressure until he loses control of himself, or finds an occasion in which he feels free to let himself go. In these cases, really uncontrollable rage impinges upon insanity and is happily rare: but, even then, the earlier stages of the fit are instances of control in spite of intense stimulation, while in the case of the man who at a certain point lets himself go, control is lost by being voluntarily abandoned.

Probably the oldest occasion for the activity of the combative instinct is the fight of the males for possession of the females. It has persisted through millenniums until a recent period, the length of which is in comparison quite insignificant. The occasion still rouses the instinct. Rival suitors would generally like to punch

each other's head and sometimes do it. Yet, partly by change of taste and partly by law, civilisation has, on the whole, been quite successful in securing that when the combative instinct is roused on such occasions it shall stop short of violence. And the same may be said of all other quarrels between individuals.

Nor is there any reason to believe that this instinct is less amenable to such control in nations than in individuals. Rather there are considerations that indicate the opposite. When private quarrels lead to blows it is generally because they proceed to extremities too rapidly for deliberation. Separation of a few hours would bring anger to reason. In national disputes there is always more time and more incentive to think.

It must be remembered that war as an expression of corporate combativeness is a comparative newcomer in the world. It presupposes a degree of culture and social order that has not obtained for more than about six thousand years, while man has existed for a million years or so and his instincts go back to far earlier aeons. So that, as far as inheritance is concerned, the combative instinct will be far more obstinately attached to the private quarrel than to the national one. And if the violence to which it leads has been abolished in the case of individuals, there is no reason from this point of view why it should not be abolished also in national differences. The fact is that behind both ancient and modern wars there has generally been, not the spontaneous pressure of the nation's combative instinct, but the deliberate stimulation of it by governments.

It is, of course, necessary in this connection to take account of the suggestion that what we know of the psychology of crowds would lead us to expect that the instinctive activities of individuals will be more easily restrained than those of a nation. But facts go to show that the addition of the crowd element does not make the combative instinct uncontrollable, even under conditions most likely to intensify it. And it must be remembered that in the case of the nation this element is present only in an attenuated form. The very existence of ordered government in any community depends upon its power to suppress mob violence, and that power depends upon the rarity with which crowds attempt to use it. Nor is this because the combative instinct in crowds is seldom stimulated, for almost every political meeting is an instance to the contrary, but because it has been educated to stop short of violence and to obey control. The same is seen in the larger and more dispersed "crowds" such as rival classes and political parties. In these the combative instinct is kept in a constant state of stimulation, and yet it is very seldom that it does not stop short of its characteristic violence.

An examination of the facts involved thus goes to show that there is nothing in the combative instinct to justify the conclusion that it makes war inevitable. Indeed, this instinct has but a small part in the inception of modern wars, which spring rather from the lust for power combined with fear or from the economic urge for the necessities and luxuries of life. Now-a-days the rulers' ambition is seldom sufficient to actuate a warlike policy unless it is combined with the people's fear of foreign aggression. It seems, for instance, to have been fear of Russia that moved the peaceful elements in the German people to support a militarist policy. Fear of aggression is the aggressor's best ally, and, like the combative instinct, is itself rather the result than the cause of the possibility of war. It would cease to operate with any effective scheme of disarmament. So that we have to reckon only with the economic urge. Here two considerations may be noted. The economic differences of States are not greater than those of classes within the State, and since it has been possible to settle the latter without violence, it should be so also with the former. And it is becoming more and more apparent that international war is economically as disastrous as civil war for all parties concerned.

We are thus compelled to the conclusion that we cannot blame our instincts for a continuance of war. If war persists it will not be because human instinct cannot be brought under control, but because human intelligence too readily makes itself the exclusive servant of the self-regarding instincts.

A. T. CADOUX.

CANADA AND BRITISH IMMIGRATION.

ULTIMATELY, most questions—political, social, economic—reduce themselves to the fundamental problem of population. Here, in England, we are a little oppressed by our quantity, a little perturbed about our quality. The teaching of the eugenists is beginning to make a slight impression. We wonder how far it is possible for a nation, by taking thought, to provide for the next generation the right kind of parents, and we are gloomily aware that not much thought has as yet been bestowed upon the matter. We are told that we are increasing from our lowest stocks, that the higher are ceasing to reproduce themselves, and again we wonder. Meanwhile, we continue to increase, and since the war we have not been able to find employment for our growing numbers, which means that those of us who earn must work not only for ourselves and our own children or aged parents, not only for the invalids and old people who cannot work, but also for a large number of able-bodied persons to whom circumstances have denied the opportunity of providing for themselves and their belongings. Neither the unemployed, nor the disabled, nor their dependents, can be left to starve. So the rest of the community must perforce do a great deal more for a much smaller return.

The population question in the New World is different in kind. There, the problem is who will fill up the empty spaces, and what sort of civilisation will obtain in those new lands, peopled by so many different races. We are a fairly mixed people ourselves, with our Saxon and Celt and pre-Celt and Norseman, our streams of refugees, Huguenot, Dutch, and others, and we can perhaps look with comparative equanimity upon the influx into Canada of the Central and Eastern Europeans, and the Russian Jews. But it is an interesting problem.

Canada needs population. No one can travel across her enormous spaces without feeling that. Until she fills up how can she resist the pull of her great and populous neighbour? If she had a larger agricultural population she could still further develop her industries, and thus again increase her numbers. She needs markets, if she is to grow industrially, and the market at her door is partly closed by its tremendous tariff wall. Her enormous distances and the resulting freight charges again mean that she needs more population, more people to consume her own productions. She has a wonderfully sunny and stimulating, if somewhat severe climate, and she needs more people. Because she has so few, she cannot keep those she has. Canadians constantly tell one with pride of their eminent countrymen who are leading the American worlds of thought and of finance. American uni-

versities are full of Canadian teachers; so are American medical schools. The American Bar and business world, too, have their share of leading Canadians. We have, and we have had, distinguished Canadians here in England. But all this export of talent leaves Canada itself the poorer. Yet how can talent be expected to stay at home when there are so few Canadians to avail themselves of its services?

Meanwhile Canadian cities are puzzled by the problem of heavy winter unemployment. Some measure of it they must expect, in view of their climate, but last year they had more than they were prepared to handle. Already by October the papers were full of it. What was to be done? There were more unemployed than could be dealt with by the ordinary charitable agencies, and there is no unemployment insurance in Canada.

Yet, despite unemployment, even perhaps because of unemployment, Canada needs more population. If she had more people on the land, her railway shops, her furniture industries, her flour mills, her metal mines and works, her clothing factories, her stores would all receive the stimulus of new customers. For her agricultural products there are markets. We need her wheat and her meat, her fruit and her breakfast foods, and we are coming to use them in increasing quantities. America demands more and more of her paper; her lumber industry, wasteful and extravagant as one is told that its development has been, terrible as are the depredations of fire, is still one of her greatest assets.

There is room, therefore, for numbers of new settlers upon the land. The great question is, whence they are to come. One hears in Canada, as one hears everywhere, of the drift to the towns. The younger generation, one is told, tend to leave their fathers' farms. The boys do not want to toil upon the land, the girls despise domestic work. Even the French Canadians, laborious, prolific, tending to spread further and further over Canada, feel the pull of the cities, and move over the border into the American manufacturing towns. Canada is trying, and successfully trying, to settle her own people upon her own land, but she needs more than her own people. The shippers are naturally longing for increased immigration, but the matter is not one for shippers alone. The whole future of the country will be affected by the kind of settlers they bring, and Canada cannot afford to think in terms of quantity only. She has a tremendous sense of individuality, perhaps all the stronger for the difficulty of maintaining it against the constant pressure of her great neighbour. The natural trend is towards the States. It is a shorter journey for most Canadians to turn south than to go across their own continent. The Western passion for conferences and congresses can be easily gratified in

America, and doctors, business men, child welfare workers, or advertisement agents can all find abundant and stimulating nourishment just over the border.

But Canada does not want to be American. She wants to be Canadian, and so far she has succeeded. One feels the difference between the two countries the moment one crosses the border. Dollars and cents remain, but otherwise the atmosphere is entirely changed. It is not for nothing that the bands in the great C.P.R. hotels begin their performances every night with "O Canada," even if in Quebec, or Banff, or Calgary, or Lake Louise they play to an audience largely composed of Americans—for Quebec and the Canadian Rockies have become the playgrounds of America. Canada wants to remain Canadian, and to that end she would welcome British settlers, if she could get the right kind. But she is very nervous about them. She has an uneasy belief that the modern Englishman is a dependent creature, demoralised by State aid. She is horrified at the "dole," the nature of which very few Canadians understand at all, and small wonder, when so few of us can explain its amount, the conditions under which it is paid, or the sources from which it is drawn. Few Canadians realise that it is part, though an imperfectly worked out and an imperfectly administered part, of an insurance scheme. They think that the Englishman, so far from being the independent resourceful creature that he has always conceived himself to be, is someone who in any and every emergency sits helplessly down and expects the Government to come to his aid. How far this lamentable picture is drawn from actual experience, and how far from the natural and traditional prejudices of the very large Scottish element, it is not for the mere Southerner to say. But that there is an element of truth in it few of us would dare to deny.

Nevertheless, one certainly meets, all over Canada and in every walk of life, numbers of English men and women who are valuable and important members of their communities. Icelanders, too, and Scandinavians, who are closely akin to us in race and in political institutions, often play a prominent part. Meanwhile, the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe are coming in fast. They are prolific, industrious, content to work upon the land, not afraid of the conditions of country life. The Jews, too, pour into the cities, and with all the adaptability of their race learn the language, pick up the business, make a living everywhere.

But how far does Canada want her future population to be drawn from Russian Jews and Southern Slavonic peasants? How large a proportion can she safely assimilate?—always remembering how totally different are their traditions of political life, how little training most of them have had for the business of self-government. Freedom, suddenly acquired, is a heady drink, and one hears Canadians discussing the way it goes to the head of some

of their new citizens, who, after centuries of oppression, are apt to break out into violence when they find themselves free. Modern democratic government demands much of its citizens. To work it successfully there must be a fair proportion of those who have the tradition of public service and of honourable, selfless public work, whether paid or unpaid, of self-respect and a determination to preserve that reverence both for law and for freedom which is part of the British contribution to civilisation. Some of the conditions over the border in the United States, where there are large foreign elements, Americanised perhaps to their own satisfaction, make Canadians anxious. Canada means to work out and to maintain a civilisation which is not English but Canadian, but she means to build it upon British foundations, and she is not sure how many bricks the Russian Jew, or the Doukhobor, or the Hungarian or the Ruthenian, can be trusted to lay upon that base.

For these and other reasons, she has pursued an immigration policy which is thought by some, especially by those who are interested in ships and in railways, to be one of undue caution. No doubt the members of a small and prosperous community, or at least some of them, are naturally anxious as to the effects of increased competition. Yet Canada would take more British if she could get the right kind, and surely we must wish that they should go. Before long we may perhaps be able, as were our ancestors in very similar circumstances a hundred years ago, so to expand our productive capacity as to absorb all our people, and to bear with ease the burdens laid upon us by the war. But that moment has not yet arrived, and meanwhile there are those great empty spaces, flooded with sun and air and light. What magic can turn the unemployed townsman of the old world into the prosperous farmer of the new? He will find, when he is established, the descendants of those other unemployed British, driven there by the troubles, so like his own, of the dreary years at the close of the Napoleonic wars. They made good. Why should not he?—despite Canadian nervousness about backbonelessness and dependence, despite his town ways. We have had over a century of city life now in this country, but that the countryman lies embedded in the nature of most Englishmen is surely suggested by the sight of city allotments, city gardens, or by other phenomena.

In 1923 there was in Canada urgent need for help with the harvest. The shipping lines took out a very large number of men, collected haphazard and in haste, from England and Scotland. There was no time for close inquiry. Arrangements were made for their return at specially cheap rates, after the harvest was gathered. But only a few returned, and among these were some whom Canada refused to keep, suspecting them to be "Red" emissaries, some who were physically unfit, and some who were

schoolboys and college students, hastening back to term time again, after a long vacation profitably spent. It is too soon to tell exactly what became of the remaining thousands, but there is every reason to suppose that they are in process of rapid "Canadianisation."*

What, too, of the women? Here in Great Britain we have a disproportion between the sexes, which inevitably leads to difficulties, both social and economic. There, in Canada, they have not nearly enough women to go round: it is the men who are in excess. Yet in what capacity are the women to go? Canada does not want typists, nor teachers, nor nurses. She has plenty of her own. Nor does she want factory operatives. There is nothing for them to do. What she wants is what, unfortunately, we want too—cheerful and efficient domestic workers. We shall naturally complain—indeed, we do complain—when the high wages offered in Canadian cities tempt away our trained and all-too-few housemaids, cooks, and parlourmaids, still more that rarest of beings, the efficient "working housekeeper." But how are the women to go? We can scarcely in these sophisticated days adopt the simple expedient of sending over a shipload of wives, as was done some forty years ago (some of them to become the leading ladies and most influential citizens of their new land). But what is to be done? Miss Bondfield's Committee advocates the sending out of more girls than boys, which should help. The only other suggestion that occurs to me is that each of the new families, for the settlement of which the Canadian and British Governments are now arranging, should be encouraged to take an unmarried sister. She would be a great comfort and help to the wife, and would diminish both her natural loneliness and her labours in the early days. Before long it is at least probable that she would be established in a home of her own.

The emigrants who went to Canada a century ago went under conditions of discomfort hardly imaginable to-day. The modern settler, travelling across the Atlantic on an admirably well-found ship, arriving at his Canadian port only a week after he leaves Liverpool, looking forward to a home equipped with telephone, probably with wireless, and before long to the lavish Canadian use of Ford cars, has only to face the most modified kind of solitude, even upon the enormous distances of the prairie. What will he make of it, and, still more, what will she? Upon the answer to that question largely depends the future of that "true north, strong and free."

LETTICE FISHER.

* The actual numbers (supplied by the kindness of a director of the C.P.R.) were: 11,429 went to Canada, under 1,500 returned.

THE MANAGEMENT OF INDUSTRY.

THE system of industrial organisation, which we have come to call "capitalism," has the outstanding advantage that it is eminently plastic. It is obvious that it has not, as yet, by any means exhausted the forms which it may assume, though current thought may often tempt one to think and act on the hypothesis that the present is something final and permanent. We may, I think, rest assured that the present organisation is but a transient stage, and that the structure of industry in the future will be as different from that of to-day as the present is different from the not very distant past. Imperceptibly, change casts its spell over the world of affairs, and, as one generation succeeds to the heritage of another, the gift changes.

It is barely a century ago since the capitalist was primarily a merchant only. He bought the raw materials, distributed them amongst the domestic operatives, and finally marketed the made-up goods. He neither owned plant nor, except indirectly, employed labour. The ominous dawn of modern conditions, in the days of the so-called Industrial Revolution, heralded a vast extension of the capitalist's sphere. He added to his marketing functions the immediate ownership of the means of production and the direct employment of labour. Factories were small, and the capitalist often filled the rôles of owner, manager, and operative together. He gathered his workers under one roof, worked with them at the same bench and fed with them at the same board. Progress, however, swept recklessly forward, and tossed the capitalist on from wave to wave. He was no longer able to cope personally with every detail of his business. The rapid development of mechanical contrivances and the great expansion of business that followed in their train, impressively commemorated by the Great Exhibition of 1851, made it essential that the successful manufacturer should surround himself with a staff of experts, both mechanical and commercial. Much had to be delegated to foremen, master mechanics, and clerks. The old familiar daily relationship with the operatives became well-nigh impossible. Industry was plunging forward into a new world, and capitalism was again to change its form.

With 1873 came the threatening clouds of depression. Foreign competition had begun to make itself felt, and the headlong rush of the earlier years of the century had precipitated industry into a thousand tangles, mechanical, administrative, and human. Pursuing material prosperity, industry had torn and twisted human life till it lay bleeding and battered under the conquering wheels of the new machine-age. Brooding over the industrial and social

order of England, such men as Carlyle, Kingsley, Maurice, Ruskin, and Dickens found, each in his own way, little but darkness, and uttered their criticisms and forebodings in devastating terms. Moreover, the stern, rugged souls who had guided industry from the Industrial Revolution to the middle of the century were passing, and a new generation, only too ready to fall prey to the lures of wealth, and lacking the character and determination of its pioneering predecessor, took over the control of these untamed forces. Ownership grew inclined to take its ease, to think lightly of its responsibilities, and to rest satisfied upon its oars.

The tremendous inward power of industry, however, straining at the leash like some great bloodhound, could not but go forward. Growth could not be repressed, and the urge towards larger and still larger corporations led inevitably to the recognition of limited liability in joint-stock ownership, in the Act of 1862. This significant change in ownership laid the foundation of four important developments—it made possible large-scale production; it made quite definite the divorce between ownership and management; it made necessary the work of the specialist; and it severed the already overdrawn thread which had linked the owner with the worker. Of these developments the first and the last have now been fully recognised. The gigantic fact of large-scale production towers above our social life, shadowing the whole landscape. The chasm which separates the owners of industrial capital from the workers gapes open, as if no bridge could ever span it. The other two developments, however—the divorce between ownership and management and the necessity for expert management—are not so patent and have commanded far less notice. Yet they are by no means of less importance.

These developments concern the position of Management in the modern industrial structure. The capitalist was no longer the breezy captain, who might be seen every morning crossing the foundry floor. Capital was now distributed among thousands, was constantly changing hands, and but rarely, if ever, appeared in flesh and blood. Between the owners and the workers grew up a new class—executive directors, factory managers, cost accountants, statisticians, technical chemists and engineers, planning managers, foremen, sales and advertising managers, transport managers, and a hundred others. As a body, we have come to call these—Management. This entity in industry covers all grades and varieties of brain-workers. Some have agreed to call it "the third party in industry." With the growth in size of industrial undertakings, and the increasing complexity of the task of control, this "third party" has inevitably increased. It has gradually added responsibility to responsibility. Collectively, in

its hands, now rests the main burden of industrial control, and the pre-eminent task of guiding the restless spirit of Labour. Capital, as an industrial partner, has, in any human, intimate sense, become remote from factory life. It does not breathe the air of the workrooms; it does not pass to and fro amid the clangour of machines; it does not meet this deputation or tackle that problem; it is something apart, something intangible. Management has taken over control.

With every extension of activity has come the need for a more continuous and expert application of administrative capacity. Distributed ownership has been followed inevitably by specialist management. Above all, perhaps, the growing restlessness of Labour and the intricacy and delicacy of the problems presented by the daily control of Labour have made expert management inevitable. Labour is no easy mare to keep between the shafts, and the task is one which only those who hold the reins can tackle. Loyalty, good workmanship, co-operation—these are not won by hundreds of shareholders, scattered over the breadth and length of the land. They are to be won only by those who exercise day-by-day control, by those who supervise the actual conditions of work, and meet the workers in the daily hubbub of the factory.

We still, however, speak in outworn terms of Capital and Labour—of the need for co-operation between the two, of the failures or successes of the capitalistic organisation of industry, or, according to our viewpoint, of the inevitable conflict or basic unity of the two. If we speak of Management at all, we are inclined to regard it as something "in the pocket of" Capital, or as a by-product, so to speak, of Capital—a group of miscellaneous activities, of secondary importance, too technical to be understood, which cannot logically be distinguished from the control which Capital exercises. We have yet to appreciate to the full the view that the executive control and supervision of industrial undertakings is something organically different from either Capital or Labour. It is only very recently, indeed, that a body of managers themselves—the National Federation of Textile Works Managers' Associations—has thought it worth while to record its view that Management is a distinct entity in industry. "Your sub-committee," a report reads, "is in favour of the third party position, as against merging the distinct industrial identity of technical Management with that of Capital or its representatives on the one hand, or with that of manual Labour on the other. . . . Functionally, and therefore economically, salaried workers belong to a group in industry quite distinct from either Capital or Labour."

Such a statement is a sign that Management is beginning to feel a corporate bond, linking together all those who practise the pro-

fession. It foreshadows the growth of a professional pride and a professional organisation. It reveals a sense of responsibility to the community, which is different in kind from that of Capital or Labour—a responsibility which places neither profits nor wages first, but insists primarily upon efficiency. It suggests new avenues for the promotion of industrial productiveness and the establishment of industrial peace. Indeed, it marks the beginning of a further era of change in industrial structure, another adaptation of capitalistic organisation.*

What, then, is the sphere of this "third party"—Management? What contribution has it to make to the needs of industry and the service which the community requires from industry? What is the significance of its growth?

We stand to-day on the threshold of great events. The past lies spread out behind us—a long, tortuous road, in the building of which achievement has been added to achievement. It is a road of success, climbing steep hills of difficulty and bridging great gulfs of danger. At length it reaches the valley of the war-shadow. It passes the valley—a way hewn out of the rocks and stained with the blood of immemorial courage and sacrifice. Looking back, we see the flowers of gallantry blossoming in the hedgerows. It is a proud highway, for all the bitterness, toil and sorrow poured forth in its making. To-day we face the moors and fenland that human foot has never traversed; a further mile of the road has to be built. Our society bends itself to the task; our factories buzz with effort, invention, ceaseless toil; millions of workers troop daily to these great houses of manufacture. Industry, that gigantic servant of the community, sets hammer and pick to the task of construction. Our social life quivers and rocks with the vibration.

The task, moreover, is not just the mechanical extension of an old road; it is rather the beginning of a new road, for the building of which there is no precedent. The country to be traversed is different; the forces engaged on the task are unlike those which laboured before. Can industry succeed? Can it build a road wide enough for the forces of the future to pass over? Can it direct the road to the point whence future generations will take up the trail with vigorous prosperity? Or is it to be a narrow, uneven

* It is encouraging to find a "leader" in *The Times* (May 7th, 1925) devoted to this subject—a "leader" which would have been impossible twenty years ago. Referring to "the third party" in industry, it says: "In the last resort, on them, more than on any other class, depends the day-to-day efficiency of industry. 'They are the true 'pivotal workers,' directing, as they do, the actual operations of industry, and determining its actual processes. . . . The technician and administrator, compelled by their functions to take a long view of the welfare of their industry, situated midway between 'Capital' and 'Labour,' and taking themselves only a small share, compared with the importance of their function, of the proceeds of industry, have, perhaps, more to contribute to the establishment of a stable industrial peace than any other party.'"

pathway, leading to a morass, which the future will be required to fashion afresh on a more successful alignment?

The answer to these questionings lies in the heart of industry itself. All depends upon the efficiency of industry, and this efficiency in turn depends upon industrial peace. Efficiency and peace—these are the two prime conditions of achievement. Recent circumstances make us doubt the immediate possibility of either. We see industry, upon which depends the progress of our whole social life, falling behind in the competition with other countries, and torn asunder with the strife of conflicting interests. How can the foundations of efficiency and peace be laid?

Efficiency in industry is overwhelmingly a question of efficiency in Management. Neither Capital nor Labour can contribute singly to the same degree to this end. Of what avail is the toil of the workshops if the product be poorly designed, if the costs be increased by unscientifically planned organisation, if inadequate advantage be taken of the facilities for inter-trade co-operation, if there be shortage of materials, ill-devised plant, inadequate or expensive transport, unhealthy conditions of work, lack of training, poor selling and ineffective sales organisation? These things do not lie within the province of Labour or of Capital. They are the concern and responsibility of Management. Neither Labour nor Capital can be efficiently employed unless Management itself can effectively put these forces to their maximum use. The key rests in the hands of Management. One looks to the helmsman first for the safe direction of the vessel; if he be indolent or ignorant, of what avail the efforts of the crew or the whirring of the engines?

Industrial administration has become a task unrivalled in complexity and responsibility. It was easy enough when the vessel was just an "old tub" in a sea becalmed. To-day, industry is a leviathan in a storm. Every branch of industry has been developed to an unprecedented degree of intricacy. The advent of science has made every task scientific, even the most menial. It has opened out possibilities which a few years ago were but phantoms. With the increase in the science of work has developed an increasing need for science in control. The old haphazard arrangements will not suffice. It is not enough to take an order and trust to fortune and hard work that it can be executed. It is not enough to take on a few men here and a few men there, and trust them or drive them to do their best. It is not enough to found policy and practice on habit, conjecture, opinion, or prejudice. The task of control must be rendered scientific; it must conduct its operations by the scientific method of investigation and standardisation. We can no longer afford to entrust the security of our national welfare to the "business man" of two decades ago. Industry is not the thing it

was, even in its purely material aspects; it is an amazing conglomeration of machines and methods. Even were industry conducted entirely without Labour, the old methods would not suffice, for the engineer and the chemist have transformed them.

Industry is, however, primarily human. In essence, it is a concentration of manifold human faculties, using certain mechanisms, to achieve the ends set before it. In the human affairs of industry, still less will the old methods of control suffice. Of what avail are the old methods of foremanship under the modern conditions of Labour mentality? Of what avail are the old standards of justice, discipline, employment, training and working conditions? Where are the old methods of control when the psychologist has come into industry? Can Management leave it all to the workers when every task has been made tremendously scientific by the investigations of the expert? Can Management carry on the old arrangements when the workers have been instructed in new methods of operation?

Efficiency in Management has been, in a decade, raised to a new plane, and that plane in turn is rapidly being raised again. New possibilities of output and of cost reduction open out every day, as a result of improved methods of planning and control. To seize upon these, to employ them to the utmost—that is the task of Management. The trumpets have sounded the great advance, and it is for the captains to put this vast army into array.

And what of peace in industry? There are some enthusiastic exponents of scientific methods in Management who, having demonstrated means of reducing costs and increasing output, are satisfied that the argument is complete and the case clear. The story is, in truth, but barely begun; for the greatest need of modern industry is a human need—the need to fashion a new order of industrial living, where all who hew and draw can find an outlet for their natural impulses and a satisfaction in the execution of their work, and where the relations between those who work and those who control and use the work can be rendered harmonious and healthy. Reduction of costs, increase of output, greater profits—these may be signs of progress, heralds of prosperity. But are these our ultimate aims? If, indeed, we believe industry to be fundamentally a form of human association, surely we cannot rest satisfied with any scheme of control which has not as its final goal the bettering of human relations and the promotion of peace? If we do not seek such an end, strife must continue, and is it not clear that strife is the death of any human association? Even were it possible, would increased output, accompanied by industrial strife, yield to us the prize we seek? Would not the success be but bitter fruit?

One often hears of schemes of industrial reconstruction which

appear altogether to disregard questions of cost and output—schemes which appeal to emotions or indefinite ideals, schemes which postulate the existence of some dreamed-of Utopia. One of the fundamental truths which I believe we have to engrave on our minds is that the reconstructed edifice of industrial life must be founded, four square, upon the factory itself. Industrial unrest will not be laid to sleep by the preaching of a gospel of goodwill alone; it will not be dispelled merely by charity or sympathy. It can only be allayed when the day-to-day business of making and buying and selling goods is so conducted that goodwill is the natural and inevitable outcome. The sowing of the seeds of peace must be in the factory itself. Peace must grow from within, not be imposed from without. Industry must itself grow the flowers of peace, out of its own soil and under its own culture. It must change its methods so that the seeds may ripen; it must alter its atmosphere so that the flower may flourish. The daily toil must produce peace; the conditions of work, the daily embarking on the task which industry sets to every individual, the passing to and fro in the factory, the roar of machinery and the busying of body and mind on the immediate job—out of these must peace and goodwill grow.

The responsibility again rests with Management. On its shoulders lies the task of so remodelling industrial conditions that goodwill can flourish. Goodwill is founded on justice. Injustice breeds every evil thing in human association—suspicion, ignorance, hatred. Justice—can there be justice where the Management is inefficient? Justice in wages—can there be justice where the Management is ignorant of what ought to be the output, when it fixes rates without a detailed scientific study of the work being done, when it prevents a worker earning all he might by ineffective arrangements for the running of machines and supply of materials? Justice in discipline—can there be justice when Management makes its decisions according to no pre-arranged code of rules, when it has not scientifically considered the selection of the individual for the work, when it has not scientifically studied the work and trained the worker in the best methods of operation? Efficiency and peace are bound up together. The way to peace is by the efficient conduct of industry—an order of industry where the workers are governed, not by a capricious and arbitrary body of Management acting by the light of “rule-of-thumb” methods, but rather by a code of scientific law interpreted by a Management which is alike governed by the same law.

Management—the “third party” in industry—stands in the forefront to-day of our industrial organisation. It is entrusted with command and leadership. It has at its call vast supplies of

capital, inexhaustible supplies of brain and talent, a working population of unmeasured potentiality. The co-ordination and application of these forces is the depth and breadth of its task. It is not enough that this task should be attempted with the tools of an already out-distanced past. New methods must be employed, fitted to the requirements of a new age. The old time-worn devices for the management of our factories must be cast on the dust-heap as surely as the old machines and plant. On the one hand, science and invention have hurried industry forward into a realm of fresh mechanical possibilities; on the other, the restlessness of a new world-mentality has made industry echo and heave with the pulsating throb of great new human forces. To control and use to the full these gigantic mechanical powers—to guide and unify these portentous human forces—to mould this strangely volatile compound of machine and man into the great instrument of service which industry, to fulfil its destiny, must become—these are the tasks which confront the “third party” in industry, as our world passes beyond the border of known and tangible things and awaits the realities which to-morrow's light must reveal.

OLIVER SHELDON.

A CENTRAL EUROPEAN FEDERATION.

THERE was a time when Central Europe, then called Germany, was, on account of its geographical position, the political storm-centre of Europe which encompassed the whole political world in those days. And again, to-day, although consisting now of a large number of States which have gained their independence and are of political importance, Central Europe is once more the political storm-centre of Europe and, therefore, also of those remaining continents which have obtained influence on world politics during the last generation.

What measures were taken in the past to counter this danger and how did they succeed? Not to cast our net too wide, we will limit ourselves to a review of the last hundred years. After the Napoleonic Wars, the Congress of Vienna set up the German Confederation and endowed it with a federal pacifist constitution, which made it strong in the defensive but powerless in the offensive. For nearly fifty years this organisation preserved the peace of Europe. In 1866 Bismarck dissolved the German Confederation and established the North German Confederation, raised it in 1871 to the German Empire, and concluded an alliance with Austria-Hungary in 1879. This alliance was intended to be a substitute for the German Confederation, but differed from it by reason of its military policy which a victorious Prussia gradually imposed upon all the German States and the Austrian Monarchy. This alliance was still further extended by Italy's entry in 1882 and made the Triple Alliance, being joined by Rumania later. The militarist system brought about the dissolution of the Triple Alliance and the downfall of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The Central European political group has been shattered, but Central Europe remains the storm-centre of the world. Indeed, it is more dangerous now than ever before, because it has been split up by the Peace Treaties into a number of countries of varying sizes, which are divided by countless antagonisms without a single link to hold them together.

If for practical reasons we include in our conception of Central Europe the Balkan States, which are so closely connected with the real Central Europe politically, economically, and geographically, it comprises not seven but sixteen States, with a population of 200 millions, i.e., Albania (817,486), Bulgaria (4,861,439), Danzig (356,740), the German Reich (59,852,682), Esthonia (1,110,538), Finland (3,402,593), Greece (5,026,795), Italy (38,835,941), Jugoslavia (12,017,323), Latvia (1,885,870), Lithuania (2,011,173), Austria (6,562,661), Poland (27,185,709), Rumania (16,262,177), Czecho-Slovakia (13,611,349), Hungary (7,980,143).

Since the first half of the nineteenth century, when national

consciousness first began to awake in Central Europe and the Balkans, these States have threatened the peace of the world more seriously than before, because here the homes of the nations were not so sharply separated from each other, and the frontiers, drawn according to the conditions of political power, were chosen somewhat capriciously and often did not even tally with the compact colonies of each nation. Consequently, no purely nationalist States arose here, and only States made up of mixed nationalities predominated. Before the World War the Austrian Monarchy was the "nationalities State" *par excellence*, and suffered more than any other country, both in her home and foreign policy, from national strife. Murder and incendiarism in the name of national unity was a constant item on the agenda of the Balkans. The German Empire may have been governed as a nationality State but it was not actually of this character owing to Alsace-Lorraine, Poland, and Denmark. The new States which the Peace Treaties have created have not done away with the old evil in spite of the increased number of units. Some of the smaller States possess, no doubt, national unity (like Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria), but many of their fellow-countrymen live outside the boundaries. The other States are again compounded of mixed nationalities. By the Peace Treaties more State centres have been established in Central Europe, including the Balkans. The centrifugal tendencies of the national minorities in Central Europe, including the Balkans, are spread over a larger number of States than before the World War; they are split up, but the power of resistance of these new little States is less than that of the larger States before the war. Pre-war, the centrifugal, conservative tendencies were encouraged by two closely-allied Great Powers (Germany and Austria-Hungary), and it was only those small States who were at variance with one another up to the last who encouraged centrifugal tendencies. To-day, the largest of all the Central European States, the nationally united German Reich, is virtually on the side of centrifugal endeavours, because a considerable portion of her countrymen are scattered over other States—States that are neither allied nor related—while the centripetal elements are thrown back upon a few medium-sized States made up from mixed nationalities. Centrifugal tendencies are to-day perhaps more dangerous than of old, although this fact is obscured by Germany's political and economic weakness.

If we wish to secure an enduring peace for Europe and the whole world, this storm-centre will have to be pacified. Unless this is done all other efforts to establish peace are built on shifting sands. If this succeeds, the greatest, the traditional danger which threatens the general peace will have been banished, and all remaining

dangers can be overcome with comparative ease. To institute in Central Europe, including the Balkans, a pacifist organisation is, therefore, the most important political task of our time. Historic continuity is in favour of it. For centuries the fates of these countries have been bound up one with the other. Most of them have formed, though in varying shape, an almost uninterrupted national or constitutional unity within Europe during hundreds of years. And even their internal configuration shows a certain similarity which destines them for each other. The boundaries of speech and country are not so sharply divided in Central Europe as elsewhere. The totality of these sixteen States forms in so far a natural whole that all the nationalities represented in it are more or less united. The 61,000,000 Imperial Germans (*Reichs Deutsche*), together with the 6,500,000 German Austrians, 3,500,000 Germans in Czecho-Slovakia and those others scattered over Rumania, Jugoslavia, Italy, and Poland would, for instance, be included in this greater organisation. The attempt of those Germans who are living outside the German Reich to join up with each other would become purposeless. The protection of minorities, which even the League of Nations has overlooked, would become truly effective in this narrower circle. And what applies to the Germans applies also, though perhaps in less degree, to those other Central European nations who are at present apportioned to various States or are scattered like the Magyars. The gravest error of construction, however, of the Austrian Monarchy lay in the various fractions of nationalities living within her Empire who were longing for union with their co-nationalists outside the Empire. This same error, and with it the same danger which threatened the peace in the construction of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, has been transferred to the newly formed States of Central Europe by the Peace Treaties of 1919. By turning these into a confederation, irredentism would be gradually exterminated.

In such a union of the sixteen States national and political antitheses seem to be comparatively well balanced. The German Reich, with its population of 60 millions, is by far the most populous State and could control the entire combination if it were not for the fact that another great State, Italy, with a population of 39 millions, was also a member of it, as well as several medium-sized States like Poland, with a population of 27 millions, Rumania with 16 millions, Czecho-Slovakia with 14 millions, and Jugoslavia with 12 millions. Thus a preponderance of the German Empire is out of the question on account of the competition of one great and four medium States with a combined population of over 100 millions. If, on the other hand, the German Reich were to be excluded from this combination, the 10 million Germans

of the Succession States would form a centrifugal element, provided that they could be induced to entertain the idea of such a combination at all, which they might regard as a dagger pointed against the German Empire. Even if these 10 million Germans were added to the 60 million Imperial Germans, we should only obtain a total of about 70 million Germans among the 200 millions of the sixteen States Combination, i.e., about one-third. Roughly calculated, they would amount to about 70 millions as against 57 million Slavs, 55 million Rumanians, 10 million Hungarians, and another 14 millions made up among the smaller nations. This motley arrangement of the map of nations in the Central European Confederation would banish the fear of the Germans establishing a majority through the other nations.

We obtain quite another picture, however, if we go beyond the boundaries of these sixteen States and include France, or even all the other remaining European countries with the exception of England and Russia. In such a confederation, called "The United States of Europe" or "Pan-Europe," France, if we take the existing conditions of force into consideration, would, on account of her military superiority, gain a dominant position, as would indeed be the case with the Romanic element altogether (with Portugal and Spain). In theory this combination has been in existence for over 300 years, and it is probably on account of the insuperable differences between France and Germany that not even an attempt has been made to put it into practice. The Central European Confederation, on the other hand, has always been in existence in one shape or another.

The settlement of the larger, the Franco-German differences, will probably have to be left to the greatest pacifist organisation known—the League of Nations. But the League of Nations by no means makes the Central European Confederation superfluous. Though independent of each other, they must and can exist side by side, no matter whether all the States incorporated in the Central European Confederation have joined the League of Nations or not. The other nations which formerly stood isolated, the League of Nations has drawn together and joined in a group for the first time. The Central European States, however, have not lived in isolation from each other for many centuries. It is only since the establishment of the League of Nations that they have been robbed of their ancient co-operation and become isolated. In the League of Nations, for instance, Austrians, Czechs, and Hungarians, who for hundreds of years have belonged to a common political system in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, are equidistant from one another as from the Chinese and Brazilians, with whom they have never had any close political or economic

relations, and with whom they are only connected by ordinary human interests. To-day, the Central European States are further removed from each other than they have ever been. An old partnership, fostered by their common interests, has been destroyed and the League of Nations, destined to embrace the whole civilised world, cannot replace it. A Russian proverb says: "The sky is high and the Czar is far away." At present we can say: "The sky is high and the League of Nations is large, too large and too far removed from specifically Central European problems to be of help in their daily solution." For this purpose a more intimate organisation is necessary, an organisation in which the people of Central Europe, who have for so many centuries been in co-operation with each other—long before the League of Nations was thought of—can settle their own differences and maintain the capital of close and mutual interests and understanding accumulated during hundreds of years, and increase it for the benefit of all humanity.

Central Europe has always had her own peculiar organisation and must have it again, either side by side or within the League of Nations. Not, indeed, in the distorted form the World War has created, that of an allied military state of the German Reich, and still less in the form proposed by Friedrich Naumann during the World War of a Central European brotherhood in arms, an exaggerated conception of the military system with a definite German preponderance, and the outcome of war psychology. If we seek a prototype in history we should refer to the German Bund and form, with allowances for the changes brought about by time, from the sixteen States of South and East Central Europe a Central European Federation. To bring sixteen States like those tabulated above under one roof is indeed a difficult task for diplomacy. However, if we take into consideration the facilities of transit to-day, the territory of these sixteen States is smaller than that of the thirty-eight German States in the "thirties" of last century, when trains did not exist and the system of small States accorded with the ideas of that period of dynastic particularism. To-day it is in direct contradiction to the prevailing view, which favours the formation of large States or State complexes. Nevertheless, Prussia succeeded in winning over a large part of non-Austrian Germany to the Zollverein. Prussia accomplished this task little by little, for she founded the Zollverein when only a few States had accepted it and then continued her recruiting. A similar proceeding could be adopted in establishing a Central European Federation, the States entering one by one. Its foundation could take place as soon as a respectable number of States had declared themselves willing to become members, while the others would be permitted to enter whenever they desired.

Each individual State within the Federation would retain its independence and own government. It would retain the political system chosen by itself, have its own government and foreign policy with all the organs appertaining to it, in fact, its own diplomacy, as was the case in the German Bund. No State will have precedence over any other as Prussia had in the German Empire, thanks to her hereditary imperial title and supreme military command. A Federal Assembly, Directory, Executive Committee or some such helpful organisation would be responsible for the peaceful management of affairs and adjustment within the group. Even the permanent presidency of one State, like Austria's in the German Federation, would be hazardous, but rotation or some other plan which would exclude any possibility of dictation would have to be considered, such as was suggested in the days of the German Confederation. The members of the new Central European Federation will not be permitted to go to war with one another. For the settlement of internal disputes they will have to make use of the Court of Arbitration or whatever institution has been chosen for the settlement of differences. The State that abandons federal arbitration will have to resign its membership. In the case of conflict between a Central European State and a State outside the Federation, the other members of the Federation will act as arbitrators and will be able to make good use of their own and foreign political connections. If one of the Federal States is attacked by a non-Federal State, the others, after having investigated the facts, will on the resolution of the Federation assist it with their military forces.

A war of attack by the Federation is out of the question because the aggressive instinct of each separate State belonging to the Federation is neutralised by the opposing tendencies of its fellow members. If, for instance, Germany wished to obtain the military assistance of the Federation for, let us say, a war against France, the Slavonic and at least a part of the Romanic Federal States would refuse to co-operate. Let us take another example. Supposing Poland or Rumania should wish to make war upon Russia, Germany, Italy, and Czecho-Slovakia would in all probability prevent it from becoming a Federal affair. The war danger would be decreased by the Federation, not increased. The present grouping of the States in Central Europe is not only a source of danger to the peace of the world, but a keenly felt hindrance to the economic development of those States which have had to suffer so bitterly through the war and its consequences. Through the increase in the number of States and the contraction of frontiers, the economic area of Central Europe has been contracted also, in direct contrast to the prevailing economic tendencies of the world. Co-operation among

these States is an axiom that has been long recognised as necessary to their economic welfare, but its realisation is impeded by their political antagonisms. As soon as these are lessened by some political Union, the national boundaries within this Union would be lowered, if not removed, and an economic *rapprochement* would follow of its own accord.

The innumerable economic embargoes which have been increased by the dismemberment of Europe must go. A uniform system of Customs (with internal tolls), administration of railways and other means of transit based on mutual understanding, must be established, and passport obligation be removed within the Federation. A coinage union for the preservation of the stability of the otherwise independent currency of the allied States, mutual agreement about civil, trade, and criminal laws, mutual exchange of experiences in all branches of civil and political administration, and mutual help generally in all branches of economic life, would be among the many corollaries of the new Federation.

In Germany, at any rate, there is at present more understanding of economic than political matters, and the advantages of the economic statutes of a Central European Union will find more ready sympathy than political ones would be; for the economic situation of dismembered Central Europe is felt daily and personally by each individual, while the political dangers of this situation are only apparent to those who have some experience in political matters. Yet just these dangers are the most serious and they include the economic. During the last fifty years it has been a part of the political system to allow sound economics to overshadow sound diplomacy. The World War has proved to us that bad diplomacy can wipe out in a moment all the successes gained by many decades of good economics. The most important factor for economic development is peace—peace made as safe and enduring as is humanly possible. And such a peace the world will not obtain so long as Central Europe, the historic storm-centre, is not pacified by an inter-State organisation.

HEINRICH KANNER.

ALEXANDER PUSHKIN.

IN the fifteenth century the Turks drove the Byzantine scholars into Western Europe. In the twentieth century a similar fate befell the cultured Russian classes as a result of the Bolshevik Revolution. Primarily a revolt of the soldiery and the semi-educated lower middle class against the supremacy of the landed gentry and the régime that owed its existence to the privileged class, the Russian Revolution has uprooted and destroyed many more layers of society than the French Revolution did. Alongside an extermination *en masse*, it caused an exodus *en masse* of well nigh the entire cultured element of the Empire, the element that not only ruled, but also worked in every imaginable sphere of enlightened activity for the promotion of the cultural, scientific, literary, and artistic progress of the country. These hundreds of thousands of Russian *émigrés* are now scattered all over the world. Their chief centres are Paris, Berlin, and Prague.

The Russian intelligenzia has proved politically a dead weight. Instead of presenting to the world a united front of patriotism and determination to save their country, the Russian politicians of various shades of opinion, ranging from reactionary Monarchism to Social Democracy, have remained hopelessly divided among themselves, and have carried on their inane quarrels over political shibboleths as obsolete as their methods had ever been impracticable in Russia. Of late, they have begun tardily to realise that the collapse of the old political and social edifice has been so complete, the eight years that have gone by since Lenin became dictator of Russia have created such an impassable gulf between the Russia of yesterday and the Russia of to-day, that they must resign themselves to the abandonment of all hopes of a cultural and political resurrection in their lifetime. They have begun to understand that the future of Russia lies in the hands not of this generation, but of future generations. Politically, they are disillusioned. Materially, they suffer great hardships. The need therefore arises naturally and spontaneously of some intellectual and spiritual solace to alleviate all the miseries of life in exile.

Latently, a movement was started in the above-named centres into which the Russian intellectuals have flocked, to establish a day of commemoration and common celebration which would bring all Russians together irrespective of their political and social differences, and it was suggested that this day be called "The Day of Russian Culture." It has already been observed in several European capitals. Special Committees have been formed which elaborated the programme of the "Commemoration."

The striking feature of these programmes has everywhere been

the same—they resolved themselves into a commemoration of Pushkin, all other items being more or less incidental. Pushkin is the name that brings Russians together, that stimulates their minds and hearts, for it is the symbol, the alpha and omega, of the Russian soul and of the Russian genius.

I know of no better appreciation of Pushkin's genius by a foreigner than the five pages of Maurice Baring's *Introduction* (xix—xxv) to *The Oxford Book of Russian Verse*:

He understood the hearts of all men and because he understood the hearts of all men, of whatever nation and of whatever race, he understood the Russian heart better than any of his countrymen. He loved his people for what they were, and as they were; and he told the story of the soul of his people in the cadence of his words and the lilt of his songs. In his verse you can hear the *troika* circling, blind and bewildered in the blizzard; you can feel the shadow of Peter the Great; you can peer into the crystal of the heart of the Russian woman; you can hear his old nurse crooning the fairy tales that were told when Rurik came over the sea. You can watch in the silence of the night the sleepless soul gazing at the blurred and blotched scroll, the smeared chronicle of its past deeds, powerless with all the tears in the world to wash away the written characters, and you can read in eight short lines an expression of the inexpressible: the declaration of love of all the unhappy lovers in the world. . . .

Maurice Baring is a poet. He understands and speaks Russian. He gives, in the same *Introduction*, a prose translation of Pushkin's "Prophet," "perhaps the greatest of his short poems," "in the hope of stimulating in some reader the desire to learn Russian so as to read this poem in the original." As a poet, he dwells mainly upon the *poetical* beauty of Pushkin's works, which he can fully appreciate owing to his knowledge of the language. To those who do not know the Russian language, Pushkin will remain a closed book; the *Encyclopædia Britannica* may give an excellent short account of Pushkin's life and principal works, various professors of literature may explain the importance of Pushkin as the creator of Russian poetry and of the Russian novel—but all these appreciations fail to convey even in the faintest degree the influence of Pushkin in Russian life.

It is, of course, perfectly true that no one who does not understand Russian can appreciate "the infinite range of the sonorous music of Pushkin's verse, its perfectly planned and magnificently close utterance." But it is by no means the mere perfection of form that renders Pushkin's works so dear to the Russians.

No one has expressed more eloquently in the Russian language the significance of Pushkin than Dostoyevski in his famous speech in Moscow on June 8th, 1880, at the meeting of the Society of Friends of Russian Literature. The speech has ever since been

regarded as the literary *credo* of every cultured Russian. Dostoyevski's favourite idea, which he always expounded with impassioned vividness, was that "To a true Russian, Europe and the fate of the entire great Aryan race are as dear as Russia herself and the fate of our mother country, because 'universality' is our destiny, and not an universality gained by the sword, but by the power of brotherhood and of our fraternal yearning for the unity of all men." Dostoyevski fervently believed that "the Russian people were destined to bring the final conciliation into all the contradictions of Europe, to find a solution for the yearnings of Europe in their own soul, all-embracing and all-uniting, and to proclaim the final word of the great universal harmony, of the fraternal unity of all races according to the Gospel of Christ." A splendid Utopia! And Dostoyevski extolled Pushkin chiefly because he saw in Pushkin's genius, in which cosmopolitanism and nationalism were so marvellously blended, the perfect expression of the Russian soul and of its possibilities.

Pushkin, who in the first stage of his literary and poetical career, imitated the works of Parny, André Chenier, Byron, and others, only "found himself" when he turned to Russia, to the spirit of the Russian people as a source of inspiration. His novel in prose, *Evguenii Onegin*, is probably rightly described by Russian critics and by Dostoyevski as his masterpiece, because in no other work did he reflect with such profound insight the spirit of the people.

"One may positively assert," said Dostoyevski, "that had there been no Pushkin, there would have been none of the subsequent writers of genius. No Russian writer, before or after Pushkin, has been in such tender, fraternal communion with his people. We have many writers who know the people, and who have written about the people with talent and with affection, and yet if we compare them with Pushkin we find that with one or two exceptions (Dostoyevski meant Tolstoy and Turgenev) they were only 'gentlemen' writing about the people. . . . Here and there in the writings of these 'gentlemen' you find a touch of haughtiness, of the desire to 'lift' the people to their own level. . . ."

Another great masterpiece is *Boris Godounov*. In that play, says Maurice Baring, "both the tragic and the poetical scenes and those that depict common life are vivid, and the characters live, but Pushkin, like Goethe, lacked the gift of stage architectonics and the optics which are necessary for successful stagecraft. So his play, though a dramatic poem of the highest order, is not an acting drama."

Boris Godounov is very seldom acted in Russia, because the production is extremely complicated, unless a method is adopted which until recently was unfamiliar to the Russian producers—the method which allows the "Old Vic" to produce Shakespearean plays in their entirety. This, however, does not mean that the play

"is not acting drama." In February last, *Boris Godounov* was staged in Birmingham by the students of the Midland Institute, the principal of which, Mr. Alfred Hayes, is the author of a very fine English verse translation of the play. The production was, of course, amateurish, and as apparently no Russian authority had been consulted, there were many blatant errors in the production, such, for example, as the presentation of Prince Vassily Shuisky—one of the principal characters of the play, modelled by Pushkin in accordance with historical truth on the Shakespearean "villain"—as a youngster of about twenty-five, when in reality Shuisky at that time was an elderly man. The wonderful scene in Pimen's cell, the juxtaposition of the serene old age of the monk-historian and the turbulent youth of the Pretender—was completely "mis-acted," if I may use a non-existing word, because the part of the old monk was taken by a young man with a voice that was not only youthful, but high pitched. The actor who took the part of Boris was neither an Irving nor a Norman MacKinnel (the great actor for whom there is seldom sufficient scope on the commercialised English stage in the absence of a theatre of National Drama). The fine scene between Boris and Shuisky (in which the Russian singer Chaliapine was so deeply impressive) was, therefore, a failure.

And yet, having never seen *Boris* on the Russian stage (it was produced by the Moscow Art Theatre after my departure from Russia), I could not help feeling that it was an exceedingly "actable" play. In the hands of a talented actor, the part of the Pretender becomes extraordinarily dramatic and affords endless possibilities. Suffice it to mention the short scene on the Lithuanian frontier. Kurbsky, the son of a *boyar* who had fled to Lithuania from the Czar Ivan, is elated at the prospect of his sword "serving the master of its hopes." The Pretender is melancholy. He moves quietly with bowed head.

Pretender:

Brave knight, I envy thee!
The son of Kurbsky, nurtured in exile,
Forgetting all the wrongs borne by thy father
Redeeming his transgression in the grave,
Ready art thou for the son of Great Ivan
To shed thy blood, to give the fatherland
Its lawful Czar. Righteous art thou; thy soul
Should flame with joy.

Kurbsky:

And dost not thou likewise
Rejoice in spirit? There lies Russia; she
Is thine, Czarevitch! There thy people's hearts
Are waiting for thee, there thy Moscow waits,
Thy Kremlin, thy dominion.

Pretender:

Russian blood,
O Kurbsky, first must flow! Thou for the Czar
Hast drawn the sword, thou art stainless; but I lead you
Against your brothers; I am summoning
Lithuania against Russia; I am showing
To foes the longed-for way to beauteous Moscow!

One might quote many other examples of intensely dramatic moments—but, like so many in the Shakespearean plays which have inspired Pushkin, acting of intuitive genius is required in order to do them justice. How many actors have availed themselves of the opportunities provided by such parts as Brabantio or Claudius?

Apart from *Boris Godounov*, Pushkin has left only two finished dramatic works: the one-act drama *Mozart and Salieri*, and *Don Juan*. The former was set to music by Rimski-Korsakov, and the latter by Dargomyjski. Both composers left the text unaltered—a sufficient proof of the "sonorous music and magnificently close utterance" of Pushkin's verse. In order, however, to do full justice to these plays, in which Pushkin's "gift of stage architecture," contrary to Maurice Baring's view, seems to me supreme, the artists must not only possess intuitive talent, but must also be masters of the art of elocution. Otherwise the superb music of the verse is lost. Chaliapine once said to me that he would never endeavour to sing the part of Wotan because he realised that he was "too small" for it. In the same spirit, few indeed were the theatres in Russia that ventured to perform these masterpieces of Pushkin's dramatic production.

Pushkin left an unfinished play: the half-realistic, half-fantastic dramatic poem *The Mermaid*, also put to music by Dargomyjski (and it is the masterpiece of the Russian composer, whose works are utterly unknown abroad).

Perhaps Pushkin's favourite form of poetical work was the story in verse, in which dramatic dialogues alternated with the verse narration. *Poltava*, *Angelo*, and *Galub* are of that type. In *Poltava*, the story of Mazeppa's betrayal of Russia, there are scenes which for intensity of dramatic feeling stand alone in Russian literature, as, for example, the short scene between Kotchub's wife and the daughter, Mazeppa's bride, to whom the mother announces that her father has been condemned to death by Mazeppa's orders.

Detached dramatic scenes such as *The City of the Plague*, *The Covetous Knight*, *Faust*, are mere sketches, but in every one of them Pushkin's genius as a dramatist is revealed. In *Faust*, a short dialogue between Faust and Mephistopheles, Pushkin's gift

not merely of "magnificently close utterance," but of psychological insight is, to my mind, apparent to a higher degree than in any other of his works. Faust is musing over his meeting with Gretchen. Mephistopheles mocks him. The following is but a feeble attempt to transcribe in English prose the passage in which both gifts—close utterance and insight—are so striking:

You are raving, Faust. . . . Shall I tell you what you were thinking about at a moment when no one thinks? You thought: My obedient lamb! How greedily I wanted thee! How cunningly I provoked the dreams of the heart of the simple maiden! Innocently she yielded to unselfish, natural love. Why, then, is my bosom filled with odious gloom and boredom? Having drunk the cup of pleasure, I look upon the victim of my passing fancy with uncontrollable aversion. Thus the reckless fool who has planned a useless misdeed and has stabbed a miser in the wood curses the ragged corpse; thus Debauch, having hastily satisfied its appetite with a venal beauty, squints at it timidly.

