

CONTENTS OF VOL. CXXXVII.

JANUARY, 1930.

Clemenceau. By Sisley Huddleston.	1
Prospects of the Five-Power Naval Conference. By Vice-Admiral Drury-Lowe, C.M.G.	7
Empire Free Trade. By the Right Hon. C. A. McCurdy, K.C.	13
Compromise and the Austrian Constitution. By Dr. Benedikt	19
Church Union in South India. By the Rev. W. Selbie, D.D.	26
The Freedom of the Seas. By Sir Selwyn H. Fremantle, C.S.I., C.I.E.	33
Modern Manchester. By Sir Gerald Hurst, K.C., M.P.	40
The Return of Women to Medicine. By Dr. Jane Walker	46
The Decline of Myth. By Professor B. Ifor Evans	51
Napoleon Bonaparte and Madame de Staël. By D. G. Larg, D.Litt.	58
Migration and Unemployment. By John Roberts	71
New Light on Columbus? By Cecil Jane	80
A Charge of Despotism. By William A. Robson	88
The Old and the New Bank of Poland. By R. Dyboski	94
Foreign Affairs. By George Glasgow	101
Literary Supplement: The Indignant Fairies	117
Reviews of Books	124

FEBRUARY, 1930.

Empire Free Trade? By the Right Hon. Sir Herbert Samuel, G.C.B., G.B.E., M.P.	137
Coal. By the Right Hon. Sir J. Tudor Walters, M.P.	149
The United States, Parity, and Neutrality. By Professor Lindsay Rogers	157
Italian Art at Burlington House. By Professor A. M. Hind, O.B.E., F.S.A.	164
Slave Trading in China. By John H. Harris	174
France's "Little Bit of Ireland." By Ferdinand Tuohy	181
Beauty from China. By Lady Hosie	188
Paradoxes and Peace. By A. Ruth Fry	198
The Splendour of the Church of England. By Professor Percy Dearmer, D.D.	206
The Fourteenth Centenary of Montecassino. By Don Luigi Sturzo	212
The Future of the <i>Mestizo</i> Countries of America. By Dr. Rudolf Broda	218
Birds' Eyes. By E. W. Hendy	225
Jehan the Minstrel. By K. M. Carroll	230
Foreign Affairs. By George Glasgow	237
Literary Supplement:—	
Reviews of Books	253

MARCH, 1930.

The Ultimate Politics of the Conference. By Norman Angell, M.P.	273
President Masaryk. By Dr. R. W. Seton-Watson.	281
The United States of Europe. By Dr. William Martin	289
Democracy and Social Justice. By Professor Ernest Barker, Litt.D., LL.D.	300
The Cartwright Interview of August 1911. By Dr. Sigmund Münz	308
Gladstone as a Christian Statesman. By William Harbutt Dawson	317
The Problem of Personality. By the Rev. Dr. J. Scott Lidgett	327
The Roman Question, Leo XIII and Signor Mussolini. By N. V. Tcharykow	338
History as a Training for Citizenship. By G. P. Gooch, D.Litt., F.B.A.	347
Chesterfield and Johnson. By H. Arthur Baker	353
Sinai: A Visit to St. Katherine's Monastery. By C. A. G. Mackintosh	361
The Sicilian Marionettes. By Isabel Emerson	369
Foreign Affairs. By George Glasgow	373
Literary Supplement:—	
Reviews of Books	389



69561
69561

THE
CONTEMPORARY
REVIEW.

VOLUME CXXXVII.

JANUARY—JUNE, 1930.

LONDON :

THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW COMPANY LIMITED,

19-19a, CURSITOR STREET, E.C.4

1930

Clemenceau himself had, in 1913, opposed the candidature of M. Poincaré on the ground that M. Poincaré might prove to be too "strong" a President. He put himself on the side of an estimable but perhaps colourless politician. "Je vote pour le plus bête," he declared in his biting way; and although the epithet, applied to his candidate, may have been undeserved, it is certain that in this *boutade* he defined good Republican doctrine. Ever since the days of MacMahon, the French have been afraid of a President who might attempt to exercise personal power. There have been a number of admirable Presidents who have possessed real influence, but they have had to proceed tactfully; and it is clear that, in principle, a President of clean-cut views and decisive action would be unwelcome in France. Clemenceau could then hardly complain if his own doctrine was turned against him. Nor, after reflection, did he complain; he had no illusions as to Parliamentary gratitude.

Moreover, there was the religious question, which is never long absent from French politics. On this occasion there was some reaction from the anti-Clericalism which had prevailed. It was believed that Clemenceau would thwart the movement for the appointment of an Ambassador to the Vatican, and a Nuncio to Paris. I understand that Clemenceau, having regard to the bravery of priests on the battlefield, would have endeavoured to find a formula which would not have shocked his convictions too violently; but undoubtedly he was not as amenable as the Catholic emissaries and the Radical converts to reconciliation would have wished.

There is, however, nothing to bewail. No honours could have added to Clemenceau's claim to remembrance—as he recognised when he ordained that his obsequies should be exempt of official honours. A room in the Elysée is not a niche in the Temple of Fame. Clemenceau himself was well aware of this; and his declining days were not unhappy. I was privileged to visit him on a number of occasions in the past ten years; and he talked freely, unreservedly, almost with boyish gusto—as he did to everybody who was admitted into the charmed circle. He rigorously excluded those who did not possess the passport to his confidence; but those whom he did receive he trusted implicitly. To them he said whatever came into his head. He growled and he grumbled; he was mordant to an incredible degree. His criticisms of his contemporaries were devastating. With an epigram he flung them into the lowest limbo. His *boutades* were final and irresistibly funny. The conditions in which one heard them precluded their publication; and yet I cannot help regretting that a collection of his witty and illuminating remarks was not made. But complete though

his condemnation of certain persons was, he was rarely bitter. The human scene furnished him with a comedy. He gloated over it, but it was with amusement. "What fools we mortals be!" was his attitude towards others, and indeed towards himself. There was, somehow, a strange tolerance, a curious good humour, even in his most scathing observations. And, of course, he was swept by tremendous enthusiasms, though generally they were enthusiasms for abstract things. I do not suppose he cared greatly, for instance, about the fate of Dreyfus; but he cared supremely about the fate of Justice. I hardly think he cared overmuch about his countrymen; but he cared overwhelmingly about France.

"The last of the great sceptics," I called him somewhere; but he was a sceptic who was capable of being a zealot. He has been described as a cynic; but there was no cynicism in his nature; he was too warm-blooded for that. Scepticism and cynicism are, indeed, unrelated, and are perhaps opposites. Clemenceau's intellect taught him to repudiate human vanities; but his emotions gave him an uncommon sympathy with human vanities. Death for him was not a terrifying thing; it was the inevitable end of life to be faced with cheerful resignation; yet he shed tears over his beloved "poilus," as they marched, electrified by his words, into the fiery furnace. He was robustly scornful of ideological pacifism, believing conflict to be the common law; yet there was a wistfulness in his contemplation of the pathetic dreams of mankind such as can only be found in an *esprit fort*.

But why should I seek to explain Clemenceau? He has explained himself better than any man of our time in a ponderous work published some years ago in France, and now, I believe, available in English—*Au Soir de la Pensée*. He explained himself too in a shorter work, ostensibly devoted to Demosthenes, but in reality an apologia of Clemenceau. It is impossible to read his Demosthenes without being deeply moved by certain pages. "He was a man," he says of Demosthenes, "in the full sense of the word. That is enough. Rightly considered, it is much." And amid the vicissitudes of his life, with his abiding consciousness of the enigma and tragedy of things, feeling the turpitudes of the base struggle, he strove valiantly to be a man—a man who would fulfil the duty of inner impulse, who would experience the joy of sacrifice without reward, who would dare to act since action in the development of the ideal is the only virtue—a man in the full sense of the word, a man to be which is much.

That is what Clemenceau was—a man. Nobody can be more. It takes genius to be a man; and few of us, alas! have genius. You can argue as you please about the shady passages of Clemenceau's life; you can argue about his policy, and about his opinions.

INDEX.

APRIL, 1930.

Problems and Parties. By Geoffrey Mander, M.P.	409
Ancient and Modern in China and Japan. By Professor Arnold J. Toynbee	415
Russia: The Fact and Technique of Religious Persecution. By the Rev. J. H. Rushbrooke, D.D.	427
The Government of Spain. By W. Horsfall Carter	435
Maintenance Allowances and the School-Leaving Age. By Mrs. E. D. Simon	445
Social Thinkers in Nineteenth-Century England. By John A. Hobson	453
The Armenians—Yesterday and To-day. By H. Charles Woods	462
The Reunion of the Christian Churches: Hopes and Hindrances. By the Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, D.D.	469
President Hoover's Shipway. By R. C. Hawkin	480
Italy: Year Seven. By A Young Italian	485
Henry, Prince of Wales: "A Scarce Blown Rose." By M. Bradford Whiting	492
Charlotte Mew. By Lorna Keeling Collard	501
Foreign Affairs. By George Glasgow	509
Literary Supplement:—	
Reviews of Books	525

MAY, 1930.

The Naval Conference and After. By Vice-Admiral Drury-Lowe, C.M.G.	545
First Thoughts on the New Housing Bill. By E. D. Simon, M.P.	555
British Industry and the Spirit of Defeat. By Sir Leo Chiozza Money	562
Greece at Her Centenary. By Dr. William Miller	573
The Palestine Report. By H. Charles Woods	581
Why Bishops? By The Rev. Canon Lacey	588
England and the Coming Arab Federation. By Sirdar Ikbal Ali Shah	596
Paul Heyse, 1830-1914. By M. Joubert, Ph.D.	602
Religious Teaching in the Provided Schools. By the Rev. A. W. Harrison	609
The African Sleeping-Sickness. By Africanus	615
The Activity School in Austria. By Paula Arnold	623
France and North Africa. By Percy Cross Standing	629
Light Rays in Industry. By Leonard V. Dodds	638
Foreign Affairs. By George Glasgow	645
Literary Supplement:—	
Reviews of Books	661

JUNE, 1930.