"I shall always be liked by the people," wrote Pushkin in one of his poems, "because my lyre evoked kindly feelings." This prophecy has been more than fulfilled, and for many more reasons than the poet adduces. Pushkin is the poet to whom Russians look not merely for æsthetic joy, but for spiritual and intellectual enlightenment. For Pushkin was not only a genius under whose pen Russian life past and present, Russian nature, Russian imagination, patriotism and creative power were made to live and to shine gloriously. He was also, even in the days of his turbulent youth, a veritable sage. His sense of humour, reflected in his epigrams and numerous other works, was equal to his powers of emotion and humane sentiment.

A short poem dedicated to the Polish poet Mieczkevicz is, perhaps, the finest illustration of the latter trait:

He lived in our midst, among people of a strange race, he had no ill-feeling against us. Peaceful, benign, he attended our discourses. We shared with him our pure dreams and our songs (he was inspired from above and looked upon life from a height). Often he spoke of future times when all peoples, forgetting enmity, will unite into one family. We listened with avidity to the poet. He went westward, and we blessed him on his departure. But now our peaceful guest has become our enemy, and in his poems, the servant of the turbulent mob, he sings Hate: from afar the familiar voice of the wrathful poet reaches us. . . . O God! restore Thy peace to his incensed soul.

Pushkin's intuitive understanding of Russian history and especially of the events of the last two centuries before his life-time is perhaps unequalled by any historian, Russian or foreign. No historian has ever drawn as true and vivid a portrait of Peter the Great as Pushkin. Catherine the Second, the other prominent figure

in the eighteenth century, died only a few years before Pushkin was born. The tradition of her "glorious reign" was still alive, and she was regarded as equally great as, if not greater than Peter. With an insight which subsequent historical research and study has already confirmed and is bound still more fully to corroborate, Pushkin saw the reverse of the shining medal. Not only in an epigram of eight lines—an immortal piece of irony—but in a short prose essay, so short that one might almost describe it as a mere note, he outlined the influence of Catherine's reign upon the destiny of the Russian people, with such wisdom and loftiness of political understanding that this short sketch will undoubtedly be the Gospel of the future Russian historians who will no longer be hampered by Imperial censorship.

Pushkin is the national treasure, the national pride, and the national idol which no revolution can squander, besmirch, or smash. "God preserve us," he wrote, "from seeing the Russian revolt, senseless and merciless." Contemporary Russians have seen it. And they turn to the Prophet, who had such boundless faith in the great future of his people and such admiration for all that is best in them, for solace, spiritual and intellectual encouragement and education.

Critics have said that Pushkin is to Russians what Shakespeare is to the British, Goethe to the Germans, or Dante to the Italians. That, and much more.

C. NABOKOFF.

THE CINEMA IN EDUCATION: SOME PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS.

FEW people will deny that the Cinema has become one of the most powerful of influences in modern society, an activity alike for creators and spectators almost equalling in popularity athletic sports, horse-racing and betting—at any rate in the Western world, and the East would appear to be following hard upon the heels of the West. Over two years ago Mr. St. John Ervine declared, in an arresting article in the *Observer*, that a new type of mentality had come into being and was moulding our literature, art, religion, politics—a type he designated as the “Movie-mind.” Since the young of to-day are the adults of to-morrow, the question of the mentality which is evolving must be of the first importance to every educator, using the term in its widest sense, that is, if the educator fulfils his proper function, which is to lead, not merely to follow. That educators do realise the importance of this matter is made evident from the attention given to it in the last few years, fruit of which appears in two recent publications, one, the Report of the Committee on the Use of the Cinematograph in Education, published in 1924 under the auspices of the Imperial Education Conference of the preceding year: the other a volume which appeared in April of this year, *The Cinema in Education*, edited by Sir James Marchant, being the Report of the psychological investigation conducted by special sub-committees appointed by the Cinema Commission of Enquiry established by the National Council of Public Morals.

Both of these Reports have very interesting things to say, with many of which probably a majority of educators will be in substantial agreement; both should be studied by all who are interested in this question. At the same time, some conclusions reached appear very arguable, and certain most fundamental aspects of the question at issue are left untouched. It is to some of these that I wish to draw attention.

It is necessary, first, to recognise the twofold aspect of the Cinema as an educational force. On the one hand it is an instrument, one among many others, for achieving certain definite results: for example, the vivid presentation of facts and ideas which it is desired to impress upon children's minds; the giving of knowledge which could be only very inadequately depicted in words or by static presentation; the representation of growth and movement; the simplification of complicated processes—all these effects can be achieved, indisputably, by means of the Cinematograph, and probably better than by any other agency.

It has also a second aspect: it is a method by which the human

mind can be affected and directed, and it is obvious which of these two functions is the more fundamental and therefore the one which most demands our interest. It would be true to say that the two Reports referred to have chosen to concentrate mainly upon that aspect of the Cinema I have cited first: both deal with such questions as the amount of material obtained and stored up in memory by the spectators, the accuracy, durability, and vividness of their impressions; the relative superiority or inferiority in these respects of the film and the lantern-slide: the different values of presentation of the film with or without verbal explanation, and other kindred considerations. That is to say, the Reports occupy themselves with the film as effecting, or failing to effect, certain concrete results relating to the *content* of the children's minds—obviously an extremely important consideration. A quotation or two will illustrate this.

“We have been deeply impressed by the unanimity with which teachers, who have taken part in these experiments and who, therefore, speak with experience, have recognised *the value of the Cinematograph as an adjunct to existing methods of teaching* and its great potentialities in the future provided a supply of really suitable films can be guaranteed. There is virtually a consensus of opinion as to its *usefulness* in teaching of nature study, geography, and industrial processes. . . .”*

Again, from the same Report: “Visual impression *imparts instruction in some subjects more easily, more vividly, and more durably* than many oral lessons.” And, “The Cinematograph *enlarges the scope of a child's experience.*”

The replies given to the questionnaire issued by the Committee furnish a great deal of material to the same effect. A headmaster of a school with 300 or so pupils, ranging from seven to fourteen years of age, states that he has found the Cinematograph of the highest value as an adjunct in imparting instruction in general science, geography, and history. “Children remember what they see, though they forget what they hear.” A headmistress in Lancashire reports that: “The Cinema *imparts instruction* through the medium of the ‘eye-gate’ much more easily than many oral lessons could do.” In the same direction, there are some negative judgments given in both Reports: namely, that the films were not grasped, or very partially retained in memory, or led to confusion rather than clarity of observation, and so forth.

The Cinema in its second aspect—as a factor in influencing and developing mind—is rarely touched upon, though a few of the replies to the questionnaire attempt to deal with it. An experi-

* The Imperial Education Conference Report, pp. 6, 7.

NOTE.—The italics are mine, used to draw attention to the special point at issue.

ment at Birmingham reports: "The Cinema may, even, be fostering a quick and careless way of looking at things, develop the habit of the unseeing eye which never gets beyond the obvious. . . . This danger of the Cinema providing an effortless way of acquiring superficial knowledge must always be guarded against if the Cinema is to be made of real educational value." From West Ham Education Department the report ran: "The Association were inclined to deprecate the use of the Cinema in schools as tending to stifle mental effort and to encourage a passive receptivity in children." In *The Cinema in Education* (p. 10) we read:

"We have been much impressed by the evidence brought before us that moving pictures are having a profound influence upon the mental and moral outlook of millions of our young people—an influence the more subtle in that it is subconsciously exercised. . . . The Cinema, under wise guidance, may be made a powerful influence for good: if neglected, if its abuse is unchecked, its potentialities for evil are manifold."

These latter quotations may serve as a starting point for the inquiry which will reveal more significant and fundamental aspects of the problems; namely, exactly and in what respects can the Cinema influence the mind and personality of the child.

Our first problem is to understand the meaning of the demand for the Cinema-entertainment; to what is that demand a reaction? Some light may be shed by study of adult modern communities, in which we see in every direction a demand for easy and quick methods for such entertainment as is characterised by incessant variety, sensationalism, and a drugging effect. The vastly popular variety-entertainment and cabaret-diversion, the jazz band, and a great deal of the drama of the moment, all bear these characteristics, as well as much of our pictorial art and literature, and, above all, the contemporary Press. In the individual much the same is to be noted, alternating with an exactly antithetical attitude, namely, negativism or cynicism (so-called) covering a very strong emotional development. In short, we see widespread a situation revealed so often by research into the deeper layers of the individual, namely, an expression in projected form of an inner fear and sense of inadequacy. Thus we may term the excessive demand for the Cinema both a *symptom* of the prevalent attitude, and a *gratification* of the wishes which create that demand, and it is by investigating along these lines that we may come to understand some of the deeper significance of the Cinema show.

In the human being's development, one of the most important stages is that earliest one in which he believes in magic, a stage characteristic of the infant, the very young child, of the primitive,

and to some extent, though disguised, of the "civilised" adult. This belief in magic expressed by means of gesture, or spoken word, or ritual, accompanies the complete auto-erotic stage, and can last so long as the child does, in reality, get his life maintained and his wants supplied (more or less) in a mysterious manner, from an external source unknown to himself: a period named by Ferenczi, the Hungarian psychologist, "the period of unconditional omnipotence." This stage passes over into the succeeding one in which the child has come to realise that his own wishes must act to achieve some desired object, which does not necessarily appear of itself: hence the stage termed by Ferenczi, "Belief in magic gesture." In this the infant or very young child stretches out his hands towards the object or cries out with his voice to it (the breast or bottle, for example), or moves his body near it, often achieving success by this method, since the mother or nurse fulfils his need. Hence evolves the "Omnipotence stage," and, accompanying it, the egocentricity of the individual.

In every human being, at whatever stage of development, some of this magic omnipotence-wish remains (manifested, for example, by the universal interest in gambling, in fortune-telling, in prophesying) and it is a vital question affecting his harmonious development how far and to what a degree this attitude is developed in the individual, an attitude based on the pleasure-principle, antagonistic to a suitable adaptation to reality. If this omnipotence-wish, achieved by magic, "this almost incurable megalomania of mankind," persists, then there is developed the type of persons "who never get reconciled to the renunciation of their unconscious irrational wishes, who on the slightest provocation feel themselves insulted and slighted, and who regard themselves as step-children of fate—because they cannot remain her only or favourite children."

It is surely clear that the Cinema-entertainment gratifies this "magic omnipotence-wish" more than any fairy-tale, any novel, picture, or drama can possibly do—and does so independently, to a large extent, of the *theme* of the film. It is the *method* which brings about so vividly the sense of wish-fulfilment. The Cinema's business is to show all problems solved, all doors opened, all questions answered: it must simplify and arbitrarily select, which is one way of making the spectator feel that his wishes are fulfilled, since real life is complex, unselective, often baffling our curiosity, and rarely offering solutions to our problems. The maintenance and dominance of such omnipotence-wishes, or, to use a more technical term, of the individual's Narcissism, tends always to regressive behaviour, since it is easier for

the *Ego* to re-tread known paths which have already proved pleasurable than to go forward on paths yet untried, and therefore incalculable as far as pleasure-giving results are concerned.

Thus the Cinema entertainment, in gratifying the omnipotence-wish, thereby maintains the regressive tendency in the individual, out of which is developed that disintegration of the personality which is so marked a feature of the neurotic, and of many of our modern phenomena. Such disintegration is inevitably the result of the failure of the pleasure-impulse to reach and co-operate in the level of development attained by the rest of the personality. By an emotional expenditure of an infantile nature only (that is, Narcissistic emotion unrelated to external reality) the life of the emotions remains undeveloped: inadequate and extravagant, at one and the same time.

That such effects are brought about, in part, by the essential nature of the film display can be shown more fully by a rather more detailed consideration of some characteristics of the Cinema show, but first I should like to consider how the spectator also must contribute to these same results. From the film-spectator the predominant demand is almost passive attention *via* the path of visual contact, so that he is able to gain his gratification with the least expenditure of effort, and, as has been pointed out already, fulfilment of gratification without effort is to put the individual once again into his early (infantile) Narcissistic-omnipotence stage, that is, to assist him into a regressive and disintegrated psychic situation.

It will here be objected that those films which are true to reality cannot possibly produce such results: that only those which are false to life and scientific truth can thus be accused. Obviously, as regards external truth of reality, there is a world of difference between a film illustrating Scott's Antarctic Expedition and one showing some crude and falsified "Crook" melodrama, and such difference must affect the personality of the spectator. Nevertheless, it is possible for some of the same unconscious effects to be created in both cases, since the *mechanism* at work is much the same, or even identical. In the film of the Scott Expedition, than which nothing could be more beautiful and more moving as far as the pictures themselves are concerned, all the elements of magic achievement, of simplification, of rapid solution are present, just as in any other film: we do not see the "blood and sweat," the love and hate, the despair and courage, the satisfactions and failures, which alone can render any account of the work a true entity. Naturally, this criticism applies less to nature films, geographical films, and films depicting mechanical processes: the Selborne Society's beautiful and accurate pictures illustrating nest-

building, haunts of wild animals, animals at play, and so forth, do give much more the true idea, but even these cannot but give the child distorted ideas, especially in respect to time-conceptions. A small investigation recently carried out among school children of different types and of ages varying between eight and twelve revealed this rather interestingly: seventy per cent. of the children believed that such processes as the development of the chick out of the egg, of the fish from the spawn, of the pearl within the oyster, of nest-building, and other similar ones, took that time which elapsed in the showing of the films, even though each step in the process was elaborated. Here is a conscious impression resulting from the method, and if we inquire into deeper levels of the mind, still more will this distortion be operative.

Those who are in some agreement with certain of the criticisms already made, will probably object, however, that such criticism applies in varying measure to every art-form: that artificial selection, simplification, adaptation, are just as inevitable in the drama, the novel, the picture, and the sculptured creation. This is a contention which cannot stand investigation. In the production of these manifestations, the human mind is working in a medium which is non-mechanistic, which, therefore, is forced to take upon itself some of the limitations and expansions of the human psyche: in consequence, the product (the play, novel, picture, statue) must, willy-nilly, carry with it some truth to reality, however slight, and at the same time must demand from the spectator his own effort and adjustment to that reality. The most foolish and "impossible" of melodramas, or the humblest and simplest of fairy-tales, asks of its hearer or reader some measure of his own creative work in filling the gaps, in developing hints, in maintaining continuity, all of which things are done—or rather left undone—by the film, operating in a mechanical universe. Indeed, just because the picture, statue, tale, are to some extent "static" do they make this demand.

Further, much of the unconscious and partially conscious emotion which not only may, but *must*, obtain expression in the work of the actor and actress satisfactorily acting genuine drama on the stage, is "cut" or falsified, owing to all sorts of artificial restrictions in film-production: hence the spectator also must suffer from lack of emotional contact, since only when another's unconscious speaks can our own unconscious be most freely liberated. In illustration of this point, a comparison might be made between Watts' pair of pictures "Love and Life," "Love and Death," and that very remarkable German film "Destiny," which London had the opportunity of seeing a year or two back. Probably present-day film-art could reach to no higher level than that exem-

plified in "Destiny," and the acting in it was quite unusually good, but it displayed the inevitable mechanical characteristics of Cinema production: Watts' two pictures, dealing with the same theme, although many would not place the art of them at any very high level, do not (for they cannot) falsify by their method.

It will, I anticipate, be objected that the Cinema-show also demands imagination for any intelligent following of the ideas presented. We must consider a little more deeply what is meant by this term "imagination." We know that an external object can stimulate by gratifying the imaginative wishes already present: we accept the day-dream in the form, for instance, of the melodrama or novelette because it is our own already-existent day-dream. Imagination is an attribute of all human beings; in the words of a famous living dramatist: "Imagination is something you *can't* get rid of, artists and everyone else have it: but what costs the artist blood and sweat is to work up the raw material of imagination into art." In other words, the response to suitable stimulus remains inadequate for use without the moulding-force of energy working upon it. It is questionable whether we do not render this imagination merely a disintegrating force if it can be so easily gratified, and therefore able to maintain itself on the regressive infantile level.

Another aspect of the Cinema intimately bound up with some of the deepest individual development impulses is its relation to time. Research into the unconscious of man has demonstrated that the idea of time (and its twin-companion death) is perhaps the most deeply-repressed material of the mind. Now the film-production gratifies (and therefore maintains) this repression in two-fold manner. In the first place, the illusion of timelessness is created owing to the fact that real human beings are never present, but only simulacra of them, and types, rather than individuals, are largely represented—which helps to maintain the effortless state of the spectator. In the second place, owing to swiftly culminating happenings, without the intermediate phases of slow elaboration, and consequently without cumulative evidence, there is lack of opportunity for slow development and growth. It is true that "oral" teaching alone will never bring to the child's mind full realisation of these slow-developing processes, but in any adequate system of such teaching provision can be made for actual investigation to be carried on alongside.

Turning from the time-illusion, we see another distortion created owing to the Cinema's uniform stereotyping technique: the film knows no light and shade. Features which are striking to the eye, however superficial or trivial in content, however subsidiary to the main idea, may become equal in value with, or even sub-

merge, the really significant features: it is noted in the Report of the Psychological Committee of Investigation how plainly this revealed itself in the children's essays. As a result, the child's yet undeveloped sense of proportion and grasp of values is retarded rather than furthered. In no form of creative art is such a condition (namely, this falsification of value) inherent, even though the inferior artist may, owing to his own deficiencies, blur his lights and exaggerate his shadows.

Yet another characteristic of the Cinematographic process, apart from any specific theme, is the constant variety in presentation, a factor which contributes to the infantile pleasures already referred to. This variety, with its constantly-changing, yet always slight, demand upon the spectator, falls into line with the very early curiosity-impulses of the child, and the continued gratification of such impulses can tend to the creation of an adult mentality characterised by inability to concentrate on even the most desired objectives: very much in present-day life seems to reveal such mentality—short and scrappy journalism and fiction, our rapid dramatic shows, our jazz bands, even our demand for quick lunches and ever quicker locomotion.

Touching upon the same unconscious impulses is that character of the film which demands from the spectator an almost exclusive visual attention. The significant rôle played by curiosity in the early life of the child, developed and gratified by seeing and looking, is maintained by means of the film's dominant appeal, and in thus obtaining and continuing his gratification he is assisted in remaining at the infantile curiosity-level.

Most competent observers agree that the present age, in spite of its virtues, is a period of easily-fatigued attention, of inability to concentrate on slow laborious processes whether of mind or body, of inability to take long views and hold to them with patience and persistency—a period, in fact, which may be characterised in many respects as childish, emotionally and mentally. It is, therefore, very much worth while to consider to what extent this extremely powerful force of the Cinema (the power of which will be further increased by its adoption as an educational instrument) may help or intensify these attitudes. In the limits of this article it is possible only to adumbrate the problem, with the hope that further investigation may follow.

BARBARA LOW.

THE STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK.

THIS gathering of over five hundred delegates from thirty-seven countries, representing "the greater number of Christian communions . . . of the Old and New World and of the Near and Far East," has hardly received from the British Press and people the attention it deserved. Other nations, in Europe and America, have shown themselves more observant of its course and character. Here and there, indeed, there may have been a tendency to exaggerate its importance and to claim for it a completeness which it did not possess, as when certain exuberant spirits, forgetting or ignoring the absence of the Roman Catholic Church, attempted to describe it as Œcumenical. But when all such untenable claims have been set aside, the Conference remains a memorable assembly, unique in modern history, and of significant origin. Itself the first organised effort since the break-away of the Reformation to bring together the scattered Churches of Christendom in a common attempt to apply a Christian solution to the manifold complicated problems of contemporary life, national and international, child of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, it embodied and developed an idea born directly out of the sufferings and problems created by the Great War. Some vision and more than an ordinary measure of courage must be allowed to men who believed that, in face of the enmity, and bitterness, and deep sense of injury which the war had left among victors and vanquished alike, the needs of the times could most hopefully be met by a closing of ranks and a pooling of resources among the Christians of all nations, who had for centuries marched and fought as separate and unrelated detachments of an army without visible cohesion. It was a bold conception, which took five years to mature and three of hard work to carry into effect. Had not the Archbishop of Upsala, to whose genius the original conception was due, been in touch with the life of his time at more points than might (to those not knowing him) have seemed possible in this age of specialisation, the task could never have been carried through; as it was, he and his band of helpers in England and elsewhere must have endured many hours of discouragement. Now, few even of those who accepted the invitation to the Stockholm Conference with some doubt of the wisdom of its promoters' plan, will be found to deny that their daring was justified by its results.

These results were not of the kind that could be summed up in resolutions or laid down in schemes of nicely-paralleled action by all the Christian bodies represented. He would have been over-sanguine—or very inexperienced—who, even before the Con-

ference settled down to discussion, supposed such an outcome of its debates to be possible. A very few hours within the walls of the Musikaliska Akademien, at Stockholm, must have taught the most optimistically-minded member—shall I say of the American delegation?—that constructive measures were not yet in sight, and that what lay before the Conference was the pioneer work of breaking down barriers, removing misunderstandings, and seeking a common ground of principle in relation to each of the subjects on the Agenda, striving meanwhile to keep steadily in view the vision of "the Church" above and beyond "the Churches." From the outset of the meeting it was to "the Church" in the singular that speakers of all nationalities, moved by a common spontaneous instinct or inspiration, referred. By its close one felt that the term was being used with a sense of its implications which had been absent or only faintly present ten days earlier, but had developed in an atmosphere of honest goodwill, desire of mutual comprehension, and that growing sympathy which comes of growing understanding.

Looking back over those ten days, one recognises a really marvellous spirit of self-restraint, which was in no wise weakened as the course of debate and the habit of companionship encouraged plainness of speech, and as frank statement of ethical objection, divergencies of philosophical thought, and, finally, of national grievances, took the place of cautious and embarrassed reticence. No one accustomed to take part in international congresses and assemblies could fail to recognise the peculiar atmosphere of this particular gathering. The men and women who composed it seemed, conscious of an immense responsibility, to be mounting guard upon themselves lest any word of theirs should disturb the conditions needful to the making of a tremendous experiment full of significance for the world and the religion of Christ. It was, in the best sense, a religious atmosphere in which, from the 19th to the 29th of August, the delegates to Stockholm lived and spoke. Doubtless, this was the more easily maintained because the subject was "Practical Christianity," theological discussion being ruled out, and the application of certain principles to Life and Work made the sole subject of discussion. Common daily worship, the saying together of the Lord's Prayer by each delegate in his mother-tongue, helped too. And the note struck at the opening service in the Storkyrkan, when the procession of dignitaries ranged from the Eastern Patriarchs and prelates in magnificent vestments and jewelled crosses to the Dutch and Danish pastors in their black gowns and white ruffs (looking as though they had just stepped down from the frame of a Rembrandt) and American divinity professors in frock-coats, the note repeated at the Engelbrekt Church on the following

Sunday, and at the Cathedral of Upsala on the occasion of the final thanksgiving, if it produced on some minds—notably, perhaps, those of the Dutch and Danish pastors aforesaid—a troubling effect of strangeness to begin with, was, by degrees, found to harmonise with the general idea at the heart of the Conference—the idea of unity in diversity.

For all this, the Conference was a difficult one; to ignore its difficulties would be to misrepresent it. The promoters had set on foot something without precedent; it was their task to meet and, if possible, reconcile views on those burning questions of the day which most divide men in secular assemblies—economic and industrial problems, social and moral problems, problems of education, of race, of international relations, of peace and war—and to relate each of them to religious and ethical conceptions varying widely according to Church and nationality; moreover, they were hampered in many cases by the aftermath of the Great War and by an intensity of nationalism showing itself from the ecclesiastical standpoint. It is tempting to think of the Eastern Orthodox Church as one body, and the strong representation of its different branches at Stockholm certainly bears witness to a general movement among them of a desire to abandon the age-long Eastern isolation and enter into brotherly relations with the Western Church; but in matters of representation it is the nationalist spirit which dominates, and each auto-cephalous Church claims a separate seat on the General Continuation Committee of the Conference. This may seem mainly a matter of machinery, but it had its practical inconveniences. Much more serious was the feeling among the rank and file of the German delegation, obvious even while it remained unspoken, that in pressing the cause of peace as the cause of Christ, and urging the use of such machinery for obtaining peace as the League of Nations, their fellow-delegates were overlooking the special sufferings of Germany, the wrongs which Germans hold themselves to have suffered at the hands of the Allies, their lack of hope in the League as it is at present constituted. This feeling found voice in a moving speech by Dr. Klingemann—as remarkable for the self-control as for the eloquence with which the speaker presented his facts and explained his position. Although he did not claim to speak officially for the delegation to which he belonged, and some of the leading members of the delegation did not wholly endorse his views, his candid utterance cleared the air. The Bishop of Winchester, who was in the chair, welcomed it as a help and not a hindrance to the debate, rejoiced openly that the Conference was being frank with itself, and added a word of penetrating sympathy—all the delegates, he said, could understand German doubts and fears in relation to the League, knowing what the one word “Silesia” must

mean to any German. The response from the German ranks was immediate; a barrier had been levelled, the sense of a possible moral boycott was then and there swept away.

With regard to industrial questions the difficulty took a different form. The Conference was full of instruction for any member willing to learn from its proceedings, and on no subject did it provide a more forcible lesson than on the connection between theology and economics. The influence of the Lutheran theology on the Central European and, in lesser degree, on the Northern European mental attitude towards problems of social and international justice and the question of peaceful arbitration *versus* force received striking illustration in arguments put forward, with evident sincerity, by certain German and Scandinavian delegates. Their expressed conviction that to look for the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth is a misleading illusion, and to work for it labour lost (since this world and all its works must remain the province of the Devil), seemed for a time to set up a hopeless barrier between those who agreed with such speakers and the overwhelming majority of the British, American, and French delegates. There was a similar clash of opinion—inevitable because consequential—on the question of the Church's past failure to recognise her duty in respect of social wrongs and industrial injustice. These oppositions revealed themselves in their most acute form during the work of some of the Commissions which sat for a week before the Conference assembled and prepared the reports which formed the basis of its discussions. There were moments in the sessions of these Commissions, composed as they were of people of widely divergent outlook on points which seemed to be crucial, when anything approaching agreement must have appeared well-nigh hopeless. Yet agreement was reached—reached doubtless, as in the Commission on which I served personally—by steady patience, willingness to understand the opposite view and deal with it by way of sympathetic argument, and, in the end, readiness to accept modifications in expression if only some fundamental position were asserted and safeguarded. So it happened that the stiffest German opponent of the more “advanced” view in one Commission bravely owned himself its convert in the Conference, adding that his change of opinion was largely due to the moving words of a fellow Commissioner—who was a Frenchman.

Membership of the Conference was largely clerical. This was, perhaps, inevitable; in a venture of the kind the appeal and the invitation went almost necessarily to the leaders of the national Churches and the several denominations, but a larger lay element, including a better proportion of women, would have added strength to the representative character of the assembly. The laymen taking part were, however, persons of considerable weight: the

most notable paper read before the Conference was, by general consent, that which Dr. Walter Simons, President of the German Supreme Court, contributed on "Christianity and Penal Justice." Full of profound philosophical thought, it cut down to the roots of a social problem which perhaps more than any other of our time has been subjected to superficial emotional treatment. In general, the appointed speakers handled efficiently the subjects allotted to them—the papers by M. Wilfred Monod and Dr. Garvie on God's Purpose for the World, by Dr. Carnegie Simpson on Education, Dr. Gillie on Youth, Dr. Deissmann on Removal of the causes of War, Pastor Elie Gounelle—that born orator—on behalf of Labour, and the Dean of Canterbury's lucid and convincing presentation of the plan for continuation of the Conference, remain in memory with the Bishop of Winchester's opening sermon and the Archbishop of Upsala's closing comment on the work done. The level of debate was well maintained, and, indeed, some of the speeches limited by stern rule to a few minutes were among those which most deeply stirred the Conference. The appeal of Professor William Adams Brown, of the United States, for acceptance of the Message, was one of such short-winged barbed arrows; another was the five minutes' speech in which Dr. Bell White, a coloured American university professor, stated the case for his coloured fellow-citizens with an extraordinary combination of argumentative force, Christian feeling, and perfect taste. A day or two later it was made known that he had been nominated by the American delegation as one of their representatives on the Continuation Committee.

I have said that the Conference did not express its mind in resolutions. Clearly the time was not yet ripe for anything so definite and clear cut. But it found itself able to send a Message to "All the followers of Christ," urging the need of unity and co-operation in action, acknowledging the failings of the Christian Churches in the past, laying down the great principles that should guide Christians in relation to economic and industrial problems, social and moral questions, and "a Christian internationalism, equally opposed to national bigotry and a weak cosmopolitanism," and adding special words of sympathy with the aspirations of Labour and Youth. The Message is—it had to be—a compromise, and as a compromise it will naturally fail to satisfy very many. But it is as far as this Conference was ready to go; it is as far as honest reporters of its conclusions could truthfully go; and, as is written in the Message itself, the Conference is "only a beginning." That it is a real beginning, I believe. That it laid a foundation of understanding and fellowship and increased knowledge of life and work on which a better world may be built, I feel confident. But the building will take a long while yet.

CONSTANCE SMITH.

THE ACHILLES OF JOURNALISM.

TO work with Stead (even for a colleague whom I note is kindly described as "zealous and energetic") was ordinarily like having a cyclone as an hourly companion; and sometimes one has been tempted to decide that there has never been anyone akin to him either on earth or in heaven. So my sympathies, along with a keen appreciation of his labour, goes out to Mr. Frederick Whyte, who, in *The Life of W. T. Stead*,* has provided what the wide range of his subject's interests has almost converted into an encyclopædia, a workman-like, solid, and admirable account of the attributes, activities, and achievements of a man who, whether we may like it or not, must be given a foremost place among the "live wires" of the world during the memorable four decades over which his varied career extended (1871-1912). The lively Eighties wherein his career came to full bloom, supplied superb justification for his reputation as the founder of a journalism which, though it has since deteriorated grievously in the hands of men lacking his alertness and acuteness of perception, his breadth of vision, and his pronounced sense of responsibility for a moral use of a high office, has even in its emasculated forms played a part far beyond the imagination of earlier journalists.

Stead, of course, was not without "warts"—who, indeed, is? As an editor he certainly lacked fastidiousness. As a rule he was decidedly careless as to dress, he would call upon Lord Rosebery, in Berkeley Square, wearing a well-worn Russian sealskin cap, suggestive of the typical burglar seeking to enter society, evening clothes were to him an abomination, clubs he would not join; and I have never forgotten how a shocked lady once described his talk at the dinner-table: "After swooping from the Hebrides to the Soudan, he settled down to discuss the bottom bone of a woman's backbone." While he had unmistakably his veiled chambers, it is not stretching many points to say that he appeared to have little reserve or even reverence—certainly not awe. At times it seemed that he regarded God as if He were a friend as intimate as Benjamin Waugh or Reginald Brett; but, of course, this impression may be justly treated as proof that in his belief, as is, indeed, indicated several times in the first volume, God was his close friend, and, in fact, Director-General. On the other hand, it was easy to conceive of him accepting an opportunity to get a peep from a peak into the underworld. The most irritating of his "warts" from the office point of view was due to the fact that though neither his figure, nor attire, nor manner were particularly appealing, he yet became the sun to a world of women. His sym-

* Jonathan Cape. 2 vols.

pathy with women was ever in evidence, and assuredly such sympathy once gave him close touch with tragedy. Being a man very stubborn in his loyalty to his own desires, counsel, where policy was concerned, seldom influenced him, probably because of his faith in the divinity of his "sign-posts"; it followed that he "went through" many friends, but I believe there were none—and the writer was often strongly in opposition to him—whose affection he ever entirely lost.

Stead wrote his leading article with rare rapidity. His style could be called only in the way of flattery distinguished—as Morley once observed, it was "a little raw"; yet, depending largely upon simple words, it was decidedly forceful and certainly "got there." But it was not his language, his style, which made him powerful: it was his sweeping designs, his determined assaults, his implacability where evil, as he might esteem it, was rife and ripe. His chief capital was, undoubtedly, comprised in the three words, with their distinctive meanings: audacity—daring—in the last resort, courage—the grim courage which would undoubtedly have faced death like a martyr at Smithfield. He was well served by a wide curiosity: he was seldom free from ideas, and he scorned "do-nothing" journalists. A Liverpool reviewer has just delighted me by "slating" Matthew Arnold's mistaken judgment of Stead; in all the history of journalism here can be few men who ever worked harder to obtain the facts and views of men who knew most upon any topic of the moment. When he had a few free minutes in the office, the staff generally found him overflowing with vivacious talk—often decidedly graphic. Gusto was at times a feature of this talk; but of "flaming egotism" I cannot recall a trace. The Chief could scarcely be set down as business-like; if he may modestly record a fact of which the biographer seems to have been unaware, it was the Satellite, anxious for permanent fruit from so much activity, who saved both "The Maiden Tribute" and his great peace tour to Continental Governments from going to waste. Large and influential committees (of which both the Chief and the Satellite became officers) were created, which organised countless meetings, including two of the biggest Hyde Park demonstrations on record. From "The Tribute" Committee there emerged later the National Vigilance Association, which, upon the spirited initiative and untiring energy of its Secretary, the late Mr. W. A. Coote, who had rallied to Stead's support, was mainly responsible for a superb fact—the international concordat which has already played great havoc with the "White Slave" traffic; from the other Committee there emanated the biggest Peace Campaign this country and the Continent have so far known.

Stead's training as a youth had made him an almost Drayton-

like Puritan, certainly an Independent, Cromwell-clad, with modern colouring by Longfellow, Emerson, and Lowell; and the Man was the child of the boy. Overlaying his weaknesses, the key to Stead is to be found in this sentence, written in 1880, in a letter distinguishing the differences between Mr. Morley and himself: "I have never, never lost, even for one hour, the conviction that this Unknown, Invisible is a force, a power, a person working with me, using me, directing me, even my mistakes and sins for the working out of an infinite, high, and noble purpose." He was an ardent friend of Man alive from the beginning, and he declared in writing: "If my life may be the means of doing much good in my day (and perhaps afterwards) I dedicate it to that purpose." These pages of arresting reflection upon his parting officially from Morley (pp. 90, 91, 92,) cast a white light, from several angles, upon Stead's career, half-suggesting, as they do, at least occasional abnormality. Yet I feel we could "stand" one or two "abnormals" of the Stead type in this hour.

I would like to run through the various campaigns in which I played a small part, the most dramatic being his commission—"Go and find Gordon," issued in the middle of Charing Cross bridge on the morning following the news of the defeat of Hicks Pasha in the Soudan, but space forbids. The writer was not intimately concerned with "The Maiden Tribute" Commission, but he never has been able to regard these articles as a mere newspaper sensation, because, apart from Labouchere's warning that he might ruin the paper, he recalled that years before, Stead, as the north-country Editor, had sent him to Stanhope, at the head of Weardale, to investigate an outrage upon a girl, and, after his release, he had kept noting like cases in a back page of the *Gazette*. A reviewer, concerned as to passages which "shocked people into an accusation of indecency," will be relieved to learn that, yielding to the clamour of his staff, which had gathered in his room, at his request, on the day before the opening issue, Stead excised a word rarely heard to-day; the sensation in the country really resulted from the general atmosphere of the revelations and the horror they excited. Stead had introduced the word, not as a stimulus to sales, but simply as a means of rousing the public to action. The mischief was chiefly wrought by a big battalion of street-hawkers, for whose action Stead was in no way responsible: it was reported the paper was reprinted by pirate printers for sale by hawkers. Anyhow, Stead the Journalist was finally hanged for the good intentions of Stead the Humanitarian. To quote only one illustration. When the writer organised *The Tribune*, he proposed to secure his old chief's co-operation, but even to his appointment as a consultative member of the staff he failed to obtain the assent of the proprietor.

Stead once aspired to enter Parliament as a candidate for Sheffield, as I have good reason to remember, but the Liberals thereof denied him this distinction. He lived intensely the political life while the rousing agitation against the Turks arising out of the Bulgarian atrocities was afoot, played a big part in creating the popular uprising, and the historic St. James's Hall Conference was a red-letter event to him. I remember, as if it were yesterday, when, as he was seeing me off by train from Darlington station, on the night that the telegram came announcing that Disraeli had "gone to the country," with a message to a Liberal meeting at a distance, he exclaimed, with a fervour most rare in an editor, certainly in those days, "Thank God! it has come at last!" Conscious of his services to his cause, justly did Mr. Gladstone say, when he honoured me with a few minutes' talk at the Station Hotel at York as he was entering upon his second Midlothian campaign, *apropos* of a small request preferred by my Editor, "I will do anything to oblige Mr. Stead."

Stead was fated to become more powerful politically, though in a briefer space, than even Lord Northcliffe was in his turn fated to be. Is it not a fact that quickly following his activities Gordon was sent to the Soudan, the measure of protection for girls was substantially increased, and the fleet was so strengthened that it was a tremendous "stay and buckler" to us in the Great War? These amazing things, amazing particularly in view of the personal source of the impetus to their enactment, he harvested not, as in these days, through the instrumentality of highly-paid signed articles by people who so make an income out of their rank, their just fame, or their much-cherished notoriety—but solely off "his own bat"—the bat of a hard-working, almost unknown, journalist, the bat of a zealous, self-sacrificing citizen, the bat of a keen-visioned and gifted "barbarian" from the ancient Christian coastline of Northumberland! Indeed, he deserves to be styled the Achilles of Journalism!

This great apostle of public service—this doer of great things—went to his death—however serenely, as a sadly disappointed man. He had for three decades at least dreamt of the delight derivable from the control of a great newspaper, perhaps the most varied, the most able, the most influential journal so far known to the world; and no man was better entitled so to aspire, so to dream, and not only to aspire and dream, but to anticipate confidently. He had more than once been given good reason to hope that his desire would be gratified; but first Rhodes and then Carnegie disappointed him. He suffered great anguish at the defeat of his highest hopes. But his "day of remembrance" will in due time arrive.

WILLIAM HILL.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

LOCARNO: A POSTSCRIPT.

POSTSCRIPTS, like prefaces, are written last to come first. The following pages were written on October 14th while the Locarno Conference was in progress and no results were known. On the following day I left for Locarno and arrived just in time for the shouting on October 16th, the dual occasion of the initialling of the Locarno treaties and of Mr. Chamberlain's birthday. As this number of THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW is already printed, it is impossible this month to add anything beyond a short note to chronicle the successful issue of the Conference. The Rhineland Pact, or as it is officially called the Treaty of Mutual Guarantee, together with the four arbitration treaties, between Germany on the one side and Belgium, France, Czechoslovakia, and Poland on the other, were initialled, and the signing ceremony was deferred till December 1st, to take place in London. The psychological effect of the Locarno treaties is of far greater moment than the mechanism of their detailed content. To be in Locarno and to talk with the Foreign Ministers of the countries concerned was to be convinced beyond doubt of the sincerity of the pacifism to which Locarno is now a monument. The word "allies" was never used by any member of any delegation from the beginning to the end of the Conference, and the word has now been deleted from the vocabulary of European post-war diplomacy. It will never again appear in Diplomatic Notes. Since the Conference ended Mr. Chamberlain and other leading protagonists have dotted the i's by pointedly speaking of "former allies" and "former enemies."

The striking feature of diplomatic thought at Locarno was that goodwill was regarded as a realistic instrument, whereas treaties, conventions, pacts, covenants were in themselves regarded as worth little more than the paper they are printed on, except in so far as they are made potent by goodwill. It would be easy to find loophole after loophole in the Locarno texts for future war, just as it would be easy to find loopholes in any texts for any purpose whatever. So far as the diplomatic opinion of the seven countries is concerned, the only important thing done at Locarno—but it is all-important—in that those countries have openly committed themselves to a pacifist policy in the future. For the first time in diplomatic history Great Powers have surrendered their historic "right to make war"—the famous paradox of international law, "les droits de guerre"—and it will be next to impossible for them to recapture, even if they wanted to recapture, so dangerous a "right." The value of Locarno may be put in this way. Hitherto

the mass of sensible people have longed for peace, but fear and stupid tradition have made them disbelieve in it, and the whole conception of international relations has been based on the hypothesis that there would be war, somewhere at some time. The difference now is that, whereas national honour in the past was bound up with war, it is now bound up with peace. After Locarno war is synonymous with national dishonour. The plunge has been taken in favour of pacifism, for the first time in European history.

It is common ground among all the diplomatists with whom one has discussed the matter that with the entry of Germany into the League of Nations, the door will be shut on the past ten years, and no matter how successfully the timid ones may look for the possibilities of war in the texts of the Locarno treaties, their discoveries will be of no avail, for those texts themselves will be of as great, and of as little, importance to the new order in Europe as the chrysalis is to the butterfly. After October 16th, 1925, it became an anachronism to talk of the Polish difficulty, or of any of the stock difficulties of European diplomacy, as we have known them for the past seven years. They had vanished like mist.

PEACE BY DIPLOMACY.

The "Fall," as the Americans aptly call this time of the year, has been the occasion of much interesting diplomacy, some of it good, some unnecessarily perverse. A year's work on the proposed Security Pact culminated in the conference at Locarno, where at the moment of writing hopes ran high that the representatives of Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Italy, Czechoslovakia and Poland would succeed in agreeing never again to provoke a war. That was good diplomacy, for in diplomacy one has to be thankful for elementary things. Philosophically, it is odd that there should be any difficulty in reaching an agreement not to precipitate a war. The thing is on about the same philosophical level as would be a solemn attempt to agree not to lie across the railway lines when an express is dashing along. Practically, however, it is a difficult thing for the nations to agree not to exterminate each other, for diplomacy is still in a primitive stage, and the diplomats quarrel outrageously about matters of the most palpable simplicity and common sense. It is not primarily their fault, of course, but of the "public opinion" which largely guides them, or cripples them. Seven years after the Great Slaughter, for instance, fifty thousand people go to Wembley every night for the pleasure of gazing at a military spectacle, the essential purpose of which is not to revolt people against war, but to arouse enthusiasm over military precision and drill. As if

to pervert perversity still further, that unbelievable enterprise begins with the parade of a child and ends with the singing of a hymn, and people's minds are encouraged to cherish and to perpetuate the delusion that war is an incident of patriotic sacrifice, whereas every serious man, woman, and child, knows that his country could suffer nothing worse than war, whether victorious or not, in any cause whatever. One knows the traditional argument that to be prepared for the worse is not the same thing as to want the worse—"We don't want to fight, but by jingo. . . ." The unfortunate thing, however, is that to be prepared for war is to make war certain. Mr. Chamberlain, then, went to Locarno while the British public went to the Stadium at Wembley, and that epigram—for it is an epigram—being reproduced in different forms in France, Germany, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, and Poland, partly explains why it is that the diplomats have been beating about the bush for a whole year, and why, having met at last in Locarno, they at first found difficulty in doing an obvious thing.

The determination and even enthusiasm shown by Mr. Chamberlain since Germany proposed the Pact of Security at the beginning of the year is a matter on which the present British Government is to be congratulated by a grateful people. Whether in fact the people are grateful or not is a matter of doubt, which is as illustrative of the muddle in human affairs as is the British Government's own inconsistency in other fields. Can it be believed that the same Government should be willing, even anxious, to sign a Security Pact but should refuse to sign a treaty of "all-in" arbitration with, for instance, Switzerland? Yet this matter has been put to the test, and the Government has refused. The British type of arbitration treaty operates for all questions except those which affect the honour or the vital interests of the country. In other words, Great Britain has concluded some two hundred arbitration treaties for the purpose of settling disputes by arbitration instead of by war, but excludes from their field of operation precisely those disputes which most certainly lead to war. Suppose Mr. Chamberlain or Mr. Baldwin were to commit a murder in private life, as against in public life (that is, in war), and they appeared before the magistrate and pleaded in this way: "My Lord, I accept the validity of our common law as the arbiter in all disputes in which I may become involved. But I make exceptions, and so far as those exceptions are concerned, I have no use for the law. The exceptions are these: where my personal honour is concerned or my vital interests, I reserve the right to commit murder without being interfered with by the police. In the present case the man I murdered was one whose existence threat-

ened my vital interests. He was, in fact, an income-tax collector. I therefore murdered him, and I refuse to be answerable to any authority except my own Honour and my own Vital Interest." What would happen? The jury would no doubt be dismissed pending a medical examination of the defendants by nerve specialists. Yet their foreign policy so far as arbitration is concerned is an exact analogy.

THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT AND ARBITRATION.

Lest it be thought that the allegation here made that the British Government's attitude to international law is in gross conflict with the individual attitude of its members to English law, be a misrepresentation, it is well to explain exactly what the position is.

The question of arbitration is not a new one as it affects the British Government. There happens to be a definite British policy on the subject, a policy that has been recently reaffirmed as a result of a certain test case. When Mr. MacDonald supported and partly evolved the Geneva Protocol last year his main object was to institute a system of universal arbitration. Mr. Chamberlain, in rejecting the Protocol last March, and in other public declarations, has stated the present Government's case against "all-in" arbitration. The two points of view were well summed up in letters from Mr. Chamberlain on the one side and from Mr. MacDonald on the other published in the press in the last week of September. The issue is best illustrated by the actual case in point, which was referred to above, namely, that of Anglo-Swiss relations. Switzerland was one of the many countries with which Great Britain had an arbitration treaty of a uniform pattern. All the arbitration treaties to which Great Britain is a party, including that with Switzerland, and numbering some two hundred, have been published, and their common feature is that the reservation is made that they shall not apply to issues which affect either the vital interests or the national honour of Great Britain. The Anglo-Swiss Arbitration Treaty was renewable every five years, and when it fell due for renewal some five years ago the Swiss Government proposed that its character should be altered by the elimination of the reservation clause—in other words that it should be made an "all-in" arbitration treaty. As the British Government did not accept that proposal, but the proposed new treaty and the old existing treaty fell through. Since then the Swiss Government has renewed the proposal for an "all-in" arbitration treaty with the same result.

The reasoning which underlay the British Government's attitude in 1920 and underlies that of the present Government is that, although in the case of Switzerland it is difficult to see what occa-

sion could arise for arbitration, either on juridical points or on points which affect the national honour or vital interests, the acceptance of an "all-in" arbitration treaty with any one country would establish a precedent. The old type of arbitration treaty would thereby become an anachronism, and it would be a matter of time only before all the other treaties were re-adjusted to the new pattern.

Mr. Chamberlain has explained the Government's inability to accept universal and compulsory arbitration and its preference for Article 15 of the Covenant as it originally stands. Similarly, the German Government in its many arbitration treaties provides for arbitration on juridical issues, but for political disputes goes no further than an advisory and conciliatory machinery. France, on the other hand, has concluded an "all-in" arbitration treaty with Switzerland. The small Powers solidly favour universal compulsory arbitration. They point to the Corfu precedent as an illustration of the inadequacy of the present League machinery and of the differentiation it may lead to between big and small States. The principle of compulsory universal arbitration is one of bed-rock importance, and its adoption by the world in general must precede any settled prospect of peace. The British Government has not yet seen its way to adopt it.

Now what conceivable purpose can be served by a refusal to adopt, as France has adopted, the whole-hogger arbitration type of treaty? Mr. Amery, conducting the British case at Geneva in the Mozul dispute waxed indignant, and rightly so, against the Turkish refusal to be bound in advance by an arbitral decision. Yet is there any difference between the particular Turkish attitude to arbitration as manifested in the case of Mosul and the general British attitude to the principle of arbitration? It may be conceded that while the British Government refused to accept the catholic principle of arbitration, it had no hesitation in applying the principle in the concrete case of Mosul. That is to the credit of the British Government. Yet harm is done to the cause of the world's progress when a Power of Great Britain's standing hesitates to take the plunge in advance and for all occasions. There can be no law, either within the boundaries of a state or in the international sphere unless that law be binding universally and without exception. A leading article in the *Manchester Guardian* hit the nail on the head when it argued that Mr. Chamberlain's refusal of an "all-in" arbitration treaty with Switzerland simply amounted to this, that he insisted on reserving to Great Britain the right to go to war with Switzerland, even though ingenuity could not devise any conceivable cause of war between the two countries.

THE LOCARNO PRELIMINARIES.

The history of the Security Pact was taken in last month's CONTEMPORARY REVIEW to the delivery of the Allied invitation to Berlin for a Conference of Foreign Ministers. A German Cabinet meeting was held within a week with the result that Herr Sthamer went to the Foreign Office in London on September 26th, and the other German Ambassadors did the corresponding thing in the other capitals, to deliver the German Government's answer to the invitation.

Mr. Chamberlain, who had been weeding his Sussex garden as a form of relaxation between Geneva and Locarno, came up to London specially for the purpose. The meeting between Mr. Chamberlain and the German Ambassador was protracted, and according to gossip, which later events seemed to confirm, had its rough patches. On the following Tuesday night the Foreign Office issued the text of the German Note that had been delivered by the German Ambassador, in which the invitation to the Locarno Conference—thus called here for convenience, the exact place of meeting not having at that time been decided on—and the British answer to it. The British answer had been handed to the German Ambassador that same afternoon (September 29th). Some interesting currents of diplomatic finesse preceded the decision to publish the Notes. When the German Ambassador gave the German Note to Mr. Chamberlain on September 26th he made a verbal statement (which, none the less, was written out in full as an *aide-mémoire*) expressing the German desire to raise at the Conference certain cognate subjects, or subjects regarded by the German Government as cognate. The most embarrassing of them was that of war guilt.

It was made clear that what chiefly worried the German Government was the fear that in signing the proposed Security Pact she should at the same time be in effect signing again the Treaty of Versailles. That was an unnecessary fear, because it has never been thought either by the British or the French or the Belgian Government that the Pact had anything whatever to do with the Treaty of Versailles. It was something wholly outside the Treaty. That consideration, indeed, was mainly responsible for the British contention that the question of the Cologne evacuation—another of the points raised in the German Note—could not be co-ordinated with that of the Pact, for Cologne was a matter directly arising out of the Treaty.

It was officially announced from the Foreign Office on the afternoon of September 26th that the text of the German Note would be issued for publication in the papers of the following Tuesday morning. It was decided on the Monday, however, not to pub-

lish the Note, the reason being, as there seems to be no harm now in disclosing, that on the one hand it would be difficult, if not misleading, to publish the Note without publishing the verbal statement which accompanied it, and on the other hand, the publication of the full dossier might have the undesirable effect of precipitating awkward discussions which ought to be reserved for the Locarno Conference itself. It was therefore decided not to publish anything.

On the following day, however, it was learned that the substance of the German Ambassadorial statements—for they were made identically in London, Paris, and Brussels—were already being given out semi-officially in Berlin. The British Government, whose only concern in this whole business was to prevent any slip between the cup and the lip and not to jeopardise the Locarno prospect by premature controversy in the countries concerned, found itself in a difficulty. On the afternoon of September 29th, it decided to publish the whole dossier, including the verbal statements, and preparations were made for issuing them that night, the argument in favour of such a course being that a clean breast was better than partial disclosure.

On further consideration, however, it was decided to publish only the formal German Note, which was a simple and unconditional acceptance of the Allied invitation and the British answer. The verbal explanations of the German Ambassadors were on that line of argument regarded as Germany's affair.

The German Note ran as follows:

"Sir,—By instruction of my Government, I have the honour to inform your Excellency of the following:

"The German Government have the honour to state, in reply to the Note of September 15th communicated by the British Chargé d'Affaires that they entirely share the desire of the Allied Governments not to protract the negotiations for the conclusion of a Security Pact. They also trust that the final settlement of the problems under discussion will be expedited by a meeting of the members of the Governments of the States concerned, and they therefore, in accordance with their Note of August 27th last, agree to the proposal that this meeting should take place immediately.

"They suggest October 5th as the date for the meeting planned to take place in Switzerland.—I have, etc.,

"STHAMER."

Now the British Government's answer to that Note could not be understood except in the light of the German "verbal" memorandum which accompanied the German Note. The memorandum was not published officially, but was as follows:

"At a moment when the Ministers of the interested Powers

are about to meet for important conversations to consolidate peace between their countries, the German Government considers it necessary to inform the British Government in full frankness of its attitude towards two questions which are most closely concerned with the purpose of those conversations.

"In the former correspondence the Allied Governments have made the conclusion of a Security Pact conditional on Germany's entry into the League of Nations. While the German Government has not challenged the linking together of the two problems, it is forced thereby to revert to a point which affects the question of German entry into the League of Nations, and which has already been mentioned in the German memorandum of September, 1924, addressed to the Governments represented on the Council of the League. The German Government now repeats the declaration made in that memorandum to the effect that the eventual entry of Germany into the League of Nations is not to be construed as a recognition of the allegation which was made to establish Germany's obligations, which implies a moral charge on the German people, and is made the foundation of Germany's international obligations. The German Government considers that the public notification (see annex) in that sense issued by the then German Government on August 29th, 1924, is of assistance to the object of an understanding and a sincere reconciliation between the nations, and for its part the German Government identifies itself with that proclamation with the express purpose of creating the condition of mutual esteem and true equality of rights such as is essential for the success of the confidential conversations now contemplated.

"Moreover, the understanding and the reconciliation which are the objects in view would be prejudiced if before the entry of Germany into the League of Nations and before the conclusion of the Security Pact it were not found impossible to dispose of a dispute which still separates Germany from the Allies. The dispute referred to is that about the evacuation of the North Rhinish zone and the final settlement of the disarmament question. As long as the present situation continues—that is, as long as there continues the occupation of a large tract of German territory, which is felt by the German people to be an injustice—there can be no faith in that peaceful development on which depends the efficacy of the contemplated international agreements. The German Government trusts that the British Government will accept these observations in the same spirit and loyalty in which they are made, and that it will recognise in them a sincere determination to smooth the way for the realisation of the great work of peace now to be begun."

ANNEX.—"Extract from the German Press, August 30th, 1924:
"The Recall of the Responsibility Lie.

"On the occasion of the passage of the Dawes Legislation the Chancellor issues the following declaration in the name of the Government:—

"The Government wishes to express its thanks to all the members of the Reichstag who have contributed to this result. They have all had to overcome grave scruples and personal convictions before they could vote for acceptance. The Government cannot allow this important occasion, whereon they assume heavy responsibilities under the Treaty of Versailles, to pass without defining its attitude to the question of responsibility for the war in clear and unambiguous terms.

"The declaration (imposed on us by the Treaty of Versailles under the pressure of overwhelming force) that Germany caused the outbreak of the world war by her aggression is contrary to historical fact. The Government of the Reich therefore asserts that it does not accept that declaration. The demand of the German people to be emancipated from the burden of this false accusation is a just demand. Until that has been done, and so long as a member of the community of nations is branded as a criminal to humanity, a real understanding and reconciliation between the peoples is impossible of realisation. The Government will take steps to bring this pronouncement to the knowledge of Foreign Governments."