Mr. Philip Snowden's Second Budget. By Francis W. Hirst	681
President Hoover's Critical Year. By S. K. Ratcliffe	691
Gandhi and Tolstoy. By Aylmer Maude	701
Dr. Schober: Austrian Police President and Diplomat. By William Leon Smyser	706
The Co-operative Movement and Free Trade. By Brougham Villiers	713
A Catholic View of Toleration. By Algernon Cecil	720
Ireland in 1930. By Hugh A. Law	731
Evangelical Catholicity. By the Rev. Dr. J. Scott Lidgett	737
The Centenary of T. E. Brown. By Professor F. S. Boas, LL.D.	745
The Royal Commission on Labour in India. By Dr. Lanka Sundaram	753
French Journalism. By Philip Carr	760
The Companhia de Moçambique. By Captain Austin King	765
Curiosity in Wild Animals. By G. B. Gooch	772
Foreign Affairs. By George Glasgow	777
Literary Supplement:—	
Reviews of Books	793

CLEMENCEAU.

NOT long ago, at a table of French deputies, I committed a *faux-pas*. My companions were Radicals and Socialists who had shown a tendency to see things as they are. We were discussing the war and its consequences, and I happened to remark: "In 1917 it was touch and go; Germany might have broken through and won." There was an unpleasant silence, and I was again reminded that, despite their logic and clear-sightedness, the French blink at realities when patriotism is involved. I think it was partly the consciousness that without Georges Clemenceau the Allies would have been defeated, which made the veteran statesman so unpopular in political circles. For, if he was popular in the country, if the common people worshipped him, he was positively disliked by the bulk of Parliamentarians. His competence in the great crisis showed up the incompetence of others. His faith, when everything was collapsing, stood out against the lack of faith of the men of Bordeaux. His energy, which swept away the *défaitistes*, was dreaded and hated. When he had led France to victory the French politicians denied him the post of President of the Republic which he coveted, and elected, as the successor to M. Poincaré, poor M. Deschanel, who was soon afterwards to show unmistakable signs of mental alienation.

This rejection of the unquestionable saviour of the country is, in my opinion, a sad blot on the political history of the Third Republic. Clemenceau had many faults; he had become impossible as Prime Minister; it would indeed have been better had he left office when the war was over; nobody, within the narrow limits of his power, opposed the policies of Clemenceau in 1919 more earnestly than the present writer; yet for his great services to France it was fitting that Clemenceau should have been carried by acclaim to the ornamental office of President. It was his ambition to be so carried. Soon after the vote which put Clemenceau in a minority, he confessed to me his disappointment. He fully realised that he had offended many members of the Chamber and Senate. He was aware, too, that physical idiosyncrasies, if not disabilities, would have prevented him from remaining at the Elysée. His habits of working in the night, of eating and sleeping at queer hours, would have forbidden his fulfilment of the essentially social functions of President. But, he told me, he would have retired quickly into private life. It was not seven years of office that he wanted; it was the recognition of his contribution to France's glory.

There were, of course, many reasons for his overthrow. He had become querulous and dictatorial. It will be remembered that

Personally, I confess that much of his policy, and many of his opinions, seem to me not only debatable but detestable. Yet I affirm that when I try to compile a list of the so-called great men I have met—and circumstances have brought me into contact with an unusual number of the so-called great men of our time—there is only one name that shines out unmistakably, that of Clemenceau. "He was a man; take him for all in all, we shall not look upon his like again." The noble oft-quoted tribute was never so properly applied as to Clemenceau. I shall account it the supreme privilege of my life that I met and talked with him.

The facts of his career are well enough known. When he passed on—on November 24th—the newspapers of every country in the world were filled with long "obituary notices," and to my knowledge many books are now being prepared, or are ready for publication. He was himself engaged, in the last months of his life, in writing the story of his relations with Foch. I think this book, doubtless of exceptional interest, was, from Clemenceau's own point of view, a mistake. For ten years he had steadily refused to write about the war and the peace-making. That was a job for others to perform. His acts were there to be judged as the world thought fit. It was not for him to condescend to recount, in an interested and partial manner, the incidents which made or marred those great days. It was not for him to belittle himself by excuses or polemics. Let those who disapprove, disapprove; let those who approve, approve; let those who choose to lie, lie; let those who are concerned in upholding their own little reputations, uphold them; let the attackers attack and the defamers defame. He would be silent; for silence alone, when one has wrought greatly, is dignified. He would not add his quota to the tittle-tattle and scandal, to the recriminations and self-glorifications—a noisome brood that swarmed over the battlefields. He would, indeed, write—in the evening of his thoughts—his philosophy of life, undisturbed, detached, his testament to his fellow-creatures. That was different. That was the essence of himself, and not mere boastings and blatancies on the trivialities of why he took this step and how he came to do that. Wrapping himself in his toga, he went to his little cottage in Vendée, and there, amid the roses blooming on land reclaimed from the sea, he stood face to face with the mighty ocean and with the yet mightier eternity. His instincts were profoundly right. Here was the fitting gesture, the appropriate close to his career. Silence was his crown. I like to think of him as going down to his grave with his critics unanswered and the details of his doings unrelated. . . . Perhaps that was too good; nothing is ever perfect.

So this strong-willed man, his task finished, reaching a quiet

haven where he could forget the storm and stress through which he had sailed with indomitable courage, gladdened by the knowledge that his life had been a single whole, that the wheel which turned with the defeat of France had come full circle with the victory of France, sat silent by the sea amid the roses. He who did not believe in immortality was already immortal. He had passed beyond the fret and flurry. Nothing could harm him more. Thus it seemed; but evil is always lurking, and it reached him even on his Olympian heights. It appears that Marshal Foch who, too, refused to write his memoirs, had held conversations with the distinguished French journalist Raymond Recouly, and had given permission for their publication after his death. There were in these conversations piercing criticisms of Clemenceau. Clemenceau was stung; his old pugnacity revived; what the curiosity of the world and the financial inducements of publishers had been unable to effect, what the criticisms of lesser men had been unable to effect, was effected by the posthumous criticisms of Foch. Clemenceau began to write feverishly, hastily, aware that he was running a race with death. For, just as he had foreseen with strange clairvoyance when the war began that he, and he alone, would lead the French to victory, and never doubted, despite the fluctuations of the fighting and of politics, that his time would come, so with equally strange clairvoyance (attested in authentic utterances) he foresaw that his book would be ended as his life ended.

There is a sense in which the world will be a gainer by this volume on the grandeurs and miseries of victory; but whatever is revealed or not revealed (and I know nothing of the contents of the volume) there is for me something unspeakably sad in this human, far too human, spectacle of shade answering shade. These posthumous polemics had better not have been. Foch is dead; Clemenceau is dead; but they who had striven together, who had never faltered, who had fought the demons of dejection and despair, who had stood shoulder to shoulder, conquering because they stood shoulder to shoulder, and who had together enjoyed the apotheosis of victory, now from their tombs wrangle over this and that. Yet, perhaps, tragic as this ultimate quarrel appears to me, it is in the right note. Clemenceau himself, had he been able to look back on the incident, would have appreciated the irony of it. It is of a piece with his views of life—an amusing blend of the big and the little, of *splendeurs et misères*.

Of his vision of humanity, which accounted for the deplorable Treaty of Versailles more clearly than any recital of the facts can account, I can only say that I believe him to be unduly pessimistic. "Is war," he asks, "really the natural condition of all living

creatures? The controlling law of the universe's struggle for existence so decrees. Everything conflicts. Every element reacts against every other. "To be sure, fighting can continue only in a rhythm of alternate intensity and relaxation." And he goes on to assert that armed peace is only another form of war. The institution of a Peace-Parliament at Geneva no whit changes the unavowed cupidities, the combinations of opposed interests, or the hypocritical discussions with which we seek to disguise them. If we search the ages of history we shall find only successive periods of peace and of war, sometimes hard to distinguish, and the preaching of human charity and the glorification of barbarity often intermingle. The exhaustion of war imposes peace; the ineffectiveness of peace foment war.

How could Clemenceau, with these views, have framed a better document than the Treaty of Versailles! It is based on the Clemenceau beliefs. Yet even in the Treaty of Versailles is the Covenant of the League of Nations. We have established a World Court. We have signed the Kellogg Pact. There has come a moment in the consciousness of man when war is seen to be a horrible and a futile thing. A revolution in thought is taking place. Clemenceau belonged to the past; but there are the present and the future. War, which was regarded as a normal and a legal method of settling disputes—or of failing to settle them—is now regarded as an abnormal and illegal method. That may not do away with wars, but it makes of war a crime against humanity. Here is a new and growing thought, and thoughts are vital forces. I think Clemenceau was altogether wrong; he had faith in France but he had no faith in Mankind. We, I trust, have such faith; but, right or wrong, Clemenceau was a man—and that is much.

SISLEY HUDDLESTON.

PROSPECTS OF THE FIVE POWER NAVAL CONFERENCE.

THE holding of the World Disarmament Conference awaits the completion by the League of Nations "Preparatory Commission" of the Draft Disarmament Convention, and the Commission at present stands adjourned pending agreement on the reduction of naval armaments by the chief naval Powers. This is the purpose of the forthcoming Five Power Naval Conference, and it is well to note that on this occasion the Conference is to be primarily of statesmen, not of naval experts. This is to be welcomed for the sake of progress, for examination of the minutes of the meetings of the Preparatory Commission since its formation shows the difficulty experienced by naval and military experts in agreeing upon anything which would effect a material and all-round reduction of armaments. What seems fair and acceptable to one or more parties is rejected by others, with the result that unanimity is obtainable only on matters of minor importance. In M. Briand's words at the Tenth Assembly, "Each finds great arguments for his own security, but is much more broadminded about the security of others!" The results obtained at the last session of the Commission, for instance, were extremely meagre, the only proposal that would have been really effective, viz. that there should be an appreciable all-round reduction on proportional principles, being rejected, presumably because it came from the Soviet delegation; although a few days later a statement by Mr. Gibson on behalf of the United States, including practically the same principles, was welcomed by all. Yet it is obviously desirable that Russia should be included in whatever agreement is finally reached.