In the British Government's answer (September 29th) to the German formal note, some outspoken observations were made on the informal memorandum. "Your Excellency," it ran, "His Majesty's Government have received with pleasure the acceptance by the Government of the Reich of the proposal for a Conference on October 5th at Locarno. His Majesty's Government note with satisfaction that the acceptance is given without reserve.

"In reply to the declaration which your Excellency made to me at the same time, I have the honour to take note of the assurance of your Excellency that the questions therein raised do not constitute conditions preliminary to a meeting of Foreign Ministers. These questions have, in fact, no relation to the negotiations for a Security Pact, and have formed no part of the preliminary exchange of views.

"As regards that part of the declaration which deals with Germany's entry into the League of Nations, His Majesty's Government note with satisfaction that the German Government raise no objection to this essential condition of any mutual pact. The question of Germany's responsibility for the war is not raised by the proposed Pact, and His Majesty's Government are at a

loss to know why the German Government have thought proper to raise it at this moment. His Majesty's Government are obliged to observe that the negotiations of a Security Pact cannot modify the Treaty of Versailles or alter their judgment of the past.

"As regards the evacuation of the Cologne zone, I have the honour to repeat that the date of that evacuation depends solely on the fulfilment of Germany's disarmament obligations, and that His Majesty's Government will welcome the performance of those obligations as permitting the Allies at once to evacuate the northern zone."

Fortunately, however, no storm arose. Mr. Chamberlain, accompanied by his private Secretary, Mr. Walford Selby, his legal expert, Sir Cecil Hurst, and two experts from the Central European department of the Foreign Office, Mr. Myles Lampson and Mr. Sterndale Bennett, left London for Locarno on Saturday, October 3rd, and the Conference began on the following Monday. On leaving Victoria Station, Mr. Chamberlain made the sardonic remark: "Wish me well, but don't expect too much."

GREAT BRITAIN AND CHINA.

The events which had led to the decision of the Diplomatic Body at Peking to hold a new judicial inquiry into the Shanghai disorders and to the convening of the Customs Conference were chronicled in this section of THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW last month. The judicial inquiry, conducted by a bench consisting of Sir H. C. Gollan, Chief Justice of Hong Kong, for Great Britain, Mr. Finlay Johnson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court at Manila, for the United States, and Mr. Suga, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal at Hiroshima, for Japan, duly began its work on October 8th. Before it began, however, the Powers, including Great Britain, decided to make a further attempt to conciliate the Chinese Government. A Note from the Powers was presented in Peking dealing with some of the subsidiary points about which Chinese opinion has been much concerned. Private negotiations had been in progress for some time, and the exchange of Notes which took place was the outcome of them. The Note of the Powers was to the following effect. They wished to settle the Shanghai incident, which they had always regarded as profoundly to be regretted; they pointed out that they and the Shanghai authorities had done everything possible to create a better atmosphere, had abolished the military organisation, re-embarked the naval detachment, cancelled all the emergency measures, released all arrested persons, and reopened all the schools. The Powers, continued the Note, now wished to continue the exchange of views about the responsibility for the Shanghai incidents, and pointed out that the

Chief of the Police, Colonel MacEuan, was suspended pending the fixing of the responsibility. They were ready to instruct the Consuls to take up the question of labour conditions in Shanghai as soon as the Chinese Government gave similar instructions to its Consuls. They repeated that they were ready to discuss the "rendition" of the Mixed Court at Shanghai and Chinese representation on the Municipal Council. The point of this latter declaration was that the Shanghai ratepayers had of late failed to elect a Chinese representative, and the hint of the Powers, therefore, amounted to this, that they were ready to consider the appointment of a Chinese representative *ex officio*. The Powers also affirmed their readiness to discuss questions concerning the construction of new roads outside the Settlement (about which the Chinese Government had had objections), and sought to reassure the Chinese about the objections that had been raised to certain by-laws issued by the Council, by stating that those by-laws had not yet come into operation and that when approved by the Diplomatic Body, Chinese wishes would be taken into account. A similar promise was made about certain other issues that had arisen, for instance, about wharfage dues, printed matter, and liberty of speech.

It was clearly the hope of the Powers that such an exchange of Notes would convince the Chinese Government of the conciliatory spirit which animated them. There was, too, a subtle suggestion, which, however, events proved to be stillborn, that if, after all, the Chinese Government were to change its mind, abandon its boycott of the impending inquiry and appoint a Chinese judge to the bench, the Powers would be delighted. Most of the thirteen demands made in the Chinese Note of June 24th, had, in fact, now been conceded, especially those which called for an improvement in the government of Shanghai.

At the beginning of October there was contributory good news which helped a little to dissipate the misty prospect of the relations of the Powers with China. It was reported that the strike in the British cotton mills in Shanghai was over, and that the workers were going back to the mills in accordance with the agreement signed on September 26th. As the strike in the Japanese mills had already been settled, that was good news. At Canton, moreover, normal business was being resumed and the general situation, in spite of the continuance of the seamen's union's boycott in Shanghai, was appreciably improved.

Unfortunately, the olive branch of the Powers did not appeal to China. Chinese feeling began to run still higher, the Chinese Government persisted in its refusal to appoint a judge, and an advertisement issued by the bench in Shanghai appealing for

Chinese witnesses to give evidence was not only not responded but led to a positive intimation that China would have nothing to do with the affair. The inquiry, therefore, started in an unpromising atmosphere. None the less, British quarters at any rate clung to the hope that the public and impartial inquiry would have the effect of persuading the Peking Government of the sincerity of the Powers, and of their exclusive purpose of establishing the truth. It was all the more desirable that a good impression should be made because the Peking Customs Conference was to begin its work on October 26th.

The British delegation to Peking will be headed by Sir Ronald Macleay, the British Minister in Peking, who will have the advantage of knowing both the Chinese and the European aspects of the problem. In 1914 he was made Counsellor of Embassy to the British Legation at Peking, during the war came back to the London Foreign Office, where he was made head of the Far Eastern Department, took part in the Far Eastern Section of the Paris Peace Conference after the war, and since 1922 has been British Minister to China. He will be assisted by Lieut.-Colonel Sidney Peel as Financial Adviser and by Mr. K. D. Stewart, a director of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce. The latter's appointment was no doubt due to the anxiety that had been felt and expressed in business quarters lest a purely diplomatic delegation might be unequal to the effective championship of British commercial interests. Attached to the delegation will be Mr. Basil Newton, of the Foreign Office, Mr. F. H. Fox, Commercial Counsellor to the Legation at Peking, and Mr. E. Teichman, Chinese Secretary in the Legation at Peking. The Chinese delegation is a long and impressive list, which seems to suggest the importance which is attached to the Conference by the Central Chinese Government. The names include the Chinese Foreign Minister, the Ministers of Finance, Commerce and Communications, and two other political officials; Dr. W. Yen, Dr. C. T. Wang, Admiral Tsai-Ting-Kan, Mr. Liang-Shih-yi; the Chinese Minister at Washington, and the Chinese representative on the International Arbitration Court at the Hague. The Secretary of the Chinese delegation will be Dr. Hawklin-Yen.

At the end of September the confusion in China became worse confounded by the threat of serious civil war. With their usual imperturbability, however, British official quarters attached little importance to the news. Even if civil war broke out between Chang and Feng there was at the moment, so ran the British view, no reason to fear that the arrangements for holding the Tariff Conference would be upset. There is always a certain grimness in the British refusal to face hypothetical contingencies.

While Japanese official quarters promptly assumed that there could be no conference in China if there was war in China, the British delegation saw nothing ahead but the conference. It is, however, an essential condition of British policy that before the Customs concessions can be made, and still more before there can be any question of conditional customs autonomy, one Government in China must be reasonably safe and supreme.

MOSUL AND THE EASTERN PERIL.

So experienced a participant in Far Eastern affairs as Lord Willingdon has publicly warned us against the danger of a gigantic conflict between a resurgent East and an out-of-date West. What worries the student of affairs when he contemplates the present phase of British policy in the East is not that the British Government is hardening in a reactionary sense, but that it is not keeping pace with the swift movement of the times. Mr. Amery is a pre-war Colonial Imperialist. On his own pre-war axioms his conduct of the British case at Geneva was all sweetness and reason. Great Britain had accepted the Iraq mandate, we had a debt of honour to the Arabs, we were bent on not deserting Iraq so long as Iraq needed us; and so moral was the British standpoint that we undertook in advance to accept a League arbitral decision, no matter what it might be, whereas the Turks laughed in the nose of Geneva. It is embarrassing for English commentators to speak their minds, for every criticism of the British Government that appears in this country is translated gleefully in Angora and is used as fuel to inflame the Nationalist anti-British excitement in Turkey. If the critics of the British Government could avoid holding candles to the Turk, their criticism would be worth more. The Turk is as God made him, worse luck; and it is easy to sympathise with the exasperation that is felt by all diplomats who are brought up against Turkish shiftiness, arrogance, bluff and the utter worthlessness of his public policy. That said, however, it is impossible not to regard British policy as unwise. It is true that Mr. Amery never accepted at Geneva a twenty-five years' extension of the British mandate, and that on Mr. Amery's and Mr. Baldwin's hypotheses British policy is not only correct, but sound. It is the hypotheses that are all wrong. The peoples of the East have grown up, and will not tolerate Western suzerainty in any form for another generation. Mr. Amery shoots wide of the mark when he asserts dogmatically that there is no question of war with Turkey and that there need be no danger of such a war if British opinion will refrain from encouraging the Turks. One can hardly escape the belief that those are right who argue that the Turks will take the first opportunity, when

Great Britain is embarrassed elsewhere, of making a bid both for Mosul and for the Mesopotamian valley.

Iraq will probably be easy game, and it will fall to British arms to hold the pass. It will mean war. Once war breaks out, all the Wembley emotions will take control and the lives of British men and the hearts of British women will count as nothing. Politically the effect will justify Lord Willingdon too late. Egypt is quiet at the moment, but would she withstand the temptation of rushing an opening? And what of India? There are many people, endowed with all the British stodginess, who are tending towards the unimpassioned conclusion that such results are possible. The alternative policy, that of leaving Iraq in 1928, even though it involved the worst and led to a Turkish recapture of her old boundaries on the Persian Gulf, could not prove to be anything so serious, even in the interests of British Empire communications. And Mr. Baldwin's plea, made at Brighton on October 8th that Great Britain has a debt of honour to the Arabs, has already been abundantly met.

An incidental point of irony has been made in some diplomatic quarters. Last March Mr. Chamberlain killed the German Protocol on the main ground that its commitments were too universal and too military. Mr. Amery's declarations at Geneva now placed Great Britain in a position where she would have been the first member of the League to derive advantage from the Protocol. Under the Protocol every member of the League would have been committed to responsibility for maintaining the integrity of Iraq against a possible Turkish attack. As things are, Great Britain, as mandatory, is committed to the defence of Iraq, while the other States members have nothing but the vague obligations of Article 16 of the Covenant. I give the argument for what it is worth, and it is not worthless. On the other hand, those who drew an analogy between Mosul and Chanak ignored the essential consideration that in the autumn of 1922 the Turks could depend on the moral if not the material support of France. The times have changed, as M. Briand made clear at Geneva, and as Mr. Franklin-Bouillon would no doubt sorrowfully admit.

GENEVA AND MOSUL.

Little is to be gained by chronicling in any great detail the unfortunate wrangling over Mosul which overshadowed the Fifth Assembly of the League. In preparation for the meeting a League Commission, consisting of M. af Wirsén (President), Swedish Minister Plenipotentiary, Count Teleki, former Prime Minister of Hungary, and Colonel Paulis (Belgium), examined the problem, visiting London, Constantinople, Angora, Mosul,

and making extensive investigations, by air, car, and foot throughout the disputed territory and Iraq. It drew up a monumental report of nearly 100,000 words and about a dozen elaborate maps. It concluded that the frontier claimed by the British Government was "a very good one"; that claimed by the Turks "good as regards the western part, which goes through the desert, but not so good as regards the eastern part." Historically both the British and the Turkish lines would break historical continuity. Economically, the arguments favoured the union of Mosul with Iraq. Strategically, the British frontier was "excellent." Legally, "the disputed territory must be regarded as an integral part of Turkey until that Power renounces her rights." Most of the people preferred union with Iraq, but only because of the British mandate; otherwise they would prefer union with Turkey. Therefore, ran the substance of the Commission's conclusions, Mosul should be joined with Iraq, on condition that the British mandate be extended to a period of, say, twenty-five years and that certain Kurdish aspirations should be met. It was a futile enough report, which blew hot and blew cold, and succeeded only in stultifying itself, and begging the whole question. Mr. Amery plunged, in accordance with a formal Cabinet decision reached before he left London, and accepted, on behalf of the British Government, an extension of the British mandate over Iraq, thereby nailing down that part of the League Commission's recommendation which, on such a condition, advocated the incorporation of Mosul in Iraq. He did not, however, accept another twenty-five years of Iraq, but merely an undefined extension, it being the policy of the British Government to stand by Iraq until Iraq is in a self-sufficing condition and ready to enter the League of Nations.

The Turks announced with their usual lack of subtlety, that they would accept a League decision if it went in favour of Turkey, but would not accept it in the alternative. After much unedifying discord it was decided by the Council of the League to submit to the Permanent Court of International Justice, for an advisory opinion, the following points:

1. What is the character of the decision to be taken by the Council in virtue of Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Treaty of Lausanne (Arbitral award, recommendation or simple mediation)?
2. Must the decision be unanimous or may it be taken by a majority?
3. May the representatives of the interested parties take part in the vote?

Meanwhile, a League representative, General Laidoner of Esthonia, was sent to Mosul to keep the Council informed about

the situation in the region of the provisional frontier between Turkey and Iraq, as defined at Brussels on October 29th, 1924. It was arranged that the Permanent Court should hold its special session on October 22nd, and the business will presumably be over by the time this number of THE CONTEMPORARY sees the light.

The meeting was regarded in advance with some anxiety by those who put their faith in the League, for either the Court will give the obvious answer to the questions put to it, in which case none of the difficulties encountered at Geneva will be lessened, or it will give answers which will raise the whole question of the constitution of the League and of the implications of the Covenant. If, for instance, the Treaty of Lausanne having referred the matter to the League, the Permanent Court rules that anything but an arbitral award shall be given, a blow will be dealt at the whole purpose and meaning of the League. The second and third questions appear to be wholly unnecessary in view of the hitherto accepted interpretation that the Covenant prescribes both unanimity and the non-voting of the parties in such decisions.

The slip made by Lord Curzon at Lausanne—one of the few slips of the kind ever made by so scholarly a mind as Lord Curzon's—is partly responsible for the unnecessary doubt on these points, but it is generally agreed that the slip was of little importance, when taken in its context. When Lord Curzon proposed, on January 23rd, 1923, that Mosul should be referred to the League, his point, as he explained, was that thereby Great Britain and Turkey would be placed on an equal footing. It was unfortunate that he added the sentence: "Further, Article 5 of the Covenant provides that the decision of the Council, upon which the Turkish Government will be represented, will have to be unanimous, so that no decision can be arrived at without their consent." Although in making that statement, he forgot the other Article in the Covenant which prescribes that the parties to the dispute should not vote, the omission did not affect his argument; for if he thought that Turkey could vote, he equally thought that Great Britain could vote.

Perhaps it is wiser, however, to regard the intervention of the Permanent Court as a simple time-saving device. Undoubtedly the best thing for the British Government to do, now that it is committed to the extension beyond 1928 of the mandate—an extension which, it is true, was provided for in the Anglo-Iraq Treaty itself—is to emphasise that its policy is to quit Iraq at the earliest possible moment. Fortunately, the Government is not committed to any definite period of time.

GEORGE GLASGOW.

October 14th, 1925.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
1. REVIEWS	661
HUGO GROTIUS; OUR LIVING LANGUAGE; THE CONSULAR COURTS IN CHINA; LETTERS OF THOMAS GRAY; SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND; THE WANDERING SCHOLAR; THE NEW BALTIC STATES (by C. E. Maurice).	
2. SHORTER REVIEWS: "On the Trail of the Bushongo"; "The Human Factor in Business"; "Things Seen in Constantinople: a Description of this Picturesque Outpost of the Orient, its History, Mosques, and the Life and Ways of its People"	679
3. NOTICES OF BOOKS: "Folk-Songs du Midi des Etats-Unis"; "The Mystics of the Church"; "A National Rural Policy"	680

HUGO GROTIUS.*

There is no need to apologise for a new account of the life and works of Hugo Grotius, the re-founder, so to speak, and certainly the populariser, of the Law of Nations. Such a book is needed, and Mr. Knight tells us that "there is no existent general biography of Grotius having the slightest claim to be a presentation of modern knowledge of his personality and activities." The fact makes this publication, with its wide range of research, timely, since "the world is now celebrating the tercentenary of the publication of his *magnum opus*, the *de Jure Belli*." While it is true that there is no modern book on a full scale dealing with this important topic, there are various excellent essays of general importance, while the great influence of Grotius on the growth, if growth is a suitable term, of law between nations is well recognised by the public at large. The Grotius Society has done a good deal to secure this result. To Englishmen Grotius is more than an important figure in the worlds of learning, diplomacy, and law of the first half of the seventeenth century; he is more than an advocate of ordered relations between nations in peace and war; he is the antagonist, one might almost say the protagonist, of the greatest English lawyer and social thinker of the seven-

* *The Grotius Society Publications. No. 4: The Life and Works of Hugo Grotius.* By W. S. M. Knight. Sweet & Maxwell, Ltd. 10s. 6d. net.

teenth century, John Selden. The *Mare Liberum* of Grotius, published in 1608, was answered in England by Welwood in 1613, and directly attacked by Selden's *Mare Clausum, seu de Dominio Maris*, which was finished about 1619 but not published until 1635. The *Mare Liberum* was in form an attack on the Portuguese claims in the East Indies, based on the famous Papal Donation. Grotius disclaims the effectiveness of the Papal gift, but also lays down the general principle that every nation is free to travel to every other nation and to trade with it. Mr. Knight, in connection with the first chapter of the *Mare Liberum*, attacks "the extravagant assertions which have been made as to the precocious erudition of Grotius." It is difficult to understand this view. Early in his twelfth year, the boy began to study at the University of Leyden under the special care of the great Scaliger, who was "struck by his prodigious capacity." After three years the boy, in his fifteenth year, sustained with the greatest applause public theses on mathematics, philosophy, and jurisprudence. He wrote excellent Greek and Latin verses. Modern scholars think highly of his Latin verse. Sir John Sandys says of him: "Of the Latin poets of that age, Baudius may excel in fancy; Broukhusius and the elder and younger Heinsius, in smoothness of style; but Grotius surpasses all in the success with which he reproduces the spirit of classical poetry, and clothes modern thoughts in ancient forms." Meursius, writing in 1625, declared that he had never seen his equal. The contemporary evidence as to his "precocious erudition" is overwhelming. Mr. Knight gives a somewhat unpleasant picture of the youth, and suggests that the unpleasantness was characteristic of the man. Mr. Knight admits his voluntary industry, but says: "He nevertheless—if the man is son of the child—talks much, in an assertive and pushing fashion. . . . If this youth had one dominating idea or impulse, it would be that he was himself a superior person, who must and shall attain an exceptionally distinguished and influential position in life." This view is new and probably untrue. That the lad was a superior person in the best sense of that much abused *cliché* is true. He was head and shoulders above his contemporaries of his own years, but that he was modest few can doubt. At the age of sixteen the University of Orleans had given him the Doctorate of Laws *honoris causâ*. It is difficult to understand Mr. Knight's statement that Grotius was "a law student proper for a period of little more than a year at most." In 1597, at Leyden, he sustained with the greatest applause a thesis in jurisprudence, and on December 13th and 15th, 1599, he was admitted to practice of the Provincial and Supreme Courts in his own country. No doubt after 1599

he "read in chambers," but his practical work was rapidly assimilated, since in 1607 he was appointed Advocate-Fiscal.

It is not easy to adopt Mr. Knight's attitude towards the undoubted learning and scholarship of Grotius. In 1600 he published an edition of the *Phenomena* of Aratus, supplying from his own pen the lost parts of Cicero's translation of the *Phenomena*. Scaliger, Casaubon (who did not know Grotius at all), and other great scholars welcomed the publication with the highest praise. Mr. Knight describes it as "this juvenile and not very distinguished performance." It is possible to prefer the views of Casaubon. While Mr. Knight admits the poetic genius possessed by Grotius, he declares that he was a member of a set of "mutual eulogists," and adds: "Nor, under these circumstances—which were not exceptional but rather typical of everything of the period in the way of eulogy—can Grotius be said to suffer an injustice if a sceptical posterity declines to be seriously influenced by the more than generous praise of which he, as a man of letters, was the constant and not unwilling subject during his early literary life." That view we do not accept; indeed, the evidence adduced leads to an entirely different view. Grotius had made great and deserved mark in literature and the field of learning before he made an even greater mark as a lawyer, a diplomatist, and a jurist. His great abilities shone in every field. When at an early age he became Advocate-Fiscal, "he carried out his duties with great distinction." His private practice must have been large, but it is hardly fair to Grotius on the evidence of Baudius to tell the odious story of a law-matter in which Grotius was engaged. We entirely decline to believe on such evidence that Grotius did more than his professional duty.

The picture of Grotius as an individual given by this book seems to us not wholly fair. Mr. Knight speaks of "his pushing, restless, ambitious nature." He almost sneers at the praise which Casaubon used with respect to Grotius when the latter was in England in 1613. Mr. Knight writes: "Indeed, it is impossible to believe that the countenance, speech, and genius of Grotius were other than as described by Casaubon. It required all that for an author to advocate a cause so opposed in its principles to those of his own quite serious published work." Mr. Knight has inserted a letter of Archbishop Abbot—who, we are told, had a personality akin to that of Grotius himself—belittling and questioning the good faith of the Dutch scholar. Abbot considered that Grotius and his friends were like the English Puritans. They probably were so, and the fact discounts the Archbishop's rather malicious letter and tittle-tattle. The visit to England of 1613 is declared to be a failure. Grotius "had failed to move

the English from adherence to the principles of *Mare Liberum*, which he himself, for the occasion at least, had not hesitated to abandon, or, by casuistry, to destroy." This is a hard saying, and is certainly not consistent with what Mr. Knight calls "the conventional estimate of history as to the personality of Grotius." The estimate presented in this book is one that is far from conclusive.

But Mr. Knight duly praises various famous publications. The *Introduction to Dutch Jurisprudence*, written in prison, is duly noted as a professional work of abiding merit:

In this treatise, as much as in the *de Jure Belli*, but still more certainly as a pioneer, Grotius appears as a leader of the school of scientific law which proclaimed the principles of natural law—natural justice, natural rights and legal liberty—and was, during the succeeding centuries, to become so important.

Nor has Mr. Knight less praise for the work of Grotius as a Christian apologist. His *De Veritate Christiani Religionis* receives the praise that the work deserves, and its deserved popularity in all parts of the world is recorded. There are even three Welsh editions. "It is as a Christian apologist that Grotius obtained and maintained his greatest and most widely spread popularity." But his activity in law was maintained. When he returned from exile and settled (a sufficiently courageous act) in Amsterdam in 1631 he at once secured a vast chamber practice, and his opinions that survive are to-day legal classics. But malign persecution drove him into the diplomatic service of Sweden and he was appointed, in 1634, Ambassador to the Court of France. It was in Paris, twelve years before, that he had written the *de Jure Belli ac Pacis*.

Mr. Knight asserts, with some courage, that the school of Grotius received its death-blow from the Hobbesian and Wolfian doctrines of the Natural Law of States. That may be true from the historical but not from the popular point of view. He denies, with some justice, that Grotius was an innovator, and holds that he handed down the moral treasures of the past with full and concrete illustration. But whatever the indebtedness of Grotius to his fore-runners, his book was a revelation of a new and better world. It was instantly successful: it was placed upon the Index (a triumph in itself) where it remained until 1896; it became a hand-book for warriors and statesmen. It was the supreme work of a very great and noble man, whose presence illuminates and harmonises many of the discords of the seventeenth century.

OUR LIVING LANGUAGE.*

This volume of the "Teaching of English" series, edited by Sir Henry Newbolt, deserves the special attention of "English" specialists, for it is written by authors to whom the English language and literature mean much. Their ideal is, perhaps, something more than the "Humanist ideal" set forth in the report of the Departmental Committee on the position of English in the educational system of England. They adopt the view that "a liberal education implies the freeing of the human reason and the development of the full powers of both body and mind." The limitations of this definition are, however, obvious. For a liberal education is also a spiritual thing—essentially related not only to the body and mind, but to the immortal personality of the pupil. Probably neither Mr. Grattan nor Mr. Gurrey would deny this. Their business is to show that English is a living language and that grammar is the link between the language and the personality of the pupils. The spirituality of the theme is well brought out by Browning and his Grammarian:

Did he not magnify the mind, show clear
Just what it all meant?
He would not discount life, as fools do here,
Paid by instalment.
He ventured neck or nothing—heaven's success
Found, or earth's failure:
"Wilt thou trust death or not?" He answered, "Yes:
Hence with life's pale lure."

So with the throttling hands of death at strifes
Ground be at grammar;
Still, thro' the rattle, parts of speech were rife:
While he could stammer
He settled *Hoti's* business—let it be!—
Properly based *Oun*—
Gave us the doctrine of the enclitic *De*,
Dead from the waist down.

So "our master, famous, calm and dead," worked at learning, worked at the means of true intercourse between living souls, sure in his faith that "actual life comes next." It is necessary to learn the art of true intercourse, and, therefore, grammar is as important for us as it was in the days of the Renaissance. But for us, that is to say, for the great mass of men and women, it is English grammar, the growing grammar of a living tongue. We have our humanistic ideal, too (humanistic in the broadest, noblest sense), and our grammar must play its part in it. Mr. Grattan and Mr. Gurrey lay emphasis on the fact, so obvious that

* *Our Living Language: A New Guide to English Grammar.* By J. H. G. Grattan and P. Gurrey. Thomas Nelson & Sons. 3s. 6d.

it is often forgotten, that for true intercourse of personalities there must be understanding "of the shades of meaning behind the grammatical phenomena of English." It is, indeed, the shades of meaning that matter. It is in the refinements of thought, preliminary to further thought or immediate action, that the elasticity of a living language exhibits itself. Even to the greatest scholars these refinements in both Greek and Latin escape reproduction. With all our knowledge of classical grammar we can only express a fragment of what Virgil meant when he describes Dido yearning for the lost *Æneas*.

The study, then, of grammar is essentially a spiritual thing: "the study of the forms and ordering of words in close conjunction with observation of the shades of thought and feeling which those words and forms and orderings signify." The new grammarians consider that this study "demands the application of the pupil's thinking powers rather than of his gift of memory," though they deprecate the treatment of grammar as a sort of mental gymnastic. We should prefer to say that grammar, in the excellent definition of it which we have quoted, rather demands the application of the pupil's personality—thought, memory, self-revelation, all in one. Great literature cannot be understood, there can be no true intercourse between Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Browning, and the modern student by mere application of thinking power. Cold, grammatical analysis leaves the great poems dead. The opening passage of *Paradise Lost*, the first twenty-two lines of *Lycidas*, the final lines of *Samson Agonistes*: in order to give the full meaning, the message, of this poet, grammar of another amplitude is necessary. And so it is with all great authors. If we are to understand them, and grammar is always the grammar of assent, the whole personality must be brought to bear, full armed with the memory of the rules that these great authors helped to make, and with the mind that is the great instrument (but only the instrument) of individual appreciation.

These experienced teachers consider that quite young children can bring their thinking powers to bear upon grammatical problems. This is so if the child can first grasp, not the logical process, but the intuitive conception, the inward meaning, of the passage:

I see—but not by sight alone,
Loved Yarrow, have I won thee;
A ray of Fancy still survives—
Her sunshine plays upon thee.

It would be interesting if Mr. Grattan, at University College, London, and Mr. Gurrey, at Emanuel School, Wandsworth, were

to test this, the one with adults, the other with immature students, by a grammatical consideration of Shelley's "Ode to the West Wind." It would not be surprising if the immature students showed a better understanding of the grammar, as defined in this book, than the adult students, since the poem is full of intuitions and (alas!) the adult students are more addicted to the light of common day. We suggest the experiment, since these authors welcome suggestions and criticism.

It is interesting to note that they lay great stress on the importance of the position of a word in a sentence. The force of the word, its *nuances*, are indeed largely determined by its position. A boy or girl who can do a good Latin prose has learnt to realise this; and, indeed, not only Latin, but English authors can be effectively parodied by imitating the position of special words or types of words. On the other hand, there is some danger in laying stress on functional position. There is the danger of begetting from the first an artificial style. Now an artificial style is disastrous, since it prevents the play of personality. Prose style should reflect, above all things, personality. Much has to be learnt about choice of words, balance of phrases, structure of sentences, and about the ceaseless need for simplicity; but when all that the grammarian can teach is learnt, nothing has been learnt unless the pupil is taught to write himself (or herself) into the sentence, to make the sentence and the aggregation of sentences a simple mirror of the personality of the writer. Unless this goal is achieved, good English prose writing is much the same thing as good Latin prose writing, an exercise in a foreign dead language based on the best authors. But English is a living language full of growth—as these learned pages show—and the student must use it to reflect his living thoughts. There is one other danger that the teacher has to guard against. His business is to instil by the processes of grammar-teaching true Humanism and not that repellant Comtism which is taken for Humanism by some educationists of our time, and has left its serpentine and slimy traces on the report of the Departmental Committee.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

THE CONSULAR COURTS IN CHINA.*

The present internecine war in China renders this lecture on the extra-territorial courts, delivered last April in London by Sir Havilland de Sausmarez, formerly the judge of His Britannic

* *The Extra-Territorial Court and China: A Lecture delivered in the University of London.* By Sir Havilland de Sausmarez. (The China Express and Telegraph Office.)

Majesty's Supreme Court for China, of great current value. The theme itself is one that has much historic interest, though it is one on which little information is to be acquired from either lay or legal books. The extra-territorial or Consular Court is an ancient institution established in the Mediterranean by the various peoples who succeeded the Roman Empire, and who had much of their commercial law and practice in common. When the Turks acquired sovereignty in Europe, Mohamet II agreed to allow Venice to have a Consular Court at Constantinople to protect the merchants there and give them justice. The Europeans formed a separate community and needed a separate court. England carried this principle into her settlements or factories in the East, and when the first trading settlement was made at Canton a Consular Court duly followed. The same principle was followed at Zanzibar. In modern times, this extra-territorial jurisdiction has been abandoned as no longer necessary in Japan, Corea, Siam, and even in Turkey, but it survives in several countries and especially in China.

Foreigners in China are not able to move freely about the country for the purposes of trade. Trade is confined to the Treaty Ports. Of these there are now about thirty-five, in each of which there is a resident British consular officer who holds a Consular Court with civil and criminal jurisdiction for British subjects. The Supreme Court for China, of which there are two judges, sits at Shanghai, the chief commercial centre of foreign trade in China. It has unlimited jurisdiction and its judges can visit any of the Consular Courts in the provinces to try any difficult or important cases, and there is an appeal from the Provincial Courts to the Supreme Court. British subjects have, therefore, their own courts and laws and protection for their persons and property from interference by the local authorities, and this extends to the administration of their property after their death.

These courts are in origin, and largely in fact, commercial courts, but they also regulate all the relations of British subjects in their social connections with one another and with their foreign and local neighbours. In China the extent of the foreign trade makes courts of this type necessary in the interests of the Chinese as well as the foreign trading population, so long as there is not a Central Chinese Government with a fully organised judicial system supported by adequate material sanctions. British exports to China in 1923 amounted to nearly £19,000,000 sterling, and in 1924, despite a restless year, the customs duties at Shanghai were about £4,500,000. This great trade could not go on under current conditions of Chinese chaos unless there was an extra-territorial judicial system backed by adequate sanctions.

The question of the hour and one, as Sir Havilland says, of great moment, is as to the maintenance of these invaluable British Courts, which represent the highest standard of British justice. The jurisdiction is as valuable to China as it is to Great Britain, since the advantages of undisturbed trade are mutual. But, though the demand for European and American commodities has increased and is, despite continual disturbances, steadily increasing, yet there is little improvement in the political position. "Young China" is "quite capable of creating a situation as difficult as any we have had to face since the Treaty of Nanking. There was then at least a Government at Peking which could control the provinces and with which we could deal. That is not now the case." Recently, at Shanghai the foreign settlements were in substantial danger. Sir Havilland asks: "Until there is a Government which can in fact represent China, how does the question of revision of treaties even arise?" It may be said that recent experience with Turkey and the Treaty of Lausanne seems to show that the court might be endangered by some political settlement. Sir Havilland de Sausmarez' protest against the possibility of revision at the present time is valuable. The question is one that involves a large part of British trading interests in the Far East, and the Extra-Territorial Court will be a necessity for a long time, even if a settled Government comes into existence. That, plainly is Sir Havilland's view. The real danger is that the question of revision might arise by a side wind, with the possible result that sacrifices made in Turkey might be repeated in China. Since Sir Havilland's lecture was delivered, discussion as to the abolition of the courts has begun and great watchfulness, especially on the part of London merchants, is necessary. The general ignorance on the subject of these courts makes it necessary for the whole subject to be closely watched by those who are interested in our great and growing trade with China.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

LETTERS OF THOMAS GRAY.*

The letters of Thomas Gray are an education in themselves. To most people Gray is chiefly known by his famous Ode, but the perfection of this fore-runner of the romantic revival should lead the lover of literature and humane learning to the letters of a man who is the most easy and natural of all letter-writers, and yet conveys in the simplest words learning which is humanism at its best. Mr. Beresford's admirable introduction to this well-produced book brings out all the points of Gray's noble character that are

* *Letters of Thomas Gray: Selected with an Introduction.* By John Beresford. Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press. 2s. net.

necessary for the understanding of the letters. He begins with Gray's poetic "Sketch of his own Character," written in 1761, words that may well be quoted here:

Too poor for a bribe, and too proud to importune,
He had not the method of making a fortune:
Could love and could hate, so was thought somewhat odd;
No very great wit, he believed in a God:
A place or a pension he did not desire,
But left Church and State to Charles Townsend and Squire.

He was, indeed, in, but not of, the eighteenth century. Born on December 26th, 1716, the son of a scrivener of Cornhill, he was educated at Eton (where he was a scholar) and Peterhouse, Cambridge. He migrated to Pembroke College in 1756 (the mystery of the migration has been recently cleared up in the volume dedicated to the memory of Sir Adolphus Ward, the late Master of Peterhouse), and became Regius Professor of History and Modern Languages in 1768 after many years of travel and literary effort. He died on July 30th, 1771, and his remains lie in the famous churchyard of Stoke Poges. His letters to his mother and his friends, Richard West, Horace Walpole, Thomas Wharton, William Mason, Norton Nicholls, and Charles de Bonstetten—men of the most various outlook and position—letters written from 1734 to 1771—were collected and published in 1775. There have been five editions, and these selections are based partly on the Rev. D. C. Tovey's standard edition published in 1900 and 1912 and partly on Dr. Paget Toynbee's volumes entitled *The Correspondence of Gray, Walpole, West, and Ashton*, issued by the Clarendon Press in 1915. The letters in the present volume contain about half of the total sum, and range over the whole period. They

are notable for many reasons: in the first place, and perhaps pre-eminently for their literary quality, in the second place, for their literary acumen and wit, in the third place, for their practical wisdom, and lastly, but by no means least, for a rare and marvellous quality of sympathy. . . . Finally, the letters of Gray are notable as illustrating the extraordinary extent of his knowledge on a great variety of subjects. Writing a year after his death his friend the Reverend William Temple described him as "perhaps the most learned man in Europe; he was equally acquainted with the elegant and profound parts of Science, and not superficially, but thoroughly. He knew every branch of history, both natural and civil; had read all the original historians of England, France, and Italy, and was a great antiquarian. Criticism, metaphysics, morals, politics, made a principal part of his plan of study. Voyages and travels of all sorts were his favourite amusement, and he had a fine taste in painting, prints, architecture, and gardening. But he was also a good man, a well-bred man, a man of virtue and humanity."

Mr. Beresford adds: "Of the singular nobility of Gray's character Matthew Arnold has said all that need be said. Indeed, it is impossible to read the letters as a whole without experiencing that refreshment of spirit which communion with a beautiful mind alone can bring." It may be added that Gray, unlike some great and good men, had a real sense of humour. His letter to Mason of January 13th, 1758, is a good instance of humour and kindly but really destructive criticism. He is dealing with Mason's Ode, and the method of combining learning, criticism, and kindness may be commended to some of the superior persons of inferior learning in our own generation. "These are my little objections, but I have a greater. Extreme conciseness of expression, yet pure, perspicuous, and musical, is one of the grand beauties of lyric poetry; this I have always aimed at and never could attain." Could there be a better instance of kindly humility combined with the enunciation of first principles? Gray, having admitted his own failure, goes on freely to criticise his friend's failure, but adds: "Do I talk nonsense, or do you understand me?" Finally, he says: "I have never seen a prettier modernism; let it be seen while it is warm." Gray had no doubt about the future of the Ode, but in a phrase he atones for all criticism: "Adieu, dear Mason, and remember me; and remember too that I have neither company, nor pleasure, nor spirits here, and that a letter from you stands in all the place of all these. Adieu."

The letters commend themselves as soon as a lover of noble literature begins reading, and so it would be foolish to attempt further commendation. But to younger folk of our time it is necessary to press the beginning of the reading. In prose style they are perfect, in temper, ease, learning, charity, they are perfect. And a delicate and delightful humour that hits off the foibles of the age make them an entertainment that few modern books can supply. Read them and read them again.

* * *

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND.*

Miss Parkes, in this well-written and carefully compiled account from many contemporary sources of the England that the seventeenth century could see, has supplied a new lantern to the student or traveller of history. To understand a period it is necessary to understand in detail its physical setting, the life that had to be lived by the people among whom and by whom the drama was enacted. This book brings out the physical limitations, not only of social, but of political life due to the absence of amenities which

* *Travel in England in the Seventeenth Century.* By Joan Parkes. Oxford University Press.

are the commonplaces of modern days. Despite flashes of colour, glimpses of romance, and touches of humour under difficulties, Miss Parkes paints the seventeenth century in gloomy, dispiriting colours. The lack of facilities for communication, the literal meaning of "the depth of the country," the intolerable roads—a century later a humorist could write of the Highlands:

Could you see but these roads before they were made,
You would hold up your hands and bless General Wade—

the dangerous bridges, the filthy towns, the physical discomforts and dangers of travel, the perils from highwaymen, footpads, and gipsies, the total absence of any sense of sanitation or even decency, made a world remote indeed from ours. Sea travel was as intolerable as land travel: the account of the attempt by Queen Henrietta Maria to make the crossing from Scheveling home makes an almost disgusting picture. After a fortnight the wretched travellers found themselves stranded on the Dutch coast. Moreover, pirates and enemies haunted all the coasts, and the seaside folk for that reason dreaded and ill-treated visitors. The cumbrous police system of the Watch and the Justices added to the miseries of travel.

The one redeeming point was the many good inns of England. In these, hospitality had become a fine art. The host was a host indeed, to welcome and console after the horrors and perils of the way. "The World," writes Fynes Moryson, the traveller, "affords not such Innes as England hath, either for good and cheape entertainment after the Guests' owne pleasure, or for humble attendance on passengers, yea, in very poore Villages." Jorevin, a contemporary Frenchman who travelled in England, claims, however, that the English and French inns were equally good. Indeed, such inns alone made travelling possible. Miss Parkes does not set down John Bunyan as one of her authorities, but, in fact, *Pilgrim's Progress* gives some very vivid accounts of the difficulties and dangers and reliefs of travel in this very period.

Miss Parkes' book, taken as a whole, emphasises the fact that the glamour of the Middle Ages had vanished before her period begins. Travel in the pre-Reformation period, and more especially before the Black Death had taken its endemic hold upon England, was easier than it became in days when the mediæval sense of local responsibility had almost vanished. Miss Parkes takes the point readily but perhaps hardly with sufficient emphasis. She writes with respect to roads and bridges:

In the Dark and Middle Ages the system of road maintenance was sufficient for the character and extent of the traffic using it. Kings and barons with their retinues, migrating from one manor to

another, armies on the march, moved with a rapidity that was rarely possible in later days. It was in the fifteenth century, with Henry V. pursuing his exhausting French Wars, with the manorial system breaking up and leaving a derelict society, with tillage on the decline owing to the high price of wool, and with agricultural labour deficient in the years succeeding the Black Death—it was then that the roads first suffered neglect, and that there began the steady decay which once started, nothing but the genius of a Metcalf, a McAdam, or a Telford could positively arrest.

Miss Parkes notes the mediæval use of the roads by pilgrims and frequenters of fairs, but makes too little of the extent of pilgrimages. In England pilgrimages were so common that the roads had to be kept serviceable. The whole subject of mediæval roads and bridges and waterways was dealt with in the volume issued by the Selden Society in 1923 on *Public Works in Mediæval Law* (Volume II). We there see the multifarious activities which were almost abandoned in the century of which Miss Parkes treats so amply and well.

But she lays stress on the fact that in the seventeenth century travellers were looking forward to better things. The increase of general trade and the need for easier communications had awakened the sense of reform. Travelling by horse (the mule died with the Middle Ages) was supplemented by all sorts of new methods, though in the early seventeenth century the public conveyance of letters, the Post, was still the work of horsemen, and horses were generally to be hired for purposes of travel throughout the century. Horses were swift where all things else were slow. Sir Robert Cary, riding by post, carried the news of the death of Queen Elizabeth to Edinburgh from London—382 miles—in less than three days. But coach travelling was bound to come. Early in the century these cumbrous vehicles were at work, and "in 1636, it was computed, there were upwards of six thousand coaches in London alone"; and before the end of the century there were seven hundred "Hackney Hell Carts" on hire in the Metropolis. The coaches improved in character, and made travel for the rich and well-to-do an almost comfortable though a dreary business. From the beginning of the century there were also stage waggons plying for hire. "These waggons, each of which was capable of holding twenty to thirty persons, traversed the main roads of England," drawn by seven or eight horses in file and covering ten to fifteen miles a day. These were largely used by women, children, and sick folk of the poorer classes, but on occasions all classes used them. Almost at the same time the stage-coach appeared, and the idea was rapidly developed. "By 1673 almost every town within a radius of twenty or twenty-five miles had a service of one or more coaches, running either daily or thrice weekly

to town." In 1669 the One Day Flying Coach carried the traveller from Oxford to London, leaving the tavern yard against All Souls' College, at six in the morning and arriving at the Saracen's Head, on Snow Hill, at seven the same evening. The whole story of the upgrowth of the stage-coach system has been paralleled in the development of the motor-omnibus in our own immediate times.

This praiseworthy book will afford considerable entertainment in its description of inns, and especially the lovable inns haunted by highwaymen, and in the accounts of all that the unwashed world of fashion had to undergo some three centuries before our time. But, as we have said, the picture is one of unutterable gloom, and the real relief to the gloom is the fact that the people of the land began to resent it and its discomforts and its filth before the eighteenth century set to work to fashion the approaches to the cleaner age which it failed to reach. Miss Parkes should next deal with the cheerier subject of mediæval travel.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

THE WANDERING SCHOLAR.*

This fascinating book by Dr. Hogarth should have been entitled *The Scholar Wandering*. Happy the scholar who can wander, even with difficulties that at times seem almost insurmountable; his horizon broadens, and men and things take on a different aspect. If the wanderer be a scholar, he sees with the inner as well as the outer eye. Travel to the unlearned is often but a passing cinematograph; he sees without knowing, and the result is transitory. Travel with an end in view, such as antiquarian or archæological search into the hidden receptacles of treasures of bygone ages, with a knowledge of those ages which only a scholar possesses, gives a zest which overcomes fatigue and hardship, and recompenses the searcher for all his efforts. In this revolving world of ours, nothing is young, nothing is old. The scholar has his reward in the smallest find of metal, pottery, ivory, or inscription, for it tells to him the tale of long ago, linking up the past with the present, and making him at one with the early or the elder days of art, whichever he may term them.

Mr. Hogarth has written a most interesting account of his travels, his searchings, and his findings, in a land which is politically much in evidence to-day. This volume is an outcome of two books published in 1896 and 1910, and combined under the title of the first, *The Wandering Scholar*. Some of the chapters are omitted, but Dr. Hogarth retained with some hesitation, "the third chapter on the Anatolian Turk, because, if it was a faithful

* *The Wandering Scholar*. By David G. Hogarth. Humphrey Milford. 8s. 6d. net.

picture of him under Abdul Hamid, it is probably not altogether unfaithful now, despite political changes. For the rest, I have made no attempt to bring the matter, archæologically or other, up to date, but have left what I wrote at the first to be judged by the standards of 1896 to 1910." Dr. Hogarth describes Anatolia as one of the gardens of the temperate earth, but dying day by day from inaction and Ottoman officialism. The unspeakable Turk is past reform, he considers, from within; Western civilisation alone can bring about a better and a cleaner condition. One wonders that life can exist at all amongst so much filth and frowsiness. A piggish contentment with things as they are, characterises the Anatolian peasant. "His standard of living is not high; his wants are few, and such as earth supplies to little labour. . . . The gulf between prosperity and adversity is neither deep nor wide; the richest man in the village commonly lives in a similar house on like food and drink, the same manual labour, as the poorest. The luxuries of Anatolian life are its necessities, slightly more abundant."

The chapter on "The Great River Euphrates" is full of interest: "a fuller, broader Rhine," Dr. Hogarth calls it, "rushing six miles an hour between towering banks which had weathered to fantastic pinnacles, and displayed a hundred metres' breadth of turbid flood, boiling in mid-stream over sunken rocks." To get north the travellers must cross it, there is neither ferry nor bridge, nothing but a flat bottomed primitive craft propelled by two bladeless poles, the stern ending in a high poop, the rudder ante-diluvian. In such a boat they were brought in safety to the Mesopotamian shore. They were now in the land of the Kurds, a handsome brown-white people. Kahlifat, where they landed, has been in the hands of the Turks since the Crimean War. The Kurds are no longer a fighting tribe. The deportation of the Kurdish tribes to the plains—wherever and whenever the Ottoman Government is strong enough—is the only possible solution of the Kurdish question, "imitating the practice of the old Persians, and lately of ourselves in North-Western Hindustan."

The Kurds are excellent tillers of the soil and the plains are most productive where well cultivated. In Samosata, the scholar found little beyond a black stone with Hittite inscription much defaced, two Roman tiles and some Greek inscription in mud walls. He failed to find any important Roman works on the right bank of the Great River; but it was with regret that the travellers left the shores of the Euphrates where for two months they were never wearied while in sight and sound of that full flowing tide.

Dr. Hogarth, in the spring of 1897, as he says, "played the journalist" in Crete, a place dear to the heart of the scholar, and his

experiences there would do more than fill an "Interlude" which this seventh chapter is named. In 1899, accompanied by Sir Auther Evans—the future explorer of Cnossos—Dr. Hogarth again visited Crete. The Turk by this time was dispossessed of the island—after the massacre of Candia—and the government was committed to the hands of British subalterns, who administered justice in a rude but honest fashion for the time being. Here, in Crete, the digger had at last come into his own, and wonderful were the finds, as all know. Pits and tombs and caves yielded up their secrets, and buried houses were explored with no post or political Greek to disturb the peace, and so the weeks passed into months and summer was well on before the wanderers bade farewell to the island with kindly feelings and regret.

The latter half of this narrative deals with "The Nile Fens," "The Satalian Gulf" and "the parts about Cyrene," all most interesting and attractive, told in a fashion simple and direct and unegotistical, so that all who run may read, even those who are not scholars.

THE NEW BALTIC STATES.*

This is a wonderful story of struggles, defeats, and victory; and it is told by a writer who has had exceptional opportunities of studying the past and observing the present condition of these three Baltic States. He brings to this study and observation an extremely sympathetic spirit, which enables him to enter into the difficulties and appreciate the heroism of these revived nations. While other races have had generally to deal with only one tyrant at a time, these unfortunate people have been attacked from opposite sides by the overwhelming forces of unscrupulous invaders.

Lithuania and Latvia had, first of all, to struggle against those Teutonic Knights who were endeavouring to force upon the northern nations of Europe their caricature of Christianity, and, therefore, like the Saxons in their struggles with the Frankish Emperors, the Baltic States clung to that old paganism which represented to them so much higher ideals than they could have gained from their Christian invaders. Estonia, whose people belonged to a race akin to the Finns and Magyars, had been engaged in its own conflict with Denmark while the other two States were struggling against the Teutonic Knights. But all three States were forced to stand together against the combined attack of the Russian Government and those German barons who were willing to accept Russian rule on condition that they were allowed in their turn to tyrannise over the conquered Baltic States.

* *The New Baltic States.* By Owen Rutter. Methuen.

The first hint of a possible improvement of conditions came to Estonia through a more humane conqueror, who rescued them, for a time, from Germans and Russians. This was none other than the great Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, who in 1632 founded in Estonia the University of Tartu or Dorpat. This university, though originally intended only for Estonia, became a centre of culture for all three Baltic States. But, as we know, the Swedes were overwhelmed at last by Czar Peter of Russia, and the unfortunate inhabitants of the Baltic States became again the serfs of the German landlords, while the rulers, both of Russia and Germany, combined to crush out the language, education, and national life for which these small nations had contended.

Then, after seven centuries of serfdom, came the Great War of 1914. The tyrants began to quarrel with each other, and the conquered races found themselves appealed to by Germans and Russians in turn to back their interests against their rival. But, though the inhabitants of the Baltic States were forced alternately into Russian and German armies, they thoroughly distrusted the promises of both those great Powers; and, when the downfall of the Russian monarchy and the defeat of the Russian forces gave the Baltic peoples a new chance of life, they established three independent republics on a democratic basis. Since then their progress has been marvellous. The zeal for education in all three States has been so great that they look forward to a complete elimination of all illiteracy. Their finances are in a very hopeful state, while their delight in the improvement in the land laws can only be thoroughly appreciated when we realise that these men have been changed from hopeless and oppressed serfs to prosperous landholders with a solid stake in the country. In short, they have made such strides during their few years of renewed life as to prove that much of the old national feeling and traditions had remained in these countries, even when obscured by German and Russian tyranny. Moreover, their trade with other countries is already developing.

Great Britain was represented in her mission to the Baltic States by a man who very early recognised the possibilities before the three republics. This was General Alfred Burt, who gave such encouragement to the Baltic States in their time of transition that, when Mr. Rutter visited them, he found that the mere name of Englishman procured a hearty welcome to himself and his countrymen; and English is recognised as the second language in the Baltic schools. Now, as Mr. Rutter rightly points out, this privileged position imposes on us the performance of special duties, and he proceeds to consider how we can best help these admirers of England to hold their own in their difficult

position. First, he urges that those who can go to the Baltic States, should endeavour to study the ways of the people, and understand their points of view. Secondly, we should invite visitors from these States to spend their holidays with English families, and learn English business methods. Thirdly, we can send them books. "Books," says Mr. Rutter, "of every kind are wanted—fiction, English classics, scientific works, histories, travels, and belles lettres. I was told in Kaunas (the present Lithuanian capital) that the librarian of the central library received demands even for English books on political economy. Nor need there be any trouble and expense in the dispatch of these books, for the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Consuls-General, in London and New York, will be glad to take charge of them."

At the same time, we should remember that these gallant people need backing and not patronage. They have driven back the Bolsheviks and crushed their plots under great difficulties; and I should like to add that each of these States has produced not only great popular zeal but also great leaders. Mr. Rutter has given us a very impressive photograph of Dr. Jonas Basanavicius, who has devoted his life to the cause of Lithuania, and helped to inspire his country with new vigour in its worst time. Then there is Mr. Ramot, the Minister of Agriculture in Estonia, who has called into life the Co-operative Societies, which are promoting dairy farming. Another notable figure is Dr. Oskar Kallas, the Estonian Minister in London. I may also mention Mr. Rignold Kalming, one of the chief promoters of education. But we must never forget that the struggle is not yet over. Only recently have the Bolsheviks tried to destroy the liberty of Estonia, and only the great wisdom and energy of the Estonian Government prevented the accomplishment of this evil purpose. And we must confess that we have neglected our duty in the matter of Bolshevik aggression. Though we were wise in the choice of General Burt as our representative in the Baltic States, we failed to stand by Mr. Wardrop in the Caucasus; and, though we recognised Georgia's independence, we have allowed the Bolsheviks to crush her. May we not, at least, atone in our relations with the Baltic States for our negligence in the Caucasus? I cannot conclude this article better than in Dr. Kallas's words, quoted by Mr. Rutter: "We people of the Baltic States ask but one thing. Keep peace in the world, so that we may help ourselves, and so help others, too, in time."

C. E. MAURICE.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Mr. E. Torday in his book, *On the Trail of the Bushongo*,* gives "an account of a remarkable and hitherto unknown African people, their origin, art, high social and political organisation and culture, derived from the author's personal experience among them." An experience of cannibals in the neighbourhood of Leopardsville gave Mr. Torday a taste for further adventures. He hunted with pygmies and gives a valuable account (there are few accounts available other than Major Christy's) of their hunts. These pygmies seem bigger than those described by Major Christy. He interviewed a gorilla, a truly horrible interview, in the forest, though both survived. But the cream of the book is concerned with Bushongo and its remarkable people. The king's "refined, strong features had very little of the African about them." This strange people in the very heart of the Belgian Congo, some five hundred miles west of the Tanganyika territory, are certainly a mystery. They have held their place amid the mad conflict of races. They must have come out of Egypt in some remote period.

* * *

The second edition has now been issued of Mr. B. Seebohm Rowntree's valuable book entitled *The Human Factor in Business*.† Mr. Rowntree insists that the causes of Labour unrest go much deeper than differences of opinion regarding wage-rates. "The whole basis of industry is challenged." The basis of industry is not discussed, but Mr. Rowntree points out that the following conditions must be secured for deserving workers whatever the industrial structure may be: (1) Earnings sufficient to maintain a reasonable standard of comfort. (2) Reasonable hours of work and good working conditions. (3) Reasonable economic security during the whole working life, and in old age. (4) A status suitable to men in a free country in the twentieth century. (5) A share in the financial prosperity of the industry in which they are engaged. Mr. Rowntree agrees with the view of the overwhelming majority of workers, namely, that it is wiser to evolve a better state of things out of what exists at present rather than to scrap it entirely and to start afresh. This book describes in valuable detail what has been done along these lines at the Cocoa Works at York up to date.

* * *

Things Seen in Constantinople: a description of this picturesque outpost of the Orient, its history, mosques, and the life and ways of its people,† by A. Goodrich-Freer (Mrs. Spoer), is one of the most delightful volumes of the "Things Seen" Series. The average traveller knows little or nothing of this ancient city which seems to belong to neither the East nor the West; but even with no previous knowledge of its wonders, Mrs. Spoer makes her readers feel that the saying "See Rome and die" is applicable to Constantinople. "Nature and art have co-operated in so extraordinary a degree that there are times when it all appears too good to be true. . . . There are quite literally, the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome." The Church of St. Sophia alone, originally built as a Christian Church, and still "the

* Seeley Service & Co. 21s. net.

† Longmans. 2s. 6d.

† Seeley Service & Co., Ltd. Cloth 3s. 6d. nett. Leather 5s.

best preserved Christian monument of its age in the world," is worthy of many visits. It is still full of reminders of its Christian birth; the figure of Christ can still be seen above the altar through the covering of gold put on by the Moslem. Over the door into the nave He still holds open the Gospel at the words, "I am the Light of the World," and above another text also taken from the Gospel. On many of the wonderful mosaics all over the building are to be found crosses and sacred monograms; as well as the monograms of the Emperor Justinian (the builder of this beautiful and ancient Christian edifice), and the famous Theodora, his wife.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

In "Folk-Songs du Midi des Etats-Unis"* Professor Josiah H. Combs of the University of Oklahoma has selected some notable examples from some two hundred which he has collected during the past fifteen years in Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, Arkansas, Oklahoma and Texas. They are in some instances echoes and memories of old English ballads, but many are indigenous, though the ballad form survived. The ballad entitled "Brave Wolfe," an account of the battle of Quebec, may have some historical value. The thirteenth stanza records a friendly meeting between Montcalm and Wolfe before the battle. The copy was supplied by Mr. Carey Woofter of the Gilmer Company of West Virginia. It seems rather absurd that an essentially English book on an English subject dealing with English texts should be edited in French. But perhaps printing is cheaper in France?

Miss Evelyn Underhill in "The Mystics of the Church"† "selects from among the vast company of mystical saints a few of those whose greatness is most clearly connected with their dependence on, and contribution to, the family life of the household of faith." Miss Underhill traces the story of mysticism in the Bible, in the Early Church, in the early Middle Ages, and then passes on to what she calls Franciscan mysticism—St. Francis himself, his friends and successors, and also Pier Pettignano, Jacopone da Todi, Angela of Foligno, and Libertino da Casalo. Next we have the English mediæval mystics, Richard Rolle of Hampole, Walter Hilton (to whom the *Musica Ecclesiastica* of Hammerlein was so long attributed), Julian of Norwich. So we come to the German and Flemish mystics, Eckhart, Tauler, Guso, Ruysbroeck, to Catherine of Siena and Catherine of Genoa, to Ignatius Loyola, Teresa, François de Sales and other French and some Protestant mystics. It is a pleasant compilation.

We must record the publication of the volume entitled "A National Rural Policy"‡ prepared by a special committee on rural reconstruction. The Committee has taken as its basis of report facts set out by specialists in agriculture, but does not claim their authority for the conclusions arrived at in the policy advocated, which involves standard prices, the organisation of distribution, the introduction of standard grades of produce and the introduction of a land system based on the idea of the land being controlled in the public interest.

* Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 49, Boulevard Saint-Michel. 40 frs.

† James Clarke & Co., 9, Essex Street, W.C.2.

‡ Noel Douglas, 38, Great Ormond Street, W.C.1. 2s. 6d. net.

WHAT LIBERALISM STANDS FOR.*

THE controlling fact in British party politics at the moment is that while political opinion has broken up into several groups, and seems likely to break up further, the machinery of the two-party system is imposed upon us, to all appearance irrevocably. A system that more or less accorded with reality in the greater part of the nineteenth century has been perpetuated into conditions where it no longer fits. A large and increasing number of voters are finding themselves driven to voting emphatically against the men and principles they dislike most, rather than for those which they like best. This is not a good thing. Incidentally, it hits Liberalism hard. But the real objection to it is that it favours extreme parties, and increases the element of uncertainty in politics. On the other hand, we must not imagine that it is entirely new. The primary condition of Party Government is that each man must sink minor differences and preferences in order to co-operate with the largest possible mass of his fellow-citizens in securing the ends that he thinks essential. He makes sacrifices in order to co-operate, but he knows that others are making sacrifices too, and he hopes that by co-operating in the matters where there is agreement he may legitimately influence his fellow-workers in the matters where there is still disagreement. No party can ever be quite uniform. There are probably few men over middle-age here who have not occasionally remonstrated or protested against the choice of candidates made by their local Liberal Association or the votes of their Liberal member.

I say this to suggest that our present difficulties are not entirely new; they are only rather worse than before. Neither are they peculiar to us: they affect all parties. The Duke of Northumberland has to support Mr. Baldwin and control his indignation while his leader expresses sympathy for miners, puts Jews into the Government, and praises the League of Nations. In the Labour Party Mr. Wheatley has from time to time to support Mr. MacDonald and at the same time modify his language so as not fatally to alienate the admirers of Mr. Saklatvala. It is all in the game, and nothing new. What is to some extent new is the general economic distress, which prevents the multiplication of candidates. If there were more money available the Revolutionaries would run candidates against the orthodox Labour candidates, the Fascists would oppose Baldwinites, and we Liberals would no doubt put up candidates in every constituency. But in the general poverty the ultimate tendency will, no doubt, be towards having two candidates only, and the struggle between different opinions will

* An Address to Liberal Candidates given on October 26th.

VOL. CXXVIII.

take place not in the voting, but in the choosing of the candidates.

Now let us try to get clear, while remembering how fallacious are all attempts to apply clear-cut abstract principles to the infinite complexities of practical life, as to what we mean by calling ourselves Liberals. You will hear the silliest things said, especially by those who are caught by the Marxian doctrine of the economic interpretation of history, and consequently do not believe in any motive but the struggle for wealth. They disbelieve in principle altogether. But it is almost as big a mistake to suppose that a great political party acts on a fixed logical creed deduced from a fundamental principle. Parties are separated by differences of psychology, not of logic. Liberalism is a temper, a spirit, a method of approach, and Conservatism is, on the whole, the opposite temper. Both parties believe in civilisation and accept the present order as the result of many centuries of human progress. Both admit the need of preserving the civilisation which we have attained: both admit that it cannot stand absolutely still where it is. But when some part of the present order is called in question and change is in the air, the two attitudes of mind differ. The Conservative tends to feel: "The institutions of the country are being attacked. Our customs, our beliefs, our well-tried traditions are being undermined; let us repel the attack and save the social order." Similarly in foreign affairs, if there is trouble at Amritsar or Shanghai, the Conservative's first reaction is: "Here is an Englishman in a tight place: up and defend him." He feels generally that a great and beneficent social whole, all parts of which are interdependent, is being threatened by foolish discontent, by faction, by malice, by idle theories and day-dreams. Those are the pressing dangers against which he stands to defend society. A Liberal, valuing the social order just as much, approaches the problem from the other end. The great danger to him is the danger of refusing to see light or listen to reason, of being blinded by prejudice, by self-interest, by class passion or national passion; of contentedly doing injustice to the weak because they are weak. He sees the social order not merely as the crown of past centuries of progress, but as a stage in a progress that must continue. He sees the danger of rejecting criticism without consideration, the danger of treating the existing fabric as one indivisible whole, and resenting every proposal to dig up the roads as if it were an attempt to undermine the citadel. Where the Conservative cries "Rally to defend Old England," we say, "Make England a better place, that she may be stronger to face the future."

The basic attitude of Liberalism, then, is the resolve to get free from all the forces that blind us, especially from prejudice and

passion and self-interest, and so try to find out what is true, and then to do what is best. A much harder task than merely to defend Church, King and Country; and a task which presents many more opportunities for large mistakes; but a task quite as necessary and, to thinking men and women, surely far more glorious. In practice, Liberalism has had two main elements in its gospel, Progress and Democracy. Examining freely the state of the nation, Liberals saw that many things needed changing, and chiefly that the poor had need of more freedom, more citizenship, more security, opportunity and the like. We saw this need: but apparently we did not succeed in doing all we should to meet it; and out of the cumulative discontent that arose from our failure, another party was formed which, leaving other principles aside, concentrated on the one pressing task of organising the labouring masses, chiefly under leaders of their own class, to use their predominant voting power for the redress of their own grievances, and ultimately for governing the country in their own way. The Labour Party contains, of course, large numbers of excellent Radicals; but it seems to me to be essentially a class party, formed in a time of stress, and perhaps justifiably formed, to meet the overpowering and neglected needs of a class which includes numerically the vast majority of the people. We have hitherto agreed with Labour in most of our social programme, but we approach the questions from a slightly different angle. We act rather less in the direct interest of the oppressed class, rather more in the interest of the whole community, which is poisoned by the existence of such oppression.

And, similarly, when true progress happens to conflict with the desire of the uneducated masses, Liberalism goes for progress. It works for Education, for Temperance, for Economy, for Free Trade, for justice to foreigners and subject races, for reform of the marriage laws, for interest in new scientific and religious ideas—all of them causes apt to be unpopular with the average uneducated man. Now, granted the existence of a party which aims at being free from prejudice, from the bonds of mere custom, from the bias of selfish interest and superstitious obscurantism, what are the main directions in which it will be likely to move?

If a visitor from Mars had studied the state of Europe before the Great War, I think he would probably have been struck by two principal evils. One would be War and the Fear of War, poisoning the relations of peoples, leading to the competition in armaments, and threatening the great downfall which eventually occurred. Another would be the State of the Poor, both in industrial and agricultural countries. We are, perhaps, accustomed to think of the industrial revolution as having made the poor still more poor, either absolutely, or in comparison with

the rich; but perhaps we are wrong. In Russia before the war, as now, a peasant family lived in extraordinary squalor; the whole family had only two rooms, one for man, wife, boys and girls in summer and one for the same in winter; processions of these starving creatures might be seen going to worship at a shrine where the jewels alone were valued at many millions sterling, or looking in at restaurants where the wines cost ten guineas a bottle. The contrasts of riches and poverty in Russia and Poland were probably greater than those in England, Germany or the United States. So that this second evil which would strike our visitor from Mars would not be a new thing caused by modern conditions or confined to particular communities: it would be the old, well-known, age-long misery and degradation of the poor.

I am not sure what else the Martian might say. It would depend on his own idiosyncrasies and habits. But I suspect that he would feel some of that horror which has often been expressed by educated Chinamen and Japanese at the moral ugliness of Western civilisation. Life in great, crowded cities seems, as Graham Wallas has shown, to stunt and starve a great many natural instincts, which then find vent in all sorts of undesirable ways—drink and drugs and prostitution and gambling, and then in the exploitation of all these vices for money-making purposes.

If these, or something similar, were the impressions made on the Martian, I think it is safe to surmise that he would not have voted Conservative, and fairly probable that he would have voted Liberal. As to the first evil, War, Liberalism has always stood for Peace and Arbitration; as to the second, Poverty, Liberalism has produced the greatest mass of remedial social legislation, and certainly has contributed much the most constructive thinking towards that end. As to the third, the Liberal Party owes a great part of its unpopularity to its identification with the forces of moral reform. We are politically the descendants of the Puritans: we combine the search for righteousness and the belief in freedom just as Milton did. We have been against Drink, Vice and Gambling—sometimes wisely, sometimes, perhaps, unwisely, and have made ourselves respected and unpopular in consequence. There is nothing that rouses the average man's dislike so much as trying to make him behave a little better than he is accustomed and contented to behave. I judge then that, before the war, Liberalism was on the great issues right; and on the whole people more or less saw that it was right, though—like Christianity or Stoicism, or any great system of thought—it was often difficult to live up to. But after the War the situation had greatly changed.

The War while it lasted and for some years after destroyed Liberalism. It reduced civilised man to the condition of a creature

fighting for its life. When men are terrified they cannot be wise or generous. When they are suffering acutely themselves they cannot think much for others. Furthermore, War teaches men to get their objects by force and fraud; and it is surprising how quickly the lesson is absorbed. It is very hard, especially for young people without previous experience of a normal civilised world, to come back from the war-atmosphere to thoughtful, honourable and reasonable politics. The bewildered herds that came back from the War could listen without effort to the extreme Tory, who had always believed in military methods; with active pleasure to the sort of blackguard who had previously not been admitted to public life, but now found himself its favourite son. They could listen to the class-war revolutionary, who urged them to apply inside their own country the methods they had learnt in fighting the enemy. And, it is worth remembering, if a nausea of the whole revolting business came over them, as it often did, they were much more disposed to plunge straight into apocalyptic dreams of brotherhood and universal love (with or without a previous massacre of all who disagreed with them) than to consider the slow and patient and reasonable rebuilding of the shattered fabric of civilised society. And what has been the result? I think it may be truly said that the destruction of the spirit of Liberalism has led us near to the destruction of civilisation; and civilisation cannot ultimately be saved without a return to Liberalism. Of this I feel absolutely convinced. Liberalism is the true remedy; and it is for us to see that it is applied. But, unfortunately, it does not follow that the remedy can be applied at once.

When we say that civilisation is in peril, what do we mean? Looking out from Geneva, or, shall I say, from the top windows of 15, Grosvenor Crescent, I see the danger in three main forms. That great, guiding mass which we speak of loosely as Europe, or Christendom, or the White Races, or even the Great Powers, which did with all its faults represent the highest level of civilisation and social order and the most hopeful guide towards the future—I might for the moment call it the Empire of Civilisation—is undermined within, attacked without, and in some vital matters is still pursuing a wrong policy.

Russia, which was never quite an integral part of Europe, is for the time being a liability and not an asset. I speak not merely of the internal misgovernment and economic distress, but of the determined rejection of most of the social ideals believed in by Liberals and associated with the progress of Western Europe. Russia is definitely hostile to the social order. In Italy constitutional government has collapsed; many Italian statesmen support the present régime with all its evils only because the reaction

against it, when it comes, will be terrible. Spain is precariously governed by thirteen generals. In Bulgaria, in spite of heroic efforts at some constitutional reconstruction, opposition to the Government shows itself by bomb-throwing, and the Government retorts by wholesale hangings and shootings. The small Baltic Republics are harassed and persecuted by revolutionary movements engineered from Russia. Jugo-Slavia is over-armed and over-stimulated. Rumania is badly governed and in danger of war. Greece, after bearing an extraordinary series of calamities with fierce fortitude, seems at last to be collapsing to the lowest Balkan level. Turkey, having expelled or massacred almost the whole of her alien populations, is divided between a desire for Western progress (sometimes merely taking the form of ham and cognac) and a sullen relapse into national isolation. And all about the map, the refusal of America to sign the Arms Traffic Convention, agreed to by the rest of the Allies after the War, has flooded the danger zones of the world with the armaments of the Great Belligerents, sold off cheap, and has thus made war endemic. And even the greatest and most solid Powers, such as Great Britain and France, are not what they were before the War.

Still, Europe is on the up-grade. If she has the chance she will recover. There is no doubt of that. Europe will recover as Austria, Hungary and Germany have recovered. The best single sign of it is that whereas in 1920 some 70 per cent. of the population of Europe had violently fluctuating currencies, not attached to gold or to any fixed standard, now only 3 per cent. are in that state. But the trouble is that Europe is not being let alone. The domination of the white races is shaken. In the war we taught the coloured peoples to fight, and we taught them that white men could be defeated. Almost the whole Moslem world is now in a state of protest, open or secret, against Christian supremacy. Japan is, of course, entirely free, and we are all glad that she should be; China is struggling; and the immense multitudes of Africa are said to be becoming conscious of their solidarity as against the white man, and finding in Islam a common religion and rallying cry. Here is a new fact, a new danger, perhaps greater than any which was visible before the War, and certainly one which raises great difficulties for Liberals.

There is also another item in this situation, about which so much foolishness has been written that I approach it with some trepidation. There is the Russian Bolshevik propaganda. The Russian Government has announced that it regards as its two principal enemies Great Britain and the League of Nations, and, as far as I can judge, it is right. For those, together with the United States, are the principal pillars on which the edifice of our present

civilisation rests. I do not want to say a word against the Bolsheviks. One of the best historians I know thinks they are very like the early Christians, but he also observes that the Roman Empire could not stand the early Christians. I do not want to abuse them. But they have taken on, among other characteristics of the old Czarist Government, its anti-British policy in Asia. Everywhere in Asia, from Persia to China, we are up against Russian intrigues. They are like the old Russian intrigues in their persistence and instinctiveness; forming a natural outlet for a crude and rather barbarous patriotism. They are unlike in this, that they have now a Gospel to preach, and—so I am informed by those who know the East well—a Gospel which exercises a strong fascination on the less civilised Oriental mind. The old Russian agent could only bribe his Pathans or Punjabis to exchange the British Empire for the Russian Empire; and his offer was not a very attractive one. The new Russian agent can urge them to exchange British rule for freedom. Every nationality is to be absolutely free, without and within. Without they will form one Soviet Socialistic Republic among a number like mightily federated and acting fraternally. Within they can kill, whiff and plunder the rich, take what land they need, and all will be free together—under the guidance of a Commissar from Moscow. A very simple democratic despotism is offered them, with, now. A the elaborate legalism and organisation that seems so necessary to the civilised Westerner and so needless and repulsive to the Oriental.

It is important that we should realise that Bolshevism is not the doctrines of the French Revolution at its highest point, like the merely a bad system of government, it is a religion, it is not people will kill and die. Its appeal is not to Westerners, for which judge it by its practical results, nor to cultivated men, who will observe its crudities and inconsistencies. Its appeal is to who will appeal to all ignorant and oppressed proletariats: "You are old starving and suffering because you are poor. The rich have everything that you want, and have got it by robbing you. They are your enemies. You have numbers on your side. Rise and kill them and take what you need." An old, old appeal; but never yet, as far as I know, has it had behind it the resources of a great, organised government.

I have dwelt on these dangers to civilisation because they make a difference to our attitude as Liberals. I think the disinterested Martian looking at the world after the War might very well say: "The first need of this society is to see that it does not perish altogether. It may be full of faults, but it must be saved." This throws us into a conservative attitude: we must conserve, before we can advance. Let us see what this means.

Mr. Keynes has spoken of a "party of catastrophe" which is permanently or precariously an element in the composite whole which we call the Labour Party. There has always been "a party of catastrophe": in the old days it was attached vaguely to our own Radical wing. It consists not only of the preachers of class war and bloody revolution. It includes the idealists who want soldiers to refuse to fight, and criminals to be treated with peculiar respect and sympathy; who think that poor people and coloured people, and especially rebellious coloured people, are always in the right, and that the only way to meet malcontents is to give them more than they ask; who not only feel sympathy with Abdul Krim and Mustapha Kemal, and the Canton revolutionaries, but actually wish them to defeat the French and the British. And, of course, it includes also—what did not exist before the war—a class of deliberate enemies, plotting revolution. A tiny minority, no doubt: but all revolutions are made by small minorities, who succeed because the soil is prepared for them. The danger here is that the work of the revolutionary is made easy in so many ways. No large class wants revolution. But it is not difficult to make men in danger of unemployment work badly in order to spread out the jobs they have over as many men as possible; and it is not difficult by systematic bad work to ruin an industry. Again it is not difficult to induce men who are feeling the pinch of poverty to strike more than is reasonable; and it is certainly not difficult, when all trade is in a perilous condition, to ruin it completely by too many strikes. And if trade is ruined it is not far to Revolution. It is interesting to reflect, for instance, how the recent unauthorised shipping strike, had it been complete and successful, might have brought the whole people of this island to the verge of starvation.

Now, we are all for democratic advance. We see acutely the faults of the present system of society. But, I think, as Liberals we realise that the present system is the result of centuries of progress and effort, and does represent something like the highest social order yet attained by humanity. We know also the infinite evils wrought by revolution or civil war, or any state whatever which substitutes force and fraud for the reign of law. We stand for Peace; we stand for Parliament; we stand inside the country as well as out for the spirit of the League of Nations. These considerations might, in certain eventualities, lead us into co-operation with the Conservatives. First, with regard to the general hegemony of the white races, our Liberal position is clear. It is expressed in Article XXII of the Covenant. We do not believe in the equality of all nations; we believe rather in a certain hierarchy, no doubt a temporary hierarchy, of races, or, at least, of civilisations. We believe that there are "peoples not yet able to stand by

themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world"; and we believe that "the well-being and development of such peoples ought to form a sacred trust of civilisation." We detest the methods of Amritsar and government by bombing from the air; we detest still more the dishonesty and cruelty with which the white adventurer so often treats the African. We detest everything that leads to the degradation or to the virtual enslavement of any subject population; and when we speak of the task of Great Britain in gradually leading the Indians and others towards responsibility and self-government, we Liberals believe what we say. But we do not for that reason favour the expulsion of the British from the Sudan, nor a great Moslem rising against the Christians, nor a negro rising against the whites. We feel sympathy for Abdel Krim as for other brave rebels, but we realise that his success would be a disaster to civilisation. We are anxious that China should be as free as Japan, but we want the re-establishment of order and the continuance of trade. We do not want revolution. It seems to me not probable, but conceivable, that in certain parts of Asia a situation might arise in which there might be a choice between giving way to anarchy and taking steps which we intensely dislike. If such a disaster occurred we should most of us have to go with the Conservatives.

In home affairs also I see two possible contingencies which would have the same effect. One is that the Labour Party might fall under the sway of that mass of reactionary, low-minded ignorance that in old days we called "the Tory mob"; the drinking, gaming, bribe-taking, alien-hunting slum-dwellers, who used to vote Tory but now often vote Labour, and have great ascendancy in the Labour Party in some of the Dominions. I do not think, in spite of some ugly symptoms, that this will happen in England in our time. The other danger is more pressing. It is that the Trade Unions, which have done such admirable social service in the past, may possibly become an anti-social influence in the future. They have had in some ways a bad training. They have learnt how to gain industrial objects inside their own trades by direct action—by striking and picketing; they can hardly help being tempted to apply their knowledge to political objects. The fact is that in our highly complex modern societies the welfare of the whole absolutely depends on the good will—and, at times, the self-sacrifice—of a great many groups. Just as, in this age of chemical warfare, even the smallest nation, if really goaded beyond endurance, can do infinite destruction before it is crushed; so, in this age of complex industrial organisation, a comparatively small number of determined rebels can do unlimited harm. The danger here is not of deliberate wrecking; it is progressive blackmail, or

the holding of the nation to ransom, first by one group of unions and then another, till trade is ruined. This danger might not be so great were it not for the need of reducing prices in the export trades, and the impossibility of continuing to pay more to road-sweepers and bricklayers' labourers than is paid to a skilled engineer. This situation seems almost inevitably to involve a conflict between the interest of the nation and the present policy of some important Unions, and it seems doubtful whether the Union leaders will be able to rise to the very high degree of prudence and patriotism that will be required of them.

Apart from those two spheres, I feel little or no difficulty in the idea of a pretty thorough co-operation with Labour—except such temporary difficulties as arise from mutual rivalry. On the need of avoiding war all reasonable men are agreed. But Labour is ready for increased arbitration, for the signing of the Optional Clause of the Court Statute, and for active measures of disarmament. So are many good Conservatives. But the bulk of the party, while accepting the successful work lately done at Locarno over the Franco-German Treaty and the entry of Germany into the League, are dead against any extension of arbitration, dead against signing the Optional Clause, are deliberately stimulating military feeling at home, and have forced forward a naval policy which is little less than scandalous. The increased cruiser programme, at a time when there is no enemy to attack us, seems not only a wanton act of expenditure, but dangerously like the first step in a new competition in shipbuilding. There is another and more permanent aspect of this matter. The cruiser programme was a surrender dictated by the Admiralty. The military propaganda is the work of the War Office. Now, I feel strongly that, at a time when a policy of peace and disarmament is necessary for Europe, it is extremely dangerous to have the Government continually under the guidance of professional soldiers and sailors. The first was this mistake, more than any other, which destroyed Imperial Germany. Mr. Gerard, the American Ambassador in Berlin, narrates how the Kaiser, being in some doubt and distress of mind, sent at once for an admiral and three generals. An American in such a condition, he observes, would probably send for his lawyer; or, in an extreme case, for a clergyman. It would never occur to him to send for a professional pugilist. Our Government behaves more like the Kaiser. On every question affecting armaments and foreign policy the Government has professional soldiers and sailors sitting at its council table. They speak necessarily with a professional bias; they represent what is practically a sinister interest, and only a strong Government with strong convictions can venture to override their advice. A Conservative Government

will, as a rule, neither dare nor desire to do so. On the whole vast problem of war and peace we and Labour think instinctively the same.

On the condition of the poor our feelings are much the same, though our prescriptions will sometimes differ. And the difference, such as it is, will be almost entirely on a limited set of economic questions, which constitute by no means the whole of the field. If we distinguish the Labour Movement, as it exists in the country as a whole, from its special manifestations as a political party, I think all Liberals must regard it with the warmest admiration. Lord Haldane pointed out years ago that in England only 5 per cent. of the people have a secondary education. Ninety-five per cent. leave school at or before fourteen. That is a shocking state of things. How do we expect reasonable political views from a populace of which such an overwhelming majority is almost uneducated, and so large a part exposed to continuous hardship? But what is striking is the effort made all over the country by these masses of people who have been starved of their rightful share in the general knowledge of man to make an education for themselves. The value of the W.E.A. and the Adult School is not to be judged by their actual intellectual results, remarks is though these are. One must remember that this difficult intellectual work is done by men who have already done a hard eleven-hours day, who have no private place to work in, no conveniences, and who are often so tired that they can scarcely keep awake. One must realise also the idealism and moral nobility which generally goes with this educational side of the Labour Movement. I took part a few weeks ago in an Adult School near Newcastle, where social subjects were discussed, Marxians, ordinary Socialists, and a few Liberals being present. I have often been at similar discussions among experts in Oxford Common Rooms. In similar Common Rooms, no doubt, one had more expert knowledge, but I do not think I ever heard conflicting views put with more frankness and more good temper, or more serious and eager desire to think things out. Take another side of the movement. I attended once a meeting of the Workers' Travel Association—an association of men and women of the working class for co-operation in travel. They had made several tours in France, Germany, Belgium and North Italy; they had stayed partly in cheap inns, partly in the houses of foreign workpeople; they had attended lectures and explanatory excursions conducted by foreign trade unionists; and they had prepared themselves beforehand by evening classes in French and German. Similar return tours from the Continent were being arranged. The secretary explained that the state of the exchanges made it very difficult for Germans,

Austrians and others to pay their way in England, and asked for offers from those who were willing to give bed and breakfast gratis for a week or two to a foreign worker and his wife. As I went away he was being besieged by practically the whole audience, all of them working class, all of them poor, undertaking a kindness which probably in most cases involved discomfort and self-sacrifice, and which was inspired by that desire for increased knowledge and increased good-will which is the very central faith of Liberalism. It seemed to me as I watched that the thing I saw before me was true Liberality, though it happened, of course, to call itself Labour. We belong on the side of those people, not on the side of those who wish to economise on schools and to stir up feeling against foreigners.

It may be said that Mr. Baldwin, in those admirable speeches which he made immediately after the election, expressed a spirit as Liberal as these people; and that we should have no more difficulty in co-operating with the wiser Tories than with the wiser Labour men. This is perfectly true. I have worked with Conservatives in the closest and completest harmony. Also, no doubt, both sides have been bidding for our votes and trying to show how Liberal they really are. Also, it seems to me that, just after the election, Mr. Baldwin did realise that, in spite of his large Parliamentary majority, his party was only about a third of the nation, and that, to govern well, he must govern according to the wishes of the nation as a whole, not according to that of the Tories. But the position has not been maintained. I suppose the blind urge of Tory prejudice, or conviction, has increasingly influenced or threatened the Government; and the speeches at the Conservative caucus meetings, the audiences which shout down Lady Astor, like the newspapers which cry "Back to Conservatism," show a spirit which cannot really work with. If we turn from the leaders and we sinkers to the ruck of the party, we find that their instinctive feeling is opposed to ours. They like what we most dislike. They like flogging, they like political prosecutions. They adore Mussolini. They are enthusiastic over the firmness of Amritsar. They are sure that if an Englishman gave orders to fire on a Chinese crowd, the only pity was that he did not do it sooner. They are glad of everything that gives a lift to drink and a set-back to temperance; everything that shows the uselessness of education and the folly of idealism; everything that throws discredit on the disinterestedness of reformers and the intelligence and honesty of the working man. I find that when I go into the society of average rich uneducated Conservatives my feelings are hurt ever so much more often than among Labour people, though

the Labour people, of course, more often lay themselves out to be annoying. The truth is—if I may without pedantry use the word in its strict Greek sense—that Labour is an aristocratic party just as we are. It believes in the rule of the good elements of life. It believes in making life a better thing. It believes in progress, enlightenment, self-mastery, "plain living and high thinking," and all the other ideals which we Liberals secretly cherish, though we dare not say so for fear of being thought priggish. It is against ignorance, against cruelty, against vice and vulgarity and the mob, which remain, in spite of vagaries, the true permanent pillars of the Tory Party.

What permanent obstacles are there to our co-operation with Labour? I will not deal with the first: viz., the intense party spirit which makes the Labour people treat as enemies all who do not utter their own catchwords, and the inexperience of public life which makes them often behave badly in detail. Political memories are short. Whatever government may next be formed under present conditions many strong words will have to be forgotten, and many mutual disapprovals buried.

The first great permanent obstacle in the minds of many Liberals is that the Labour Party is Socialist, and we are not. I confess that this point troubles me little. For a generation past Liberals have been passing, or defending, measures which were denounced as Socialist by the Conservatives, and which did extend the action of the State to lengths that would have shocked Cobden and Bright. I think Sir W. Harcourt was perfectly right when he said in jest, and that was thirty years ago, "We are all Socialists now." One of the great objections to State interference in the last century was that the State did not possess enough knowledge or enough organisation to do the proposed work effectively or intelligently. Now it often does. The State has become a far more effective self-conscious unity. For example, the State now has a record of the condition of the teeth of every child in every elementary school. It has far more complete statistics about mines and roads and railways, and the milk supply and public health, and hosts of such subjects, than were dreamed of fifty years ago. And where it has knowledge it can act. So I think that action by the State is likely to increase, and, indeed, bound to increase, with the natural development of society. The fundamental theory of Socialism presents to me no difficulty. And in practice I do not believe that it will be pressed hard by the Labour Party. State interference is very unpopular, and all parties will be careful not to extend it more than necessary. I fully expect to see the Socialist leaders reiterating with increased emphasis a number of abstract statements about the nationalisation of all

means of production, adding under their breath some comforting phrases about "the inevitableness of gradualness," while in practice they take the advice of experts and move only a few steps towards dealing with one or two large monopolies. I do not think the trouble is coming here. As for liberty, especially personal liberty of speech and thought and printing, I think the Socialists are quite as zealous for it as we are. It is not the Socialists who threaten liberty. One must always remember that this country consists to an overwhelming extent of uneducated people with little aptitude for abstract thought; and the less fitted for abstract thought they are, the more they indulge in tremendous metaphysical phrases. Such principles as personal liberty, or free speech, or the social revolution, the nationalisation of the means of production and exchange, and the like, are never by any conceivable chance principles of definite meaning and direct application; they are mottoes, or slogans, useful for emphasising a particular aspect of affairs which the speaker thinks important at the moment. I should, therefore, draw a sharp distinction between the advocacy of a tax on corn, which is an intelligible, practical proposal likely to do harm; and the advocacy of the principle of universal human equality—which is a false and almost nonsensical piece of metaphysics, some approximation to which is likely to do good.

I feel more difficulty about Labour methods. Uneducated people thinking for themselves see things much too crudely; and Labour speakers do assimilate themselves to that point of view. They think that war and most other bad things are simply made by wicked capitalists. Also they are convinced—with some justification—that they are never allowed fair play, and that the capitalists are cheating them; consequently they allow themselves great licence to cheat in return. It would need a philosophical dissertation to compare and contrast, throughout history, the steady, crushing, hypocritical unfairness of those who are in control of the machine and can transpose the truth by a turn of the wrist with the angry, uncontrolled mendacity of those who can only scream and swear. Connected with this rawness and crudeness of method is the obvious tendency, if not to preach class war, at least to appeal constantly to class feeling and to stimulate anti-social passions.

These qualities are, I think, somewhat prominent in the Labour Party. But I would suggest that, after all, they exist in all parties; and especially have existed in our own Radical Party in the past. We must not forget how violent and absurd our own extreme wing has been, and normally is.

When I was a freshman at Oxford, an electrician putting in

electric light at Hatfield was killed through touching a live wire; and I was told by an enthusiastic politician that the wire had probably been deliberately left uncovered by the Conservative leader out of hatred for the working class. And my informant was not the silliest Radical in Oxford. Every great political party has elements in it calculated to repel a wise or honest man. The wise leader has to lay down the policy he thinks right, and let the fools follow him if they will as well as the sensible men.

I therefore look forward, sooner or later, to a policy of co-operation with Labour—unless indeed something goes so terribly wrong that Labour finds itself committed, against its will, to the forces of disorder. If the expulsion of the Communist element so forcibly and honourably pronounced at Liverpool by Mr. MacDonald is successful in its results, the natural consequence will be a rapprochement between constitutional Labour and Liberalism, such as resulted in the great majority of 1906 and the magnificent work of the Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith Governments, a period which will stand out in history. We Liberals are still something like a third of the nation in point of numbers; we pull very much more than our weight in intellectual power and force of character. This is not an empty boast. The people who do not think have almost all deserted us, and left our intellectual level high. The people who are on the make have left us to a man; our candidates are men who are ready to oppose the stream and to make a sacrifice for their principles. The Liberal Summer Schools are beyond doubt the best summer schools in the country. Our political economists are beyond question the leaders of economic thought, and I am touched to-day to see that the most brilliant of all denounces the over-estimation of money as the greatest evil of European society. And the record of the last Parliament, when Labour was in office, is enough to show the immense superiority of the Liberals to other parties in practical initiative and thoughtfulness. I conclude, therefore, that, if the co-operation I speak of should come to pass, the influence of Liberals upon the spirit and attitude of the whole would not be negligible. A strong infusion of Liberal elements would steady the Labour Party in intellectual things. It would keep them from wild economics or the contempt of all economics whatever; it would raise and stabilise their standards of public conduct, which are now a little shaky. It is curious to reflect that the great mass of people under thirty have really no experience of the normal and orderly life of a civilised nation in a time of progress and security; and the Labour Party has no experience of office or responsibility in such a time. The Liberal Party has that experience, and one of the things that make us sometimes unintelligible to the young

is that they think in the terms natural to war and post-war societies; we in those of a much better, richer, friendlier and securer time. Decency in public life seems to us natural, to them rather odd and suspicious. Much as an American car conductor has been known to offer to fight an Englishman because the latter was so polite.

Labour can give us something, too. It can give us faith and enthusiasm; and can help us to get rid of the sour rectitude and the touch of despondency which are the inevitable consequences of repeated humiliations and ever-increasing defeat. Then, if the co-operation can be brought off, we can work together for the great Liberal causes; for a League of Nations' policy abroad, the increase of arbitration, the reduction of armaments, and the final banishment of war beyond the horizon of the civilised world; for Free Trade, more representative government in industry, a higher national level of life, opportunity and freedom; for the increase and the improvement of education, till not 5 per cent., but 100 per cent. have at least some chance of as much intellectual training as they like and are fitted for; for the raising of the average standard of morals and manners, the lessening of drink, and gambling, and prostitution, and brutality. These are old questions; but new ones are crowding upon us, and unless we can get peace inside and out, they will take us unawares. The problems of population and eugenics; the absolutely necessary and long-delayed reform of the marriage laws; the problems which will arise as the coloured races now governed by the white races begin to resent that government, and even, as they assimilate the dangerous and subversive doctrines of Christ or Mahomet, to assert the equality of all souls in the eyes of God; when the Yellow Races, cramped and half starving on one shore of the Pacific while the opposite shores remain almost empty and unpeopled, at last decide that they can tolerate the situation no more. All these problems, or masses of problems, are close upon us; none can be solved except by Liberalism. Not Fascism nor Bolshevism; not Socialism nor Conservatism; not the victory of one class or another class; only the Liberal spirit of trying to find what is true, irrespective of prejudice, and the Liberal spirit of trying to do what is best for the whole, irrespective of passion or class interest.

It may well be that the path before us will be one that requires much public spirit and self-sacrifice. Well, have we not learned both those difficult lessons? Have we not learnt them from Asquith and Edward Grey? It may be that for some time to come Liberals will be almost excluded not only from office but from the House of Commons. Still we shall exist. Our votes will be eagerly

courted. Like other opposition parties, we shall have our opening in literature. And literature works slowly, but in course of time with deadly effect. For my own part I should like best to see a Liberal Government with a Labour wing; next to that, I should like a Labour Government with a Liberal wing; next to that, a Labour Government, a little better tempered than the last, and ready at least to accept some Liberal support and to listen to Liberal criticism.

I have said nothing about the technique of electioneering, of the possible proposals on one side or the other, or what bargaining power the weakest of three parties may still possess. Political memories are very short. The future is peculiarly uncertain. Think what a change might be made by a real split in either of the other parties; by the failure or success of the coal settlement; by a war in Iraq; by all sorts of accidents now unforeseen. The one thing that I see clearly is that Liberalism is what the world needs both at home and abroad. We must hold ourselves ready either to give it what it needs ourselves, or to help others to do so.

GILBERT MURRAY.

INDUSTRY AND ECONOMICS.

PROBABLY at no time in the history of the world has the relation of industry and economics been of greater importance than to-day. Already before 1914 circumstances had led people to disregard the essential connection between the two. But such dissociation as had taken place between economics and our daily life had not been sudden. It is necessary to go back a long way to find the beginnings of that dissociation which has had serious, perhaps disastrous, results. The division of the products of industry which in ultimate analysis is among the chief subjects of study by the economist has been matter of debate for many centuries. The guild system of the Middle Ages; the apprenticeship methods in vogue until late in the last century, and still not quite extinct, are both of them endeavours to find the solution of a perhaps insoluble problem. But matters complicated enough until the birth of the "Industrial Age" in which we live, received an impulse which was to render them much more complicated and confused when man began to discover how to utilise the expansive power of steam. Steam at once multiplied man's possibilities, and has gone on increasingly doing so ever since.

The great increment to the energy of the individual man given by these discoveries rendered the factory system inevitable. This gathers men into large groups; the groups begin to reflect upon their condition, often, it may be said always, without any knowledge of the real governing circumstances. In a country possessing even such freedom as Great Britain had at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, reflection tended to be translated into action. This was peculiarly the case among the race to which we belong which for untold generations has striven for freedom. The Trade Union was the result, a result attained by bitter struggles and much suffering on the part of those who were its founders. And so we come to the position in which we find ourselves to-day.

Many circumstances, even before the outbreak of war, had led men to think that economic law could be disregarded with impunity. Many of these were political in their character, and were produced by the ever increasing power of the people to determine the course of affairs. The politician, eager to conciliate the mass from which he derived his right to determine the policy of the nation, yielded more and more to ignorant clamour. Time after time Parliament was invited to "give," as it is called, concessions of various sorts to the democracy. Many of these were disguised under specious names, and defended on grounds of doubtful

validity. Great names can be adduced in favour of many of them.

We speak of economic law. We mean thereby all the circumstances which go to produce certain phenomena. Whether we know them or not, the laws are there, and when we have fully discovered them we find they are absolutely inevitable.

Let us consider what we mean by the terms industry and economics. Let us assume that a group of men is set to produce any useful article of commerce, and that the whole group, however composed, is necessary to the production of the article in question. What is their ultimate reason for its production? The article is, we will assume, something not of immediate necessity to them. It is to be disposed of to others who will use it. The result will be to supply to the group the means of livelihood; the satisfaction of their various desires, of which obviously the first is the continuance of life, which is for each a prime necessity. The result, therefore, of their labour must be sufficient to satisfy this equation. But it by no means follows that the group in question contains within itself all the elements needed for the production of the article. It may have to obtain materials or assistance elsewhere, and may require the labour of other men not solely occupied in this production. The product of the sale of our commodity must, therefore, be sufficient to satisfy these further demands upon it. Complicated implements may have had to be provided in advance, and the producers of these too must equally be satisfied. Last, but not least, our group must be able to carry on its affairs free from interference, and must be able to obtain the supplies to which reference has been made without let or hindrance. This protection must be paid for, for otherwise those affording it would not be able to live, and so the tax-gatherer appears among postulants for a share of the product.

This is true of all the groups of producers in the country, and indeed, in the world. And thus we come to the first economic law which affects industry. It is this: the reward of industry can in no case exceed the total amount of the product. In this there is no question of "the cost of living" or a "standard of life." The one and only gauge is the total amount of the product. If the participants are dissatisfied with their share, they have one of two remedies; they may go elsewhere and get better conditions, or they must produce more without further cost. There is yet another alternative which I dismiss for the moment, namely, that the discontented participant shall get a larger share of the total than he is at present receiving.

There arise many corollaries from this law. For example, any concessions that may be made to any of the participants must come out of the total product. It is impossible, therefore, to "give,"

as it is called, anything. Everything must be paid for. "Free" education only meant that what had hitherto been paid for by the recipient of the education, was now to be paid for from the product of the industry of the community. It would not be difficult to enumerate many other similar "gifts" which, if they were productive of the desired results, would be fully justified. But if all that they did was to encourage unthrifty habits they would impose a double burden on the community, for they make a demand on the total product without giving any increase to it.

Let us return to our hypothetical group of men. Their energy is to be used in the production of the article on which they are engaged. How best can that energy be utilised? Independently of themselves, there are the tools which they employ to enhance it. These must be of the best quality, and used to the best advantage. Very specially is this latter condition imperative, for to use them to less advantage means a smaller production and consequently a smaller amount to divide. But the energy of the man himself must also be considered. How long and under what conditions can it be best applied? The week contains 168 hours; during how many of these can he labour? How many hours of work can a man do in a week on the average and be no worse a man at the end than he was at the beginning, except that he is a week older and, therefore, a week nearer being no man at all? Various answers have been given to this question. Sixty years ago the normal week's work consisted of six twelve-hour days with a daily hour and a half off for bait time—sixty-three hours of work. It may be questioned whether a man ever did work sixty-three hours and produce as much as he could have done in less time. If employers had been wise they would have recognised an economic law founded on physiology that by employing men for fewer hours under better conditions they would get better results. The downward limit varies. There are jobs where twelve hours a day could easily be put in without any detriment to the man. There are others in which eight hours might be far too long a spell. For the sake of argument, we might admit that an eight-hour day worked six days a week during which the average man should do all he could, would fairly satisfy the economic law. The man who is paid on this assumption and does less than the amount indicated is robbing his employer just as much as the grocer who sells the workman fifteen ounces of butter for one pound is robbing him, and both are perpetrating a crime on the purchaser and on the community at large.

Implicitly we have stated another law affecting industry. All those who take part in the production of the commodity are bound in the interest of the community to produce the largest amount

possible. Any hindrances which diminish production, either from the employer or from the group itself, inflict an injury on the community at large.

We have now to turn to another quite different aspect of the case. A great teacher has told us that "man does not live by bread alone." But man is seized of other desires which go far beyond the mere wish to live. The American Declaration of Independence asserted the claim of man to "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness," and an economic law which disregarded this essential demand for happiness would not be worthy of the name. And so we come to examine what we mean by the entity called "man" whose wants are to be satisfied. It is obviously not a single individual. It must be a man who will endure for ever, and the human unit therefore is not some particular man but a man and a woman and children. Statistics have told us that at least three children are needed to maintain continuance. The primordial needs of these must be satisfied. And thus we come to consider the standard of life.

That it should be as high as circumstances permit, no one will deny. There should be a perpetual endeavour to make it higher for those whose existence lies at the lower limits of possibility. Every endeavour to accomplish this without contravening economic law should be encouraged. We must, however regretfully, admit the possibility of conditions under which the standard of life should deteriorate; but nothing should be neglected to prevent this happening. It would, indeed, be better that those enjoying the higher standards of comfort should lose something, if thereby something could be added to those at the lower limit. But no effort should be wanting on the part of those at that lower limit to contribute to the improvement. It is in their power. They can do more than anyone else to achieve the result. But it is futile to pretend that this can be accomplished without sacrifice on their part. These are hard sayings, but the economic law is inexorable. A real improvement would be only made possible by implicit obedience to it, and there is good ground for hope that the sacrifices would speedily bear fruit in real and not merely apparent improvements in the standard of life.

We have now considered certain claims which "man" as defined makes on the world in which he lives—claims conditioned by the fact that they must be satisfied out of the product of his industry. Let us consider this condition, and with it what may be called the "social unit." If we take any large collection of human beings we could split them into a number of divisions: manual labourers, foremen directing the labour, managers providing the means to employ the labour, owners bringing the needful capital to

set the whole machine agoing. All these go to make up each industrial group. We might group together all those whose product is essential and indispensable—for example, the bakers and the butchers; the tailors and the shoemakers and so on. We should finally get a number of persons on whose labour the actual existence of the unit depended and from whom all the rest derived their means of subsistence. This group, or any like group throughout the world, produces that on which it itself lives and on which all the rest also depend for their livelihood.

Other callings must be adduced. With the world as it is, we cannot dispense with persons to whom the guardianship of public order is entrusted. These add nothing to the useful product. The police officer and the magistrate, the judges of various degrees, have to be provided. Physicians and surgeons make their claim on the useful product. We think it necessary to provide for defending ourselves against neighbouring peoples who differ from us, and, if needs be, to attack them. And thus the armed forces of the State make a claim on the useful product. A certain proportion of the human race appears to be unfitted to bear any share in the useful activities. Whether these persons should be classed as mentally defective or not does not concern us; unless we are prepared to deal drastically with the problem they present, we must provide for them. And they, too, make a demand on the total product.

All this has been said to indicate how varied a draft is made on the useful product of the nation. The problem which faces us to-day is whether we have not imposed on the community more than it can carry, and, if so, how it is to be alleviated. Space forbids us to dwell on the complicated problems of taxation, in a large measure a consequence of the War. They owe not a little to the readiness of the politician to make gifts out of that useful product, and to the readiness of the recipients to take those gifts. That which has been called public assistance has arisen from £22,600,000 a year (of which £11½ millions was for education) in 1890, to £36 millions in 1900, £63 millions in 1910 and £458,000,000 in 1923-24. The demand on the total useful product for housing, pensions and other matters now pending is still increasing.

To return to the economics of the useful group that interests us. Very exhaustive analysis shows that in any industrial group, where we can get the whole of the items which go to the production and the sale of the article, they fall under the following heads:

- (1) Labour which absorbs about seventy per cent.
- (2) Salaries which absorb about five per cent.
- (3) Sundry charges which absorb about fifteen per cent.
- (4) And there remains about ten per cent. to reward those who

having undertaken to provide the article and to meet all the costs incidental thereto, have to wait until its sale realises the sum which in time will give this reward.

Long consideration of the problem—careful examination of the industries with which I am familiar—and inquiries made with regard to others outside my ken, lead me to believe that something like the foregoing result would emerge if the examination were extended to all industries, whether indispensable or not. The items will vary a little. For example, an industry which has a very large capital and a very small turnover will require less under the first three heads and more under the fourth. By far the most important is the first. It comprises all those whose muscular effort, directed more or less by intelligence, is able to use necessary apparatus. The mere labourer whose skill goes no further than to fill a barrow and wheel it to a spot where its contents are needed stands at one end of the scale. The highly trained artificer whose skill in manipulation is essential to good results, stands at the other. The performance of the most disagreeable work has to be secured and so has that of the most skilled. Some economists have tried to persuade us that work should be paid for in proportion to its unattractiveness. As we all know, the facts are against them, and half our troubles would be over if we could in some way gauge the relative value of brawn and brain. Up to now, in a rough and ready way, this relation has been settled, apparently to the lasting discontent of all the parties to the bargain.

Now as to the next head—salaries. By that is meant all that goes to the administration in contradistinction to the productive side of the enterprise. We hear a great deal of comment on this item which is thought to be of much greater importance than is in fact the case. But that we may not underestimate it, we will include in it all that can be regarded as administrative charges. It is a matter of great surprise how constant the amount is as between one industry and another. In setting it at five per cent. of the total amount realised in sale, any error lies in placing it too high. On closer examination the head falls into three quite distinct divisions. At the bottom come the mere clerks, whose duty it is to record the daily operations. This class is a large one. It contains the girl or boy newly come, as a typist, getting a salary of a very modest amount. With growing experience more and more difficult work is given to the newcomer. The duties call for little more than brains, some amount of education, attention and accuracy. When better qualities disclose themselves, powers of initiative and independent thought, the avenue to the next grade is open. For the present purpose all persons of the salaried class in receipt of less than £500 a year are included. We will call

them routine clerks. Next come those who bring to the discharge of their allotted tasks a higher intelligence, and perhaps the power to direct the work entrusted to them into better channels. In this class are comprised all those whose salary is £500 and upwards, but under £1,000. These may be called departmental clerks.

Lastly we come to the real brains of the concern, those to whom its progress and development are due. In this class are all those who receive £1,000 a year and upwards. We may call them management. Great numbers of salaries have been studied and the following figures cannot fail to be of interest :

If £100,000 were paid for salaries the wage bill would amount to about £1,500,000, and the total gross revenue to about two million pounds.

The routine clerks would number about 220, and would get to-day about £59,000, or an average of £265 apiece

The departmental clerks would number about twenty-five, and would draw about £16,000, and get an average salary of about £660.

The management would number about eleven, and would draw about £25,000, and would get an average salary of £2,250.

If we compare the figures of to-day with those of 1913, we get the following result :

	1913	1924
	£	£
Management	1,727	2,000
Departmental clerks ...	622	655
Routine clerks	105	214

This is very interesting from many points of view. Note, for example, that management is only about fifteen per cent. better paid than in 1913, departmental clerks only five per cent. better, while routine clerks have increased from £105 to £214, more than double.

It should be noted in passing that wages, in the important industry examined, have in the same time increased from £73 to £169, or two and one-third times. These figures have been taken from a large undertaking, in which as yet but very small reduction in the rates of wages have been made.

Another interesting comment is that there is a very real distinction between the three classes. The routine clerk with difficulty emerges from his class. He has not the intelligence which justifies his employer in giving him advances. This is shown by the fact that the average salary is deplorably close to the lower limit, and a very little above the wage rate. Similarly the departmental average keeps too near the lower limit. Finally, the number of men earning £1,000 a year and upwards is very small. It may be doubted whether there is a sufficiently wide field of choice from which to pick the persons to take control of great and complicated enterprises.

The next head, sundries, need not detain us long. It contains such items as rent, royalty paid for the right to work minerals, interest paid to others, including that very important item of interest paid to the State or to the local authorities, and a whole multitude of small items from which the enterprise cannot escape, but which in many cases are paid most reluctantly.

Finally, we have a residue which goes to those whose capital has made the enterprise possible. We hear bitter complaints about something called "Capitalism." It would be well if the complainants would tell us precisely what they mean. No one appears to deny that thrift is a quality of value to mankind, but the moment a man earns more than he spends, he becomes perforce a capitalist. His thrift enables him to save more, and as he saves he puts it in the power of himself and his fellow men to earn more. As things are to-day, no man can be set to work unless a sum of money has been expended in providing him with the tools he must use, and with the place to work in. The modest toll taken by this part of the enterprise would not serve greatly to enhance the shares of the other participants. If it were not taken there would be nothing to share, and when taken, a great part of it must be returned to enable the enterprise to continue operations.

This article has sought to show the close connection between economics and industry, and to prove that the study of economics is essential to industrial success. It has urged that only by the scientific division of the useful product of the nation can that success be achieved, and that to give to any industry, or any man, or any group of men, that which they have not earned, is to rob those who have. It has dismissed the idea of attaining a standard of life independent of the capacity to pay for it, and it has striven to prove that if a higher standard is to be reached it must be by means of better production.

HUGH BELL.

EMPIRE TRADE & EMPIRE SETTLEMENT.

I.

DURING the last century and a half the white peoples, and notably the British people, have annexed and reserved for their own use all the great empty regions which are still available for human settlement, and which are suitable for permanent settlement by white men. This reservation can only be justified and, indeed, can only be permanently maintained, if the resources of these fertile lands are developed and made available by commerce for human use; and this in its turn will only be possible if they are adequately peopled and equipped with the capital necessary for their development.

Failure to achieve these ends will inevitably lead, sooner or later, to a breakdown of the reservation and an inflowing of the swarming peoples who are not of the white stock—perhaps after some desolating war in which the supremacy of the whites and their civilisation will be overthrown. It is not too much to say that the leadership of the world, which the white races have won during the last century, is unlikely to last very long unless they can establish themselves, in sufficient numbers, in the lands wherein they claim monopoly rights. Among the many vast and challenging problems which face this generation there is none more momentous than this. And it is a problem which peculiarly and predominantly concerns the British Empire, because the great regions whose destiny is involved are mostly parts of the Empire.

During the last hundred years we have attained so high a degree of success in peopling and developing the empty lands that we have been perhaps over-ready to assume that the problem presented no serious difficulties. Although the process of settlement and development in the great Dominions has been far less sensationally rapid than in the United States or (more recently) in parts of South America, it has nevertheless been a very remarkable achievement. When their distance from the main centres of population is considered, the development of Australia and New Zealand during one short century is perhaps an even more astonishing achievement for white civilisation than the amazing growth of the United States. This achievement (as well as the settlement of the other Dominions) has been mainly due to the fact that Great Britain and Ireland were during that century a brimming reservoir of population, an inexhaustible source of capital for development, and a centre of fermenting energy in trade. Men, money, and markets, the three requisites for the rapid development of new countries, were all abundantly available.

But this would not have sufficed if the process had not been

guided, during the critical generation following 1830 when the new States were taking root, by a systematic policy of emigration directed from Britain partly by the Colonial Office, but mainly by various colonisation societies and companies, mostly inspired by the group of Radical and Liberal imperialists of whom E. G. Wakefield, Lord Durham and Sir William Molesworth were the chief. It was their work which really founded the prosperity of Australia and New Zealand, and their ideas contributed also to the development of Canada. And they did this work without any large outlay of public money drawn from Britain. They made the process of settlement, in a considerable degree, pay for itself, by using the funds derived from the sale of lands in the colonies to pay for the transport and establishment of desirable settlers. Thus Britain (which, in spite of her wealth, was then, as now, burdened with heavy debt charges and with the immense cost of bringing about the reconstruction of her own unwholesome social order) was not called upon to pay for the process whereby the new lands were made prosperous. It was out of their own potential resources that the cost was defrayed of bringing out the population needed for their development.