The difficulty with the experts is that security to them seems impossible unless superiority of some sort is maintained for their own forces. They would appear to have little faith in the League or in agreements for the settlement of disputes by pacific means. The present article expresses the point of view of a naval officer who believes in the League of Nations and believes also that the problem of a general and appreciable reduction of armaments, to which all States members of the League are definitely pledged, can be solved only if considered in relation to the Covenant and the Paris Peace Pact. The basis of any agreement for further naval reductions must be the acceptance by all parties of the Peace Pact as a definite and binding obligation: as a declaration that the only war admissible in future is one of international co-operation against the party which breaks that solemn pledge by proceeding to hostilities after having refused pacific settlement of its dispute. So-called "private war" (war as an instrument of national policy) has been proclaimed

to be illegitimate, and the nation which resorts to it "will be branded," in the words of General Smuts, "as a public danger and nuisance by the general consensus of opinion." References and appeals to the past avail us little. Modern war has become a conflict of nations, not of professional armies and navies only, a fact which must be taken into consideration especially as regards war at sea. When the whole nation was mobilised for war—as it would be in the future—there would be no "private property" at sea: all would be contraband. That is what we finally came to in the last war. By "Black List, Embargo, Rationing, and Licence" the enemy's sea-borne trade and supplies were stopped, and the neutrals suffered in the process.

"Embargo," according to the War Cabinet report of 1918, was "a measure applied to bring political pressure upon neutral countries in order to compel them to cease exporting certain products, and to grant loans to the Allies." Are neutrals likely to submit to this in future supposing two nations to be engaged in private war? "I don't believe," wrote Colonel House, "that the United States and others would willingly submit again to Great Britain's complete domination of the seas any more than to Germany's domination on land. The sooner this is recognised the better." History is a continuous process of adaptation to changing conditions. If in future we are to aim at a domination that would ensure the security of our trade and the capture of the enemy's, regardless of neutrals, what force should we require? At one time during the last war over fifty cruisers were employed after one enemy cruiser. Moreover, our geographical position *vis-à-vis* the enemy was exceptionally favourable, and though in future, under the convoy system, enemy raiders would have the range of their operations considerably restricted, we should still require a large number of cruisers for the convoys, in addition to those required for operations against the enemy's trade. It is obvious we have not sufficient for all purposes, and to try to build up to the full number required would inevitably result in a fresh naval competition which none could afford. That our Empire communications and food supplies necessitate a bigger navy than that of any continental power (or Japan) is evident, and is admitted I think by them. But that we should have a strength sufficient for complete domination is another matter, and the fact that we have now accepted parity with the biggest neutral settles it. America does not require parity, or anything like it, to protect her shores: she demands it in order that her sea-borne commerce, which is world-wide and increasing, shall not be interfered with again in a war in which she is neutral. She realises what this interference means under modern conditions, and if our positions were reversed we should do the same.

Would Freedom of the Seas solve the difficulty? Frankly "No"

if private war were still to be considered legitimate; for I do not believe that under such circumstances (i.e. two nations engaged in private war) an agreement for freedom of the seas, or for freedom of foodstuffs only, would be adhered to. Our commerce and merchant shipping would be too tempting a bait. If, on the other hand, the agreement were kept, and all sea-borne goods were free, the war might continue interminably so far as the navies were concerned, and sea power would be deprived of one of its chief weapons. But the reinforcement of the Covenant by the Peace Pact has altered the whole situation, and this is a fact which the Conference will have continually to bear in mind. In Mr. Kellogg's words, "The world has now given a solemn declaration outlawing war, making it a crime against God and man"; and Mr. Hoover and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, in their joint statement, have declared our ratification of the Peace Pact to be, not merely a declaration, but a positive obligation. Consequently, as the only war possible in the future is one of international co-operation against the breaker of the Pact, there should, in such a case, be no neutrals to trade with the "aggressor," and Freedom of the Seas would then be, as defined in President Wilson's second point, viz. absolute freedom, except in so far as the seas may be closed, in whole or in part, by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

This being accepted, three further steps should be taken to implement the Peace Pact:

1. We must be sure that the aggressor will be isolated. The proscription of the outlaw must be made a reality, and he must forfeit all rights of commercial intercourse while he is engaged in private war. "The nation which recants this pledge, and proceeds to defy the League, will be a traitor and a law-breaker to a loyally established order, and will be dealt with on that basis."* The world has surely the right to expect that no State signatory of the Peace Pact would protect any of its nationals who gave aid and comfort to an aggressor nation, and this view is confirmed by the statement of a prominent American. "It is quite inconceivable that this country would stand idly by in case of a grave breach of a multilateral treaty to which it is a party."†

2. There must be agreement as to the aggressor. To lay down an exact definition of aggression is no doubt impossible; but the procedure recently suggested in America by Judge Hughes (already provided for in the Four Power Pacific Treaty), of a conference of the Powers interested, should enable a decision to be taken, it being understood that to proceed to hostilities, following a refusal to submit to pacific settlement, at any rate implies aggression. Some such conference is also suggested in the following

* General Smuts' Rhodes Lecture, 1929.