Since then conditions have greatly changed. Great Britain is no longer, or, at any rate, is unlikely long to remain, a brimming reservoir of population. It is true that she has at the moment a large surplus of unemployed men and women; but most of these would be rapidly absorbed by any real revival of world-trade. In any case she has no surplus, but a deficiency, of agricultural workers, whom the Dominions primarily need. Moreover, her rate of increase is steadily dwindling; her birth-rate has so seriously declined that it is only by reason of a decrease in her death-rate that her numbers continue to grow; and the best statisticians compute that by 1940 her population will be stationary, and thereafter will decline.

This tendency to sterility is not peculiar to Britain. It marks all the most progressive white societies in and outside of Europe. Even the young communities in the fertile new lands are not exempt from it; their natural rate of increase almost everywhere displays a perturbing decline. The cause of the change is doubtless to be found in the higher standards of comfort which are everywhere exacted. But it is coincident with a very rapid increase in the non-white races, due to the peace and the mastery over Nature which western methods of government and western science have given to them. These are among the dominating facts of our time. They immensely intensify both the difficulty and the importance of bringing about a more rapid development of the lands which the white peoples have reserved for their own use.

Unless they are ready to fall back upon the peoples of Eastern and Southern Europe (as Canada is to some extent doing), the Dominions must therefore recognise that the reservoir of population upon which they can draw is approaching exhaustion. France has long since ceased to be a source of emigration; she now attracts immigrants, in actually larger numbers than the United States. If the Dominions want to attract population of British stock, they must make haste to utilise the brief interval before Britain passes into the same category as France—the interval during which, owing to trade depression, there is still an available surplus.

Nor is it only the reservoir of population that is approaching exhaustion. Britain has also ceased to be an inexhaustible reservoir of capital; the margin of capital available for export has sunk to narrow limits, mainly owing to the fact that 22 per cent. of the national income is taken every year for taxes; and if, in the near future, she undertakes (as she ought to do) a systematic policy of developing her own home resources, this will also tend to restrict the exportable surplus. It is significant that Australia has recently been compelled to raise a loan in New York, being unable to get the money in London.

Finally, the ebullient energy of British commerce, which played so large a part in the development of the Colonies during the last century, has also been restricted, not so much by any decay of vigour at home as by the shrinkage of world-trade (which is temporary) and the wholesale erection of new tariff-barriers everywhere, notably in the Dominions themselves; and this seems to be permanent. When the British trader was carrying the flag everywhere, and with trade bringing population, he had almost everywhere an open market. It is obviously impossible for him to show the same productive energy in countries which now raise barriers against him, as he did in the days when he had free access. In proportion as the Dominions adopt the policy of economic self-sufficiency they must, of course, anticipate a slowing down of the rate at which their external trade increases; for they can only sell as much as they are willing to buy. The very generous preferences which they offer to British traders do not fundamentally alter this fact; they only mean that the British trader get the lion's share of a reduced market. The Dominion grower, having to pay more for the manufactured goods he uses in order that they may be made at home, is *pro tanto* less able to increase his output and therefore to attract and employ fresh workers.

These are all reasons for believing that the problem of migration is tenfold more difficult, besides being tenfold more urgent, than

it was a century ago. But there is another reason, yet stronger. Having achieved a higher standard of living than prevails in the older countries (mainly because of the riches of their virgin soil and their freedom from restricting traditions) the Dominions are naturally anxious to preserve it. For this purpose they seem to be unwilling to trust to their own energy, working upon their inexhaustible resources. They prefer to put their confidence in the erection of artificial barriers against the incoming of people used to lower standards, and of the goods produced by them. Nobody blames them for pursuing this course, particularly in so far as its aim is the maintenance of their race-character; they have to decide upon their own policy in this vital matter for themselves.

But in so far as the maintenance of their standard of life is held to be threatened not merely by the immigration of peoples of different stocks, but by the immigration of men of their own stock, or the goods produced by them, it must be obvious that the policy is extremely difficult to reconcile with an increase of population drawn from old countries that are struggling, against many difficulties, to raise their own standard of life. And it is certainly unreasonable that the Dominions should expect the people of the Old Country, burdened as they are, to pay the cost, or any part of the cost, of overcoming this difficulty, and to pay it out of weakened resources which they want to use, and ought to use, for the improvement of their own standard of life.

II.

It is in the light of these broad facts that we ought to consider proposals for the more rapid development of the resources, and the more rapid increase of the population, of the great new white men's countries for which we have our share of responsibility. To-day the Dominions, and especially Australia and New Zealand, are awake to the urgency of the problem. They have their own plans for dealing with it, for which they ask our co-operation. These plans are coloured, and, indeed, determined, by the character of their domestic policy, with its insistence upon the legislative maintenance of a high standard of life and its pursuit of the aim of economic self-sufficiency. However ardently we may desire the ends which these plans are designed to serve, we must, in considering how we can co-operate, look at them in the light of our own national needs and problems.

The Dominion view has never been put more forcibly or persuasively or with a more genuine sympathy for the difficulties of the Mother Country, than in a little book by Mr. F. L. McDougall entitled *Sheltered Markets* (John Murray, 5s.). I propose to

examine briefly the argument of this book, from the standpoint of a Liberal who is proud to inherit the traditions of these Radical Imperialists who laid the foundations of the free Commonwealth of to-day, and of one who feels as urgently and ardently as Mr. McDougall himself the supreme importance of imperial development, and recognises that it is at once the duty and the interest of this country to do everything in its power to forward it.

Mr. McDougall's main contention is that the only effective way of increasing the British population of the Dominions is to bring about a more rapid development of their resources such as will attract, and provide an ample livelihood for, fresh population. With this view we must all heartily concur, however widely we may differ as to the best means of attaining the ends desired. He also urges that any such development must be highly beneficial to British trade, and must therefore increase the prosperity of the Mother Country inasmuch as, per head, the people of the Dominions purchase far more British goods, and especially more highly-manufactured goods, than the people of other countries; so that a million people living in one of the Dominions are far more advantageous to us than a corresponding number of people anywhere else. This also is undeniable. Mr. McDougall proves his point, which indeed scarcely needed proof, up to the hilt. Sentiment, similarity of habits, the use of a common tongue, and (in Australia and New Zealand) of a common coinage, all help to produce this result, which is undoubtedly assisted in a marked degree by the preferences granted to British goods. No one would dream of denying that an increase in the numbers and prosperity of the inhabitants of the Dominions must be better for our trade than a corresponding increase in the numbers and prosperity of the inhabitants of foreign countries—provided always that the increase is brought about by means which do not involve us in a more than equivalent loss in other directions. This is a proviso to which Mr. McDougall attaches too little weight.

Thus far we are in complete agreement with Mr. McDougall. He is stating one of the reasons which make us most anxious to encourage Empire development. It is when he begins to expound the methods he would have us adopt that we begin to be at variance with him. The best way, says Mr. McDougall, in which we can help the development of the Dominions, and, therefore, of our own trade with them, is to give them the advantage of a "sheltered market" in Britain, as we have the advantage of "sheltered markets" in the Dominions. And we can only give them a "sheltered market" by imposing duties upon their foreign competitors, so that they may get a better price for their products; because it is only by these means that they can compete, while

maintaining their higher standard of life, against peoples with a lower standard of life. In other words, all our people (who themselves have a lower standard of life, unhappily, than their Dominion cousins) are to pay more for their necessities or simple luxuries in order that a larger number of people may enjoy the high standard of life prevalent in Australia. This does not appear to be a fair arrangement, or one which would be likely to foster imperial patriotism among those who had to pay for it—chiefly the poor.

And there is another consequence, which Mr. McDougall overlooks. By setting up duties against foreign produce which competes with Dominion produce, we should be making it difficult for our foreign customers to sell to us, and therefore also to buy from us; we should be running the risk of a serious diminution of our foreign trade. To this Mr. McDougall's reply is, that we should be more than compensated for any loss of foreign trade by increased trade with the Dominions. That would only be the case if the volume of our trade with the Dominions were equal to that of our trade with the rest of the world, and capable of great expansion; whereas the fact is that our trade with the whole British Empire is only 40 per cent. of our total oversea trade, and half of this 40 per cent. is with parts of the Empire (notably India) which would not be affected by the preferential system. So that we should be penalising something like four-fifths of our customers in order to encourage the remaining one-fifth. And the result of such a policy might be so serious a reduction of our national income that we should be unable to enlarge our purchases from the Dominions.

Moreover, the very fact that the Dominions buy from us already so large a proportion of what they import leaves the less margin for expansion in their markets. A striking proof of this is provided by the movement of trade since the war. It was to be expected that, as a result of the dislocation caused by the war and the impoverishment of Europe, our foreign trade would suffer far more than our imperial trade—especially as a good deal of foreign competition disappeared from imperial markets. Yet the strange thing is that the proportion of our trade with the Empire and with foreign countries has changed very little; it is still not far from the proportion of two foreign to one imperial which held before the war. It is, therefore, a very unsafe assumption that any loss which might be caused by imposing duties upon the foreign competitors of the Dominions would be balanced by increased Dominion trade.

It may perhaps be replied that in any case the loss could not be great, since it is only proposed to apply the preferential system

to a few minor commodities, not to the main staples. Mr. McDougall nowhere admits this, or suggests that preference should only cover such things as wine, currants, apples and tinned salmon. To do so would stultify his whole argument; for it would be absurd to argue that a great increase of population could be brought to the Dominions by an enlarged demand for such unimportant products. It is only by preferences on the great staple products, especially wheat and meat, that any vital stimulus could be given to Dominion development.

If there were any suggestion of a system of complete free trade within the Empire, there would be more substance in the argument, though even then there would be a good deal to be said against it. But no such suggestion is or can be made, because the Dominions have set their faces against it; and, as things stand, the conclusion seems to be irresistible that the tariff method is a hopeless means of reaching the end we all desire, and that advocacy of it is apt to stand in the way of other and more effectual methods. It is a device which can only appeal to those who have adopted the ideal of national self-sufficiency as their guide. That ideal is, in a measure, practicable for countries which can supply their own primary needs. For Britain it is not only impracticable, but the attempt to pursue it would be ruinous; we are committed, not merely by tradition, but by the very circumstances of our national life, to the acceptance of the opposite doctrine, the doctrine of the interdependence of the whole world. Even the alluring ideal of imperial self-sufficiency is debarred to us. It is debarred because the Dominions have adopted the narrower system of national self-sufficiency, and will not throw down their tariff walls. It is debarred because even India is setting out upon the same path, and is opposed even to the concession of any preference. It is debarred because, in the case of the dependent members of the Empire, we could not depart from the policy of open markets without arousing just protests against our control of such vast portions of the earth's surface—a control which was only tolerated by the rest of the world because every British dependency was open to the traders of all nations.

III.

It is always an ungrateful task to oppose honest and sincere schemes devised to attain ends which one profoundly desires. But the rapid development and peopling of the half-empty white lands is a matter of such urgent moment, especially to this country, that it is supremely important to be on our guard against false lights which might lead us to shipwreck.

The man who rejects any such honest proposal lies, however, under an obligation to set forth his alternative. Mr. McDougall's proposals invite us to make a fundamental change in the fiscal system which is dictated by the very conditions of our national existence. It would be a valid reply to him to urge that the true solution is to be found in a drastic change in the fiscal policy of the Dominions, whose peoples form, when all is said, only one-quarter of the white population of the Empire. And, indeed, I believe that this is so. I believe that an immediate and rapid development would take place if the Dominions were to resolve that they would trust for the maintenance of their standards of life to their own energy, to their vast virgin resources, and to their trade organisations; that they would throw down tariff barriers so as to permit their farmers and miners to obtain all that they need at the lowest possible price, thus enabling them to develop new lands and employ fresh population; and that, subject to any race-limitations or other tests of fitness they might desire, they would admit and welcome all immigrants freely, and even spend money lavishly to help them to make a good start. The result would be, at first, a decline of some of their manufactures, and an increase in their rural as against their urban population. But an immense growth of numbers and prosperity would follow. This, I believe, in common with other Liberals, to be the true path to rapid development; and I hold that the fiscal policy which all the Dominions have adopted, the policy of economic self-sufficiency, is the main barrier to their advance.

But not being a citizen of any of the Dominions, I have no right to advocate a change in their accepted policy. The Dominions, like ourselves, are masters in their own house, and pursue the policy which seems to them most likely to forward their own well-being as they conceive it.

Meanwhile, we must do our best to encourage emigration and settlement by other means. We, in this burdened country, cannot be expected to find great sums of money for the purpose of expatriating men whose upbringing has been a charge upon our resources, and whose wealth-making capacity will in future go to enrich the lands to which they emigrate. It is right that we should contribute, because it is our duty, because we can thus somewhat relieve our burden of unemployment (though it is not the unemployed or the unemployable who will leave us) and, further, because we shall, after all, be sending forth future purchasers of our goods. But the main cost ought in fairness to fall—as, indeed, it does under the existing Empire settlement agreements—upon the Dominions themselves, whose wealth will be increased by the productive capacity of every emigrant. In the period when the

most difficult work of settlement was carried out, its cost was in the main defrayed out of colonial resources, and in one form or another this will have to be done again if migration on a large scale is to recommence.

There are, however, many things which we can do in this country to help the process. We can provide suitable training for intending emigrants, especially young people. We can recreate our agriculture, as Denmark has done, so that we may have once again a virile peasant and yeoman stock from which the empty lands may be recruited. We can make the fine and free life of the new lands better known to our people. We can develop and improve imperial communications. We can stimulate the flow of needful capital to the Dominions in so far as our narrowing margin makes this possible. All this, in a measure, we are trying to do. But only the action of the Dominions can overcome the obstacles to the free movement of trade and population which their own policy has created.

The importance and urgency of the problem are great. The difficulties are equally great. But they are not diminished, they are rather increased, by the concentration of attention upon methods which, even if they were practicable, would fail to achieve the ends for which they are designed.

RAMSAY MUIR.

THE NEW GERMANY.

THOUGH many continue to cling to the belief that races change but little, it is impossible to deny the profound transformation that is taking place in the Germany of to-day. Side by side with the militant imperialism which still lingers among many advocates of the old régime, an entirely different spirit is growing, a temper which if not unmindful of the debt that it owes to the imperial founders of its well-being, is desperately anxious to restore the economic structure which the war imperilled, and to revise a scale of values which it holds was found wanting.

Most people will agree that of every country which waged the war none have suffered more vicissitudes than Germany from the day the Armistice was signed. After a mighty conflict waged on land, sea and air, during which she strained every nerve and made every conceivable effort and sacrifice to bring about a successful issue, she emerged shattered and broken, being compelled to accept conditions that she considered to be appallingly unjust and humiliating. After having continued to believe in ultimate victory even when things seemed darkest, she suddenly awoke to the agonising consciousness of defeat, and, without a moment's hesitation, almost spontaneously, in fact, decided to make away with everything that appeared likely to retard the peace that she needed. Almost at a sweep the whole fabric of the Hohenzollern Empire vanished into thin air.

The Revolution was not, however, a deliberate assault against the régime that it superseded; it merely indicated the measure of revulsion in feeling which the consciousness of defeat had roused against the military clique and all existing institutions. Consequently, the movement which a few Spartakists originated in the hope of establishing Soviet rule in Germany, though momentarily successful, soon scared the more moderate elements and made them unite against it. The Communists first sought to obtain control of the Directory of Soldiers' Councils, which they had formed in the hope of emulating Russia, and after failing in this object, determined to bring about a dictatorship of their own party. They proclaimed a general strike, appointed a Provisional Revolutionary Committee, and summoned a mass demonstration of their adherents in the Siegesallee.

Indecision on the part of the Communist leaders at a moment when the opposition was at its weakest, coupled with the most resolute conduct on the part of Director Noske, saved the situation, however. Seeing that he could place no reliance on the police or military, he transferred his headquarters to the suburbs, summoned

the Officers' Corps to his assistance (in spite of repeated warnings on the part of the moderate Socialists of the Directory that an alliance with the avowed champions of the old order would only react against himself), and soon constituted a force that proved more than adequate for the situation. To placate his Socialist allies he allowed them to offer their mediation, but when this had been refused, proceeded to break up the revolutionary movement with the help of his newly-organised army. His troops first stormed the offices of the *Vorwärts* newspaper, and then, after some severe fighting, captured the various buildings which they occupied in the capital. Very soon the revolt fizzled out, as, once Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, the ringleaders, had been arrested, the Communists lost heart and dispersed. From that moment the triumph of the more moderate elements was assured, and though further attempts were made by the Spartakists in March of the same year, 1919, to revive the movement, they were all suppressed with comparative facility. The revolutionary era now came to an end, and with the Weimar constitution the new Germany came into being.

Based partly on a draft which Professor Preuss drew up on the invitation of the Government shortly after the first elections to the National Assembly, partly on the work of others, the Weimar Constitution not only effected a happy compromise between the extreme decentralism of the Federal Germany of the past, the extreme centralism now advocated by many, but provided an almost perfect machinery for the free development of democratic feeling. Being the work not of one man, nor of one party, but due to the efforts of many, it was a compromise between conflicting interests and even rival economic theories. It not only broke with the past by extending the suffrage to all German citizens irrespective of sex, by separating Church and State, and by exalting the sphere of the individual while diminishing that of the State, but it created a network of functional bodies representing every industrial unit in the country through which it attempted to reconcile the claims of capital and labour. Political and educational emancipation, the exaltation of fundamental rights as compared with those of the State which now becomes a merely utilitarian expedient: such, in short, are the dominant features of the constitutional edifice in which are reflected many of the changes of thought and feeling which arose from the Revolution of 1918.

Leaving aside, however, further examination of this Constitution, let us consider the new Germany now in full transcendental travail. What are the most salient points in which she differs from the Germany of Bismarck? Will she remain a Republic or recall the Hohenzollern dynasty? Will she content herself with

what the Powers have left to her? To all these questions I can only endeavour to give tentative replies, since it is abundantly clear that her future must largely depend on the quality of treatment that she will receive from the world generally.

To begin with, it is necessary to point out that even after the Weimar Constitution, the prospects of the new Republic remained extremely dark and uncertain, as it had got rid of the Bolshevik bogey only to find itself threatened first by reaction, then by anarchy, this last being probably occasioned by the occupation of the Ruhr and the weakness and unpopularity of the Republic itself. Ever since Dr. Stresemann has been at the helm either as Premier or Foreign Minister, however, these dangers have greatly abated. First, the mark was stabilised, owing mainly to the exertions of Dr. Luther, Finance Minister, and Dr. Schacht, Director of the Reichsbank; then additional relief came to the distracted country in the shape of certain international economic measures with which the name of Stresemann is closely associated.

After occupying the Ruhr for more than a year, the French began to realise that the plan which they had conceived and put into execution of securing reparations by the process of seizing the property of the debtor nation, had failed lamentably, and that instead of good accruing from their occupation, the German capacity to furnish any larger sums as reparations had been considerably diminished. A wave of reaction now set in, and very reluctantly Poincaré consented to allow the international inquiry which Germany was continually demanding to determine her real capacity of payment. Two committees were appointed to study what measures should be taken to stabilise the German currency and to estimate the value of the capital which had escaped from the country, and to devise methods for bringing about its return. General Dawes was appointed chairman of the more important of these two bodies, and a scheme was devised and agreed upon by Germany and the Allies that was destined not only to stabilise the mark, but to place the Reich in a better position for the ultimate payment of her debts. For a time the inquiry was held up by the French refusal to evacuate the Ruhr until Germany had begun to put the scheme into operation, but with the victory of the Left in France a compromise was found acceptable to all parties, and the year 1924 closed with a widening belt of light in the horizon.

From that moment the resurrection of Germany has proceeded apace, while her position in Europe has been strengthened by the negotiations which were begun at the London Conference last year and successfully terminated in the sunny moral atmosphere of

Locarno. Her entry into the League of Nations, moreover, restores her to a status of equality among the nations and removes the humiliating effects of defeat which have so long weighed down upon her. Her dark days are now definitely over, and if only she is well guided and inspired by the statesmen to whom she is entrusting her destinies, there seems no reason why she should not soon take her place as a liberal and progressive force in the councils of Europe. For the present she has a manifold task to accomplish. She must continue to modernise her internal structure, she must heal the sores of the terrific struggle from which she is still suffering, and she must restore her position as a Great Power by winning back the shaken confidence of her neighbours and giving them every evidence of her new resolve to seek peace and ensue it. I shall now proceed to discuss these questions and to show how manifest are the differences that she presents when compared with the Germany of the past, whom so many persist in asserting to be even to-day living behind the outward presence of the democratic institutions that she has imposed on her people.

Among the many lasting impressions left in my mind by my recent visit to Germany, one of the most striking is the consciousness of the new wave of republican feeling that is growing up within the country, and of which the Weimar Constitution is the symbol. Though it can hardly be said to represent more than half the electorate, if as much, it is certain that a very powerful and active body of opinion is committed to its support. Its principal strength lies in the industrial regions of Germany and the urban proletariat of Germany and, like the monarchist movement, its chief appeal is made to German youth. In fact, the much-debated question as to whether the country will remain a Republic or restore monarchy will largely depend on the way in which the various Youth Movements will react to the intense propaganda to which they are being subjected.

Rarely has a generation of young men and women possessed higher ideals than those which the Youth Movement at its best is showing to-day. Purified and chastened by the experiences of the arduous struggle through which their country had passed, the Jugendbewegung is in a large measure a revolt of the romantic idealistic south against the military rationalism of the north, a protest against materialism, and an assertion that in individual and spiritual freedom the German soul will be reborn. The importance of conciliating this enormous body of inchoate and impressionable opinion is, of course, realised by every party in Germany, but the real struggle lies between the Nationalistic youth and those who follow the banner of Socialism as, while there are many staunch Republicans among the Centre and

Democratic parties, only the Socialists offer any determined resistance to the monarchist idea.

The Royalists are strongest among the professional classes, great industrialists, university professors, students, landowners, farmers and agricultural labourers; the Republicans find their chief adherents among the urban proletariat, the workers in the industrial districts, and that section of the intelligentsia which only pays homage to the spirit and not to the forms of the pre-war régime. East Prussia, Bavaria, Baden and Hesse are overwhelmingly monarchist; Saxony and the Rhineland republican; Prussia almost equally divided.

Of the profound sense of duty animating the various groups of young men and women who uphold the monarchist or republican ideal there can, however, be little doubt. And however divergent their views may appear where politics are concerned they display a remarkable unanimity in the idealism that they all alike manifest when dealing with their Fatherland. All embody in a certain measure the passion for autonomy and self-realisation to which the movement had first owed its birth in 1913; and, thinking less of purely material values, exhibit the same lively concern with regard to the spiritual attainments which they believe to be their only goal. "Do not ask what shall we do? Listen to the voice within you. If it is dumb you know you are on the wrong track. But if your bird sings follow its note—to the uttermost solitude or the darkest fate." Such is the spirit that animates young Germany of to-day, and as Professor Forster wrote in 1923, "the Jugendbewegung is a moral rejuvenescence of the German people, the return of the German soul to its best traditions. It announces the German spring; it is a real consolation for every German who is inclined to doubt whether the German soul will ever free itself from the enchantment in which its quest of power seems to have inextricably involved it."

This new Germany is consequently even more firmly knit together that it was before the war; the heart of this union and the sense of duty animating every one of its members are so strong that come what may the German nation should be able to face the future not without confidence. Whether the Republic has come to stay, however, is a matter difficult to estimate. Everything will depend, firstly, on whether the Royalists will be able to conciliate their differences and agree as to the candidate whom they will seek to get appointed to that high office; secondly, on the measure of economic and political achievement which the present republican government will be able to fulfil.

While there are two powerful and almost equal bodies of opinion supporting the cause of Kaiser and Republic respectively, there is a not inconsiderable portion of the electorate whose political shade

is uncertain but whose patriotic fervour is strong enough to induce it to support any government that brings peace and prosperity to the distracted Fatherland. On the shifting, indeterminate class of opinion and the rising generation that politicians continue to woo with every conceivable weapon, will largely depend the status of the government that will definitely establish itself in the Germany of to-morrow. For the present the Nationalist strength is divided in its allegiance. The North and East support the claims of the Crown Prince and the house of the Hohenzollerns; the Catholics of Bavaria uphold the claims of Prince Rupprecht and the dynasty of the Wittelsbachs, not only because this house is inseparably associated with their own fortunes, and so genuinely popular that a plebiscite held at any moment in Bavaria would undoubtedly carry the Prince to the throne by an overwhelming majority, but because they deeply resent the loss of the many privileges which they were made to surrender when the Weimar Constitution was forced upon them. As Bavarians, moreover, feel that they are of little count in the new centralised Germany of to-day, and that the loss of their throne is the chief cause of their diminished prestige, they will continue no doubt to agitate for the return of their popular monarch and the revision of the constitution. Time was when they seriously contemplated raising their candidate to the supreme dignity of Emperor of Germany, but the failure of Von Karr's carefully laid scheme, caused no doubt by Ludendorff's premature launching of the Hitler Putsch before the conspirators were ready, has put an end to these hopes, so that their present ideal to-day is to recover their throne and autonomy within the Reich.

Next to the rapid growth of the republican movement and New Youth Idea which I have already described, other noteworthy changes in the political landscape to which I would draw attention are the gradual absorption of power by the Reich and the shifting of the centre of power and interest from Prussia to the west and south-west. Prussia, it may be remarked, only succeeded in obtaining the hegemony that she ambitioned in 1871 by paying a heavy price. She was compelled to grant a measure of autonomy to every State in the Federal union that included not only the monopoly of direct taxation but even the control of railways, posts, and telegraphs. Now most of these and other privileges have been swept into the rubbish heap by the revolutionary broom, and if the Federal States continue as before to collect taxes they only do it as tax collectors, all the money collected going to the Central Exchequer with the exception of a certain proportion of it which is returned to the State that collected it. Federal Law now overrides State Law, while sovereignty, instead of residing in the Federated Governments as before the war, rests in the electorate and Reichstag.

The centre of power and interest, moreover, has shifted from the Prussia of Bismarck to the industrial districts of Westphalia and the Rhineland where the great industrial magnates hold sway, or to south Germany itself. This is caused, partly by the substitution of an impersonal republic for the highly Prussianised Empire, partly by the heavy territorial losses which she incurred through the war. On the west she ceded Alsace-Lorraine to France; Moresnet, Eupen, and Malmedy to Belgium; on the north the southern part of Schleswig to Denmark; on the east the provinces of Posen, West Prussia, and part of Upper Silesia to Poland, East Prussia being severed from the rest of Germany by a wide Polish belt stretching northwards along the Vistula to the sea. The mere loss of territory was, however, of little moment compared with the loss of prestige that accompanied it, though it is significant that even to-day the principal actors on the stage of German life are most of them of Prussian extraction. To mention only a few names, both President Ebert and Preuss the Father of the Weimar Constitution, Erzberger and Rathenau, Stinnes and Cuno, Dr. Luther and Stresemann, belong to the hardworking, plodding nation whose signal achievements in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the proudest on the roll of German fame, amply justified her assumption of the imperial dignity in 1871.

Next in importance are a whole series of institutions that were created to further the economic welfare of the nation as a whole, protect the interests of the workers and improve the relations between capital and labour; the Reichswirtschaftsrat, or Federal Economic Council, a body representing every aspect of the economic life of the country, which has proved, both in its criticisms on the social and financial measures submitted to its consideration, and in the schemes that it has itself elaborated, of the greatest possible assistance to ministers; the Works Councils, bodies of workers elected by their comrades in every industry to protect their interests, negotiate with the employers and generally deal with every question concerning their welfare; and the Conciliation Boards, an entirely new machinery set up to deal with labour disputes, which has proved of such value in averting strikes that I cannot refrain from dwelling at some length on its activities.

The first remarkable feature of this novel system is that conciliators are appointed by the Federal Ministers of Labour for the adjustment of important disputes in specific economic areas, which usually cover the areas of several conciliation boards. The second feature is that appeal is only made to those conciliators when the conciliation boards who first deal with each case are unable to settle the dispute in question. The third is that the awards given by the conciliators only apply to those important industries in which

a national stoppage would create a real economic injury to the community. The fourth feature is that these awards are final and backed by the whole power of the State; that they apply to questions of wages and hours of work, deal with the whole field of working conditions and seek to protect any small group of workers who are too weak to protect themselves effectively.

How has this system worked? No doubt it is possible to pick holes in it, to assert that it is undemocratic and arbitrary, and that it can only be entrusted to persons of generally recognised impartiality, authority, and economic and social experience, a combination which it is urged is so uncommon that few conciliators are likely to possess it. But experience has proved that such is not the case. In 1924 there were no less than 153 awards, and of these a considerable proportion were solicited by the workers themselves. It cannot be denied, moreover, that this system not only prevents the violent outbreak of disputes which would prove injurious to the community at large, and provides a more expeditious method of adapting conditions of labour to changes in the economic situation, but that it also secures a higher standard of these conditions than would otherwise be attained by natural development. It would be well in my opinion if a similar system of arbitration were adopted in this country.

But mention must also be made of the transformation that has also taken place in the Army, though many will assert that its disappearance is merely the result of the Treaty of Versailles. For a century the Army had been the chief symbol of national life, the foundation and bulwark of German strength, the institution of which each German was perhaps the proudest, certainly the most conscious. Now all this panoplied, highly decorative but equally efficient organisation has vanished, leaving to-day only the Reichswehr, an Army restricted by the Peace Treaties to 100,000 men, and the so-called Militaerpartei, a group indefinite in number and almost invisible, whose dream is undoubtedly to restore at some time or other the Army that it has lost. Who and how strong are these champions of militarism? We know that they exist and that many post-war organisations, such as the Bismarckbund and Stahlhelm, uphold their doctrines, but it is equally certain that these activities are offset by such anti-military and anti-war associations as the Reichsbanner, and that for the present the German people is bent on social and economic reconstruction. Affairs in Europe to-day are progressing towards rehabilitation, and this is a process in which "the development of militarism has no opportunity," and accordingly if only the world generally reaches out its hands to Germany and in co-operation with her seeks to build on better foundations, there seems no reason why the present pacific spirit

and hatred of war should not continue. I am not saying that this may not change in time and that the requisite seeds of militarism are not still to be found within Germany, but I maintain that they are only dormant, and that the results achieved at Locarno, coupled with a settlement in the East that will give satisfaction to German aspirations, will most effectively curb such militancy.

Of the necessity of finding such a solution there can be no question. For though the German signatories to the Locarno Pact have agreed to accept the treaties by which the present Eastern frontiers of Poland are guaranteed against aggression on their part, the East frontier and Polish corridor continue, and will continue to remain Germany's supreme thorn in the flesh. If nothing is done, therefore, to remove the sense of wrong created in their minds and to make satisfactory adjustments to the Eastern boundary that will prove satisfactory to both Poles and Germans, I see nothing but inevitable war sooner or later. Happily, for the moment the current sentiment is strongly pacific.

In the meantime, in spite of crises in the coal trade, iron and steel industries and a dearth of capital caused by the period of inflation, Germany is rapidly putting her house in order. Her exports are increasing and will this year, for the first time, be within measurable distance of those quoted for 1913, while agricultural production actually exceeds the pre-war output. The whole nation in fact is progressing economically and producing more wealth than it consumes, while industries are being put on a good basis, transport facilities are increased, and the practically annihilated commercial navy is being restored to more than half its 1914 tonnage, all this it may be noted in a period of six years, and in spite of the most doleful complaints on the part of manufacturers that the Republic was fast approaching economic dissolution.

The most dominating impression that my recent visit to Germany has left on me, therefore, is that the Germany of to-day is neither Chauvinistic nor militant. It is a Germany chastened in spirit, democratically inclined and thinking constructively, a country, in fact, that possesses such power of recuperation and "will to live" that, come what may, her economic recovery at home and abroad is only a question of time. That it would be to the measureless gain not only of England but of the world that this will be effected in the near future, is my sincere conviction.

DUDLEY HEATHCOTE.

FRANCE'S PERIL.

MISGIVINGS about the future of France are being felt even in quarters which have hitherto maintained their optimism. It is not merely a succession of Ministerial crises that we are witnessing. It is not merely the deadlock of a particular Parliament in which there is no clear majority on one side or the other, and in which, owing to the Radical attachment to the Socialist Party, there is the greatest difficulty in creating a Government of the Centre. It may be that the Parliamentary system is on trial in France. It may be that, as good observers have predicted for some years, we are approaching the end of a régime. The multiplication of scandals to which nobody pays much attention, the inefficiency of the Deputies, the inability of the outstanding politicians to allay passions—indeed, their deliberate encouragement of passions at a moment when all hands should be called to the pumps if the ship of State is to be kept afloat—these and other symptoms seem for many people to denote the need of a complete renovation of French legislative and administrative institutions.

One liked to suppose that the mischief was caused by a war-exalted Bloc National, but that theory will no longer hold water. The so-called Bloc or Cartel des Gauches, whose foreign policy has deservedly aroused for it and for France considerable sympathy, has been terribly disappointing in its dealings with the vital internal problems of the country. Hardly did it seem possible that one would have regretted the Bloc National; and yet an old and repentant Radical like myself can feel nothing but distress at the failure of the Radicals to live up to expectations. They have failed far more completely than the Nationalists because the Nationalists were in power during a transition period and their mistakes could be corrected. The Radicals came to office at a time when it was urgently necessary to face realities. They have floundered lamentably. Nothing that they condemned timidly when in opposition have they discarded after eighteen months. On the contrary, they have introduced many new evils. They were understood to be antagonistic to loans, but they have raised more loans in a given space of time than their predecessors; and what is worse their loans, some of them at an excessively high rate of interest, have been futile. They fulminated against inflation, but while they were fulminating they were, for the first time without authority and in an occult manner, printing bank notes and permitting the returns of the Banque de France to be falsified. Nor have they succeeded in balancing the budget or in promulgating it punctually, in spite of many assertions that this was their primary purpose. The

Bloc National was blamed because of the budgetary deficits, but it is to be observed that those deficits were reduced year after year until they were as small as the deficits since shown by the Radical Governments.

The real charge against the Bloc National is that it proceeded too slowly. It was always moving in the right direction, but it told the truth bit by bit instead of calling immediately for a supreme fiscal effort. It had, with the complicity of the other parties, and for that matter with the complicity of other countries, cherished the illusion that Germany would pay, and, therefore, was reluctant to saddle the French people with crushing obligations. Poincaré however, it should not be forgotten, was overturned at the May elections last year chiefly because he proposed heavier taxation—thus giving his opponents an opportunity of making great play at the polls with his alleged undemocratic intentions. It is the irony of politics that a Prime Minister may be upset not for his blunders but for his most admirable initiatives. Not because he was the man of the Ruhr but because he was the man of the décrets-lois and the double décime, was Poincaré, with the Bloc National, defeated. The situation was then by no means desperate. Solutions might still have been postponed for a number of years—on one condition. That condition, which was essential, was that confidence should not be shaken. The Bloc des Gauches not only neglected to find a solution, but proceeded to divide the country when unity was called for by untimely political disputes and by vague threats against capital which had the effect of drying up the sources of Treasury revenue and of sending much available French capital abroad.

The reasons for this deplorable revival of long forgotten quarrels are not difficult to discover. They are to be found in the unfortunate alliance of Radicals and Socialists. The Cartel was a legitimate electoral creation. With the existing electoral law which implies the formation of lists, it was obviously to the advantage both of the Socialists and the Radicals to stand together in most of the multiple-member constituencies in order to rout the Nationalist candidates. They had a common purpose, a supreme and excellent purpose—that of smashing the Bloc National. But when their task was accomplished it was not easy to see how the two parties could maintain their association in Parliament. Their positive aims are entirely different. Traditionally, the Socialists in France are revolutionary, while the Radicals are bourgeois, that is to say, conservative reformers. But if they had no common positive programme, they could stand together on a negative platform. They could, for example, join hands in a fresh attack upon the clericals. The anti-clerical campaign was the dominat-

ing feature of the first Herriot Ministry. It came to nothing because there is to-day no genuine clerical menace, and even the French Ambassador at the Vatican was left in possession of his post while the Papal Nuncio remained in Paris. The effect of the strife was to rend the country in twain and to awaken more bitter feelings than have existed for many years. The policy of combat was inaugurated with such symbolic gestures as the driving of Millerand from the Elysée. But, unfortunately, these diversions not only could not conjure the financial peril but were bound to increase it. Herriot failed and had recourse to the occult printing of billets.

When he was succeeded by M. Painlevé there was a general appreciation of the need for appeasement, and the Opposition was willing to support the new Ministry. M. Caillaux was brought from Mamers to tackle in earnest the neglected problem of French finances. Unhappily, precisely in the measure that the Opposition aided the Government, the Radicals and the Socialists looked upon the Government with suspicion, and there has been not only a Party fight but an unpleasant personal fight, not open but covert, for several months.

I have never been able to understand the implicit faith that many people in France and in England placed in M. Caillaux. To regard him as the "last card" was to invite disaster. His ideas, so far as one knows them, lend themselves to controversy. For six months he depended upon expedients and seemed to have no clear designs. At the end, when his credit had nearly run out, he produced a project which is surprisingly inadequate and erroneous in its conceptions, and since it has been made the basis of subsequent schemes it would be well to analyse it as rapidly as possible.

It provides for a Caisse d'Amortissement—a sinking fund. Now there is a good deal to say for the speedy repayment of the enormous floating debt which has become exceedingly dangerous to France. The practice of the Treasury has been to sell short-term bonds, and while the sales were greater than the reimbursements which were demanded the Treasury could keep afloat. With the loss of confidence some means of redeeming the floating debt had to be found. But although it is possible to argue that the Caisse d'Amortissement should be free from Parliamentary control—and indeed there is a widespread demand which is perfectly justifiable for the removal of certain financial operations from Parliamentary interference—the Caisse d'Amortissement is to be deprecated if it is to be given, as under the Caillaux and the subsequent Painlevé scheme, any power of calling for fresh bank notes for its replenishment. That Parliament should not take the easy

path of inflation is certain, but in so far as the Caisse d'Amortissement is a "personne interposée," designed to relieve Parliament from this direct responsibility, it is to be condemned.

It has been speciously declared that inflation is not inflation when it consists in exchanging billets for bonds. The ingenious theory has been put forward that a short-term bond is really a billet on which interest is paid, and thus it is permissible to substitute billets for bonds. Those who are guilty of this economic fallacy overlook the fact that a billet is forced currency while a bond is not. If there are Frenchmen who use bonds in financial transactions, that is their affair. But if we are to accept the sophism that billets and bonds are equivalent, then we must logically admit that all kinds of bonds, long-term as well as short-term, which are capable of being employed as money, are a species of inflation. Moreover, even if one accepts the absurd argument, in what way are the evils of inflation lessened by the repurchase of bonds by newly printed paper currency? But it is suggested that the Caisse d'Amortissement can be filled by the proceeds of special taxation. M. Painlevé made much of the special contribution of acquired wealth. Clearly, however, the needs of the Caisse are immediate, and any contribution of acquired wealth whether by supertaxes based on income or by capital levies cannot be effectively collected for some time.

I have myself tried to draw a distinction between the various forms of inflation, but although there are, indeed, several kinds of inflation, and although the legal limit as fixed in France is purely arbitrary, yet it is dangerous to agree that one kind of inflation may be good while another kind may be bad. Inflation is a slippery slope, and once on the downward career it is unlikely that politicians will continue to draw nice distinctions. Inflation implies monetary depreciation, and monetary depreciation must be followed by a rise in prices, and a rise in prices must in its turn involve the printing of more bank notes to satisfy commercial calls. And so we start once more on the vicious round, and the pace is apt to become faster and faster. It is with alarm that one regards the successive elevation of the "ceiling" this year. Before the November crisis it had been raised in a few months from forty-one milliards to fifty-one milliards.

A further point was the suggestion of a Banque d'Etat placed under the authority of the Finance Minister. Everybody knows that the Banque de France has not been sufficiently independent of the Government. Everybody knows that in Austria, in Hungary and in Germany one of the most important conditions of restoration was the complete separation of the Bank of Issue from the State. In short, one of the most unsatisfactory signs in

France is the revelation of such a bankruptcy of ideas, and of such outmoded ideas even in men like M. Caillaux. The improvisations of M. Painlevé are less surprising but are not more commendable.

The Radicals at their Nice Congress adopted the Socialist policy (which has nothing to do with Socialist doctrine) of a capital levy. It is to be feared that the Herriotists were anxious above all to find another common platform with the Socialists. The more one examines the proposal of a capital levy, against which M. Caillaux expressed himself in the plainest terms, the more one is convinced that it cannot save France. The experience of other countries, including Germany, would seem to be conclusive. Theoretically the operation is simple and beneficial. The State, it is argued, to-day takes ten per cent. of the national wealth, but to-morrow that national wealth will be increased by ten per cent. because the franc will be relieved of a dead weight which was submerging it. In fact, however, the immediate mobilisation of ten per cent. of existing capital cannot be accomplished. In so far as the mobilisation is a slow process the State does not reap the advantages that are urgently required. But it was suggested that instead of a simultaneous realisation of French capital, which would produce perturbations and probably a complete crash, the payments to the State should be distributed over a period of years, the State, in the meantime, creating certificates representing its credits.

How is the greater part of the French industrial enterprises to be valued, and above all how is one to estimate capital in formation? If France has never been able to collect efficiently the income tax because the proper machinery has not been set up, it is obvious that the collection of a capital levy involves a great renovation of the antiquated financial machinery. Whatever shape the capital levy takes it implies an enormous and prolonged preparation. One has to take into account also the psychological factors. France has good cause to be suspicious. M. Hyacinthe Philouze, a Radical writer on financial questions, says: "The enormous disillusion that has been produced by the disastrous financial liquidation of the war, the lack of foresight, the wastefulness, the demonstration that, in spite of the progressive increase of the sacrifices demanded from the taxpayer, the gulf in which disappear the products of the taxes and the loans is incessantly growing greater, have created in the country an atmosphere of lassitude, of disheartenment, and of distrust which will be difficult to dissipate. Further, the bitterness of the political quarrels and the underground attacks against men in whom the country had confidence have increased the inquietude. This sentiment is predominant at a moment when the defence of our Treasury demands

a renewal of national trust. Never was the hour less favourable for the success of such an experiment which must meet with an obstinate resistance, which must provoke a *sauf-qui-peut* of capitalists and of capital, an economic and financial crisis, and a collapse without precedent of the franc."

The problem of the transference of capital from its holders to the State is doubtless easier than the transfer of capital from one country to another, but it is, nevertheless, a redoubtable operation which requires the highest technical skill and the best technical machinery. There must be, in present circumstances, an immense fall in values. M. Caillaux has shown how certain banking establishments are making ready to gather in enormous profits, if the country is, as it were, put up to auction. If there is a general borrowing such as will be necessary, enterprises will be crippled. It has been stated without contradiction that a particular bank, which has been named, expects to obtain on the most advantageous terms mortgages on land, buildings, and factories. But this is not all. The capital levy may not have more evil consequences than the unfulfilled threat of a capital levy. If it were possible to rush it through Parliament then the State might in the end record important tangible results. Everybody believed that the Senate would not pass such a measure and a prolonged Parliamentary struggle would ensue. Therefore, the maximum of anxiety and destruction of confidence would be produced for the sake of mere time-wasting discussions.

One objection to the Caisse d'Amortissement proposed by M. Painlevé was the composition of its Council of Administration which was such that it would not be protected from the raids of the Government. That, however, was a matter which could easily be righted. It was essential that there should be no doubt of its autonomy. Whatever else is done, a sinking fund of some kind was held to be necessary to reduce the floating debt. In France the device was first tried by Baron Louis, the Minister of Finance under Louis XVIII, in 1816, and its history is not particularly promising. But assuming that it cannot be avoided in present circumstances, it must borrow from the Banque de France before the special taxation destined to replenish it begins to flow in, and these borrowings, which may reach over eight milliard francs, together with other Treasury borrowings, cannot possibly be described as anything but inflation, for obviously the Bank can lend only by printing notes. The most stringent guarantees are called for; and it was, with the franc still not stabilised and the budget still unbalanced, to be questioned whether those guarantees were forthcoming. The special contribution which was to be spread over a period of fourteen years did not satisfy the Socialists'

definition of a capital levy, but it was nevertheless exceedingly onerous. Commercial and industrial undertakings, for example, were asked to pay 50 per cent. of their annual profit if they made a single payment, or 5 per cent. annually if they spread the payments over fourteen years. In addition, shares and salaries were to be further taxed to the extent of 15 per cent. on the former and five per cent. supertax on the latter. Even the rentes which were issued tax-free were not exempted. Real estate was to pay an extra tax amounting to one and a half times the net income derived therefrom if a single payment were made, or three annuities of 60 per cent. or 14 annuities of 15 per cent. There was also a somewhat absurd poll tax of twenty francs levied on street-sweepers and multi-millionaires alike. It was natural that there should be a general outcry that the middle classes were being crushed by this sudden demand, and that the French manufacturers were being dealt a fatal blow. Moreover, the complicated system would be difficult of operation. It is unlikely that this scheme is final.

There is in France to-day a general sentiment not unlike that which was experienced in 1917 before the advent of Clemenceau. People are waiting for something, or rather, for somebody. What will it be? Who will he be? No answer can be returned to this question, but it is ominous that on all hands one hears the call for a Strong Man in a country which has had the most unsatisfactory experience of Strong Men.

The great producers—and no more imposing list of names has ever been printed—in a letter to the President of the Republic express their apprehensions. They regard the moment as exceptionally grave. They are prepared for sacrifices and call for energetic measures. They cry that if such measures are not taken without delay there will be not only a financial crisis, not only a political crisis, but a social crisis, and by social crisis they mean in plain language an upheaval in which the national institutions will be overthrown. They insist that confidence has been shattered, and only by the union of all Frenchmen and the cessation of party struggles can that confidence be restored and an exceptional contribution be obtained from rich and poor alike, in proportion to their means, for the salvation of the country in danger.

But what is most remarkable in this appeal is the request that Parliament should voluntarily renounce by a solemn act its initiative in financial matters. French commerce and industry no longer believes that a Parliament which has shown itself to be so impotent is the proper body to deal with the vital problems. What should be done—and among the things to be done is the definite abandonment of the easy method of inflation, the limitation

of the floating debt, and the amortisation of the public loans—should be done outside Parliament. It is for Parliament—with its incessant strife, with its vicissitudes of majorities, its battle of parties, its personal intrigues—to frame an organic law restricting its own powers and to place an autonomous Caisse d'Amortissement under the direction of the great moral and economic forces of the country.

In one of the Radical organs I find a still more pertinent criticism of the Parliamentary system. There is described the "afflicting spectacle that is offered by the politicians with their disorderliness, their talkativeness, their manœuvres and their impuissance." How excellent, says the writer, were the parties of the Left when they were in opposition! How eagerly we awaited the day when they should triumph! But the months have passed and we have seen men without doctrines, orators without will power, and leaders without courage. We have seen the lobbying, the machinations, the conspiracies, the conflicts of ambition. In the shadows the plotters, sometimes avid of power and sometimes shrinking from seizing it, move about agitatedly, stabbing each other. One hears resounding phrases. The Government follows this or that current, obedient to every wind that blows; smashes on mysterious rocks, changes its pilot or its crew on the high seas, dashes in one direction and then brusquely turns. In all this there is not a directing idea and not a powerful arm. The muddle creates in every class the desperate sentiment of incertitude, the poignant sensation that everything is falsified, upset by occult powers, by unworthy comradeships, by banks installed in the Ministries and in the newspaper offices; while the politicians have only shown self-complacency, a desire to gain time, to set aside the problems and to safeguard their future. There is a bankruptcy of men and of vision; those who were regarded as chiefs turn out to be politicians.

Be it remembered that this is not a picture painted by me, but by Pierre Lœwel in *La Volonté*. He concludes by quoting a passage written by Mérimée in 1862: "There is certainly much inarticulate agitation at Paris and elsewhere. One suffers from the monetary crisis, from the alimentary crisis, from the religious crisis. It is clear that neither the Ministers nor the Chambers commend themselves to the public. One aspires towards something which is neither the present nor the past."

In an Opposition journal, *l'Eclair*, M. Paul Reynaud writes that the only issue is a dissolution. He adds: "Is it a *crise de régime*? Yes, if the people of France having to elect a new Chamber do not take heed of the experiment which has cost them so dear."

It would be possible for me to multiply these quotations which underline the unusual seriousness of the situation. Some of them are inspired by party rancour and some of them by personal disappointment. But when all allowances are made there remains a sense of uneasiness that has not existed before. It may be that this uneasiness will be allayed, and that even before this article appears France will be conscious of the need for steady and united efforts and will have found the chiefs she demands. Public opinion is exceedingly patient in France, but is apt to be explosive. If the politicians do not realise in time the heavy responsibility which lies upon them the consequences cannot be foreseen. But, for my part, I maintain my faith in France and in the ultimate good sense of the people and their leaders.

SISLEY HUDDLESTON.

THE SELF-GIVING OF GOD.

THE Incarnation is the central truth of the Christian Religion. The Fact is fundamental: the doctrine of decisive importance. Both the Fact and the doctrine are vital to the religious experience of Revelation and Redemption, of spiritual fulfilment and satisfaction in Christ. They are equally vital to the theoretic interpretation of the Universe, since the Fact of the Incarnation is the culminating event of history and, therefore, contains within itself the Sufficient Reason of all things. Hence to attempt in any way to minimise the content and significance of the Incarnation is to deal a deadly blow at the faith of Christians and to destroy the *differentia* of Christianity among the religions of mankind. Yet, unless Christian thought can so present the truth of the Incarnation in its relation to the world-order that, taken together, they form a consistent whole of which the Incarnation furnishes a rational and consonant explanation, the legitimate claims of Reason must remain unsatisfied. Is this possible? In order to answer the question it is necessary, first of all, to survey the content and sources of the doctrine and then to examine how far it is coherent with the meaning and system of Reality as they are unfolded in history.

The doctrine of the Incarnation is based upon a spiritual valuation of Jesus Christ that arises from religious experience. The starting-point is that God is so completely and finally manifested in Him that any doctrine of God which either falls short of or diverges from the character, teaching, and spirit of Jesus must needs be either incomplete or erroneous. He is acknowledged as the Redeemer of mankind in such a sense as that the efficacy of His work not only implies, but declares His Divinity. He holds such a supreme and abiding place in the conscious and continuous experience of His followers as likewise postulates His Divinity. All this was seen to spring out of an unique relationship between Him and God which involves, not only complete harmony and interpenetration of Personalities, but also identity of nature and unity of being between them. Christian thought could find no final satisfaction until, adopting current metaphysical terms, it reached the *Homo-ousion* of the Nicene Creed.

The doctrine of the Incarnation could only have come into existence by means of belief in the Resurrection and Ascension, which both confirmed and gave adequate expression to the Divine Majesty of the Man Christ Jesus. Yet the inmost spring of the doctrine and the secret of its tenacious life have been strictly and intensely spiritual. It explains the self-consciousness of Jesus and the influence of His Personality upon His Disciples. The con-

sciousness of His unbroken, intimate and all-controlling relationship as Son to God as His Father—a consciousness which at once distinguished Him from and united Him with Mankind—was borne out by the impact of His Personality upon those who adhered to Him. And His personal influence was continuous and ever-expanding. So far from being dependent upon His physical presence it grew deeper and more pervasive after that presence was withdrawn. This fact accounts for the opening reference of the Acts of the Apostles to “all that Jesus *began* both to do and to teach, until the day in which He was received up.” The growing experience of Him enjoyed by His followers showed His power to gather to Himself the spiritual tribute of all the ages and all the highest traditions of mankind. When St. Paul says that “there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman: but Christ is all, and in all,” he indicates a universal hospitality and reconciling power in Christ that are due to a transcendent “Truth” in Him, which receives and enlarges, purifies and fulfils all that has gone before. The greatness of His Personality is revealed in the greatness of His heirship and in the corresponding greatness of His origination. He is not overwhelmed or obscured by the vastness of His inheritance, but, on the contrary, so completes and vitalises the whole as to open a new era of Truth, Unity, and Power to mankind. Furthermore, when St. Paul speaks of the power of Christ “to reconcile all things unto Himself. . . . whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens,” he means that the Ascension stands, not for a scenic display or an external control, but for a spiritual value which in consummating and harmonising all Reality, makes the Universe the *home* of spiritual life.

The sustained endeavour to give dogmatic definition to the truth of the Incarnation had a two-fold motive. It was, first of all, an attempt to reach and formulate final truth in regard to the nature of the Godhead and to the relations of God to the world. Equally, its object was to safeguard the values and needs of spiritual life by a regulative framework of definite belief. In order to attain this two-fold end it was necessary to rear the doctrine upon the combined foundation of Scriptural authority and spiritual philosophy. By this means the Creed at once established the pre-existence of Christ in the eternal nature of the Godhead, and attributed to Him supremacy over the Universe, not as a Superman, but by reason of a constitutive office that orders the mutual relations of God, the Universe and Man by His own immanence in them all. In the earlier stages of this process the term *The Logos* played a predominant part as connecting the Old Testament doctrine of the Word and Wisdom of God with the Stoic and

Alexandrian philosophy of immanent and universal Reason. Eventually, however, this abstraction gave place to the doctrine of the eternal Sonship of Christ, as emphasising His Divine Personality, and the controversies that arose turned upon the need to establish the belief that Christ is “truly” God and “perfectly” Man in face of conflicting tendencies either to minimise the Divinity or to injure the Humanity of the Incarnate Son of God.

The doctrine of the Incarnation, as thus formulated, is as unique as the Personality it sets forth. It is so for three reasons. First of all, because it was necessitated by the majesty of a human personality arising, not out of official position or world-wide fame, but out of unapproachable spiritual pre-eminence. In the next place, because it did not aim, like the Indian Avatars, to portray a Divine Being—one among many—as appearing in the world for a particular and limited task, but to describe the Personality “in Whom dwelleth all the Fullness of the Godhead” and Who, therefore, satisfies for ever all possible needs of the spiritual life. And, finally, because Christ is set forth thereby, not as a prodigy, but as a world-explanation in Whom the perfection of God is manifested in a Divine “philanthropy” (Titus iii, 4), which reveals the glory of God as consisting, not in His apartness, but in His Self-giving, and as apprehended, not by a process of negation till He appears as bare Being, but by the affirmations which set Him forth as the eternal realisation and energetic spring of all Spiritual Values.