† Senator Borah, March 25th, 1928.

sentence in President Hoover's recent Armistice Day address: "Though outside the League of Nations, America must still aid in the further development of methods such as joint inquiry by the parties, assisted by friendly nations, in order that action may be stayed and the aggressor subjected to the searchlight of public opinion."

3. We must push on with a general reduction of armaments, realising that the more armaments are reduced *all round*, the less there will be to fear from any individual State.

The principle having been accepted that the only war in the future will be international co-operation against the aggressor, it should not be difficult for the Five Power Conference to reach agreement on an appreciable all-round reduction of naval armaments, provided also that the following points (already stated by Mr. Gibson at the Preparatory Commission) be accepted:

(a) That any approach to the disarmament problem on purely technical grounds is bound to be inconclusive.

(b) That naval needs are purely relative, i.e. that what we require for our own defence, depends chiefly upon the size of the navies maintained by others.

(c) That even if the danger of war is admitted, it could be guarded against just as well by the maintenance of relative strength at low levels as at higher levels.

Bearing the above in mind, it should be possible for the Conference to dispose of the four main outstanding questions which the Preparatory Commission failed to settle:

1. *The total tonnage allowed each Power.*—Is this to be a "global tonnage" as proposed by France and Italy, or "tonnage by classes" as proposed by Great Britain and America? The Preparatory Commission was divided, but the French subsequently proposed a compromise that might well be accepted, viz. that, within an agreed global tonnage, there should be a division into tonnage by classes, with power to change tonnage from one class to another after giving a year's notice to the League.

America has already intimated her willingness to accept this as a basis of discussion, and the Admiralty offer, referred to by Sir Austen Chamberlain in his conversations with M. Briand on March 9th, 1928, approached very near to it.

2. *Reduction in size of future Capital Ships.*—There appears to be some confusion in the public mind as to the terms Capital Ship and Battleship. A Capital Ship is the strongest naval unit afloat and has for some time past been called the Battleship. If the strongest fighting ship afloat happened to be a Launch armed with a three-pounder gun, that Launch would be the Capital Ship, and whether she was called a Battleship or a Launch would make no difference. The function of the fighting ship is to control the

lines of sea communications, and the main requirement for the purpose is that she should be big enough to keep the seas, and have sufficient speed and armament to overhaul and capture the ships which carry commerce. Ten thousand tons is ample for this purpose, and the reason for having ships of much larger tonnage is purely a relative matter, viz. because other nations have them. It is the inevitable result of competition and the desire always to build up to the maximum permissible. The cost of a 35,000-ton ship is roughly about £7,000,000 and its annual upkeep about £432,000. To accept this reduction from 35,000 tons say to 10,000 tons would, therefore, do more than anything else to reduce the very heavy financial burden of naval armaments without in any way affecting security. And, as noted below (see 3), it would probably greatly facilitate agreement as to the reduction or abolition of the submarine.

To argue that these big battleships are necessary as a covering force for the cruisers on the trade routes is to beg the question. Provided the reduced size is generally accepted, ships of 10,000 tons would do just as well, and would not require the same number of smaller cruisers (five to every three battleships) to accompany them. The reduction to 10,000 tons would therefore have the further advantage of releasing a number of smaller cruisers to reinforce those operating on the trade routes.

3. *Reduction or Abolition of the Submarine.*—The main argument for the abolition of the submarine appears to be its possible illegitimate use against non-fighting ships as in the last war; its use against fighting ships being, of course, perfectly legitimate. Opinion on the subject is divided, the Powers in favour of its abolition being those which are strongest in Capital Ships and with the biggest mercantile marine to protect, i.e. Great Britain and the United States. If the reason for retaining the submarine is that it is a relatively cheap and effective defence against the big and costly Capital Ship, then a drastic reduction in size of the latter, as proposed above, should go far to meet that argument. If one of its supporters—France, for instance—considers the submarine is required to protect the transport of troops from one Continent to another, it can at least be pointed out that the security so claimed may be more than outweighed by the danger to the transports of attack by the enemy's submarines. Lastly, if the retention of the submarine in any strength is persisted in (whatever may be the purpose its advocates may have in view), then other Powers must of necessity greatly increase the number of their anti-submarine vessels—especially destroyers—and the main object of the Conference will be defeated. There seems, therefore, a good case for abolition or very drastic reduction.

4. *Supervision.*—Although, up to date, we have opposed, at the

Preparatory Commission, the French proposal for a Permanent Disarmament Commission to supervise the fulfilment of the disarmament agreements, at the Tenth Assembly Lord Cecil, on behalf of the Government, suggested the recognition of a competent international authority to watch and report upon the execution of the Treaty. What is wanted is an impartial commission, responsible for centralising all information supplied by States to the League, and available to conduct an inquiry, should one party become suspicious of the good faith of another. This does not imply continuous supervision or anything like it, and it should not be difficult to reach agreement on this point.

Finally, there is the important question of the relative naval strengths to be fixed for each Power. Here the fact that in accepting parity with the United States we have definitely ruled out the possibility of war between our two countries greatly facilitates the problem; for the basis for calculation, the starting-point, as Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond* has suggested, can now be taken as the strength of the comparatively smaller navies, i.e. the naval forces which the big military Powers consider to be the minimum required for defensive purposes.