Of all this, St. Paul gives the most succinct and impressive summary when, speaking of Christ as the Son of God, he declares that “all things have been created through Him, and unto Him: and He is before all things and in Him all things hold together” (Col. i, 16, 17). In this statement he represents the Incarnation as the consummation and, therefore, the complete revelation of a world-order which by its very constitution has contained the possibility and promise of it. He discovers the secret of the world-order as containing spiritual values and potentialities, which at once constitute it an organic whole through an immanent Reason, and supply to it an energetic principle of development which reaches its goal in Christ. Hence he finds continuity, wholeness and consonance throughout. The appearance of Christ, the transcendent personality and event of history, is yet a fulfilment which sheds light upon the whole as a spiritual evolution on the highest plane that can only attain its end in the appearance of the Personality in Whom the highest values are, at once, realised, vindicated and diffused.

Serious difficulties for thought would have been avoided had due weight been consistently given to this teaching of St. Paul. The ordinary treatment of the Incarnation represents it as an interven-

tion for a remedial purpose from above and *from without*. The modern mind finds it impossible to accept such an isolated event as an interjection and intrusion upon a mechanically self-contained and self-sufficient world. Men think nowadays in terms of Evolution, which, whatever its merits as a description or explanation, is a habit of thought which outreaches any inductions from Nature. Hence, if the Fact of the Incarnation is to be accepted, it must be shown to be consistent with the world-order and process, congruous with the spiritual nature of man, and continuous with the universal activity of God.

The trouble arises largely from the departmental and discontinuous treatment of the spiritual world, on the one hand, and of cosmic order on the other. Each system has been elaborated without regard to the other, each has accepted belated tidings of the other, and each has been too prone to assume its own finality. Each is, on its own premises, self-contained and complete. Yet each needs to be revised in the light of the other, if truth is to be attained.

In particular, the usually accepted doctrine of the Incarnation distinguishes between a general and a special activity of God, as though they were in contrast with one another. The general activity of God in the constitution and ordering of the Universe is construed in terms of Will and Wisdom and Power: the special, in terms of Christ, of Grace, and Spirit. Christian teachers who desire to be on good terms with scientific thought have too often rushed in to accept the conception of the Universe which has formed the basis of the physical sciences as though it were final and complete instead of merely provisional and pragmatic, and so assume a self-contained Universe, which can only be modified by the invading and interfering act of an external God. They then bring to bear upon the situation a Theistic doctrine, which, just because the significance of the Incarnation has not been fully grasped, appears, not merely to distinguish, but to separate God from His world. Hence, when a return is eventually made to the Incarnation it appears as an interjection and an innovation, instead of as being the consummation and explanation of all things.

Such treatment of the Incarnation misreads both the Nature and Method of the Universe and the relationship of God to it. The Universe is the whole that either is or can be experienced by consciousness. It culminates in the personalities that apprehend it, and these personalities are constituted by the Values which underlie and fashion their thought, affections and pursuits. What remains of the Universe when these personalities and their constitutive values have been eliminated for the purposes of physical investigation is but an abstraction, which can

only be treated as the whole, or the significant part of the whole, by Imagination and not by Reason. This physical abstraction, however legitimate for a limited and provisional inquiry, is no more the Universe than the Values of which it has been denuded. Nay, more. Since the Universe culminates in personalities and is only real as known or knowable by personalities, since also Values are vital to the activity of these personalities, it may well be argued that the Values and the consciousness that lives by apprehending them have a higher claim both to be and to explain Reality than has all that remains when they are left out of account. Hence the Universe can no more be explained by ether, electrons, energy and the like than a picture by its pigments.

Man comes to himself in and for the Universe, and in so doing brings the Universe itself into full actuality, by the apprehension and pursuit of the Values of Truth, Beauty, and Goodness. These appear to him *as given* and as containing alike the meaning, the promise and the justification of Reality. Only through these can man find himself *at home* in the Universe. He ventures upon it in thought and activity because he counts upon finding in it an inner reason that will persistently evoke, assist and reward his efforts to realise the highest values by means of it. His consciousness, actuated by the appreciation and pursuit of Values, is so constitutive of Reality that, were it obliterated, the remainder would be no more the world of Science than that of Art, Poetry, or Saintliness. Broadly speaking, all must stand or fall together. There is no world of Facts and Laws without Values. It should go without saying that physical science cannot find and should not expect to find either these Values or the consciousness that apprehends them—or even God Who explains them—as mere elements or factors of Reality. Nor is this possible in anything that is spiritual and personal, e.g., systems of thought, pictures and poems, laws and constitutions. The personal is found in the Values of all these. Through Values spirit speaks to spirit; whether the spirit of man to his fellow man, or that of the Universe to man.

Hence, the Method of the Universe is to reveal itself—its meaning and possibilities—to and through Personalities—their intellectual and æsthetic vision, their spiritual and moral character, their practical achievements. It waits to be discovered and appropriated by them. It prepares the material for them and also the environment which both nurtures and challenges them. When these personalities appear the Universe itself appears to them and through them. The Universe, as the object of Knowledge and of Valuation, is, at once, the producer and the product of personalities. Both it and they come to their own together by the manifestation of spiritual Values. The nature, the promise and the constitutive

office of these Values suggests that their Source is to be found in infinite and perfect Personality. And equally, the way in which they are revealed, sustained, and made inwardly satisfying in face of brute necessity and of material interests suggests the active influence of God Himself, Who makes the revelation and maintenance of Spiritual Values both the means and the material of fellowship between Himself and man. It is in such fellowship that the "Humanity of God" and the "divinity of man" are made manifest.

It follows from all this that the study of Spiritual Values—their meaning and implications—is of fundamental importance for the true apprehension of God and the adequate explanation of the Universe. The Earl of Balfour, after surveying this subject in his Gifford Lectures, concludes that "Divine guidance must be postulated if we are to maintain the three great Values—Knowledge, Love, and Beauty." (Theism and Thought, Second Course of Gifford Lectures, p. 248.) He reaches this conclusion because these Values, though they are essential to the higher life and satisfaction of men, have no survival value in the physical sense. On the contrary, they are frequently embraced and maintained to the injury and even at the cost of physical survival. While the few seek rational support for these values the many accept them implicitly, without seeking for such support. All this being the case, they cannot have emerged by chance or have sprung from a non-rational source. Hence Divine guidance must be postulated for their explanation.

The argument is cogent. Yet do not the facts in themselves and the very conception of guidance involve something still more fundamental, upon which even Divine guidance must rest both for its possibility and its procedure? The conception of guidance, taken by itself, appears to suggest the externality of God, Who deals with a situation, otherwise created, by the complementary method of suggesting and enforcing ideals which lie outside and apart from both the original nature of man and the environment in which his physical being is rooted. This seems to be an inadequate account of the Values—both of their immanent relationship to man himself and of the way in which they connect man with the Universe, which at once nurtures and provokes them into activity and influence. Man is not himself without these Values. They *well up* within him, bringing with them intuitive vision, self-evidencing authority, and influence that is vital to his personality. And as the Values are more intimate and deep-seated than external presentation, so God must be more intimate and immanent than a mere Guide. He is the *well-spring* of spiritual values. They are the offspring, not merely of His external activity, but of His

immanent life. In them He gives not only His guidance, but Himself as the Ground and Law, the Life and End of man.

Lord Balfour says, "If, taking the 'argument from design' in its simplest form, He (God) be regarded as the external Creator of all the world, it seems natural to think of Him as the Creator in the same sense and to the same degree of every part of it—of the good and the bad, the pleasurable and the painful, the sublime and the petty, the beautiful and the mean. If, again, taking an idealistic view, He be regarded as Spirit underlying all the Universe of appearance, the essential Reality to Whose perfection all that is makes contribution, then again He would seem to be equally related to all subordinate values, be these high or low, be they good, bad, or simply 'indifferent'" (p. 255). Hence Lord Balfour concludes that, as his arguments involve preferential action on the part of God, they "most easily harmonise with religious, rather than with metaphysical statements" (p. 256). "Something more," he adds, "than deism or pantheism, something other than doctrines of an Absolute about which everything can be said, or a One about which nothing can be said, is needful. Theism of a religious type is necessary, if the real Values on which depend all our higher life are to be reasonably sustained" (p. 258).

Is this contrast between Religion and Metaphysics either needful or safe? Is either the argument from Design or the "idealistic view" necessarily beset by the weakness which Lord Balfour imputes to them if the meaning of Spiritual Values be sufficiently explored? These Values are progressively revealed, come to exert authority and set standards, gradually spread and prevail, are the presuppositions by which the world is judged and transformed. Is not God made manifest in the *issue*, and in the way by which it is prepared and led up to? Do not the Values, therefore, reveal alike the immanence of God and the purpose and method of His Design?

Does not God, just because He reveals Himself in the highest Values "on which depend all our highest life" proceed

- (1) by positing and constituting centres of finite activity, culminating in personalities, that are differentiated yet not separated from Himself?
- (2) by co-ordinating the Universe of such centres by a universal and immanent life and law, regulating their inter-relationships and interactions?
- (3) by energising throughout the whole of this system in order to secure the evolution which shall finally express His mind and fulfil His purpose by the revelation and eventual triumph of the Values, which make the whole process worth while?

and (4) is not this procedure adopted for the sake of the Values, since it is the only way by which Values *can come to be valued*—be revealed and appreciated, won and enjoyed?

If this view be accepted, it follows that God stands in organic relationship to His World, and that the Incarnation consummates this relationship by the gift of a transcendent Personality, Whose advent at once fulfils and explains all that has gone before. Both the Incarnation and the Values when studied together coincide in their witness that God, the eternal Perfection, goes forth not only in self-manifestation, but in the Self-giving of Sovereign Fatherhood. He not only guides, but underlies the world; His underlying being understood in the sense that the nature and supremacy of the Values necessitate and declare. All fruitful interpretations of the Universe, whether through the Reason and Spirit of Hegel, the Activism of Eucken, the *Élan Vital* of Bergson, or even the pragmatism of James, while transcended, can be brought together by the idea of the Self-giving of Love, creating fellowship with itself through the revelation and maintenance of Values, for the manifestation of which the constitution and process of the Universe have been immanently and Divinely prepared. The relation of the thinker to his thought, of the artist to his masterpiece, of the artificer to his work are all suggestive, though all fall short, of the vital and constitutive Self-giving which makes God the author, the sovereign, and the end of His world.

Christian Theology has surrendered its own ground in so far as it has failed to apply, or has even receded from, the philosophy of the Incarnation in its endeavours to give a reasoned interpretation of the Universe. For fear of Pantheism it has fallen into Deism, through neglect of its own means of preserving and harmonising, in a higher synthesis, the elements of truth in both. Any Theology of Creation which fails to take full account of the Incarnation is in peril of making God an "unnecessary hypothesis," of reducing the Incarnation to a mere miracle, and of leaving Spiritual Values so insecurely based that they appear as *epi-phenomena* springing out of an alien world.

This defective treatment has been due to the setting up of a province of so-called Natural, as distinct from Revealed, Religion, and to the consequent endeavour to satisfy its intellectual demands by means of the Old Testament, interpreted by the help of the successive philosophies, Platonic, Aristotelian, and so forth, that seemed to be in accord with it. The interpretation of God and of His relationship to the world by means of the Incarnation and St. Paul's philosophy of it as consummating and, therefore, explain-

ing the original world-order is the supreme and the most difficult task of Christian Theology. With the partial exception of the early Greek Fathers, Christian thinkers have resiled from this task, to which, indeed, their thought and experience were inadequate. In the first ages they accepted many of the presuppositions of their own previous philosophy, clothed them in Old Testament terms and supported them by its authority, in order to deal with a degraded Paganism, which was equally repugnant to neo-Platonists and to themselves. Subsequently, as the distinction between Natural and Revealed Religion became accentuated, theologians proceeded to build up a systematic doctrine of the Attributes of God—Natural, Moral, and Spiritual—in order to represent Him as the Sufficient Cause of the Universe treated as an external product. Moreover, from the earliest times, it was needful to maintain the spirituality and the supremacy of God against the grossness of Paganism. Hence the "philanthropy" of God became, for thought, so concentrated in the Son as to guard the sublime perfection of the Father from full contact with the world, rather than to manifest His profound concern in it. Furthermore, the necessity of setting forth the sovereign Personality of God led to the Augustinian emphasis on His will, as the final and complete explanation of all that is.

And, finally, lest God should appear to be dependent upon His world, or involved in its struggles and vicissitudes, His Eternal Blessedness must be safeguarded by the doctrine of His impassibility, originally a crude reaction against the crude anthropopathy of Paganism. As the result of all these influences God has come to be conceived as, by reason of His spirituality, sovereignty, and blessedness, remote from the world, though essential to its existence. Christian theology does well to resist the view that God is dependent upon the world for His self-realisation and blessedness. Yet it seems contradictory to insist religiously on the care of God for His world while destroying theologically every possibility of His having a vital and costly concern in it. The very fact that he creates, constitutes, and sustains it shows that He is vitally concerned in it. He does not eject it from Himself: but takes it to Himself, in giving Himself to it. It is necessary, therefore, to correct our spiritual idealism by an equally spiritual realism. The perfection of God should not be conceived in terms of abstract spirituality. He is not revered by stripping Him, in thought, of the manifold riches of His Being, or by seeking to apprehend Him through the abstention and austerity by which alone a creaturely striving attain to spirituality. Even the Creatorship of God can only be explained through the continuous and

generous self-giving of His immanence throughout Creation. The error of Tritheism is substituted for the truth of the Trinity, if the latter be used to limit, instead of to express, the sympathy of God. His Blessedness is secured neither by means of, nor yet apart from His world. It comes of the unlimited resources and the ceaseless exercise of His Love, in bringing the Values of His own eternal perfection to their eventual triumph in His Creation. The concern of God in His world is, therefore, real, and is in proportion as His creatures are ends in themselves and not merely means; in proportion as they realise, or are capable of realising, those spiritual values in which He reveals and bestows Himself. His presentation of these values and His influence in aiding the choice and pursuit of them alike involve His self-giving to and throughout the whole Universe in which they appear as the consummating end. Hence God is vital to the world and the world is vital to God in the sense that apart from it and from the fulfilment of His purpose in it, His Love would remain unsatisfied. A God with no such costly concern in and sympathy with His world would not be Love; would not be "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Thus the Incarnation consummates and reveals the eternal and universal self-giving of God; a self-giving that is conditioned throughout by His spiritual perfection both in itself and in the ends and means it prescribes. Creation could not culminate in, or be redeemed by, the Incarnation, were not God alive in and for the whole, making the glories of His own perfection the Values in which His world has its meaning and worth.

J. SCOTT LIDGETT.

FREEING THE SLAVES.

TO Sir Arthur Steel Maitland belongs primarily the honour of commencing what Lord Cecil rightly described the other day as "a landmark in the history of slavery." In the early hours of a bright September morning just three years ago, Sir Arthur Steel Maitland found the sanctity of his bedroom in the Hotel des Bergues invaded by an importunate "lobbyist" with the plea that he should commence a new assault on slavery. As the plea was a strong one, and as both breakfast and correspondence were waiting, the Delegate of New Zealand succumbed to the wiles of the lobbyist, with the happy result that the League of Nations was committed to an attack on "slavery in all its forms" by the unanimous acceptance of the resolution moved by Sir Arthur Steel Maitland in his capacity as one of the delegates of New Zealand.

The slavery resolution of 1922 was followed up in 1923 by vigorous support in the Assembly from Mr. Edward Wood, and in the result, a Temporary Slavery Committee was set up to gather information and make recommendations. The terms of reference to the Slavery Commission were drawn widely in order to permit of a survey of the whole ground of slavery, thus it comes about that the League of Nations was in the 1925 Assembly placed in possession of a mass of material upon every form of slave trading and slave owning. The work of the League received a substantial impetus by the enlightened and far-reaching action of the Maharaja of Nepal, who, in one of the finest, if not the finest, abolitionist speeches in history, decided to strive for the liberty of the 53,000 slaves in the Kingdom of Nepal.

The British Government has met the situation with an alacrity which will receive widespread public support and thankfulness, for the very first day upon which the Commissions of the League met together, Lord Cecil opened the proceedings by making his first public act that of tabling a new Anti-Slavery Convention in the shape of a Protocol, which it is now known had been prepared in advance by a Committee sitting in the British Foreign Office. The most useful feature of the Preamble is that the Protocol will remain open for a year, in order to give time for the Council to consider additional measures for meeting the situation. As a result of the three years' work, the League of Nations now has before it a mass of information upon "slavery in all its forms" and the draft Protocol for a Convention presented by the British Government. The first question which arises is whether or not the instrument is comprehensive enough to deal with the evil—most people will feel that it is not, and will ask what means

can be taken and what steps are possible to secure essential amendments to the draft Protocol.

It is important in the first place to recognise at once that the League of Nations is attempting to deal with a gigantic evil; the comfortable illusion that only smouldering embers of slavery remain won't do at all. The evil is deep-seated and widespread, involving customs and habits of great cruelty, and even the lives of a host of unfortunate people. At the same time, new forms of slavery are emerging which in their cumulative effect must lead to serious domestic and international embarrassments. The category of the varied forms of slavery adopted by the League Commission is indicative of its ramifications:

The Status and the Legal Status of Slavery.
 Slave-Raiding and Similar Acts.
 Slave Trade.
 Practices Restrictive of the Liberty of the Person.
 Domestic or Predial Slavery (Serfdom).
 Compulsory Labour, Public or Private, Paid or Unpaid.
 Transition from Servile or Compulsory Labour to Free-Wage Labour or Independent Production.

The Slavery Commission of the League was composed of eight persons, and of these eight no less than six had held high office in the Colonial sphere; thus the Chairman, M. Gohr (Belgium), had in his colleagues a wealth of experience upon which to draw. This Commission received a mass of reports from different parts of the world, then they met together in twenty-one plenary sittings to consider the material previously circulated, and as a result M. Gohr informed the Council that even now his Commission was unable to lay a complete Report before the League. But what they do lay bare is a story of grave import, and had it been possible to publish the evidence upon which the report is based, the disclosures would have been of a sensational nature. It is unfortunate that the reticence of the British Government should have given the lead to other Governments in this respect, and it is still difficult to understand why Mr. Ponsonby should have laid it down that it was "not in the public interest" to let the world know what was going on. One result of this secrecy is that exaggeration is attaching itself to current stories which seem to be based upon authority. But although shorn of the evidence, the report is still a terribly eloquent document.

THE DISCLOSURES.

The Temporary Slavery Commission reports the existence of slave-trading and slave-raiding in the following fifteen or sixteen areas: Sahara, South Morocco, South Tripoli, the Libyan Oases,

Rio de Oro, Senussi country, Abyssinia, Liberia, China, Hedjaz (traffic through Egypt, Sudan, Eritrea, Somali coast) and the Far East to Arabia (incredible as it may seem, there is reason to believe that this refers to either or both the native states of India and or the Dutch East Indies). The information at their disposal, says the Commission, is quite reliable and thus they are able to assert that:

"The slave trade is practised openly in several Mohammedan States in Asia, and in particular in the Arabian Peninsula, especially the Hedjaz. It is known that the Hashimite Government received dues on slaves sold in the markets, which is equivalent to an official recognition or the legality of this trade."
 "There can be no doubt that negroes from the African continent are imported and sold as slaves in several districts of Arabia."
 "The Temporary Slavery Commission is informed on authority which it regards as entirely trustworthy, that many of the slaves of foreign origin in the Hedjaz are either young girls from the Far East who come as pilgrims, or are smuggled for sale; or are persons coming from various countries accompanying their parents or masters in the pilgrimage to Mecca . . . but there appears to be no doubt that they are sold as slaves."

The Commissioners say with regard to Liberia and China:

"Allegations which it has not been possible to bring to the notice of the Governments concerned have been made to the effect that slave-dealing still continues in Liberia and China. This is contrary to the declarations made by the Chinese and Liberian Governments."

The Liberian Government may declare itself to the contrary, but in view of available facts it seems rather a futile proceeding. It cannot be long before certain Governments publish the facts, and this denial will then look exceedingly foolish. As to the Chinese declaration that slavery does not exist in China, the Archbishop of Canterbury said in the House of Lords as recently as May 13th last:

"The revelations about China and the degree and character of Chinese slavery were to me startling in the highest degree. I had occasion to talk over the matter with an eminent Chinaman who is in this country. I drew a very dark picture of what China appeared to be. It appeared so dark to me that I hardly liked to put it to him as being true, but he said that it was not nearly dark enough. I spoke of Western China, where slavery is rife, but said that it was impossible to buy slaves at this moment in the great cities in the East. He said, 'Oh, yes, it is. I could buy them in half an hour. There is not the slightest difficulty in buying girls; I could buy them anywhere.' In Hongkong the position is different, but I am told that in Shanghai, even with its European zones of influence, slavery is still rife."

The International Labour Office in Geneva has now issued *in extenso* the evidence of the Commission appointed to investigate

conditions in Shanghai and its vicinity. In this evidence the following statement is made which emphatically confirms that made by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords :

" Young female children are commonly purchased and employed as domestic servants. They probably begin to work as soon as it is possible for them physically to do so. This practice is general throughout the country. It obviously lends itself to great abuse, and the Commission has little doubt that, like other forms of slavery, it is the source of much human misery. The Commission has reason to believe, from the evidence given before it, that many slave children are employed in native brothels and trained to prostitution. Such sale of female children, although undoubtedly contrary to Chinese law, does not appear to be interfered with in any way by those charged with the administration of justice."

The second main category of slave-owning and slave-dealing is a wide one, namely, that of transfer by exchange, sale, gift or inheritance, adoption, debt-bondage. This group again is commercial slavery and really comes within the definition of the British Government that slave-owning is the assertion of a property right. The most dangerous of these appears to be debt-bondage, where the Commission says :

" . . . the creditor so arranges that his debtors get more and more into debt, with the result that, what was in the beginning only an apparently equitable contract, is transformed finally into enslavement for life."

and again :

" The abuses of the system known in certain parts of the world as peonage may lead, in the opinion of the Commission, to a form of debt slavery even graver in its social effects than those practices which arise out of native custom."

The Commission in this section draws attention in curious phraseology to the need for vigilance :

" . . . in regard to the purchase of young children by missions or other charitable bodies with the object of freeing them and of improving their physical and moral condition. Experience has shown that such action has in some cases had the result of encouraging the capture and enslavement of children in order to sell them."

FORCED LABOUR.

Domestic slavery is probably the least harmful form of slavery except in cases where in Native States the owner possesses the right of sale and of life and death, and in native areas under the colonising Powers where the administration exacts compulsory labour. The Commission devotes one section of its report to compulsory labour. In many countries it is difficult to separate the problem of forced labour from domestic slavery, because the tendency is for chiefs and tribes to satisfy the demand

by European Governments for forced labour by imposing this upon the domestic slave class. The problem of forced labour formed the subject of the most difficult and sometimes heated discussions in Commission VI, which dealt with it during the sittings of the League of Nations this year. As originally prepared, the Protocol on Slavery limited the right of Governments to exact forced labour to works of purely public interest. In the Kenya White Paper, Cmd. 2464, three definite principles were laid down; first, that sanction could only be given for the raising of a limited number of forced labourers providing they were for public works only, and that in cases where these public works were undertaken by private contractors, no labour could be provided except with the prior sanction of the Secretary of State. The third main principle laid down very emphatically by Mr. Amery was that compulsory labour should be paid at the market rate, as it would be impossible to defend any other course. The claim to impose compulsion in order to obtain labour for administrative purposes derives its title from the indigenous custom of calling out labour at times of disaster, or for primitive works of public good, such as native paths, bridges across streams, and so forth. There is, however, great need to circumscribe modern demands based on this root title. Under native custom the chief would never call out labourers to an extent or for a place which would interfere with the domestic requirements of the tribe, nor would labour be called out for long periods, or in circumstances which would separate the worker from his family. This demand as applied to-day in the case of railways or bridges of modern construction frequently takes the labourers hundreds of miles from their homes for extended periods, separates them from their families, and gravely interferes with the domestic and economic life of the community.

UNOFFICIAL DISCLOSURES.

Under the terms of reference to the Slavery Commission it was made possible for that body to receive reports from influential sources. It thus came about that a large number of reliable reports were received from societies and individuals possessing intimate knowledge. Amongst these reports is an extremely interesting and formidable indictment of Portuguese rule in Africa by Professor Ross, coupled with a manifesto issued by the Governor of Portuguese West Africa. The manifesto of the Governor clearly shows that the labour system now in operation easily comes within the well-known definition by the late Lord Cromer, namely, " We regard the system (forced labour) when applied for private profit as wholly unjustifiable and as synonymous with slavery."

The Report by Professor Ross forms the result of an American

Commission of Inquiry into conditions in Angola and Mozambique. This Report was issued to the League of Nations with a prefatory note signed by such eminent Americans as George Foster Peabody, Raymond Fosdick, Joseph Chamberlain, Hamilton Holt and H. N. MacCracken, and they express the opinion that the Government of Portugal "will do all within its power to abolish all evil practices in the employment of native labour in its colonies in Africa." In this Report Professor Ross deals with a new system of forced labour for private profit. One planter told him that he had "bought" his people from the Government by the simple process of paying the head tax to the Government and giving the worker his food. Another planter, Professor Ross states, secured a number of labourers by the payment of \$675, and of these he says: "They were quite thin, and eleven died on the three days' march. If they dropped on the march no one was allowed to stop to cover them with earth." Of the two hundred, thirty were sick and four died on arrival. This Report by Professor Ross has been submitted to the Portuguese Government by the League of Nations for their observations, and it is expected that Portugal will promptly meet the allegations of this Report by sending out an impartial Commission of Inquiry.

THE BRITISH SLAVERY PROTOCOL.

The Slavery Protocol (now Convention) placed before the Assembly of the League of Nations by Lord Cecil, disappointed the most earnest advocates of the abolition of "slavery in all its forms," but it did represent an advance, it did incorporate for the first time the problem of forced labour, and incorporated it in an instrument dealing with slavery—that in itself was a highly significant step on the part of the British Government. Lord Cecil moreover, repeatedly emphasised that the British Government would gladly have gone further, providing other nations were willing to do so. But the Protocol has emerged from the Commission (VI) of the Assembly in a still less satisfactory condition than it was in when introduced, because it extends a temporary tolerance to forced labour for private profit, a system of labour which British statesmen of all parties have repeatedly declared to be slavery. There were not wanting critics among the delegates to the Assembly, as well as other influential persons who held that rather than incorporate this clause, it would be better to abandon the British Protocol altogether.

The Convention has two main features—Slavery and Forced Labour. First, there are the definitions of slavery which are quite new to slavery instruments, and which it would be difficult to improve:

"Slavery is the status or condition of a person over whom any or all of the powers attaching to the right of ownership are exercised. The slave trade includes all acts involved in the capture, acquisition or disposal of a person with intent to reduce him to slavery; all acts involved in the acquisition of a slave with a view to selling or exchanging him; all acts of disposal by sale or exchange of a slave acquired with a view to being sold or exchanged, and, in general, every act of trade or transport in slaves."

Attached to each article is a valuable statement covering the interpretations. For example, where in Article 2 of the Convention the phrase occurs "slavery in every form," the Commissioners say in their Report to the Assembly that this sub-paragraph "is intended to include all forms of 'debt slavery'".

The second main feature is that of forced labour. Article 6, which deals with forced labour for public works, falls lamentably short of the British position even in Kenya, but what gave rise in Geneva to much greater concern was that the Convention in this respect did not go so far as the provisions in the Mandates. In the Mandates the following stipulation is made:

"The Mandatory . . . shall prohibit all forms of forced or compulsory labour, except for essential public works and services, and then only in return for adequate remuneration."

Article 6 of the Slavery Convention reads as drafted to-day:—

"The High Contracting Parties recognise that recourse to compulsory or forced labour may have grave consequences, and undertake, each in respect of the territories placed under its sovereignty, jurisdiction, protection or tutelage, to take all necessary measures to prevent conditions analagous to those of slavery resulting from compulsory or forced labour.

"It is agreed that:

"(1) In principle, compulsory or forced labour may only be exacted for public purposes.

"(2) In territories in which compulsory or forced labour for other than public purposes still survives, the High Contracting Parties shall endeavour progressively, and as soon as possible, to put an end to the practice. So long as such forced or compulsory labour exists, this labour shall invariably be of an exceptional character, shall always receive adequate remuneration, and shall not involve the removal of the labourers from their usual place of residence.

"(3) In all cases, the responsibility for any recourse to compulsory or forced labour shall rest with the central authorities of the territories concerned."

The comparative weakness of the Slavery Convention in this respect leaps to the eye. There is nothing in this Article which limits such *corvée* to works of urgency, and still worse, no provision is made as to wages for the conscripted labourers. It is understood that the provision with regard to forced labour for private profit owes its inception to the action of a Continental Government, due to the fact that a system of labour hitherto

regarded by most Colonial Governments as barely distinguishable from slavery exists widely in the Colonies of this European power. This revelation will come as a considerable shock to most people, particularly in view of the substantial British financial interests in the Colonies in question.

But there is a year before the States Members of the League and before the public, for the final draft of the Convention will not be sanctioned until the Assembly meeting of next year. Dr. Nansen, to whom civilisation owes so much for the moral leadership he gives to the Assembly of the League, has already tabled on behalf of Norway three amendments to the Convention, and secured the consent of the Assembly to attach these to the Convention and Report on Slavery which is to be issued by the Council. The first amendment is that all disputes arising from the Convention shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the second provides for annual reports to the League of Nations upon the progress of abolition, and the third calls the attention of the International Labour Office to the *conditions* of slave labour and forced labour as distinct from the *systems*.

Taking the work of the Slavery Commission and the disclosures made by that body, coupled with the action of Lord Cecil in producing and piloting through the Assembly a new Anti-Slavery Convention, it is no exaggeration to say that these represent the biggest advance made by Anti-Slavery forces since 1885. But the fight to free the slaves and to abolish slavery will be a stern one, and calls for the help of every man and woman who believes in freedom for the slaves. The immensity of the task will be realised when public opinion wakes up to the fact that taking all classes of slaves and conscripted labourers covered by the Convention, their number must largely exceed 1,000,000 men, women, and children.

JOHN H. HARRIS.

RECENT PROGRESS IN TROPICAL DEVELOPMENT.

THE passing of 1925, with the trade and industrial conditions of this country still problematical, is not inappropriate for reviewing some of the more striking features of tropical economic development—a phase of Empire development which ought to command more and more public attention amongst all classes. In making this review the adjective “tropical” is used in a liberal and convenient sense to embrace not only countries or regions lying between Cancer and Capricorn but also certain adjoining regions of a sub-tropical character, like the lower southern United States, where cotton is grown and where coloured labour is commonly employed.

The principal products derived from these vast and far-flung areas are: cotton, tea, sugar, rubber, tobacco, maize, vegetable oils, hemp, hides, cocoa, coffee, spices, rice, tin, petroleum, silver, lead, gold, chromium, manganese, and diamonds. Imports of these products into the United Kingdom from tropical and sub-tropical countries in 1923 were of the value of something like £250,000,000, or about twenty-four per cent. of the total value of our imports. The regions producing these products took something like thirty per cent. of the value of our exports. This trade would seem at any rate worth keeping, if not developing.

Tropical and sub-tropical countries are of fundamental importance as the source of the world's cotton supply. The development of new cotton fields, on account of the world's increasing consumption, is a topic of the first moment and a matter in connection with which very considerable progress has recently been made, though the expansion so far has constituted only a small fractional part of what appears to be required. Great Britain, largely through the activities of the Empire Cotton Growing Corporation and the British Cotton Growers' Association, which deals respectively with the direction of the scientific and commercial aspects, has brought about important extensions in many countries, especially in the Sudan, Uganda, Queensland, and India. The Sudan Plantations Syndicate, under a unique system of native tenancy, grew 20,000 bales of cotton in 1924, and now with the completion of the Makwar dam there will be sufficient water to produce 100,000 bales immediately and ten times that quantity in course of time. The Imperial Government guaranteed the principal and interest of loans to a total value of £13,000,000 for the construction of this dam and its complementary works; the dam itself is nearly two miles in length, while the reservoir above the dam will be a lake some fifty miles long, and there will be 9,286 miles of canals.

In some ways more remarkable has been the progress of cotton production in Uganda, where 100,000 bales of rain-grown cotton were produced by native growers in 1924, compared with fifty-four bales in 1904. In Queensland, 166 acres under cotton in 1920 increased to 100,000 acres (80,000 bales) in 1924. Satisfactory as these developments are, it must be borne in mind that in Africa particularly, the yield per acre is very low and there is ample scope for introducing better systems of agriculture and more penetrating analysis in regard to factors of production and ginnery efficiency*. Intimately connected with cotton-growing is the provision of railways, and, as already noted in the case of the Sudan, irrigation. Concerning the former, recent developments in Africa have been remarkable; for a detailed and comprehensive account of them the reader is referred to *The Times Trade Supplement* for July 26th and August 23rd, 1924. The latest development is the new £10,000,000 loan for East Africa, the outcome of the Ormsby-Gore Commission. A few months ago a new and rather attractive irrigation scheme for cotton in the south-east of the Gold Coast was put forward, and other industries are also likely to arise in this country in spite of the fact that it already produces more than one-half of the world's supply of cocoa. In nearly all the British fields, cotton is grown, not on a plantation company basis, as rubber and tea are principally grown, but on a native tenancy basis. This in itself is a highly important developmental phase, and is closely connected with modern views on land tenure in tropical countries, the principle of which is that the land belongs to the people, and while the Government should and does make grants in perpetuity, there must be conditions as to utilisation and a rental subject to revision and altered from time to time on the basis of extrinsic improvements like roads.

A matter of considerable interest at the present time, in connection with tropical development, is the cultivation of the West African oil palm on a plantation basis. This tree, the principal source of vegetable oil for soap-making, is mainly exploited in its wild state in the forests of Nigeria, but for some years the Dutch, in Sumatra, have been obtaining highly satisfactory results on a plantation basis, due to higher yields, improved quality of oil and labour economy resulting from geographical contraction and the introduction of machinery. Areas in the middle of British Malaya are being planted up, and it has already been shown that an acre of oil palm produces £44 worth of oil as against £24 worth in the case of copra (from coconuts). The cost appears to be greater in regard to oil palm, but it would seem to be quite evident that the

* The training of men for this purpose, at the recently established Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture in the West Indies, is being actively pursued.

return on capital is much greater. This does not in any way signify that the copra will diminish in importance. This product has a "quality" value for margarine; according to the late Lord Leverhulme nothing is safer to produce. What it does mean is that Nigeria will need to introduce more efficient methods of collection and extraction—a matter that has, in fact, received scientific attention for the last three years. In regard to extraction, the so-called "soft" oil of the trade is prepared in the tropics from fresh unfermented fruit, and is a much more laborious process than that of preparing the so-called "hard" oil. To prepare a ton of soft oil in Nigeria takes the native 420 working days, whereas to make an equal quantity of "hard" oil involves only 132 working days. The premium (in 1924) of £1 per ton on soft oil gave only 0.83d. per day extra for the additional labour involved. This is one of the matters that the Nigerian Department of Agriculture is dealing with.

An outstanding topic of constant discussion and appeal is the production of Empire sugar, and this still remains very largely a political and economic problem closely connected with tariffs. Although a few new factories have been established in British cane-growing countries, and although an investigation of possibilities of expansion in East Africa has recently been made, there are no definite signs of expansion at all comparable with that effected in recent years in Cuba and Java. But Cuba, in spite of her, 4,000,000 tons output per annum, and her immense and highly efficient factories, is finding soil depletion and mosaic disease increasingly serious matters. There has been a general tendency in many sugar-producing countries to spend money on factory machinery and supervision, at the expense of the production of cane. In the application of science to sugar production—especially in regard to the technology of manufacture—the United States and Java still lead the world, but important research has recently been inaugurated by the British Sugar Research Association, while the new instructional sugar factory opened at the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture, Trinidad, this year, will give a lead to all cane-sugar countries in regard to completeness, efficiency, and unparalleled facilities for training and research. But inducement, political or otherwise, is needed for the increased investment of capital in British tropical and sub-tropical sugar production if those trained at the new school are to find suitable employment in the Empire rather than in Spanish-American countries.

Turning to developments in connection with rubber and tea, it should first be noted that these commodities (and to a less extent coffee) are, like sugar, mainly produced by joint-stock companies,

the capital being mainly derived from Britain and the United States. The area under rubber has not undergone any material expansion during the last few years and scarcely any new companies have been formed, mainly as the result of the slump in market prices during 1920-23. During 1924 there was a very definite expansion in the world's consumption of rubber, and the near future will probably show some considerable activity in regard to new developments, especially on the part of the United States. In regard to tea, the area under this crop has only been very cautiously extended, if at all, on account of a threatened over-supply, and the new issues that have been made in the last year or two were principally in respect of estates already in bearing. The recent boom in tea shares has mainly arisen from increased demand for this commodity in the United States and Russia. At present there is something like £20,000,000 worth of British capital invested in tea in India and Ceylon, giving employment and good living conditions to over 2,000,000 natives. Developments in regard to coffee production have taken place in the last few years in British East Africa (Kenya), but the dominant country of production is Brazil (Sao Paulo), and the recent investment of British capital in this country in connection with both coffee and cotton is interesting. Concerning tobacco, while the United States, India, and Sumatra are the great producing regions, encouraging developments have taken place in recent years in Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Our preferential tariff is not only increasing Empire production but cheapening the price of tobacco in England.

The developments so far considered have had relation to agricultural commodities produced essentially for export. But there is another aspect, seemingly strange but only in accordance with modern tendencies, that most tropical countries, in spite of their being primarily agricultural, should have to import a large proportion of their food supplies. But local Governments are realising the danger of this system of producing cash-yielding crops for export to the neglect of the local food supply, and rice is the great staple food, the local production of which is being encouraged in many places. Ceylon and British Malaya are dependent to a large extent upon India, Siam, and China for supplies of rice (which is the staple food of Eastern peoples). Because of periodical shortages and for other economic reasons, Malaya and Ceylon are endeavouring to increase their local production. The steps that have been taken by the Malayan Department of Agriculture in this direction are well worth studying in detail. As with cotton, irrigation is an important, indeed an essential requirement for the economic production of rice, and the rapid development in Siam in

recent years has been largely due to the execution of large irrigation schemes. Important projects are now in hand in Malaya. From a general point of view it may be well to call attention in this review to the economic connection between rice and wheat. The latter is being imported into some tropical countries, for instance, into West Africa and the West Indies, in considerable quantities. The natives are beginning to like northern foods better than their own tropical foods. The effect is, in regard to wheat, to reduce the surplus of flour available for northern countries, and for this reason alone it would seem economically desirable to encourage the local production of cereals like rice and millet and maize in tropical countries.

Intimately connected with agriculture in tropical countries are the pastoral or live-stock industries and forestry. Space will not permit anything more than a brief statement to the effect that attempts are being made to improve the live-stock in the tropics, especially in the direction of dairy animals and draught cattle. As regards forestry great progress has been, and continues to be made. Unfortunately, the popular impression still prevails that tropical forestry should mainly consist in the exploitation and marketing of valuable timbers like teak, mahogany, and greenheart, and of wood like mangrove for fuel. From the standpoint of sound development and progress it is technical forest administration—the adoption and execution in perpetuity of far-reaching policies—which is fundamentally important. A vast amount of silent progress of a non-spectacular kind is being made, especially in Malaya, Ceylon, Siam, West Africa, and in British Honduras. The history of forestry in British Honduras is a romantic though perhaps not a very creditable one economically; but the new leaf has been turned over and after only three years of rational forest policy really astounding results have been secured which are well worth studying in detail in the official reports. In the tropics the forests are usually mixed jungles containing a large proportion of useless species, and the general method of development by the Forestry Department lies in the demarcation of extensive reserves with improvement fellings, i.e., helping the economic species to increase. The Indian service has been the pioneer of tropical forestry. It should be noted that in India and in many other tropical countries the Forestry Departments are revenue-yielding.

Coming now to the question of mining developments we have to notice first the greatly increased activity in India. Increased mining in the State of Mysore led in 1923 to the production of more than twice the total chromite obtained in 1922. There have also been big increases in the output of iron and steel, lead, manganese ore and mica. The output of petroleum in India is being

maintained. India is making every effort to develop the manufacture of machinery. Another notable feature of the East is the improved efficiency of tin mining in Malaya. In 1902 it took thirty-seven coolies to produce ten tons of tin ore, while in 1924 it took only twenty-four. This has resulted from the increased employment of machinery, including latterly suction dredgers which enable the low grade ores to be worked economically. During the past year there have been a considerable number of new tin-mining companies formed. Those intending to operate in Malaya have need to be highly capitalised, since no new fields of any note have been discovered and a great deal of expensive machinery is needed to cope with secondhand deposits. Of all countries, perhaps, mining progress has been greatest in recent years in the Belgian Congo. In 1924, over 85,000 tons of copper were exported from the Congo, making it the third largest copper-producing country in the world. This country is extraordinarily rich in minerals, and is now exporting gold and diamonds and has large deposits of iron ore and some coal. Coal discoveries and the exploitation of this mineral are relatively new phenomena in the tropics, the principal and most recent mines (excluding those of India) being in Nigeria, Nyasaland and Malaya. Artificial heat being unnecessary for the most part in tropical countries, the coal is all available for strictly productive uses. Far surpassing the tropical coalfields in importance are the oilfields, the principal ones being in California, Mexico, Sumatra, Burma, Trinidad, and from the point of view of recent development, those in the Maracaibo region of Venezuela. This country is also likely to increase its output of gold, but one of the most noteworthy discoveries of gold of very recent date is in Kenya, in East Africa. In fact, we are only just beginning to find out what tropical Africa has got. Apparently highly valuable deposits of no less than fourteen different minerals have been located in Northern Rhodesia, near the Congo, where the Rhodesian Congo Border Concession Limited is about to operate. New and very extensive deposits of manganese have been found in the interior of the Gold Coast, and this country, like British Guiana in South America, has large reserves of bauxite, the principal source of aluminium. Most of the world's lead supply lies in the sub-tropics, and in connection with this may be mentioned the new and very large lead and silver mines in central Queensland. Close to that country is the island of New Guinea which appears to be rich in valuable minerals; and gold is already being produced there on a more or less permanent and profitable basis. It is probably not untrue to say that tropical countries are becoming the great producing centres of mineral wealth. This wealth is subjected to royalties

and taxation, and in nearly every case the revenue is utilised for improving the country. The magnificent roads and railways of British Malaya were chiefly paid for out of the revenue derived from the export of tin.

General progress in the trade and commerce of the tropics calls, in conclusion, for a few remarks. Obviously, from what has been said concerning production, the trade of the tropics is now part and parcel of world trade. Fast steamers and cables and wireless, and even aircraft, have largely eliminated the obstacles and difficulties of overseas communication and transport. The great problem of the less developed tropical regions is to get produce to the coast. The improvement of harbour facilities is also fundamental in the modern development of tropical trade. Between the end of 1919 and the end of 1923, our tropical Crown Colonies borrowed £39,925,000 for railway and harbour construction. All this money was raised in London. A feature of tropical trade is the advent of the United States as the largest purchaser of tropical produce—England takes only a very limited proportion. Another interesting feature is the cosmopolitan character of tropical trade. Even places like the African Protectorates and Crown Colonies like Ceylon trade with thirty or forty different countries, many of these being other tropical countries. England has the bulk of the tropical African trade; the United States that of Central and South America. The investment of capital in the tropics is almost as internationalised as trade. The United States has £175,000,000 invested in the Cuban sugar industry, and Great Britain has £19,000,000 invested in rubber and tea in the Dutch East Indies. Commercially and industrially, even the more primitive tropical countries are becoming organised. Chambers of Commerce are found in every tropical port and producers have already combined, as, for example, the rubber growers, the Indian tea growers, and even the world's cocoa growers. Manufacturing industries, like cotton-spinning, are developing in many tropical countries. Only the less accessible and more backward parts of Africa and India lie outside of the stream of Western commerce and economic and political ideas. The danger is that these ideas may become obsessive, inhibiting in the minds of the natives full recognition of the more fundamental knowledge, ability and enterprise which are setting free, more and more efficiently, the agricultural and mineral wealth referred to in the course of this review.

W. R. DUNLOP.

SHAKESPEARE'S SUSANNA.

SIDE by side in the noble chancel of Stratford-on-Avon church are the four tombs, just beneath the famous Shakespeare bust, of his wife, himself, his eldest daughter Susanna, and her husband, John Hall. Your interest and curiosity are at once aroused when you read the words of the inscription upon Susanna's tomb. They run thus:

Witty above her sex, but that's not all,
 Wise unto salvation was good mistress Hall,
 Something of Shakespeare was in that, but this
 Wholly of Him with Whom she's now in blisse.
 Then, passenger, hast ne're a teare
 To wepe with her that wept with all?
 That wept, yet set herselfe to chere
 Them up with comforts cordiall.
 Her love shall live, her mercy spread,
 When thou hast ne're a teare to shed.

What more do we know of this daughter, "witty above her sex," with "something of Shakespeare" in her, and yet "wise unto salvation" and a ready comforter to all who were in any kind of trouble, who, though living now in "blisse," is yet still living in the grateful hearts of her Stratford neighbours? The picture is attractive. One would like to fill it in. It suggests so much. And, above all, it suggests the inquiry, if "something of Shakespeare" was in her, does that imply that something of Susanna was in Shakespeare? Let us fill in the familiar background first. Susanna was born in 1583, when the poet was nineteen years old, and baptised (where he himself had been) in Stratford church on Trinity Sunday, no doubt amidst a crowd of friends and neighbours. Her name Susanna, from the Apocrypha, was a popular one with Puritans, and probably implies Puritan influence among his relations. She was married at the age of twenty-four to John Hall, a much-thought-of medical practitioner residing in Stratford, of strong Puritan sympathies. His advice was sought by high and low alike through the whole district. The inscription on his tomb speaks of him as "most renowned for his medical skill," and also "worthy for his deserts to rival Nestor in length of years." But Susanna outlived both her father and her husband, who died in 1617 and 1635, the latter at the age of sixty. She herself reached the age of sixty-six, and died in 1649.

Susanna was only a young married woman of twenty-eight years old therefore, when Shakespeare, in 1611 or thereabouts, sold his shares in the Globe and Blackfriars theatre and retired to New Place, Stratford, which he had purchased in 1597, and where he

resided till his death. This fact is important, for it means that from that time onward his life would be largely shared with his favourite daughter and her husband. Mutual incompatibilities, if they existed, would have made such close relationship unbearable. The fact that it was maintained, therefore, rebuts them and establishes a close and deepening affinity of the utmost significance. And if there already existed in Shakespeare's inner nature, in his habits of mind, in any deepening outlook on life, affinities which rendered him susceptible specially to his daughter's influence, it might become exceedingly powerful. Quite possibly one reason for his early retirement at the height of fortune and personal power may have been this very influence already existent.

His special regard for his daughter in any case does not rest upon suppositions, but on facts of the most convincing kind. When he made his will, in 1616, at the end of this period of closed intercourse, he made over to Susanna and her husband practically all his estate: New Place; all his land, barns and gardens at or near Stratford; his house at Blackfriars; and other property. He barred his wife's right of dower; and made them executors of his will and residuary legatees, giving them the fullest rights over his household furniture and personal belongings; whilst to Elizabeth, her daughter, he gave his plate, with the exception of a silver and gilt bowl to Judith, his second daughter, and a small tenement in Chapel Lane (the remainder even of this to revert to Susanna), and £150 within a year of his death, with another £150 if she was alive three years after. There is an underlying note of confidence as well as affection in all this, as though some reason led him to think that the family interests for which he had laboured so hard were safe in their hands.

The absence of his wife's name from the will, except only as an after-thought, and then merely as the recipient of his "second-best bed," has been taken by some to imply estrangement. There may have been *mental* estrangement from Anne in her later years. She was a simple country girl eight years older than himself, whom he had married as a minor, and one who certainly never shared his gifts or larger outlook upon life. But anything deeper than this is rebutted by facts. Anne, who died in 1623 at the age of sixty-three, expressed the wish to be buried beside him, and she lies just below his bust. And Susanna, the daughter who seems to have displaced her as first in his affection, placed upon her grave a touching Latin inscription which, whilst it proves her literary skill, is also a testimony to her affection. But it is more. For its allusions to her mother are strangely confined to infancy, and confirm the impression that mental or physical infirmity crabbled

and confined her later years and made her dependent on her daughter's care. Such a fact would explain Shakespeare's will, and his appointment of daughter and son-in-law with such full powers. The inscription runs thus: "A mother's bosom Thou gavest, and milk, and life! For such bounties, alas! can I only render stones. Rather would I pray the good angel to roll away the stone from the mouth of the tomb, that Thy spirit, even as the body of Christ, should go forth. But prayers avail nothing, save that Christ may come quickly, and the imprisoned soul may be able to seek the stars."

The recently published Letters of Richard Quyny,* the poet's friend at Stratford, and father-in-law to his daughter Judith, reveal clearly that, even whilst in London as a playwright, Shakespeare maintained a continuous connection with town and home affairs, and in every probability in those earlier years (1583-1596) paid periodic visits to Stratford. He was regarded by Richard himself and other Stratford men as an honest and dependable friend, as the "Letters," show, whose help might be freely sought in perplexity. He was struggling himself at first with difficulties—to recover John Shakespeare's home from constant and distressing pecuniary embarrassment, but before his father's death in 1601 that had been achieved. Stratford was a town which felt to the full the growing spirit of Puritanism which was becoming a new and sobering force to the nation, and his friends there, Thomas Greene, the Quynys, and others, were strongly influenced by it; but that evidently made no difference to their friendship. Though himself never a Puritan, yet, like the greatest writers of his time, he was open to its uplifting influence, and if his allusions to Puritanism in earlier plays show a dramatist's guile to rouse humour in his audiences by allusions to Puritan eccentricities, yet they certainly reveal no hostility or contempt. The fact of Susanna's intimate connection with it might to some extent predispose Shakespeare's mind in its favour, and open him to its influence, and when he came to live at New Place we know that on one occasion he welcomed a Puritan preacher there.

The extraordinarily vivid pictures of child life we meet with in his earlier plays and poems (see Fripp's *Master Richard Quyny*, pp. 95-100) reveal an intimate and loving association with home life, and we can hardly fail to connect the lament of Constance over Arthur in "King John" with the loss of his youngest child Hamlet. If his professional career had as object the recovery of home from its difficulties, his retirement there reveals home as his final objective. And Nicholas Rowe says his later years were spent "as all men of good sense will wish theirs to be, in ease, retirement, and the conversation of friends."

* *Letters of Master Richard Quyny*, by Edgar J. Fripp, 1924.

How does this affect our view of Susanna's influence as a dominating force in Shakespeare's later years? She was just in the young prime of life at the time when he began to see her continuously. "Witty above her sex," that is, no dull, uninformed rustic or provincial, but keen and smart, cultured and refined, with "something of Shakespeare in her," possessing that psychological affinity with himself which so often exists between father and oldest daughter, with no strong mother's influence to rival or weaken her own. We might naturally expect to discover in her a Desdemona or Miranda to charm his hours of ease. But we must first lay down one indispensable condition to any spell she might exert upon him. It would not be mere cleverness but personality, not genius so much as goodness, not subtlety of intellect but depth of womanly feeling, which would charm and influence him. Whatever be the Elizabethan coarseness which we sometimes have to complain of in him—the almost unavoidable outcome of his dramatic environment in a rough and ignorant age, only just emerging from quasi-barbarity—yet Shakespeare always expects something different in his women, and it is just that expectation which is the secret of his commanding influence over humanity. The characters of his heroines—their simplicity and tenderness, their feminine grace and charm, their loyalty and truth, their moral purity and beauty—are unequalled in all literature. Think of Cordelia, of Imogen, of Miranda, of Rosalind and Celia, of Portia and Jessica, of Beatrice and Hero, of Hermione and Paulina, of Olivia and Viola, of Helena and Hermia, and many another—how they captivate us by subtle gifts of personality! There is in them no heavy goodness that bores, no lifeless and repellent virtuosity, no intolerable dullness. They have all the charm of true womanliness. And this commandingness of women's influence as woman is present even when it is dangerous or mischievous, as in the case of Juliet, Cleopatra, or Lady Macbeth, for it is always an influence of personality. "Shakespeare's women," it has been said,* "are not learned"; in spite of some apparent exceptions they are not even educated, in one sense of the word. Even Portia was "an unlessoned girl." It would certainly, therefore, not be erudition which would attract him in Susanna; it would be the indefinable yet all-powerful charm which "wittiness," in the Elizabethan sense, and feminine character, as Shakespeare portrays it, would exert.

And those are just the features we see in Susanna's personality. Everything we know of her suggests that she must have had that delightful crispness of Rosalind, that pure devotion of Cordelia, that sweet companionableness of Miranda, that perfect grace of pure, young womanhood which would attract one so intensely

* Morton Luce, *Handbook to Shakespeare's Works*, p. 205.

human as Shakespeare was. Even the inscription on her husband's grave bears witness to her comradeship, for it says: "Lest anything should be wanting to his tomb, his faithful wife is at hand, and he has the companion of his life as his comrade in death."

Now Susanna, in a remarkable way, embodied the special influences to which in his later life Shakespeare was specially open. There are two facts in his career which call for a fuller explanation than they usually receive. One is his early retirement. The other is the alteration in his latest work. At the early age of forty-seven, in the full tide of success, when he was the adored of Court and nation, he withdrew from public life. And at the very moment when the Drama, deserted by the Puritans, was fast degenerating into the licence and coarseness which ruined its later influence, and made towns like Stratford (which, in spite of its Puritan burgesses, had welcomed players)* refuse them admission and even pay them to leave, he wrote his purest and most uplifting play. No man reflected more truthfully than he did the whole form and image of his time. He was far too human and far too great to miss any of its influences, especially the greatest. Like Petrarch in Italy, like Spenser and Bacon in his own land and day, he had felt to the full "the larger temper of the Renaissance." Its joyousness had captivated him; its freedom had emboldened him; its versatility had delighted him; its humanism had broadened a naturally universal mind. But if the Revival of Learning had done this in one direction, it had also done it in another. If it had given him the Decameron of Boccaccio, the lives of Plutarch, the philosophy of Aristotle, it had also given him the English Bible he loved and revered. None of the familiarity for it which almost breeds contempt with the Modern is present in the minds of the great Elizabethans, least of all in Shakespeare. The Renaissance influence in him is permeated with the character which it bore in Northern Europe, not heathen, but religious; the widening of life with a new and genuine humanism, and its ennobling with a clearer vision of God. And Shakespeare's mind and his work represent the transition through which the age itself was passing, and he reflects its noblest features.

"Himself Elizabethan to the core, he stood at the meeting-point of two great epochs of our history. The Age of the Renaissance was passing into the Age of Puritanism."† And, side by side with this, in his later years, the freedom which the Renaissance had brought was passing, by revolt from all authority, into a licence, the full force of which was felt by the Drama. For

* *Letters of Richard Quyny*, p. 48.