If the Peace Pact is accepted as a definite obligation it may well be asked: "Who is the enemy?" For the measurement of the respective strengths of *all* armed forces (land and air as well as sea) should then depend on a consideration of those strengths not as pitted against each other, but as instruments for co-operation in the maintenance of world peace and order.

One further factor must be mentioned as affecting the success or failure of the forthcoming conference, namely the support of public opinion. At the last Assembly of the League of Nations Sir George Forster, a member of the Canadian delegation, made a statement before the Third Committee which was very generally applauded: "One hundred and fifty million people in the New World," he said, "are resolutely determined that never again shall Governments or Dictators use the people as pawns for the settlement of international disputes by force." I believe that remark would be echoed by peoples of the Old World as well, for it has become increasingly evident that civilisation and modern war cannot exist side by side. War is no longer legalised by international law. The world has given a solemn declaration making private war a crime, and it now rests with the Governments of the world to act up to the implications of this declaration by agreeing to a drastic all-round reduction of armaments. Success this time depends on the statesmen, not on the experts, and the statesmen, if they are to succeed, need the support of public opinion.

S. R. DRURY-LOWE.

* Article in *The Times*, November, 1929.

EMPIRE FREE TRADE.

THE aim which Richard Cobden and his Free Trade friends set before themselves was to convert the world to the principles of Free Trade, believing that by the removal of every barrier and hindrance to the free interchange of commodities prosperity in every country would be increased, friendships strengthened, and a grave source of misunderstandings and difference removed. They regarded Free Trade not only as a source of wealth, but as a powerful instrument of brotherhood and goodwill. Even the Protectionists, in this country at least, have conceded the merits of Cobden's great ideal.

The Empire Crusade aims at an ideal not less generous, though less ambitious: the removal of every barrier to free commercial intercourse between the peoples of the British Empire. Is there anyone who doubts that complete Free Trade within the confines of the British Empire, if it could be attained, would not only be of material importance, but of moral and spiritual advantage to the British peoples? If a protectionist world persists in regarding commerce as war, customs as fortresses, and tariffs as armaments would it not be a good and pleasant thing to have peace and disarmament at least among ourselves in the British Commonwealth of Nations?

But if Cobden was a great idealist, he was also a practical man. Read John Morley's account of the negotiations between Cobden and Louis Napoleon for the reduction of the tariff barriers between France and England. Before his visit to France in 1859 he paid a visit to Hawarden where he opened his mind to Gladstone. They were both thoroughly alive to the objections from the orthodox Free Trade standpoint of such a treaty as it was proposed to negotiate. If economic rules were never under any circumstances to be contravened, we ought not to bargain with France, but to act upon Free Trade principles and remove duties for France in the hope that France would do likewise. "But," says Lord Morley, another great Free Trader, in his *Life of Cobden*, "they felt that the occasion was one which could not be judged in this simple way. *An economic principle, by itself, as all sensible men have now learnt, can never be decisive of anything in the mixed and complex sphere of practice.*"

Richard Cobden believed that half a loaf is much better than no bread, and, acting in that belief, negotiated a commercial treaty with France of considerable importance to British traders. I think he would have been amazed at the apathy and despondency with which the present-day Cobdenite watches the area of effective Free Trade for Great Britain shrinking decade by decade, and year by

year, not only in foreign markets but in the markets of the Empire.^c

It is as a convinced and unrepentant Free Trader that I ask leave to state the case for the Empire Free Trade Crusade. I believe in Free Trade as a sound economic policy to be secured as far as possible and at any reasonable cost. "With a great sum," said Festus, "obtained I this freedom." "But I," said the Apostle, "was born free." Where I join issue with some of my old Free Trade colleagues is on this point alone. To secure and extend such freedom of trade as we already possess, to safeguard our existing markets from further disastrous curtailment, we ought to be prepared to pay a price. Would the policy of Empire Free Trade mean salvation for British trade and prosperity for every part of the Empire? Would it be worth our while to modify our present fiscal system in order to secure it? Those are the questions I propose to consider, and, before doing so, I wish to deal with one fundamental fallacy with which Free Traders and Protectionists appear to be equally afflicted: The illusion that upon the fiscal system of a country its commercial prosperity depends. A moment of reflection will show them that the fiscal system of any country is only one of many factors, and very far from being the most important of the factors which make for failure or success.

The commerce of a nation is merely the aggregate of the activities of its individual traders. It is by examining the factors which make for failure or success in the case of the individual that we arrive at a just perspective of the factors which govern the prosperity of nations, the rise and fall of commercial empires. In thousands of councils of commerce, boards of directors of public companies, conferences between partners and heads of departments up and down the country, on every day of every week of the year, decisions are being taken upon which, to an overwhelming degree, the prosperity of their businesses depends. Decisions of policy, schemes for expansion or development, decisions involving vast expenditure, decisions requiring experience, wisdom, and capacity. Day by day their executive officers are engaged, efficiently or inefficiently, in carrying those decisions into effect. If we examined, at the end of any year, the results of these complex operations, we should find at one end of the scale businesses returning to their proprietors profits in excess of the whole of the capital involved, businesses returning large dividends of 20, 30, or 50 per cent., and at the other end of the scale businesses returning the barest margin of interest on the capital, and undertakings where millions of capital have been sunk in the gulf of irresolution, inefficiency, and incompetence. All of them have been operating under the same fiscal system subject to the same rating system, the same system of taxation, and the same climate.