† Green, *Short History of the English People*, p. 435.

the new Drama represented "the very age and body of the time, his form and pressure," and that age and body were both noble and vile. It was particularly sensitive to the new forces of public opinion. "Wild, reckless, defiant of all past tradition, of all conventional laws, the English dramatists owned no teacher, no source of poetic inspiration but the people itself."* That licence grew greater on the stage as the reaction from it towards the seriousness and dignity of life grew, with the growing power of Puritanism. And it involved what in truth was an unnatural estrangement. Puritans, who had been friendly to plays and playwrights at first, withdrew their support, and left the forces of licence in undisputed possession, thus hastening their more rapid deterioration. "Fewer men came to the playhouse with their souls ready to answer to the touch of genius." What they really wanted sank lower and lower, as Ben Jonson, who refused to stoop to it, had to learn with bitter disdain. But Shakespeare withdrew, and his latest plays give one the impression of a man who feels he can breathe freely after passing out from the stifling air of the Blackfriars Theatre into the green fields of Warwickshire. For to a mind like his freedom could never be mistaken for licence, nor light irresponsibility become the excuse for fatalism and pessimism, nor mere surface-gaiety be confounded with the real greatness and simplicity of life. It has been said† that "he never scoffs at goodness, and never allows evil to go unpunished" in his plays. He was no libertine, no hater of Puritanism, no cynic with a brief for dishonest doubt.

With middle life a change had come over him. The joyousness seems to go out of his work. It is as though the very complexity and vastness of the new world which thought and fancy had evoked staggered him, as it did other Renaissance teachers. The "spirits" that he had called up from "the vasty deep" refused to return there, but stayed to haunt him. He would fain break the spell like Prospero:

"But this rough magic
I here abjure . . . I'll break my staff."

The realised grandeur of life took possession of him. The shams and coquetries of the Court, as his last plays reveal, disgusted him. He revolted against the unreality and coarseness of it, and retired to Stratford. Whether or not Susanna's influence hastened the retirement, it certainly ministered to it. For she could give him, at the moment when he most needed it, the very influences he was seeking. All critics are agreed that in the plays born out

* Green, *Short History*, etc., p. 428.

† Morton Luce, *Shakespeare, the Man and His Work*, p. 72.

of that retirement* we find the richest and maturest products of his intellectual and artistic skill. What they do not explain is why, at a time when the whole Drama was deteriorating, we find in them a new moral uplift and, behind their sweet and pleasant pageantry, a fresh insistence on the essential realities of life.

Take "The Tempest," his latest play, by way of example. It has been described by various writers as "a play of moral awakening," a return to nature, a criticism of life, an autobiography, an enchanting parable of true love. But, whichever way we take it, the moral drift and moral intensity are plain. The characters in Shakespeare's last plays, "Cymbeline," "Winter's Tale," and "The Tempest," especially the last, are, in an ascending scale, embodiments of true and perfect love. "There is,"† writes Mr. Morton Luce, "no hint, or rather, no declaration of virgin manhood till we find it here." It took Shakespeare, he says, some twenty years to learn this truth. And the love of Ferdinand and Miranda he regards as his "most valuable legacy to our moral and emotional life." Whilst Miranda herself is the apotheosis of ingenuous, unsophisticated womanhood unstained by contact with the world.

No moral teacher ever emphasised the self-control which true courtship and marriage demand in stronger words than Prospero's to Ferdinand at his betrothal:

"Then as my gift and thine own acquisition
Worthily purchased, take my daughter; but
If thou dost break her virgin-knot before
All sanctimonious ceremonies may
With full and holy rite be ministered,
No sweet aspersion shall the heavens let fall
To make this contract grow, but barren hate,
Sour-eyed disdain, and discord, shall bestrew
The union of your bed with weeds so loathly,
That you shall hate it both; therefore, take heed,
As Hymen's lamps shall light you."

And Ferdinand's reply:

"As I hope
For quiet days, fair issue, and long life,
With such love as t'is now . . . the strong'st suggestion
Our worser Genius can, shall never melt
Mine honour into lust, to take away
The edge of that day's celebration."

Light, almost fairy-like, as the touch is throughout this play, at all points it touches upon reality. The whole outlook upon life is a revolt against the surrounding coarseness and grossness. It is Shakespeare's final conversion to the simple and natural, to the pure and spontaneous, to the Puritan's sense of life's seriousness

* "Winter's Tale," possibly, and "The Tempest."

† Shakespeare, *the Man and His Work*, pp. 257-258.

and wholesomeness. Repentance is

"Nothing but heart-sorrow
And a clear life ensuing."

Grace is so real that even a Caliban may seek it, and in its light we ourselves, like Prospero, may forgive too,

"They being penitent,
The sole drift of my purpose doth extend
Not a frown further,"

and we need not any longer stand upon desert for ourselves or others, and thus "burden our remembrance with a heaviness that's gone." The "great world itself," even in its "gorgeous towers" and "cloud-capt palaces" is fleeting and dissolving, and we ourselves are but "such stuff as dreams are made of." It is love, pure, heavenly love, which alone abides, and makes life worth the while. And prayer alone brings the "relief"

"Which pierces so, that it assaults
Mercy itself and frees all faults."

In the light of such mercy one may even make "every third thought the grave" and yet, as Shakespeare's will says, assuredly believe through "thouliet merites" of Christ to be made "partaker of lyfe everlastinge." We can mark in all this "something of Susanna," and very much of the great secret of Susanna's benign influence.

T. A. GURNEY.

GENEVA AND THE WORLD'S CHILDREN.

GENEVA has, in a flash of inspiration, been called "the capital of the world." The view-point is, of course, more a spiritual than a material one. Is it at Geneva that the ancient prophecy will yet be fulfilled: "They shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it"? Will it yet prove to be the holy city of moderns, guarding no sepulchre of buried hopes, but guarding rather its Palace of the League of Nations as typifying the consummation of the world's highest hopes?

After a few hours in Geneva you feel the "aura" of the city, just as of an individual previously unknown but newly introduced. This aura or atmosphere is most aptly described by the word *international*. Taking a first walk by the lake side you are charmed by the beauties of the Jardin Anglais, then the statue of a Duke of Brunswick claims your attention. Next, you unexpectedly find yourself on the Quai Président Wilson, and, lifting your eyes, France's crowning glory, the *massif* of Mont Blanc, silences you by her radiance. To-morrow you may see the five gilded cupolas of the Russian Church glistening against the cloudless blue of a summer sky. Truly, Geneva is international!

At lunch in your hotel, one glance shows how the continents meet in this corner of Switzerland, a Japanese seated here, a family probably from the Argentine there. "That young Apollo is surely an Australian," you say. Then from neighbouring tables comes a mingling of tongues: the unmistakable American accent, the musical flow of French or Italian, the strong harshness of German, and perhaps a Scotsman's rolling "r's", besides other speech altogether unrecognised.

An inquiry into the activities of Geneva, apart from the city's purely commercial undertakings, discloses the thread of international co-operation running through both warp and woof of her corporate life. It will not be long before someone speaks of the International Labour Bureau, of the International Council of Women, of the International Union of Students, of the Union International de Secours aux Enfants (known in England as the International Save the Children Fund), all having headquarters there along with many other kindred international associations. Was not Geneva the birthplace, over sixty years ago, of the "Red Cross," whose emblem of pity is the Swiss national flag with the colours transposed, so that a red cross stands out on a white ground, instead of the white cross on a floating pennon of red? Geneva is, therefore, the fitting home of the International Committee of the Red Cross, whose activities during peace are still directed to saving life. This same international spirit breathes

through the activities of the University. Every year an international summer school is held. During last summer its doors were also opened to the Fifth International Congress of the History of Medicine, to the Seventeenth Universal Esperanto Congress, and lectures on current international topics were arranged for the many visitors staying in or passing through the city.

New ground is constantly being broken in these efforts towards international co-operation. Thus it was that from August 24th-28th of this year there was held in Geneva the First International Congress on Child Welfare. Most civilised nations have, during the present century, turned their attention to the care of the child, but those who took part in the Premier Congrès Général de l'Enfant realised how, for the first time, the world was uniting to fulfil its sacred obligations to the child—those obligations outlined in letters of gold by the Declaration of Geneva and focussed in the words, "Mankind owes to the child the best that it can give." Delegates from over fifty different nations took part in the Congress. Practically all the European countries, with Great Britain and Ireland, were represented, also the English Dominions, the United States of America, South America, the continents of Africa and Asia, and islands of the sea. At the close of the opening session delegates passed rapidly across the platform in full view of the audience of eight hundred persons, and expressed in a few words the goodwill of those nations that they represented; delegates from Sweden, Austria, the Argentine, New Zealand, Czecho-Slovakia, Italy, Germany, the free town of Danzig, China, Greece, India, Malaya and others. It was a moving spectacle.

The army of Congressionists was made up of men and women, young and old, titled notabilities, representatives of governments and of public bodies, doctors of medicine, doctors of law, educationalists, nurses, social reformers, health workers, and many in other walks of life. There was scarcely a section of the community unrepresented. We believed before, and now know, that no stronger link can bind the world together than interest in and enthusiasm for the child. This fire of enthusiasm seemed to burn more brightly in the Congress every day, whether in the earnest deliberations of the four-hour sessions that lasted through each morning, or during those opportunities for social intercourse when, in spite of language difficulties, delegates and others stammered out to one another the story of their efforts, of their hopes and fears, in the cause of the child. "Will it all end in talk," some asked, "as many a Congress has done before?"

The Plenary Session of the last day showed that it could not be so, and that the worst fears of a few would not be realised. Four hours were spent in considering and passing resolutions,

submitted by each of the three sections of the Congress: the medical, educational and social sections. These were no pious expressions of opinion, or non-committal resolutions, but were trumpet calls to action. Professor Delaquis, of the Swiss Federal Government, emphasised this in his stirring speech that closed the Congress. He showed that many of the resolutions indicated what the more advanced nations had already attained to and their desire to obtain the co-operation of those who had not yet come into line with them. Other resolutions, he said, dealt with ideals as yet unattained by any nation. But he reminded his audience that "*les idées paraissant avancées aujourd'hui seront demain les idées acquises*"—the advanced ideas of to-day will be the realised ones of to-morrow—and that international progress would be the rich fruit of international co-operation.

Four immediately practical steps were taken before the doors of the Congress hall closed on those who would form the vanguard of the Twentieth Century Crusade in the cause of the child. These were, firstly, the formation of a permanent committee, whose duty it would be "promptly to transmit the resolutions passed by the Congress to the Governments concerned, and to make preparations for a second general Congress on Child Welfare." Secondly, the Executive Committee was asked to approach the Swiss Federal Government with a request to present the resolutions passed by the Congress to the Sixth Assembly of the League of Nations. Thirdly, the advisability was urged of establishing permanent international bureaux of information in all matters relating to child life, sub-divided into technical and specialised sections. Lastly, an international fund was established for the relief of alien children, and 10,000 francs was promised by the International Union of the Save the Children Fund as a nucleus for this. Apparently no grass was to be allowed to grow under the feet of the first Child Welfare Congress!

A glance at the work of each section may prove interesting. This was a privilege granted to few attending the Congress, as the discussions of their own sections usually proved too absorbing to allow of time being spent in any other.

The medical section was presided over by Professor von Pirquet, of Vienna, a name honoured in every country of the world, and everywhere associated with the valiant effort to save child life from one of its cruellest enemies, tuberculosis. Professor Pinard, of Paris, was there, growing old in years, but with fiery enthusiasm still burning in him for mother and child. No extinct volcano he. After hearing him speak one knew what quenchless passion can possess a human heart and mind. Professor Rollier, of Leysin, spoke. It is he who has re-introduced everyone—but

above all the child—to one of humanity's truest friends, the sun. Others there were of equal fame, and those whose fame will yet grow as the years pass on, until they too rank amongst the saviours of mankind.

That doctors differ is a common subject of jest, but these doctors presented a united front to the greatest enemies of child life. The question that opened their deliberations was: "What destroys or damages life in its beginnings and in its earliest days?" and the subject of infant mortality was closely investigated. This led up to a comparison of the measures adopted in different countries which have resulted in a reduction of the pre-natal and post-natal mortality rates. At the second session the feeding of children was considered, for the enemy of malnutrition lurks close to many a child in times of peace, even if more so in times of war. Ignorance above all gives that enemy a chance, but poverty too. So "the proper feeding of children" was a well-chosen subject for deliberation, a distinction being rightly drawn between the feeding of infants, the pre-school child, and the child of school age.

Heliotherapy was ably advocated by Professor Rollier, of Leysin fame, who fascinated his audience by slides of his miracle-cures, perhaps more irrefutable than those of Lourdes. He was followed by Dr. Saleeby, who, in our own country, has done much to educate the public to the value of sunlight. He is nothing if not practical, and held up to his listeners a piece of glass called Vita-glass, which allows the precious ultra-violet rays to penetrate into our rooms, instead of shutting them out as the usual lead-laden glass does. Enthusiasts were listened to from other countries whose climates offer a better opportunity for sun-heating and sun-worship than ours. But astonishing results in Heliotherapy and Balneotherapy have followed the work of Sir Henry Gauvain, together with other pioneers in England, and it was a disappointment to many that he was prevented from bringing the results of his work before the Congress.

Then followed a closely allied subject, the causes of crippling in children, for sun treatment is an especially valuable weapon when used against surgical tuberculosis, one of the main causes of crippling, as also against rickets, which produces deformities familiar to all. How many realise the amount of physical and mental suffering endured by children through crippling? Figures give some idea of the extent of the evil, but imagination and sympathy can alone give an idea of the extent of the suffering. Last year, it was estimated that there were 100,000 crippled children in our own country. Many other countries have an equally tragic record. But the sun shines literally as well as figuratively

on this shadow of child life—as the sun should always shine on children! For it is now known that much crippling is preventable—and “if preventable, why not prevented?” we ask, in the hackneyed but trenchant words of our late King.

The result of the deliberations took the form of a series of resolutions submitted to the Plenary Session and passed unanimously after full discussion. These resolutions can be read with benefit in three pages of print. But the question is, What do they stand for? They challenge the world to stand by the child and bring about a speedy fulfilment of the ideal that each child should have life, and more abundant life. The mother is challenged to realise her sacred obligations, and from the earliest dawns of infant life, through all the stages of development, to give the best of herself physically, mentally and spiritually to the perfect unfolding of the precious human being entrusted to her. Fatherhood and potential fatherhood are challenged to realise the equally sacred obligation of giving to the world another citizen with the certainty of only beauty and strength wrought into every cell of life. The world of science is challenged to bring its offerings of discovery and knowledge to the altar of mother and child, as wise men of old brought gold and frankincense. Men and women the world over receive a like challenge to bring their natural gifts or powers acquired through special training to forward the same worthy cause. The social and political structure of civilisation is challenged to realise that justice to and consideration of mother and child is one of the surest foundations upon which to build a permanent and prospering State. This surely is the vivifying spirit breathing through resolutions that dealt with such apparent commonplaces as ante-natal and welfare clinics for mother and child, the dangers of alcohol and other racial poisons, the necessity for specialised instruction in pediatrics, and general propaganda in all questions relating to health, the urgency of social and housing conditions, and married women's labour, as affecting infant mortality, and many other allied matters.

The refrain that seemed to sound out again and again from these seemingly matter-of-fact resolutions was the gracious word *prevention*. Disease and suffering withdrew further and further into the background as permissible partners of any child's life, while health, beauty, and the *joie de vivre* alluringly came into the foreground as meet companions of a creature with untold possibilities woven into every fibre of its being. Few to-day would be found on the poet's side when he wrote,

“Hate and deformity are Time's
And love and loveliness Eternity's.”

The reply of the twentieth century is to claim this “love and

loveliness” equally for time as for eternity, now we begin to realise that the means towards such an end are not far to seek, but lie ready to our hand. Are they not to be found, first and foremost, in a banishing of ignorance, and in using those beneficent forces of nature, sunlight and air, sleep and exercise, and natural food, that a mistaken civilisation has crowded out of life? So the First General Congress on Child Welfare joined hands with nature and other protagonists of childhood when it recommended that “helio-therapy should be more systematically adopted in the case of children predisposed to, or actually suffering from tuberculosis and rickets, and that it should be used as a prophylactic measure for healthy children, by the establishment of more open-air schools, or by the methodical application to ordinary schools of the principles of fresh air and sun treatment, and that in every country steps should be taken by public authorities for the early prevention of crippling and of the causes that lead to it.”

Work done by the other two sections was conducted under the leadership of distinguished presidents, these being the Marchioness of Aberdeen and Temair, and Monsieur Georges Scelle, Professor of International Law in the Faculty of Law, Dijon. He occupied the chair in Section II that dealt with social welfare and administration as affecting the child. During these deliberations much of the darker side of life came to the fore. There was the cause to be considered of the unmarried mother, the widow, the deserted wife and child, the orphan, the mentally deficient, of alien children and of the child emigrant. Truly a tragic and disconsolate gathering of womankind and of the world's children! But their defenders were not wanting. Our one-time poet-laureate tells us:

“Till Arthur came
There grew great tracts of wilderness,
Wherein the beast was ever more and more
But man was less and less,
And thus the land of Cameliard was waste.”
But when the great knight-errant came
“He drave the heathen; after, slew the beast, and felled
The forest, letting in the sun, and made
Broad pathways.”

So, too, in the Genevan Congress Hall, as often before in the world's history, the cause of helpless, suffering humanity was again championed. Men and women determined that fatherhood should be compelled to assume its rightful responsibility, that widowhood should receive from the State protection and aid towards an independent existence, that orphanhood should rediscover father and mother and home in the large heart of the nation. These were amongst the subjects earnestly discussed in

the daily sessions and adopted in resolutions. It may be noted that one resolution was passed unanimously, amid applause. To those who were not there that resolution reveals the spirit of the Congress. It reads thus :

"It is essential that every necessitous orphan, as well as every deserted child, without distinction of nationality, origin, race, or religion, should be assured of guardianship, and of an education which is officially recognised, and that the help given to such children in general should no longer be a work of charity, but also, and before all, a social duty of every civilised country."

Children are too often the hapless victims of circumstance, whereas adults are not infrequently the victims of their own wrong doing, and it is beginning to be realised that the treatment meted out in each instance should be very different.

Valuable and interesting work dealing with education and propaganda was done in Section III under the gracious presidency of the Marchioness of Aberdeen. The necessity was stressed of further advances in every branch of welfare effort that affected the lives of children and adolescents, while at the same time pointing out the desirability of special training for those who should undertake such work. A glimpse into interesting possibilities for the future was to be found in the recommendation that universities should set up Chairs of Social Welfare, and that a State Diploma in Social Welfare should be awarded to students. The need for and benefit of organised recreation, more especially in large towns, was fully discussed, and such organisations as the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides received well-merited recognition.

Possibly the most momentous discussion was on the education of children in international goodwill. To those with spiritual vision it might have seemed as if the walls of the Bâtiment Electoral, in which the Congress was held, faded gradually away, to emerge again in ever clearer outline as the Palace of the League of Nations. At any rate the Congressionist was in Geneva, and might be forgiven this "vision splendid." The spirit of the discussion is best given in the opening words of the resolutions passed in connection with this special subject :

"The First General Congress on Child Welfare is of opinion that in every country the education of the child, while based in the first place on patriotic sentiment, should be directed towards a wider love, namely, that of humanity at large, and that sanction must be given to efforts towards stirring in the hearts of children of all nations a current of sympathy and trust which may help to hasten the advent of an era of universal peace."

The International Save the Children Union, which inaugurated the "Premier Congrès Général de l'Enfant," and all who took part in it, may surely feel that they have helped to "Let in the sun and make broad pathways."

MARGARET ALDEN.

GOOD KING WENCESLAUS.

INTO countless millions of English keyholes and letter-boxes childish voices, in the dark evenings of the Advent season, have sung the deed of charity that was done by good King Wenceslaus on the Feast of Stephen. It is a curious thing that this carol, which is no older than the Oxford Movement, should have taken so firm a hold on the English popular imagination; transplanting most successfully to English soil one of the oldest and most popular hero tales of Bohemia. It is as curious as would be the singing of a carol in praise of King Arthur by the children of Prague.

This same good King Wenceslaus, whose mission of pity is sung year after year in English doorways, has been the centre for nearly a thousand years of religious and national cult in Bohemia and the other Slav provinces of the Czecho-Slovak Republic of to-day. Since the year 967, generation after generation has handed down this tradition; a story that is as vivid amongst the Slav peoples of Central Europe to-day as it was on that September day in 967, when before the eyes of the horrified Czechs the hand of the fratricide struck down their king at the steps of the church door.

The story is connected in its beginnings with that stirring romance that is almost without parallel in the history of European civilisation: the missionary journey of the two Slav clerics, Cyril and Methodius, who from Byzantium carried Christianity and civilisation through Central Europe and northward as far as Russia. Their trail to-day is as clear as it was in the middle of the ninth century, when, starting from Constantinople, they carried the Scriptures to the Bulgars and laid the foundations of Bulgarian literature by their invention of the Slav alphabet. They pushed on, founding one missionary centre after another, converting the Pannonians and Dalmatians, until by about the year 868 they reached the distant kingdom of Moravia, where they established their headquarters at Velehrad.

As to the success of this religious and cultural enterprise, what testimony can be more eloquent than the existence to-day of whole literatures, traditions of culture, and a series of ecclesiastical histories? There is little doubt, however, that a very large part of this success was due to the wisdom of the Byzantine missionaries in giving to their converts that medium of public worship which still survives under the name of the Old Slav Liturgy. This experiment with a vernacular rite, if it were an experiment and not an adaptation, in some way or other appears to have attracted unfavourable attention on the part of the Latinisers at

Rome. A complaint was laid before the Pope, and Nicholas I summoned the two missionaries to Rome to give an explanation of their actions. But by the time Cyril and Methodius arrived in Rome Nicholas I was dead, and Adrian II had been elected as his successor. The Pope seems to have judged the matter with an open mind, and the use of the Slavonic Liturgy was not only approved, but received the special seal of papal sanction. But from this long journey only one returned. Cyril died in Rome and was buried in St. Clement's, where his body still rests, and Methodius returned alone to the outpost at Velehrad.

A vast cultural centre was established at Velehrad, which was then the chief town of a kingdom of Moravia considerably larger in extent than the Moravia of to-day. Beyond the dark forests and sparse village settlements the mission at Velehrad penetrated, until it brought within its scope Slovakia and Bohemia, where it numbered amongst its first converts Wenceslaus, King of Bohemia. Like most of these early hero tales, that of Wenceslaus is heavily overlaid with legend. But legend, in this instance at least, was not so much occupied in building up a structure of the marvellous as in depicting a striking contrast between Wenceslaus and the society in which he lived. Had he existed some centuries later, the story of Wenceslaus might well have read as that of a pioneer of the Quaker movement. Whatever of religion there was in Bohemia appears to have been pagan. Feudalism at its crudest and unloveliest flourished among the barons and landowners. And entrenched in their strongholds the local barons indulged their passions and human appetites, untouched and unrestrained by the humanising influences of Christianity.

It is this rapacious and unbridled society, like a black and gloomy background, that tradition uses to throw into prominence the pure and lofty character of Wenceslaus. The constant preoccupation of the barons in acts of brigandage and war-making is contrasted with the pacific nature of Wenceslaus; his extraordinary personal affection for his people is made to stand out all the more clearly by the oppressions and exactions of his contemporaries. Around his pacifism and paternal regal affection legend has woven some of its most delicate and most touching stories. Plundering and robbery was the treatment dealt out to their people by the squires and local barons. But Wenceslaus goes about secretly at night, accompanied by a single attendant, carrying with his own hands such comforts as money, food, clothing, linen, and fuel to the needy. Nor was it alone in these works of external charity that Wenceslaus showed his spiritual kinship with the Quakerism of later centuries. His adoption of Christianity was followed by his initiation into the School of Cluny, the famed Burgundian centre

of civilisation founded by Abbot Odo. As an initiate of Cluny, Wenceslaus pledged himself to the development of his own interior life by the practice of prayer and meditation; to promote peace everywhere according to the teachings of Christ; and to purge his kingdom from the relics of paganism.

War was almost entirely abolished from Bohemia; but the sweeping away of paganism and the social righteousness that animated the conduct of Wenceslaus were, apparently, little to the liking of those members of his family whose personal interests were involved in the maintenance of the pagan régime. A considerable faction, to which both the religion and the standards of conduct of the old order offered obvious advantages, gathered round the king's brother, Vratislav, whose way of life found little use for either pacifism or social justice. The principle of non-resistance had become a dominating passion with Wenceslaus, which he carried to the point of heroism when, on a September day in 967, Vratislav with a considerable number of his supporters, met the king as he was about to enter a church. Evidently some plan had been arranged. But what is certain is that, on some pretext or other, Vratislav struck a blow at his brother the king, and Wenceslaus fell at the church porch mortally wounded. He refused to take the least action in his own defence, the national legend tells us, and preferred to die rather than lift a hand, or even seem to lift a hand, in an act of violence against a fellow creature. His death, in justification of his principles, became invested with sanctity and heroism, and his memory is revered in Czecho-Slovakia every year on September 28th, as the day of St. Wenceslaus, King and Martyr.

That was nearly a thousand years ago, and the cry of horror that arose to the lips of the Bohemian people, as they saw their king struck down by the hand of the fratricide at the church steps, still survives to this day, in an ancient chanson of King Wenceslaus which has the invocation "Do not leave us nor our children to perish!" The chanson survives, not so much as an interesting literary relic as the echo of a spontaneous outburst of sorrow, wrung from the heart of the Czech people as they mourned the untimely death of their king and protector.

During the centuries that have elapsed since the death of good King Wenceslaus, in no single epoch of Czech history has there been a time when his name was not called on, his aid invoked. The Roman Catholics have continued to venerate him as a saint and martyr. But alike in times of prosperity as in days of national misfortune, the name of Wenceslaus, protector and patron of the motherland, was on the lips of those uncompromising nationalists the Hussites. The far-flung religious confederation

of the Czech Brethren called on him as their patron, and even the Czech Protestants of the fifteenth century invoked him, as they groaned under the domination of foreign masters. So his image has remained, amongst simple and learned alike, that of the ideal prince, the man of peace, the ruler consumed with a passionate devotion to the principles and practice of human pity.

During the war, as Czech lips called upon Wenceslaus, there was hope breathed with the invocation. Amid all the uncertainty as to the result of that great conflict, there was always the assurance that Wenceslaus would not leave his people to perish. A new and high significance, pregnant with historic and patriotic meaning, crept into that centuries-old refrain "Do not leave us nor our children to perish!" The singing of this ancient song was sternly forbidden by the Austro-Hungarian authority that ruled in Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, and more particularly was it forbidden in Slovakia. Even before the war the Austro-Hungarian ruling category had coined the word "Wenceslaus" into a derisory epithet when applied to the Slavs. As an attempt to modify the Slav attachment to Wenceslaus and all that his memory held, the cheapening of his name was a failure. It succeeded only in implanting his name and the sentiments of the old song more deeply than ever in the popular heart. The awakening national hopes and aspirations that were associated with the name of Wenceslaus spread beyond the motherland, and the Czecho-Slovak legionaries in Siberia caught its magic. They formed themselves into a nationalist regiment, and placed themselves and their military company under the invocation of Wenceslaus.

His tomb may be seen to-day, enshrined in its beautiful chapel in Prague Cathedral. But amongst the Czech peasants there still persists an old legend that Wenceslaus sleeps, not in his tomb in Prague Cathedral, but in the heart of a mountain, where through the ages he will slumber profoundly until the day of danger and disaster arrives, when, surrounded by his knights, he will arise and come forth from the tomb to succour his people in the hour of their necessity.

But it is not a little curious that this Bohemian contemporary of our own English Edgar the Peaceful should have his praise sung to-day by English children in English doorways, for his charity on the Feast of St. Stephen; that the most heroic figure in Czech national legend should have become nationalised in the folk songs of England.

CHRISTOPHER WATTS.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

LOCARNO AND AFTER.

THE distinctive feature of the Locarno Conference, which culminated on October 16th in the initialling of the Treaty of Mutual Guarantee and of the four arbitration treaties, was that it fired the imagination in a way wholly different from any other conference since the war. Neither at Locarno nor in any of the countries whose statesmen initialled the treaties was much importance attached to the treaties themselves by comparison with the pacifist spirit which they appeared to release throughout Europe. It was the psychology of Locarno that mattered. The interesting thing was that few people took any interest in the actual texts. Perhaps the best example of this is afforded by the impression made on Dr. Benesh. Dr. Benesh is one of the most realist of diplomats. In a conversation which I had with him in Locarno on the same afternoon as the treaties were initialled he said to me:

"The importance of what has been accomplished to-day will alter the whole spirit of European affairs. In particular it will have the following effects: (1) It will wipe out in a certain degree the past. The facts of the present situation are accepted by all parties as the basis on which Europe is to enter on a new life. (2) A definite pact has been signed whereby the signatories undertake (a) not to make war (b) to respect the inviolability of the frontiers of Germany, France, and Belgium. Therefore, for the first time since the war the four Great Powers say the same thing. It is a tremendous advance on anything that has yet been accomplished. In one sense it is a partial Protocol, for whereas the Protocol aimed at the universal outlawry of war, the Pact outlaws it so far as one particular danger spot is concerned. For the first time in diplomatic history nations have renounced their sovereign 'right to make war.' That fact brings with it an entirely new conception of international war and peace. (3) Arbitration treaties have been concluded which provide for arbitration on all points. It is an unexampled and tremendously important thing that Great Powers have agreed on arbitration for all questions without exception. The arbitration treaties are conceived in such a way that they restrict the possibility of war to such war as may be prescribed in fulfilment of Article 16 of the League Covenant. (4) In spite of the fact that there is no Eastern Pact to balance the Western Pact—the seriousness of which is that Eastern conditions are hardly as stable as Western—yet the moral importance of the Western Pact will be a powerful influence for peace in the East. (5) Central Europe will be consolidated. Settled peace on the

Rhine means settled peace on the Danube. (6) Russia will inevitably be drawn into the European system again, for it will no longer be possible for her either to maintain her isolation or to play on the differences of the Western Powers. (7) In the United States too, the established fact of the European consolidation of nations will have great influence in the future both as regards her general conception of European affairs and her own relations with Europe."

The public opinion of Europe as a whole quickly grasped the big change that had been made in Europe by the Conference. It was the first time since the war that the Germans had been received on a perfectly equal footing by the ex-Allies. At the Dawes Conference of August, 1924, Mr. MacDonald had started obliterating the diplomatic trenches that had separated Germany from the Western Powers. At that Conference for the first time since the war the Germans were asked something by the ex-Allied Powers which they had a right to refuse, but the process of wiping out the distinction between Allies and enemies was only half finished. At the Dawes Conference the Allied representatives met first, and drew up between themselves an agreed scheme. It took them a fortnight to do so, and the German delegates were then called in and invited to express their views on the draft agreement submitted to them. The Locarno negotiations by contrast were originated by a German proposal. It is true that for seven months after the Germans made their proposal the French and British Governments exchanged views with the object of co-ordinating their policy. After that, however, and before the Locarno Conference was arranged, the jurists of all the Powers concerned, including Germany, assembled in London to hammer out, not a one-sided draft, but one which would contain the greatest common measure of agreement between all the parties. When, therefore, the delegates met at Locarno, they started to work on a document which had not only been approved by the German jurists, but which had been partly created by them, and that document was different in important respects from the original Franco-German-Belgian document. Moreover, there was an important difference in procedure. Whereas at the Dawes Conference the German delegates found, when they entered the conference room, that three sides of the tables were occupied by the Allied delegates, the remaining side being reserved conspicuously for themselves, at Locarno there was no arrangement of places. It was a more informal affair, at which the delegates took haphazard any place that might be vacant, and at which there was not even any formal president.

Within ten minutes of the opening of the Locarno Conference on October 5th, the delegates were working on the jurists'

draft as if it were an unopposed Bill in the House of Commons. A week was taken in eliminating agreed clauses and reserving the more controversial clauses for further discussion. By the time the second week was reached the reserved clauses had shed their terror. The delegates had become imbued with the desire and the determination to succeed, and, therefore, agreement was reached smoothly and without difficulty. At Genoa, in 1922, everybody was threatening to go home all the time: at Locarno, in 1925, no one could go home before success was reached. Success, therefore, was easy. It was the psychology of Locarno, both inside and outside the Conference, that was the big thing in European history.

Although it is a tactless thing for English writers to assign to Mr. Chamberlain a predominant share in the glory, because opinion in the other countries concerned is naturally inclined to assign all the glory nearer home, yet it would probably be admitted by all the statesmen who were at Locarno, that Mr. Chamberlain was in fact the protagonist. Every statesman I myself spoke to at Locarno was insistent, and even enthusiastic, about Mr. Chamberlain's personal achievement. Although there was no formal president, Mr. Chamberlain was universally referred to as "Monsieur le Président," and it was to him that difficulties were privately referred.

On his return to London, Mr. Chamberlain made the following statement to the British Press (October 23rd): "I have been profoundly moved by the reception accorded to me and by the appreciation expressed by my sovereign, my colleagues, and my country. I am deeply grateful for the kindness, which exceeds anything that I feel I can deserve. But I confess that I am a little frightened by so generous a recognition of the work done, lest it should lead to exaggerated expectations, and I have for myself, personally, very present at the moment the warning that was addressed to those of whom all men speak well. Let me say, first and foremost, that those of us who were at Locarno, and who had not represented our countries throughout all these difficult years, would be the first to recognise what we owe to the work of our predecessors, to their successes, and even sometimes to their failures. We were in many respects fortunate in the time and circumstances of our meeting and in the condition of public opinion that prevailed in our different countries. If we have merit, it is that we knew how to use the opportunities which came to us and which had not occurred to others, and that we were true exponents of the great mass of feeling in our different countries. Of my colleagues in that Conference I shall always have the warmest memories. Some were old friends. Some, I

hope, will be friends henceforth—all animated by the same determined will to pull Europe out of the rut of suspicion and hate and fear in which she has lain these ten, and indeed, for a good many years past, and to bring—if it were within the power of ministers and governments to do so—rest and appeasement to our much-tried people.

"We were able, without great difficulty, to come to agreements, not only in regard to the situation in the west but also in regard to the situation in the east; agreements which do not, indeed, make war impossible—no human undertaking or human foresight can do that—but which render war infinitely less probable than it would otherwise have been, for the nation which disturbed the peace of consent made at Locarno would draw down upon it the execration of the world. And nothing since my return has given me greater satisfaction than to see how the work of the nations represented at Locarno is welcomed by the rest of the world. There have, in the past, been many international agreements and alliances. I am not sure that this is not the first of comparable character of which it could be truly said, and is almost universally felt, that while it gives security to those immediately concerned, while it reconciles old enmities without impairing old friendships, yet that it threatens no one, but helps to create peace and security. I feel, therefore, a great underlying confidence that Locarno has made a real contribution to the peace of the world. The British Government, like the other Governments which were there represented, means to give full force to these agreements, and to draw their natural consequences from them. We have confidence in our own work. We shall be prepared to show that confidence. I hope that the confidence born among the ministers sitting at Locarno, shared now by the governments to which they have reported, will spread in ever widening circles among our people. If the world and we ourselves are to draw the full advantage of these treaties we must put away some old memories, think of the past rather to avoid a repetition of old mistakes than to remember the mistakes of others, and face the new world, face the prospects that are open to us with confidence and trust in the loyalty of all the other nations, and in the faith that we have pledged. I say with some confidence that as we get away from it, Locarno will be seen to be the real dividing line between the years of war and the years of peace."

LOCARNO AND RUSSIA.

It was those who had been most profoundly impressed by Locarno who were most profoundly puzzled by the attitude of the British Government immediately after towards Russia. Both

during the Conference and after, all good Europeans increasingly speculated on the possibility of resolving the deadlock between Russia and the Western Powers. It was indeed a tribute to the work done at Locarno that the public opinion of Europe should have immediately assumed it to be sincere, and, therefore, proceeded to submit every European problem to the pacifist criteria laid down at Locarno. One of the most urgent and most important of those problems was that of reconciling the social structure of the Soviet Union with that of the Western capitalist states, so as to enable Russia to return to the political family of European nations. If the statesmen who went to Locarno were sincere—and the ceremonial kisses which were a feature of the Conference certainly seemed to indicate that they were—then it necessarily follows that the vow of pacifism undertaken in regard to Germany's relationships with Europe ought equally to apply in spirit to the relationships between the European countries and Russia.

It came as a shock, therefore, to find that the British Government was as unrepentantly and as short-sightedly determined to snub Russia after Locarno as before. Mr. Rakovsky, for instance, has been Russia's political representative in London for two years. He is the most charming, most courteous of diplomats, who has worked unceasingly for the cause of an Anglo-Russian understanding. Since the present British Government came into power, however, he has been cold-shouldered and left in isolation at Chesham House. After Locarno one was justified in expecting that the British Government would display, if not more genuine friendliness, at least a little more elementary commonsense in its attitude to Mr. Rakovsky. Yet it came to pass that Mr. Rakovsky was transferred to Paris, and replaced in London by Mr. Krassin. On November 7th he and Madame Rakovsky held a reception at Chesham House to celebrate the eighth anniversary of the Soviet Republic. In the circumstances it was their farewell reception. The chief representatives of the Diplomatic Corps in London went to it as a matter of course, and among them the French and German Ambassadors. Not a single representative of the British Government was there—an omission which was not excused, but made more puerile, by the official argument that November 7th was not a proper occasion for the Government to be represented. Every commentator in the British Press who had given the Government full and even generous credit for Locarno, made indignant protest against the inconsistency and the stupidity of thus continuing to boycott Russia. As if to show, however, the length to which perversity could still go, Mr. Rakovsky, on the following Saturday (November 14th), was allowed to leave London

without a single British representative being included among the Diplomatic Corps at the station. Now, if the British Government is prepared to allow its hare-brained Diehards to blackmail it into stultifying the whole purpose and achievement of Locarno, then the plain man must assume that the emotional tears shed at Locarno, and the fraternal kisses with which they were sanctified, were nothing more than crocodile tears and comic kisses, so far as the British delegation was concerned. It is an odd and puzzling thing, for Mr. Chamberlain and his colleagues were sincerity itself at Locarno; but why the sequel?

On any ground of realist policy, whether the British Government wants a war with Russia or has enough sense to want peace with Russia, it is impossible to ignore Russia. It is a country occupying one-sixth of the entire world's surface, and has a population of 140,000,000 people. Even Poland, who, till the summer of this year, had been a willing instrument of all the anti-Russian forces in Europe, has realised that peace with Russia is more expedient than the alternative. The Rapallo Treaty of 1922 is a good enough indication of Germany's philosophy in this matter. Czechoslovakia is on the friendliest terms with Russia, and is well to the fore in the race for Russian markets. France takes every opportunity to be polite to Russia. The present British Government conspicuously bases itself on the antiquated polemics of 1917, and appears not even to want to know the changes that have since taken place either in Russia, or between Russia and other countries.

Russia, for instance, is no longer negligible as an economic factor in Europe. During the past two years the position has radically changed, and even since the British elections of last autumn much water has flowed. The official figures published by the Russian Government show that the work of restoring the industries, and especially the agriculture of Russia, will be near enough completion by the end of next year. In the year 1924-5 the total trade turnover was £100,000,000 sterling, and for 1925-26 the estimates provide for a turnover of exactly double that amount. Great Britain is, or ought to be, interested in the Russian opportunity, if only from the point of view of the British unemployed. At present the amount of British trade done with Russia is a small fraction of British trade as a whole, but even so it is greater than the Russian trade with Rumania, Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and many other countries both in Europe and in America. British trade with Russia is the second largest in Europe, German trade being first. There is no reason why the British trade should not be tripled and quadrupled. The Russian refusal to honour the Tsarist obligations up to 100 per cent. is no reason why present trade opportunities should not be exploited, for every country in Europe

has found that the Soviet Government has scrupulously met the commercial obligations it has itself incurred.

Politically great strides have been taken towards a rapprochement between Russia and the rest of Europe. The recent visit of Mr. Chicherin to Berlin and to Warsaw led to an important tightening of Russo-German and Russo-Polish relations. Another important event was the substitution of the Esthonian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Poust, by Mr. Birck, the Esthonian representative in Moscow. The complimentary telegrams which passed between Mr. Birck and Mr. Litvinov, Assistant Commissar for Foreign Affairs, on that occasion, were a political event of some moment. Even Signor Mussolini takes every opportunity of improving Italian trade relations with Russia, and has the sense to make periodic references in public statements to Russo-Italian friendship. Rumania is moving on the same lines. Mr. Duk, Rumanian Minister for Foreign Affairs, has declared both in Geneva and in the Rumanian Parliament that Rumania is ready to resume full relations with Russia, and even to conclude with Russia a sort of Locarno pact containing a mutual guarantee of existing frontiers. Whether Russia would consent to the *status quo* as the basis of such a pact is another matter, but Rumania's initiative at any rate indicates the importance attached in Bucharest to Rumania's relations with Russia. Germany in her turn shows every determination to reconcile Rapallo with Locarno. While seeking the friendship of the Western Powers through the stereotyping of the Versailles frontiers in the West, she none the less has taken steps to assure Russia that friendship with the West is not incompatible with friendship with the East. Mr. Chamberlain, it is true, has made platonic remarks to the same effect, but two of his more grim colleagues in the Cabinet have thought it consistent with Cabinet responsibility to make public statements to the diametrically opposite effect and to interpret Locarno as a lever against Russia. German diplomacy in this particular field is more consistent. It is not an accident that the Russo-German trade agreement was signed in Moscow while the Locarno Conference was actually in progress, and that an agreement has been signed in Berlin for the granting of credits to the extent of 100,000,000 marks to the Russian State Bank for the purchase of industrial products in Germany.

The success of Russian diplomacy in Asia is still more striking. The Tsarist treaties with Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan and China, and the treaties which affect them, have been torn up, and whether Sir William Joynson-Hicks likes it or not, the peoples of Asia, who in the Tsarist days regarded Russia as an enemy, are now disposed to regard Russia as a friend. We have had recent and ample evidence of the bearing of this development on the

British Empire, and it thereby becomes all the more difficult to understand British foreign policy in its Russian aspect. Japanese foreign policy moves in the direction of Moscow, not away from it. Even the United States, whose qualified aloofness is dictated as much by a desire not to intervene in European affairs as by the Asiatic merits of the case, and whose interest in Russia is more distant than that of Great Britain, has none the less kept a keen eye on the Russian market. The most important concessions acquired in Russia have been acquired by America, namely, the Harriman manganese concession in the Caucasus, and the Lena Goldfield concession in Siberia, of which half the capital is American.

It is a melancholy fact that Great Britain, who has most to gain from sensible relations with Russia, should be the least enterprising in the whole world so far as Russia is concerned. In order to draw some attention to this all-important question, I have taken some trouble to explore how far Russian opinion is ripe for a renewed attempt at an Anglo-Russian understanding. To this end I have obtained from Mr. Rakovsky, who has just returned from Moscow, certain considered statements in answer to questions which I put to him. The three subjects were: (1) The effect, if any, of Locarno on Russian opinion. (2) The possibility, from the Russian point of view, of Russia's entering the League of Nations, and (3) the attitude of the Russian nation towards the problems which, in the view of the present British Government, constitute an obstacle to friendly relationship between the two countries.

On the question of Locarno Mr. Rakovsky said: "There are, of course, no formal contradictions between the Locarno and Rapallo Agreements. The Rapallo Agreement was an ordinary agreement establishing peace and friendship between two countries that had suffered most as a result of the World War. It in no way established an alliance between those two countries, each of which preserved her complete freedom of action. It is true that the Rapallo Agreement might have been the starting point for a more intimate political and economic rapprochement between Germany and Soviet Russia. But as Germany has now bound herself more closely to another group of Powers, the question naturally arises what influences this may have upon German-Russian relations. It must not be forgotten, however, that relations between States are not conditioned merely by treaty formulae, but by the actual interests which bind them, and it is impossible to say at present what forms the relationship between Germany and Russia will assume in this sense. You know of the repeated declarations by Luther and Stresemann that Locarno would not be in opposition to German-Russian friendship. You also know that on the eve of the con-

clusion of the Locarno Agreement a Soviet-German Trading Agreement was concluded, and that the German banks have opened up credits for the purchase of goods from German industry. If the application of the Locarno Agreement were to depend in future exclusively upon Germany, one might well suppose that it would in no way influence our mutual relations. But in actual fact the policy which Germany will be compelled to pursue towards us will depend not only on her own will.

"We are amazed at the interpretation given to the Locarno Agreement in other countries, particularly in Great Britain. Naturally, we cannot but be disturbed when a member of the British Government declares that the Locarno Agreement forms an instrument for defence against the Soviet Union, and that the most important service rendered by the Agreement is the wedge that has been driven between Germany and Russia. I know, of course, that statements of another nature have been made, particularly by the responsible leader of British foreign policy, Mr Chamberlain. Personally, I do not think that the Locarno Agreement could, at any rate in the near future, become the starting point for an active anti-Soviet policy. My reason is that were the Locarno Agreement used thus, it would be stripped of all its pacifist adornment, and would appear before the whole world, not as a means of strengthening universal peace, but as a new step towards the organisation of war."

In answer to my question about the League of Nations M. Rakovsky said: "Those who advocate the entry of Russia into the League of Nations may be divided into two categories. The first of them sincerely consider that the consolidation of international peace is impossible without the co-operation of the Soviet Union, and still more impossible if attempted in an anti-Soviet sense. They, therefore, urge the settlement of outstanding questions between the Soviet Union and other countries, particularly Great Britain, and regard the entrance of the Soviet Union into the League as the culminating point in such a settlement. But there is also the category of those who, while inviting us to enter the League, continue to carry on a campaign against us as the 'enemies of civilisation,' and who contribute nothing whatever towards a settlement of outstanding questions. My Government has not discussed the question again, and our point of view, therefore, remains the same as that expressed by Mr. Chicherin. But it is necessary that our point of view should be understood, and that people should not labour under the impression that peace is being offered to us, and that we continue to threaten an exhausted Europe with disorders and war.

"What is the aim of the League of Nations? Two words

which have been used frequently, both in connection with the Locarno Conference and with last year's Geneva Protocol, are 'security' and 'disarmament.' Those words, according to the League's supporters, represent the League's fundamental object. As for disarmament, our point of view is that we are prepared to go very far in that direction, provided that the same measure is applied in all countries. Whether we be within the League of Nations or outside it, the Soviet Union will fulfil faithfully any obligation which it may voluntarily assume. So far as security is concerned, the word is mainly used with reference to the security of the frontiers. For us, however, the question is one not only of the security of the frontiers, *but the security of our existing social structure.* (Mr. Rakovsky asked me to underline that.) In this respect our position is an exceptional one. Whereas no other country, including Germany, need have any fear of the violation of its social structure in joining the League of Nations, we, on the contrary, have to face the question whether, if we join the League, and are there confronted by all the other States which, by the common nature of their social structures, would form a united *bloc* against us, we should not find ourselves in an unfavourable position for the defence of our interests. The question which arises involuntarily before every Soviet citizen is whether the League of Nations may not be used for forcing us to change our social structure. That is the greatest stumbling block that lies in our path. Another question that arises is whether we should not be forced to participate in measures of military and economic repression, and thus be made the instrument of a policy opposed to our own ideas."

"You know, of course," I here interposed, "that there is no definite obligation to take warlike measures under the Covenant, and that so far as policy is concerned, on a non-Russian issue, the stipulation for a unanimous vote would mean that you could not be forced into any line of action against your will?"

"I must confess," he answered, "that although I am acquainted with the statutes of the League of Nations, such different interpretations are given to them under different circumstances, that I really do not know whether your interpretation would be applicable in all circumstances and in all cases. Moreover, even if we had the formal right of veto which you mention, we should hardly be able to preserve our freedom of action; for, by joining the League we should assume, not only juridical obligations, but also certain moral obligations. It is only necessary to remember the short history of the Soviet Government, which has consisted of a series of hard struggles for existence. It is scarcely five years since foreign troops occupied various parts of our territory.

Even now we are not recognised by all States, and in some of the countries that have recognised us voices are raised from time to time calling for a denunciation of the act of recognition. Finally, periodical campaigns, urging a holy war against Russia, are launched. You need not be surprised, therefore, at the uneasiness of Soviet opinion. Although we are opposed to the League, we are not opposed to the abstract idea of an international organisation for the furthering of economic and political co-operation between countries. We expressed our view on that subject in Genoa. We considered that the problems submitted to such an international association of peoples as we favoured should be even wider in kind than those dealt with by the League of Nations; that such an organisation should help in the solution of economic questions, such as those of raw products and credits; and that all countries should participate on a footing of equality. We mean juridical equality, such as is so little in evidence in the League of Nations. Such an association as we suggest ought to depend on its moral authority, not on force. We are still in favour of such an organisation."

On the subject of the two chief obstacles to the immediate resumption of friendly relations between Russia and Great Britain, namely, the refusal of the Soviet Government to honour the Tsarist obligations, and the connection of the Soviet Government with the Third International, M. Rakovsky said:

"I shall reply frankly. In the first place, we have no war-like intentions. I shall take by way of example Bessarabia. At the end of the war with Wrangel, and after the signing of the Riga Treaty in 1921, we could have seized Bessarabia by force without any difficulty. Right was on our side. Bessarabia is really our province, because we have not signed any agreement renouncing it. The occupation of Bessarabia would not even have been an act of war, but simply an administrative police measure. From the point of view of our internal conditions, we could readily have arranged for the occupation of Bessarabia. In the Ukraine there was then about a million and a half of the soldiers of the Red Army, the demobilisation of whom was exceedingly difficult on account of the condition of our railways. It was also difficult for us to feed them. To have thrown them into Rumania would have been an easy way out of our difficulty, especially as Rumania did not stir a finger to defend the Poles when we were at the gates of Warsaw; and consequently we could be fairly sure that Poland, exhausted as she was by the war with us, would not have sent soldiers to defend even the Rumanian capital, Bucharest, let alone Bessarabia. If, in spite of all this, we refrained, it was to give the world another proof of our pacific policy."

He next spoke of debts. "Every government (he said) must carry out the obligations which it itself assumes. Have you ever heard of our refusing to carry out any obligation we have taken upon ourselves? It is a different matter when the obligations in question are those of a hostile régime which was overthrown by revolution. On this point the opinion of the bourgeois lawyers varies. I could cite you scientific authorities from the American and European universities who consider that a government which has arisen as a result of a revolution or rising, may repudiate the obligations of a former government. It was thus that the United States acted when it obtained independence from England. The French Government which arose from the French Revolution, although it did not repudiate the debts of the monarchy, reduced them to a third. That was also a partial repudiation of debts.

"On the other hand, do we refuse to pay? Beginning with the first invitation which we received for the proposed conference in Prinkipo in 1919, we declared that, under certain conditions, we were ready to liquidate the past. We could not allow ourselves to be forced to annul formally the decree on this subject, and consequently we said that we should liquidate the past as an exception to the existing decrees. Is it not all the same to you in what form we liquidate the past? Our theoretical reasons should be of no interest to you. They are only of significance to us in our internal policy. If we once come to terms regarding the figures, then we need to insert no formulæ in the coming treaties on the debts, except a simple registration of their liquidation. What is important for us is the reduction of the debt, not only because a number of States have been split off from the old Russia (a large proportion of the Tsarist loans was spent on the erection in these States of railways, ports, etc.), but also because, as a result of the war and intervention, we have suffered many losses and have become much poorer. I should like to ask you one question. Do you think that if Russia were still ruled by the Tsarist Government, and not the Soviet Government, she would pay the same interest on the debts as before the war?

"You surely know that the Tsarist Government was on the eve of a financial crash even before the world war; that its whole financial system consisted in borrowing new loans with which to pay the interest on the old ones? We have material at our disposal proving that the Tsarist Government, even before the war, was gathering information from various German professors regarding the possibility of declaring State bankruptcy. What value would Russian scrip now have on the exchanges if the old Tsarist Russia were still in existence? You surely cannot imagine that it would have had any greater value than the French rentes?

And what does this signify? An automatic reduction of the debt. Is it not amazing that after having been forced to expend the resources of our country to defend ourselves from intervention and from the White generals whom the European States assisted, that we should be asked to behave to the bondholders 'like gentlemen'? What have English citizens who held German stock received? Nothing. By contrast something will be received from us.

"Here naturally arises the question of credits. Why do we connect the question of loans and credits with that of the liquidation of the Tsarist debts? Because we consider that at this moment the two questions are inseparable—that there can be no liquidation of the debts without our obtaining the necessary credits. You reply: liquidate the debts, restore confidence, and you will then receive credits. Where is the guarantee that this would be so? If the only demands made on us would be the question of debts, I could, perhaps, understand your point of view. But something more is demanded from us. You no doubt remember the Bankers' Memorandum which came as a bombshell on the opening day of the Anglo-Russian Conference. Your bankers demanded the abolition of our Socialist structure of society. Should we ask for credits after a decision has been come to on the debts, all this will again be proposed to us, and the question of credits and a loan will, in the hands of the western capitalists, be a means for exerting pressure upon us, with a view to forcing us to abolish the Socialist form of production. They want to seize our industry. They want to seize our transport and our trade—that is the aim of the City and of the stock exchanges of other countries. This is recognised by every Russian worker and peasant, and, therefore, they say: 'Consent to pay only when the foreign capitalists have guaranteed to assist us in the restoration of our national economy.'

"Now for a few words on the Third International. I personally consider that far too much importance is given to that question. This is particularly the case in countries such as America, where there is scarcely a Communist movement at all, and in Great Britain, where the Communist Party has but a membership of four to five thousand. But let us speak of the essence of the matter. What is the Third International? It is an international organisation of Communist parties having a legal existence in various countries. Such international organisations have existed for over seventy years. The First International was founded in 1864, and its Central Committee was established here in London. I should like to remind you of the fact that, after the First International had been accused of organising the Paris rising, the

famous Paris Commune of 1871, and after laws prohibiting the existence of this organisation on the Continent had been passed, the Continental Governments proposed that the British Government should issue an analogous law. But the British Government refused.

"After the First International, in 1889, that is, during the Paris International Exhibition, the Second International was formed. That also is an international organisation. The resolutions of its Executive Committee are obligatory on all its constituent Socialist parties. Individuals belong to the Second International who were ministers, and some of whom are still ministers, as for instance, in Belgium, and some who will be ministers again. I have never heard that the Second International had ever adopted a resolution renouncing the application of force for the reconstruction of society. The Third International continues the traditions of the Second. The Third International accuses the Second International of not having been consistent, and of having betrayed the programme adopted at all international congresses, right up to the Amsterdam Congress of 1904. Can we refuse the request of the Third International that its Executive Committee should sit in Moscow, and can we deny the right of Russians, not formally connected with the Soviet Government, although they stand close to it, to participate in its Executive Committee? That would be absurd. At the head of the Soviet Government is the Communist Party, which considers itself a member of the Third International. To demand of us that we should renounce our convictions—this is demanding the impossible. What may be demanded of us is what we, as a matter of fact, have already done without any demands—to bring about a very definite organic differentiation between the Soviet Government and the Third International. The Soviet Government is a State authority. The Third International is a private organisation. This differentiation is becoming more and more pronounced, as the international connections of the Soviet Government are extending, and as it is becoming stronger both at home and abroad."

TIMBER FLOATING ON THE NIEMEN.

Although Poland, in her relations both with Russia and with Germany, is proving herself a good disciple of the Locarno spirit—Count Skrzynski gave Mr. Chamberlain the surprise of his life at Locarno—there is still much need of a Locarno for the Polish-Lithuanian problem. Since October, 1920, when General Zeligowski violated the Zuvalki Agreement two days after it was signed, by annexing Vilna and a third of Lithuania's territory—the subsequent blessing of the League in this matter being a

melancholy irrelevancy—there has been no improvement in Lithuanian-Polish relations. The condition is one of political war. All diplomatic, economic and railway communication has been suspended, and on both sides of the demarcation line stand armed forces. Still another disaster has now to be added to the history of Lithuanian-Polish diplomacy; for recent negotiations have failed to lead to an agreement over the floating of timber on the Niemen—an all-important question for both sides.

When Lithuania handed over the sovereignty of the Klaipeda territory to the Allied Powers in pursuance of the Klaipeda Convention with those Powers, she pledged herself among other things to permit the floating of timber on the Niemen from the regions under Polish occupation, although many impartial observers would in the circumstances have understood if she had found it too difficult to grant such a concession. On the ratification of the Convention she set about the business of carrying it into effect. Two methods of approach were open to Lithuania: (1) to announce that timber floating was permitted to all countries, including Poland, and to issue regulations about the practice thereof; (2) to negotiate with Poland with a view to an understanding on technical points. The second alternative was chosen. As the bulk of the timber, apart from the Russian, would be rafted from territory under Polish administration, it would clearly be better that an understanding be reached with Poland so as to avoid further difficulties. With the help of a little diplomatic oil from London, the Polish and Lithuanian delegations met at Copenhagen. The conference was, however, wrecked on the Vilna rock. The Lithuanians agreed to all the technical facilities for Polish timber rafting and offered an arrangement whereby the consul of some foreign Power should protect Polish interests at Klaipeda. The Poles, however, demanded their own consular organisation, the full resumption of normal economic intercourse, and the opening of the railway between Vilna and Kovno. If Lithuania had agreed to those demands she would in effect, so her representatives argued, and so it seems only too reasonable to concur, have signalled her recognition of the *status quo* in the occupied territories of Lithuania—a recognition which no Lithuanian Government has ever been prepared to give. A Copenhagen *procès-verbal* was none the less signed incorporating the technical points on which agreement had been reached, and it was decided to have another try at the *pons asinorum*. The new Conference met at Lugano on October 10th—so near and yet so far from Locarno—and again was wrecked on the same rock. It appears that the Lithuanian Government has now decided that the alternative of an understand-

ing with Poland having failed, it remains for Lithuania to issue the proclamation instituting free navigation on the Niemen together with the regulations, with which Poland will have to comply.

POLAND AND THE GERMAN "OPTANTS."

It is a pleasure by contrast to record a Locarno improvement—Locarno now being an adjective, common noun, proper noun, verb and whatnot—in Poland's relations with Germany. The Polish Government has decided to stop expelling the German "Optants" from Polish territory—those Germans, that is, who under the Vienna Agreement have "opted" in favour of German nationality. The tension which had existed between Germany and Poland over the German minorities in Poland was for several years an ugly disturber of the general peace. Last summer the friction culminated in heated German complaints about the Polish expulsion of German-speaking Polish subjects and the confiscation of their property in that part of Poland near the Prussian boundary, where in the old days the Prussian Government had carried out a violent anti-Polish policy. That policy consisted of dividing up the land and handing it over to German farmers for colonisation, the effect being to eradicate Polish influence. The League of Nations intervened last year and caused the Conference of Vienna to be held between the Germans and the Poles. The economic war between those two nations in the summer of this year intensified the bitterness, however, and at the beginning of August the Polish Government began expelling those Germans who had not opted for Polish nationality under the Treaty of Vienna. The Poles had such rights under the Treaty, and Dr. Stresemann, in a Reichstag debate on August 6th, declared that he had failed to induce the Poles to relinquish them. Much suffering was caused to the expelled Germans, for no arrangements were made for settling them in Germany. The happy ending is undoubtedly a Locarno triumph.

GEORGE GLASGOW.

November 16th, 1925.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. REVIEWS	793
JOHN SELDEN; RELIGIOUS EDUCATION; SCANDINAVIAN VERSE; A FOURTEENTH CENTURY MYSTIC; THE PIPE ROLLS; AN ELIZABETHAN TEACHER.	
2. SHORTER REVIEWS: "Love Letters of Mary Hays"; "The Writers of Greece"; "Nathaniel Woodard: A Memoir of His Life"; "Armour and Weapons in the Middle Ages"; "Charles Dickens and Other Victorians"; "The Council of Nicæa: A Memorial for its Sixteenth Centenary"	807
3. NOTICES OF BOOKS: "Among the Papuan Head-hunters"; "A Discourse upon Usury by way of Dialogue and Orations, for the better variety and more Delight of all those who shall read this Treatise"; "Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda"; "Acting Versions of Everyman and the Second Shepherd's Play"; "Galswintha, a Tragedy"; "Statics, including Hydrostatics and the Elements of the Theory of Elasticity"; "Autobiography of John Stuart Mill"; "M. Tulli Ciceronis de Finibus Bonorum et Malorum, Libri I, II"; "The English Pope (Adrian IV)"	810

JOHN SELDEN.*

John Selden's remarkable commentary on that mysterious mediæval commentary on the English Law of the age of Edward I, which is known as *Fleta*, reveals in no slight measure the unplumbed depth of the learning of England's most learned man. The work, as Mr. David Ogg says in his Introduction to the famous *Dissertatio*, "should be read not as the pedantic exercise of a recluse, but as the mature work of a great scholar who, in his person, had already vindicated those ideals of personal liberty which are part of our greatest heritage of the past." Mr. Ogg points out that Selden had been imprisoned in 1621 for his part in the Commons' protestation, and in 1629 for his opposition to the Tunnage and Poundage proposals. Selden, indeed, was moving, a serene and unimpassioned figure, in the great scenes that were destined finally to establish constitutional government in this country on an unimpugnable basis.

It is, perhaps, not strange that in the successive ages of our his-

* *Joannis Seldeni Ad Fletam Dissertatio*. Reprinted from the Edition of 1647 with Parallel Translation, Introduction and Notes. By David Ogg. Cambridge: At the University Press. 20s. net.

tory it has been great lawyers rather than great soldiers or great statesmen who have secured results that survive after the sound and fury of the council chamber and the battlefield have fallen on silence. After all, national law is the expression of national personality, and it is most natural that it should receive its expression as a national fact from a trained mind. It was Henry de Bracton who led the school of civilians that made the Common Law of England a reality for the whole land. The Common Law is one of the bases of England as the mother of free institutions and personal liberty.

Edmund Plowden, born in 1518 and dead in 1585, survives not only as the greatest lawyer of a great age, but as one in whose personality was enshrined all the wisdom and all the principles of that Common Law which was the chief bequest of the Middle Ages to the age of the Tudors. Though a Roman Catholic who openly exercised his faith, neither Parliament nor Crown dared to attack him. He stood for all that was noblest in public and private life, and, though a Roman Catholic, he was offered the Woolsack by Queen Elizabeth, a great office that he declined to accept as it would have involved repudiation of his faith.

The mighty Selden was born two years before Plowden died, and on him, a Puritan and a Parliamentarian, Plowden's mantle fell. But it was as if the mantle of Elisha came to Elijah, since Selden was even a greater person than Plowden. He, too, was a man that knew no fear, and strode his generation like a Colossus. He sought neither office nor fame, and when Charles I wished to offer him the Woolsack, Clarendon plainly told the King that he would refuse to accept it. A contemporary, a friend and an opponent of Selden, was only less great than he, Thomas Hobbes, whose influence on Continental politics perhaps exceeded that of Macchiavelli, and whose fame as a thinker impressed Europe in a fashion that would have amused Selden. Hobbes died in 1679. The due succession was taken up by Blackstone, who gave the English Common Law permanent literary form, and made it a possession of the United States of America; and Bentham, who indirectly but certainly, is responsible for English private and social law at it stands to-day. These figures, Bracton, Plowden, Selden, Hobbes, Blackstone, Bentham, not only adorn the history of free England, but have largely made England what it is.

For sheer intellectual force, for "an erudition more vast than was ever garnered by any other human mind," for perfect balance of judgment and serenity of outlook on human affairs, Selden stands alone. He played his part in the affairs of State in an age when steady forces were never more needed. He stood for liberty in an age when most other men were standing for licence on one side

or the other of social and political affairs. He faced realities with a steadfastness that perhaps comes out more clearly than anywhere in his *Mare Clausum*, written in 1619 in answer to the *Mare Liberum* of Grotius, published in 1608. When it was published in 1635 Grotius gladly admitted defeat. The bare fact is that legally in so far as the sea is capable of dominion it can be closed. That was the old Roman law, and it was the law on which England relied when she boldly closed to neutrals as well as enemies large areas of sea in the late war. The old claim of the Spaniards and Portuguese which Grotius attacked was wrong, because these Latin peoples claimed theoretically to close the sea on the authority of a Papal Bull. They did not in fact exercise *dominium*. It was the old distinction of seisin in fact and seisin in law. There can be no seisin in law of the sea unless it is supported by seisin in fact. The Latin claim was proved to be a false one by Drake, his predecessors and successors. The English claim to the Narrow Seas was proved to be true by our fighting admirals from the days of Drake to the days of Nelson. After Trafalgar the claim was abandoned by England. The claim was needless and remained needless in times of peace, but when the German Fleet in 1914 threatened the peace of the world the claim for the period of war was revived, the claim to occupy by the process of exclusion sea areas that played a vital part in the conduct of a war on which the future not only of the British Empire but of Europe and America turned.

Selden was born in 1584, a Sussex man, educated and trained at Oxford and at the Inner Temple. He practised to some comparatively slight extent at the Bar, and from 1607 onwards poured forth works of incomparable learning, including his famous *Titles of Honour*, his *History of Tithes*, and the *Mare Clausum*; entered Parliament and made great mark, and, with the assistance of the Dowager Lady Kent (who may or may not have been his wife), became the central figure of the most learned society that England or the Continent could produce. He was a continual and unwearied worker, but one who exhibited none of the outward weariness of mere learning. Humane, affable, courteous, he would have been thought, says Clarendon with his delicate irony, "to have been bred in the best Courts, but that his good nature, charity, and delight in doing good, in communicating all he knew, exceeded that breeding." His priceless *Table Talk*, taken down by his devoted private secretary, reveals the charm, the realism, the irony, the learning, the kindliness and delightfulness of the man. He must have been a host indeed in an age of feasting and of intellectual feasts. One would think that he had nothing else to do but entertain his fellows and enrapture them with the magic of his learning and personality. But all the while his capacious,

untroubled mind was ransacking and re-arranging the learning of a thousand years as exhibited not only by the successive scholars of Europe but also of the East, and also was laying the basis of all modern research into the principles of legal and constitutional history in this country.

The book before us, his commentary on *Fleta*, so admirably edited, translated, and introduced by Mr. David Ogg, is an example of his ripe learning thrown off to please a publisher in the dark days of 1647. He takes the opportunity in his commentary to emphasise once and for always the historical and legal value of contemporary commentaries in creative legal periods. He sighs for the texts that might have thrown light on the Code and Novels of Justinian. In later days we have awakened to the value of such documents, as the magnificent work of the Selden Society testifies. In this book Selden makes clear the significance of Roman law from its reintroduction by Irnerius to Europe, and especially its significance in England. Mr. Ogg, in the light of knowledge that even Selden had not secured, raises the question whether, if Selden had realised that Irnerius of Bologna could not have known of the discovery of the Pisan MS. of the Pandects in 1137, he would have regarded Irnerius as an innovator? The case for the continuity of Roman law teaching through the dark ages after the dissolution of the Western Empire is a very slight one, and Mr. Ogg, after full consideration, declares that:

There is thus reason for accepting, with certain reservations, the theory of Selden, which was substantially that of Savigny, whereby Irnerius is regarded not as a continuator but as an innovator. . . . The importance of the Bolognese revival lay not in the fact that Irnerius made possible a more accurate and detached study of Roman law, but that he popularised a secular subject, independent alike of theology and the needs of the moment. That was more than a renaissance: it was a revolution.

This is exactly the type of outlook that Selden took. He saw a great movement, a great revolution, and with unerring instinct he, though a scholar who loved to dive deep into the minutiae of things, threw aside the petty question of a trickling continuity from Imperial times and saw in the glossators men who gave back to a world distraught the very thing that the world needed and had lost: the law that was the immortal fruit of a great and peace-compelling Empire. Mr. Ogg here, as elsewhere, has touched the very note of Selden's character as a thinker, as one who subordinated the fascinations of vast knowledge to the imperious implications of that knowledge, often the very implications that a lesser man with equal learning would have missed.

J. E. G. DE M.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.*

The possibility that the Government will shortly introduce legislation enabling local education authorities to deal, by way of agreement with the Voluntary School managers, with the whole question of religious education in their areas, renders this publication a very timely one. It is in no sense a piece of special pleading. It states the facts of the position in judicial fashion, and will enable members of local authorities to think out their problems with an instructed mind. The problem of supplying to pupils in all schools, whether primary, intermediate, or secondary, religious instruction as part of the regular curriculum varies in its form from area to area.

The rural problem is a serious one, since thousands of Voluntary Schools cannot deal with intermediate education, and there is a need for what are called rural central or junior secondary schools, and if such schools are not made the subject of agreement it will mean that in them religious instruction will not be part of the curriculum. Arrangements are needed to secure such instruction in the developments which must follow the recent raising of the school age to over fourteen years in all the schools of the country. The urban problem is different, but not less difficult. There must be some guarantee that in the central schools, to which so many children are now transferred at the age of eleven, there should be religious instruction. There must also be an adequate guarantee that in the secondary schools such instruction should be part of the regular curriculum. The Board of Education at present do not regard religious instruction as a necessary part of the curriculum in secondary schools. This aspect of the local problem affects rural and urban areas alike. Some headmasters and headmistresses of secondary schools have pleaded that with the crowded curriculum there is no time for religious instruction as part of the curriculum. But that plea is plainly a bad one, for some of the very best secondary schools in the country, schools that shine in the giving of a broad liberal education and obtain a notable share of university scholarships, are denominational schools with religious instruction as part of the curriculum.

This little book traces carefully the history of elementary education before and since the Act of 1870, its relation to religious teaching, and the bitter political controversy on this subject. The author says, "The echoes of that bitter controversy have nearly died away; comparatively few people to-day know exactly what it was about, and the old war-cries evoke little response; but the

* *The Problem of Religious Education: Being Articles contributed to "The Guardian," with an Introduction by Sir Frederick Holiday.* "The Guardian" Publications, Ltd., 39, King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2. 7d., post free.

effects of that controversy still remain, and the prejudice then created still, however unconsciously, stands in the way of settlement." The dual system was the compromise arrived at, by which the Voluntary Schools could give the religious teaching provided by their trusts, while the Board (now the Council) Schools were placed under no statutory duty to give religious instruction, though religious instruction might be given, and in practice almost universally is given, under the famous Cowper-Temple clause, of a totally undenominational character.

It was hoped that this compromise, which, of course, left the managers of Voluntary Schools with the burden of supplying and maintaining their schools, would prove a lasting one and that the Sunday School system would supply all that was lacking in the way of definite religious teaching. To-day, when the bitterness of controversy has died away and when all the denominations are combining to face the dangers of purely secular teaching, it is found not only that the Churches of all denominations are suffering from lack of regular congregations, but that the Sunday Schools, including even the highly-organised Wesleyan Sunday Schools, have a falling average attendance. No one will deny in these circumstances that some great combined effort is needed if England is to remain a Christian nation. That effort must be associated with the schools, and must take some account, at any rate, of the wishes, when they are definitely expressed, of the parents of children as to the form of religious instruction that should be provided. To-day the Church Schools contain less than a third of the children of school age, and of these a considerable proportion are Nonconformist children, while the Council Schools contain more than two-thirds of the children of school age, and of these a very large proportion are Church children. The question, therefore, arises, how are all the children to secure religious instruction, and how, if at all, are the wishes of parents to be met?

It is certain that this difficult problem can best be dealt with locally, and that the Local Education Authorities should have power to control by agreement the religious education provided in all schools in their respective areas. Sir Frederick Holiday in his admirable Introduction to this book says:

No settlement is likely to prove stable and permanent which fails to pay due regard to consciences, to the rights of parents, and to the equitable and impartial use of public funds collected from all sections of the community; and that these conditions involve the full recognition of denominational schools and denominational teaching as an integral part of any national system.

That statement of principle can be tested by the local authorities. Problems that seem insoluble for a vast community can be

solved locally, given the new spirit of desire to help one another that marks the relations of the denominations to-day.

* * *

SCANDINAVIAN VERSE.*

In this attractive volume, which should be in the hands of all interested in Scandinavian studies in this country, and especially in London, where University College is specialising on the subject, Sir Edmund Gosse deals with the poetry of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, while Mr. W. H. Craigie writes on what may be called the later poetry of Iceland, an island with a most remarkable literary history and one that, even in modern times, scarcely belongs to the normal Scandinavian school. It is to be regretted that Mr. Craigie only begins his selections with poems from the seventeenth century work of Hallgrímur Pétursson (1614-1674) and Stefán Olafsson (1620-1688), as some examples of the work that links the poetry of the Skalds of the period before the thirteenth century with modern times would have had special value for the students of modern developments. Mr. Craigie, however, brings out the salient and, indeed, singular point in the history of literature, that while the "Edda Poems" and the work of the Skalds had no worthy successors after the opening of the thirteenth century, they had permanently stamped their form on the literature of the island:

The form indeed survived, especially all that was most artificial in it, but the spirit had almost entirely disappeared, and poetry had come to be regarded as consisting essentially in elaboration of metre and diction according to established rule and precedent. This conception of the poet's task, however deadening in its effect upon the imagination, had at least the merit of preventing any breakdown in the tradition which demanded a strict observance of prosody and alliteration as the first requisite of all poetry. Precision of form thus survived as a natural and essential attribute of any new development in style or subject which might arise in course of time. It was therefore equally shared in by the religious poetry, of which the *Lilja* of Eysteinn Asgrímsson (c. 1350) represents one type, and the *Ljómur* of Jón Arason (c. 1540) another, and by the versified sagas and romances known as *rímur*, which attained so much popularity that their composition has maintained itself without intermission for more than five centuries.

This Icelandic poetry was kept alive during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries at, at any rate, the level of the thirteenth, and "so ingrained had the sense of form become" that the formless popular Scandinavian ballad never gained any hold in Iceland,

* *The Oxford Book of Scandinavian Verse: XVIIIth Century—XXth Century.* Chosen by Sir Edmund Gosse and W. A. Craigie. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 8s. 6d. net.

and the old form was adopted by Pétursson and Ólafsson in the seventeenth century, poets of outstanding merit. Pétursson's hymns in the past two centuries and a half have passed through forty-five editions. These poets had no direct successors, but the "ceaseless undercurrent of *rímur*" kept poetry alive in an age of prose, while Sira Jón preserved the forms alive and introduced translations of foreign literature that made possible the nineteenth-century revival which retained the poetic forms and forms of thought characteristic of Iceland, while in many cases presenting as well a wider humanism. Mr. Craigie points out that the work of two living poets, Stephan G. Stephansson, who for fifty years has lived in Canada, and Einar Benediktsson, has shown "that the traditional form of Icelandic poetry is capable of being made the vehicle of profound and sustained thought to an extent not hitherto attempted or realised."

Sir Edmund Gosse's accounts of the poetry of Denmark, Norway and Sweden will be read with interest. Thomas Kingo (1634-1703), Bishop of Odense, the son of a Fifehire weaver, made Danish religious poetry wholly national. "The originality of Kingo is very remarkable. He was probably acquainted with the Scottish psalms of Alexander Hume, but on the whole it is very difficult to point to any model from which he can have borrowed his brilliant new metres and his picturesque illustrations." That great genius, Ludvig Holberg (1684-1754) is represented here by an extract from the mock-heroic epic, "Peder Paars' Journey." He was not, however, a lyric poet. At the opening of the nineteenth century Danish literature had at last secured a great measure of freedom from German influence, and the greatest poets of Denmark, Johannes Ewald (1743-1781) and Adam Gottlob Oehlenschläger (1779-1850), were the forces that secured this necessary enfranchisement. The nationalism of N. F. S. Grundtvig (1783-1872), the reformer, was an important influence. "His earliest verses sought to rouse his compatriots, and for sixty years he continued to keep them awakened." Frederik Paludan-Müller (1809-1876) created a new tradition in Danish literature, marmorial and didactic. The more recent realism of Georg Brandes has had more influence on prose than poetry.

The poetry of Norway, as a national fact, was delayed till a generation after Norway secured in 1814 complete independence, though before that date Norsemens, such as Holberg, played a great part in Danish literature. The history of modern Norwegian verse opens with the names of Welhaven (1807-1873) and Wergeland (1808-1845) who were the contemporaries of Tennyson and Browning. Wergeland, a lyric poet of exquisite simplicity, was attacked by the sophisticated Danish critics, but he has come

into his own (and more than his own, according to Sir Edmund Gosse) to-day. The outstanding figure in Norwegian literature is, of course, Henrik Ibsen (1828-1906). He had Scottish and German as well as Norwegian descent. A curious aspect of Norwegian literature is the artificial tongue called *Maal*, based on various Norwegian dialects, and introduced by Ivar Aasen (1813-1896). "It has spread so widely in Norway as to divide its literature from those of the sister countries," and in this dialect or tongue a poetry is growing up of which some specimens are here given. The fact is probably unique in the history of literature. But the language has a popular basis, and the Norse people like it, and having become a reality, it must have a literary future despite Ibsen's snort at "chatter of monkeys."

The poetry of Sweden goes back to the seventeenth century, to the days of Gören Lilje (1598-1672), who declared that the muses must "learn to sing in Swedish." He "purified the language, and introduced a variety of verse-forms, especially the hexameter which has since his time been of constant recurrence." This language was further developed for purposes of poetry by Gustaf Rosenhane (1619-1684). In the eighteenth century the discursive tendencies due to Italian and German influence were pruned by Olaf von Dalin (1708-1763), who brought English and French influences to bear on the literary forms. The genius of Hedvig Charlotta Nordenflycht (1718-1763) and Karl Michael Bellman (1740-1795) brought new forces, romantic and national in essence, to bear. Another woman of genius, Anna Maria Lenngren (1754-1817) did much to restore the classical form which was followed, as everywhere in Europe, by the Romantic revival, and out of the many literary struggles arose the great figure of Esaias Tegnér (1782-1846), the supreme literary figure of Sweden. His great lyrical contemporary was Erik Johan Stagnelius (1793-1823) who "died at the age of thirty without having seen his name in print." Sir Edmund Gosse notes the revival in Finland of Swedish literature after the great days of Tegnér and Stagnelius were closed. Johan Ludwig Runeberg (1804-1877), the great Finnish poet, used the Swedish language "with incomparable freshness and originality." This volume will introduce the reader to a large field of literature that may have, and, indeed, has already had, in the case of Ibsen, its reactions on the work of English writers.

• • •

A FOURTEENTH CENTURY MYSTIC.*

The Shewings of Lady Julian of Norwich, 1373, is an elder version of a famous work, transcribed into modern English by the

* H. R. Allenson. London. Third Edition. 3s. 6d. net.

Rev. Dundas Harford. It is the first transcript that has been made from the Amhurst Manuscript—a document which had been lost sight of for a hundred and sixty years. This reprint will be welcomed by those readers who already know *The Revelations of the Lady Julian*. It is indeed, an important addition to the literature of Christian Mysticism. Mr. Harford contends that the Amhurst Manuscript is, in all probability, the earliest known by twenty years. It is shorter, and has several features distinguishing it from the already known versions.

At all periods of the Christian era, and, indeed, throughout the history of all races and religions, mysticism has held sway over the contemplative mind. Men and women have seen visions and dreamt dreams, and the craving for revelation is as current now in the twentieth century as it was in the first century when St. Paul was caught up into the third heaven, or in the fifteenth century when Thomas à Kempis wrote *The Imitation of Christ*, that most perfect example of well-balanced mystic literature. The Lady Julian describes the "three methods of revelation,"

"that is, by bodily sight, and by word formed in mine understanding, and by ghostly sight. But the ghostly sight I may not, and cannot, show it unto you as openly and as fully as I would. But I trust in our Lord God Almighty that He shall of His goodness, and for your love make you to take it more ghostly and more sweetly than I can or may tell it you. And so may it be, for we are all one in love."

The latter sentence is the keynote of her meditations, namely, the love of God, and the fact that He is All-love, and without His Love we are nothing: "No soul is rested till it be *noughted* of all that is made."

The parable of "The Littleness of All-things" is not far from present day thought. The atom that lay in the palm of the Lady Julian's hand, which she feared might fall suddenly to nought for its very littleness, and her inquiry as to what it might be, is thus explained and answered, "It is all that is made. It lasts, and ever shall, for God loves it"; "and so hath all-thing its being through the love of God." Littleness and greatness are only quantities connected with the finite. To the Infinite there is no distinction between the two. As with Time, "a thousand years as one day," so with all other attributes. It is the love of the Creator and the created being "oned" that profiteth. These "Shewings of Lady Julian" read in the light of to-day should be, and doubtless are to those who value the mysticism of the Middle Ages, a source of help. Strip them of the mediævalism and over asceticism of that time, such as the craving for bodily sickness, and all manner of pains, bodily and ghostly, and there is found within the vesture of words the earnest

desire to be spiritually Christ-like, and to show forth His life in a state of salvation, that is to say, in a state of health, bodily, mental, and spiritual. Then, and not until then, will the *oneness* which the Lady Julian sought after be attained.

* * *

THE PIPE ROLLS.*

The Pipe Roll Society, after ten years of enforced inaction due to the war and the cost of printing, has resumed publication of the invaluable mediæval records which it has done so much to place at the disposal of historians. The Pipe Rolls are records of that part of the Mediæval Exchequer, the Upper Exchequer, which passed the accounts of the Lower Exchequer, the Treasurer's or receiving department. The latter received the money or payments in kind from the sheriffs, or other local persons liable to collect and account for local taxations and amercements. At Easter these accountants paid into the Receipt or Lower Exchequer an instalment, to be completed at Michaelmas, and received receipts in the form of tallies, pieces of wood notched so as to indicate the amounts paid. Mr. Charles Johnson, in his interesting introduction to the Pipe Roll of 2 Richard I, says that:

"Each receipt has its counterfoil, because the notched piece of wood is split longitudinally, but not through its whole length. At a short distance from the thicker end a transverse, oblique cut is made, so that the stick falls into two parts of unequal length. The shorter, known as the 'foil,' is kept by the Treasurer and Chamberlains, the longer, or 'stock' of which one end is of the whole thickness of the original stick, being given to the sheriff. Both pieces are written on in order to show to what debt they relate, and no foil can be fitted in any stock but its own, because the diagonal cut is not always made at the same angle. The sheriff cannot, therefore, falsify his receipts."

At Michaelmas the account was adjusted, the full account of the year for each sheriff or other accountant was taken, and then the Pipe or Receipt Roll was made up after a detailed examination of the sheriff or other accountant, who vouched the customary local outgoings, and produced the writs which warranted local extraordinary expenditure, such, for instance, as repairs to castles. The dreaded examination was followed by a settlement of the

* *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Thirty-Fourth Year of the Reign of King Henry the Second, A.D. 1187-1188, now first printed from the Original in the Custody of the Right Hon. the Master of the Rolls, under the direction of the Council of the Pipe Roll Society, London. Printed for the Society by The Hereford Times, Ltd. The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Second Year of the Reign of King Richard the First, Michaelmas, 1190 (Pipe Roll 36), now first printed from the Original in the custody of the Right Hon. the Master of the Rolls. Edited by Doris M. Stenton. London: Printed for the Pipe Roll Society by J. W. Ruddock and Sons, Lincoln.*

accounts of the sheriff's "farm" of the county (the rents payable to him as sheriff with allowances), and the business was concluded. If all was square, the sheriff saw the blessed words, *et quietus est*; if something was still owing, the amount was registered with the words *et debit*; while if there was a balance in the sheriff's favour it was recorded in the words *et habet de superplusagio*, which he might get later as a matter of account. The good man then made his oath to the Marshal of the Exchequer that he had made his lawful account according to his conscience, and so departed for his county. It might be that he departed very well satisfied, but, in fact, the Barons of the Exchequer and their assistants were astute men, and it was an unusually competent sheriff who deceived the Treasury in any substantial fashion. The Crown from that day to this has employed extremely capable persons for the task of wringing the uttermost legal farthing from the lieges of the King.

It is plain enough that the records of this terrifying process should yield a mass of historical material from every county in England. The importance of these rolls was recognised by the Record Commission of 1833, which published in that year the Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I and the Chancellor's Roll of the third year of King John. In 1844 the roll of the first year of Richard I was issued. Between 1883 and 1915 the Pipe Roll Society printed the rolls from the fifth year of Henry II to the thirty-third year of Henry II. The first of the volumes before us provides the thirty-fourth year. The second volume begins a new series with the roll of the second year of Richard I, containing the accounts from Michaelmas, 1189, to Michaelmas, 1190, while the second volume of the series for the year 1925-1926 will provide two rolls for the year 1191-1192. It is plain, however, that the activities of this most useful Society, which throws open for general use manuscripts, unique in Europe, containing "vast stores of material for all students of administrative, feudal and legal history, for the genealogist, the philologist, and the local historian," cannot fulfil its purpose unless it has many new members. The fact is not generally realised. If it were realised, all antiquarians in Great Britain and the Dominions, and also in the United States of America, would hasten to join the Society and pay the annual guinea which entitles the subscriber to receive the annual volume. All local societies and libraries should become subscribers, and we believe the need of members is entirely due to the general public ignorance of the great work for English history that the Society has done for more than forty years.

Each volume is full of attractive material. To the historian of London, for instance, as Mr. William Page has shown, the Pipe Rolls are specially significant. The Pipe Roll for 1187-1188

records the purchasing of land near Newgate for the making of a gaol. The latest costs of the building of the gaol is recorded in Michaelmas, 1190, £103 3s. 9d. The history of English Jews at the end of the reign of Henry II and the crucial years of Richard I are written at length in these pages, and the modern Jewish community in England should find much of sad interest in these records. The cost of the keep of children (to take a small but much-disputed point in the history of education) is touched upon in the entry with respect to the Tower of London "*pro pannis et harnasio puerorum qui sunt in custodia R. xiii M.*" Who were these boys? That girls were not always safe in the custody of the smaller feudal lords is shown by a grim entry for Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire. It explains why the Bower-schools of the really great nobles were a popular institution. They offered full protection. There is a reference to the Cathedral School of York, where the master received one hundred shillings a year. We read also of the master or tutor of the King's nephew, the future Emperor, Otto IV. The said tutor, Marbotus, lay sick at Northampton and had to be maintained and cured.

Mr. Johnson draws attention to the many references to the preparations for Richard's Crusade. Henry de Cornhill accounts for £2,250 for the purchase of two-thirds of each of the ships which were to accompany the King, and for the wages of their crews, including the King's own ship with its crew of sixty men. The Sheriff of Essex supplied cheese and bacon, the Sheriff of Cambridge beans, and the Sheriff of Gloucester horseshoes. All sorts of expedients were used to raise money for the Crusade; many towns bought new charters, the new Bishop of Winchester paid £3,000 for the restoration of certain property, maladministrators paid heavy fines, while those who massacred the Jews in the coronation year paid highly for their brutal enthusiasm. Thus the Jews, indirectly as well as directly, helped in the Crusade. One other small point may be noticed. A mill at Canterbury provided, out of the charity of the King, £11 a year for John, the son of Rohais, the sister of Saint Thomas, the murdered archbishop. The King was a gentleman, and did not repudiate the claims of his father's conscience.

* * *

AN ELIZABETHAN TEACHER.*

Richard Mulcaster, of Border stock, born about 1530, was educated at Eton and King's College, Cambridge, whence he migrated to Christ Church, Oxford, in 1555. In 1561 he became

* *Mulcaster's Elementarie* [Tudor and Stuart Library]. Edited with an Introduction by E. T. Campagnac. At the Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d. net.

THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

the first headmaster of the Merchant Taylors' School, a post that he held for a quarter of a century. An interval of ten years as a country clergyman was followed by twelve years as High Master of St. Paul's School. He retired from teaching in 1608, and died on April 15th, 1611. His adult life covered the greatest period of English literary history. He well might say in his *Elementarie*, now so exquisitely reproduced after a lapse of three hundred and forty-three years by the Clarendon Press, under the competent editorship of Professor Campagnac, of Liverpool:

"I take this present period of our English tung to be the verie height thereof, by cause I find it so excellentlie well fined, both for the bodie of the tung it self, and for the customarie writing thereof, as either foren workmanship can give it glosse, or as home wrought hanling can give it grace. When the age of our people, which now use the tung so well, is dead and departed there will another succede, and with the people the tung will alter and change. Which change in the full harvest thereof maie prove comparable to this, but sure for this which we now use, it seemeth even now to be at the best for substance and the bravest for circumstance, and what-soever shall becom of the English State, the English tung cannot prove fairer than it is at this daie, if it maie please our learned sort to esteme so of it, and to bestow their travell upon such a subject, so capable of ornament, so proper to themselves, and the more to be honored, by cause it is their own."

This remarkable statement and prophecy was written in the year 1582, when the glories of the great dramatists and the music of the nest of singing birds was about to become a possession of the civilised world. It was written by the greatest schoolmaster of the Elizabethan age after more than twenty years of teaching.

To Mulcaster education was a national business. He took the Queen's view of things. "It cannot but yield most honorable matter for historie to work on to everlasting memorie, that hir most excellent Majestie among other hir affaires vouchsafed to consider of the state of learning in hir time, that it went in right course, for the right maintaining of a peaceable government, which peaceableness is the end of all government, as learning is the mean." He as a teacher and administrator of a great school regarded his work from outside, so to speak, and in his famous work, the *Positions*, he discussed the general theory of education from the points of view of the teacher and the learner. In the *Elementarie* he turns to the curriculum, to the universal basis of higher learning, the curriculum of all children until they "passe to grammar." He proposes in this book later to consider the higher curriculum suitable for those who are to pass into the larger world of national affairs. He urges that learning as such is to be reserved for those who show capacity to receive it. Such learning is as much a matter of specialism as "divinitie, law and physik," but the first stage,

the "Elementarie," though necessary, and an institution for the higher learning, is not, apparently, to be limited to those who are qualified to pass on. Indeed, to have adopted that view would have been to run counter to the Queen's view. The age of elementary education, Mulcaster says, ends at twelve. He was too good a teacher not to know that there or thereabouts was the period of bifurcation, when the child was either to pass to grammar or to apprenticeship. One or other path the child, or, at any rate, the boy, had to take, and Mulcaster so framed his institution into learning, the training in "reading, writing, drawing, singing and playing," as to make a broad opening for either pathway. Professor Campagnac says, "Mulcaster meant by learning the equipment needed for a particular 'job'; but it is clear that he is an advocate of an education broader and deeper than equipment for any particular 'job,' because he desires every man to exercise himself in his special function not only for the benefit of himself and his fellow-craftsmen, but also for the benefit of the State." The elementary school enables the "simple teacher" (as Mulcaster calls himself) to make "choice of wits most fit for learning."

That is one aspect of the policy of national education to-day. The general problem is to see in what field of innumerable fields the child is likely to be efficient. But it is generally recognised that whether a boy or girl is to proceed to higher book learning, or to technical work, or to work in the field or the shop or the factory, a common basis of general knowledge, especially a general knowledge of the uses of the English language, is essential. Mulcaster, writing at a moment when English was about to become one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest literary language in the world, shows the teachers of his age how those uses should be communicated. His experience, as the pages of this book show, is of the greatest practical value, and the educationist who thinks in terms of general principles should turn to it to-day to find out how this great teacher taught.

J. E. G. DE M.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Had not these *Love Letters of Mary Hays** been associated with the famous names of Mary Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, Lamb, Southey, and Coleridge, despite the enthusiasm of her great-niece, Mrs. A. F. Wedd, who edits them, they would in all probability have lacked any interest to-day. The present generation has little interest in "exquisite sensibility" of a hundred and fifty years ago. They, however, verify the characters that Jane Austen delineated. To-day, the eternal woman has taken on another rôle, changing, but always *la même chose*, only another facet of the same jewel. One wonders

* *The Love Letters of Mary Hays*. Methuen. 12s. 6d. net.

the first headmaster of the Merchant Taylors' School, a post that he held for a quarter of a century. An interval of ten years as a country clergyman was followed by twelve years as High Master of St. Paul's School. He retired from teaching in 1608, and died on April 15th, 1611. His adult life covered the greatest period of English literary history. He well might say in his *Elementarie*, now so exquisitely reproduced after a lapse of three hundred and forty-three years by the Clarendon Press, under the competent editorship of Professor Campagnac, of Liverpool:

"I take this present period of our English tung to be the verie height thereof, by cause I find it so excellentlie well fined, both for the bodie of the tung it self, and for the customarie writing thereof, as either foren workmanship can give it glosse, or as home wrought hanling can give it grace. When the age of our people, which now use the tung so well, is dead and departed there will another succede, and with the people the tung will alter and change. Which change in the full harvest thereof maie prove comparable to this, but sure for this which we now use, it seemeth even now to be at the best for substance and the bravest for circumstance, and whatsoever shall becom of the English State, the English tung cannot prove fairer than it is at this daie, if it maie please our learned sort to esteme so of it, and to bestow their travell upon such a subject, so capable of ornament, so proper to themselves, and the more to be honored, by cause it is their own."

This remarkable statement and prophecy was written in the year 1582, when the glories of the great dramatists and the music of the nest of singing birds was about to become a possession of the civilised world. It was written by the greatest schoolmaster of the Elizabethan age after more than twenty years of teaching.

To Mulcaster education was a national business. He took the Queen's view of things. "It cannot but yield most honorable matter for historie to work on to everlasting memorie, that hir most excellent Majestie among other hir affaires vouchsafed to consider of the state of learning in hir time, that it went in right course, for the right maintaining of a peaceable government, which peaceableness is the end of all government, as learning is the mean." He as a teacher and administrator of a great school regarded his work from outside, so to speak, and in his famous work, the *Positions*, he discussed the general theory of education from the points of view of the teacher and the learner. In the *Elementarie* he turns to the curriculum, to the universal basis of higher learning, the curriculum of all children until they "passe to grammar." He proposes in this book later to consider the higher curriculum suitable for those who are to pass into the larger world of national affairs. He urges that learning as such is to be reserved for those who show capacity to receive it. Such learning is as much a matter of specialism as "divinitie, law and physik," but the first stage,

the "Elementarie," though necessary, and an institution for the higher learning, is not, apparently, to be limited to those who are qualified to pass on. Indeed, to have adopted that view would have been to run counter to the Queen's view. The age of elementary education, Mulcaster says, ends at twelve. He was too good a teacher not to know that there or thereabouts was the period of bifurcation, when the child was either to pass to grammar or to apprenticeship. One or other path the child, or, at any rate, the boy, had to take, and Mulcaster so framed his institution into learning, the training in "reading, writing, drawing, singing and playing," as to make a broad opening for either pathway. Professor Campagnac says, "Mulcaster meant by learning the equipment needed for a particular 'job'; but it is clear that he is an advocate of an education broader and deeper than equipment for any particular 'job,' because he desires every man to exercise himself in his special function not only for the benefit of himself and his fellow-craftsmen, but also for the benefit of the State." The elementary school enables the "simple teacher" (as Mulcaster calls himself) to make "choice of wits most fit for learning."

That is one aspect of the policy of national education to-day. The general problem is to see in what field of innumerable fields the child is likely to be efficient. But it is generally recognised that whether a boy or girl is to proceed to higher book learning, or to technical work, or to work in the field or the shop or the factory, a common basis of general knowledge, especially a general knowledge of the uses of the English language, is essential. Mulcaster, writing at a moment when English was about to become one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest literary language in the world, shows the teachers of his age how those uses should be communicated. His experience, as the pages of this book show, is of the greatest practical value, and the educationist who thinks in terms of general principles should turn to it to-day to find out how this great teacher taught.

J. E. G. DE M.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Had not these *Love Letters of Mary Hays** been associated with the famous names of Mary Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, Lamb, Southey, and Coleridge, despite the enthusiasm of her great-great-niece, Mrs. A. F. Wedd, who edits them, they would in all probability have lacked any interest to-day. The present generation has little interest in "exquisite sensibility" of a hundred and fifty years ago. They, however, verify the characters that Jane Austen delineated. To-day, the eternal woman has taken on another rôle, changing, but always *la même chose*, only another facet of the same jewel. One wonders

* *The Love Letters of Mary Hays*. Methuen. 12s. 6d. net.

that Mary Hays could have had any sympathy with Mary Wollstonecraft, but she evidently had, as she wrote and thanked her for her book, *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, which she hailed as "a work full of truth and genius." What Mary Hays considered "the rights of women" is a little difficult to conjecture from her attitude shown in these letters. Mary Wollstonecraft certainly told her more home truths than she could have been accustomed to hear, and her letters are such sound advice to writers and reviewers that they will hold good for all time. What an untold blessing it is that women have something better to do in this age than to spend hours of day and night in writing foolish letters! Mary Hays had fallen in love, and it was not even a love that endured to the end. Shakespeare never allowed his women to give even a "hint" of their love, till they knew its twin was already at their feet. One feels sorry for William Godwin! Mary Hays harrassed him with letters, which generally he declined to answer according to the contract made between them, but, fortunately, occasionally he was drawn into a reply, and these letters form the most interesting part of this volume, for by them we arrive at his considered opinion of authors and their works. Mary Hays was fearful of having forfeited Godwin's good opinion of her. This is his reply: "That, I swear to you, is not the case. I found, or thought I found, you in error; but that neither shocked nor surprised me. There is scarcely any difference of opinion by which a person can forfeit my good opinion." One suspects that Mary Hays was in reality less foolish than her letters. Perhaps her "Eccles" was not worthy of her, for she improved in style after his decease. Hearts that are worn upon the sleeve, even in letters, fail to attract; they need other value, else it seems almost sacrilege to lay them bare. Perhaps they reflect their period, and, if a true reflection, are worthy of publication.

The Writers of Greece,* by Professor Gilbert Norwood, provides, from the pen of an excellent scholar, a valuable survey of the great Greek poets, philosophers and dramatists, from Homer to Theocritus. As to Homer, Professor Norwood points out that nothing is known as to the early poets who composed the great epics, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. "An *Iliad*, telling of Achilles' wrath and its appeasement, was composed something like one thousand years before Christ; its bulk was afterwards increased by episodes not vitally connected with the original theme." The *Odyssey* was later, and was similarly enlarged, and both were given a fixed form and somewhat Atticised at Athens. Professor Norwood pays a notable tribute to Sappho: "The outcome of superb genius wedded to immense spiritual force, have created flawless perfection." She is not a poet, but poetry itself. After almost a millennium Greek poetry, subtle and sweet, still survived, but Theocritus was only a poet.

All English educationists should read Sir John Otter's volume relating to his father-in-law, *Nathaniel Woodard: A Memoir of His Life*.† This great founder of famous modern schools was born in 1811 and died in 1891 after a life of extraordinary devotion to education, and especially religious education. Educated at Oxford, after his marriage,

* Oxford University Press. 2s. 6d. net.

† John Lane. 15s. net.

he had first the sole charge of a poor district in Bethnal Green, and then passed to a curacy at New Shoreham, in Sussex, where he began his educational work, and issued his famous pamphlet of 1848 on the subject of the neglected education of the middle classes. This full book gives the story of his mighty struggles for middle-class education on a religious basis, and records the upbuilding of Hurstpierpoint, Denstone and Lancing. It is a moving record of the life of a very great man who singlehanded won the respect and support of statesmen and the Church, and did more than any man to lay the basis of middle-class education.

The late Mr. Charles H. Ashdown, in *Armour and Weapons in the Middle Ages**, supplies, with many figures and illustrations, means for what may be called an instructed examination of these vestiges of past ages. The interest in the subject is very general, and no elementary book was available for students not only of actual armour and weapons but of brasses and effigies. Mediæval workmen were not always strictly accurate in their presentation of the armour of their own age. England to-day is the only country whose sepulchral brasses may be studied in their full development. In twelve chapters Mr. Ashdown passes through the Saxon, Norman, chain-mail period, the sleeveless tunic (or cyclas) period, the studded and splinted period (c. 1350), and the comparatively rapid changes demanded by defence in the two hundred and fifty years following the Black Death. It is a careful and useful book.

Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch in *Charles Dickens and other Victorians*† here prints some of his Cambridge lectures delivered in his capacity as King Edward VII Professor of English Literature. The essay on Trollope was not so delivered. Sir Arthur says in his preface that Trollope was "one of our greatest English novelists—and perhaps the raciest of them all." He was certainly a reckless novelist if his absurd perversions of English law are considered, but his Barseshire is an actual piece of England, and Sir Arthur pays a tribute to his originality and the great measure of his power. The tribute to Mrs. Gaskell is deserved. She indeed was a very great novelist. The secret of the triumph of Dickens is said to be his universal charity, the secret of Thackeray his exquisite prose, balancing heart and intelligence in speech.

Dr. A. E. Burn, the Dean of Salisbury, in his learned volume *The Council of Nicæa: A Memorial for its Sixteenth Centenary*,‡ discusses the many problems arising from the Great Council which met at Nicæa, in Bithynia, in the presence of the Emperor Constantine, in May, 325, and finally condemned Arianism. Many famous bishops were present at this Council of Confessors, as St. Chrysostom calls it. Arianism was "met at every point; its claim to be logical, its argument from Holy Scripture, and its appeal to tradition." The minority won the victory by sheer force of thought. The inevitable reaction in the East and the long "fight in the dark" of Athanasius against the world followed. He stood like a rock and conquered his enemies. "What was confessed by the Fathers at Nicæa" has prevailed.

* George G. Harrap. 7s. 6d. net.

† Cambridge: At the University Press. 10s. 6d. net.

‡ S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. net.

*The Elements of Mechanics**, by Mr. F. S. Carey and Dr. J. Proudman, is a textbook of great merit, which students of applied mathematics would do well to acquire. The logical structure of the subject is a prime consideration with these learned authors, and the book naturally proceeds from the concrete to the abstract. Moreover, Statics and Dynamics are developed side by side, and "the internal forces of a body in equilibrium are treated on the same lines as those adopted in the discussion of moving bodies." This prominent feature is an extension of Newton's method in Statics, and a departure from the pre-Newtonian tradition usually found in works devoted to Statics. The use of the Theory of Vectors is another feature of an excellent book.

Mr. D. R. Mackenzie, F.R.G.S., in *The Spirit-Ridden Konde*,† provides "a record of the interesting but steadily vanishing customs and ideas gathered during twenty-four years' residence among these shy inhabitants of the Lake Nyasa region, from witch-doctors, diviners, hunters, fishers, and every native source." The book indicates "the leading ideas and practices which make up the background. . . . The task has been undertaken at the request of some of the leading men of the tribe." The book should do much to reveal the psychology of the Bantu mind. The Konde are a pastoral and agricultural community, quite untrained in the arts of war. With them any great phenomena is a revelation of an anthropomorphic God, the God of righteousness according to Konde lights. The idea perhaps springs from the earlier custom of deifying men. God controls the ancestral spirits. Ancestor worship is universal, and the spirit-worship, Mr. Mackenzie inclines to think, is really religious. Yet human sacrifice was common and may still exist. The fact that rain-makers might be slaves is very important. It shows that the Konde took over the faith of an elder people.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Mr. E. Baxter Riley, in his book "Among the Papuan Head-hunters,"‡ gives (as one who has spent many years in their midst) "an account of the manners and customs of the old Fly River headhunters, with a description of the secrets of the initiation ceremonies divulged by those who have passed through all the different orders of the craft." The book has fifty illustrations and two maps. It is to be noted that the bull-roarer, so familiar in Australian tribal life, is used in the Papuan initiation ceremonies. The book is well compiled, but Mr. Riley tells us very little of the circumstances under which he was able to secure such a large volume of information about these strange and not unpleasing peoples.

Mr. R. H. Tawney has written an historical introduction to a reprint of the work by Thomas Wilson, originally published in 1572, entitled, "A Discourse upon Usury by way of Dialogue and Orations, for the better variety and more Delight of all those who shall read this Treatise."§ Mr. Tawney considers it worth while to make the work

* Longmans. 8s. 6d.

† Seeley Service & Co. 21s. net.

‡ Seeley Service and Co. 21s. net.

§ G. Bell and Sons. 15s. net.

accessible to modern students of the development of economic thought, since it "without being original or profound, is typical of one side, in the discussion of credit and money-lending, which was a characteristic phase in the early history of financial capitalism, and which, after the Enclosures, provided the principal economic controversy of the sixteenth century." The author was a commercial lawyer and distinguished civilian, an ambassador, a statesman, and one who moved in the highest intellectual circles of the Elizabethan age. He was a conservative of the old Pauline school and had no sympathy with the new economy. Hence his book. Mr. Tawney examines in attractive fashion the types of Credit which underlie the controversies discussed by Dr. Wilson.

Mr. Aubrey F. G. Bell, in his account of "Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda" (1490—1573), supplies some useful notes on a great scholar and humanist of the days in Spain "when new countries were being conquered yearly beyond the seas, wonderful buildings and new universities were springing up everywhere at home and a passion for knowledge and observation and discovery began to fill the minds of rich and poor alike." The contemporary of Erasmus, Sepúlveda had various controversies with him, and greatly appreciated the vast abilities of the sage of Rotterdam. Mr. Bell provides a useful list of Sepúlveda's many publications.

Mr. W. R. Duffey, the Professor of Speech and Dramatic Art in Marquette University, Wisconsin, has produced "Acting Versions of Everyman and the Second Shepherds' Play,"† which may attract English stage directors. Mr. Duffey, in preparing his versions of these old Moralities has not hesitated to add "phrases which seem to be better suited to the actor than those in many of the older works." He points out that the additions and subtractions may be clearly seen by comparison with the standard literary editions. These acting versions move well.

Mr. Douglas J. Boyle, in "Galswintha, a Tragedy,"‡ has produced a terrible drama, that recalls Webster's manner, of the Dark Ages, of the time when law and order were struggling in the days of the Visigoths with the untamed passions of men and women. The play is simple, the story of a Queen, Galswintha, wife to Chilperic, and of Fredagonde, Chilperic's earlier concubine. It is full of movement and tragic sadness; it preserves the unities and shows something more than common knowledge of character and personality. Leudaste, the murderer, is drawn with great skill. Mr. Boyle has certainly a future in his chosen field of high art.

It is desirable to record, though over-late, the new and revised edition of Dr. Horace Lamb's notable volume on "Statics, including Hydrostatics and the Elements of the Theory of Elasticity."§ The book

* Oxford University Press. 5s. net.

† The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

‡ West Hill, Stepney Road, Scarborough. 1s. 2d. post free.

§ Cambridge: At the University Press. 12s. 6d. net.

represents the substance of lectures delivered during a number of years, and should be acquired by all mathematical students who can use the Calculus. Special prominence is given to geometrical methods, and the book opens with a very useful account of the Theory of Vectors, to use the term introduced by Sir W. R. Hamilton in 1853. Capillarity, the subject of frequent discussion, is specially treated, while the difficult field of internal stresses and elasticity is introduced as offering means of solving problems which on the ordinary principles of Statics are "indeterminate."

* * *

Professor J. J. Coss, of Columbia University, has printed the "Autobiography of John Stuart Mill" in a complete form. This interesting work now appears for the first time without alterations or omissions from the original manuscript in the possession of Columbia University. The "capitalisation and punctuation of his manuscript" is accurately followed. Professor Coss considers that this manuscript was the final draft intended for publication in view of Miss Helen Taylor's statement attached to the "Autobiography of J. S. Mill," written by herself, "To be published without alterations or omissions within one year after my death." This pious work has now been performed.

* * *

Every scholar should add to his library Dr. J. S. Reid's volume, "M. Tulli Ciceronis de Finibus Bonorum et Malorum, Libri I, II."† The first complete edition of Cicero's works was compiled by Lambinus, in 1566. It was in 1839 that the famous Danish Latinist, J. N. Madvig, published his great edition of the *de Finibus*, showing that all the known MSS. came from a late and corrupt original. In Dr. Reid's edition, with its elaborate footnotes grammatical and philosophical, minute learning and broad views are both exhibited. Dr. Reid repeats Diel's charge that Cicero tampered with his Greek originals. The sources on which Cicero drew must have included many now lost. The present work represents its practical finality in these textual problems.

* * *

Miss Edith M. Almedingen's work on "The English Pope (Adrian IV)"‡ has a foreword by the Roman Catholic scholar, the Rev. C. C. Martindale. Writing of the twelfth century and of the career of Nicholas Breakspear (1100?—1158), Father Martindale says: "The sense of Nationality had not altered into its caricature—the passionate, blind nationalisms of our day. Nor had the perception of spiritual unity become its parody, academic internationalism or cynical cosmopolitanism. Because belief in God, and hence in man's brotherhood, ruled in Europe, the beggar boy became the Universal Father, and because of him, men in Europe went the nearer to being one great family." The record of the life of Nicholas shows a very able, godly man in ceaseless action, and Miss Almedingen's knowledge of Norse history helps to make clear Nicholas' work as Papal Legate in Scandinavia. Some local traditions at Langley, his birthplace, should have been noted.

* Columbia University Press. 12s. 6d. net.

† Cambridge: At the University Press. 16s. net.

‡ Heath Cranton, 6, Fleet Street, 10s. 6d. net.