No business man can believe that in any country of the world the fiscal system is comparable in importance to its financial resources, the efficiency of its transport, the adequacy of its raw material, the condition of its plant, the experience, organising ability, enterprise, initiative, and confidence of its manufacturers and traders. Look where you will, in any country you like, you find the same phenomena under whatever fiscal system the industry of the country is conducted: vast profits, profits beyond the dreams of avarice secured by the resolute and efficient, and bankruptcy and failure awaiting others. Does any person suppose that Henry Ford would not have made a fortune in Free Trade England or the Coats, the Wills, the Courtaulds in the United States? The experience of the Old World has sufficiently demonstrated that neither Free Trade nor Protection afford in themselves a cure-all for industrial depression. The experience of the New World has abundantly demonstrated that protective tariffs need be no obstacle to the steady growth of industrial prosperity, if other factors are favourable.

The policy of Empire Free Trade is primarily a policy of prosperity, a policy of co-operation between all the peoples who make up the family of British Nations in the pursuit of prosperity for all. If it demands modification of fiscal policy, it is not from any doctrinaire adherence to any economic doctrine, but only because full co-operation is impossible between the countries which make up the British Empire without some modification on one side or the other or both of the conflicting fiscal systems which are making co-operation every day more difficult. The aim of the Empire Free Trade crusade may be summed up in one sentence: We seek to secure for every part of the British Empire opportunities of better trade, better wages, and a higher standard of living, equal to those already enjoyed by the United States of America. In the last fifty years, the United States of America has grown very rich, the increase of its national wealth has been at a rate far exceeding the growth of its population. In the last thirty or forty years the number of wage-earners in the United States has been doubled, but the wages paid have been increased sixfold. In other words, the wages per worker have been trebled, and to-day the average wage of a worker in America is between two and three times the corresponding wage in this country. This is a hard fact and it is a thousand pities that we should ever forget it. In that period, America has ceased to be a mainly agricultural community, it has become the greatest manufacturing country in the world, until to-day it probably produces more manufactured goods than all the other countries of the world put together. The population of the United States is about 6½ per cent. of the population of the world. They are producing about 50 per cent. of the world's manufactures.

And the rate of progress never stops. Watch the growth of the manufactures of the United States at periods of twenty years :

In 1869, goods to the value of over 3 million dollars.

In 1889, goods to the value of over 9 million dollars.

In 1909, goods to the value of over 20 million dollars.

In 1929, goods to the value of over 60 million dollars.

How is it done? It is a question of supreme importance to Great Britain, once the workshop of the world and now contemplating ruefully idle looms, closed coal pits, and a million men and women unemployed. Why are we relatively losing ground year by year? What are the causes? Of two things one, as the French say, either we are handicapped by material disadvantages or we fail to handle rightly the raw materials of prosperity within our grasp.

A brief survey of the economic resources of the two great branches of the English-speaking peoples will help us to answer that question. The area of the United States is roughly three million square miles, the area of the countries which make up the British Empire is fourteen million square miles. The population of the United States is one hundred and twenty millions, the population of the British Empire is four hundred and fifty millions. In natural resources developed and undeveloped, the British Empire is far richer than the United States of America. In actual production the British Empire furnishes to-day 71 per cent. of the world's supplies of gold, 43 per cent. of its tin, 88 per cent. of its nickel, 58 per cent. of its rubber, 99 per cent. of its jute, 62 per cent. of its palm products, and 44 per cent. of its wool. But the great difference between the British Empire and the United States is the stage of development which has at present been reached. Forty-eight per cent. of the land of the United States is under cultivation as against 10 per cent. of the area of our Empire. In the great Dominions, the acreage under cultivation varies from 3 per cent. in New Zealand and South Africa to 1 per cent. in Australia. The British Empire is a vast estate, teeming with unexplored resources and, alas, with unutilised man power.

Most of the people I meet, even in the best informed circles, seem a little ignorant about the state of affairs in the United States, a little surprised to learn that wages there are two and three times the wages in this country. And if you discuss the question with anyone to whom the facts are familiar, he will probably vouchsafe a general and comprehensive excuse about no comparison being possible between Great Britain and the United States, where natural resources are so much greater, where spaces are so much larger, mountains so much higher and lakes so much deeper, and other geographical details of that kind. This idea will not bear a moment's investigation. If it were true it would be no excuse

for the British Empire, though it might furnish an excuse for the Old Country. The Empire does not lack high mountains or deep lakes or extent of area or abundance of natural resources. In all these respects it is far richer than the United States.

But as a matter of fact it can be demonstrated as simply as a proposition of Euclid that higher wages, rapid growth of wealth and the consequent prosperity of the United States are in the main due to one cause of a very different category. The official statistics of Great Britain and the United States as found in the census of production for each country show that, give a certain amount of raw material and apply to it an equivalent amount of human labour, the result in the United States is trebled.* This is a hard saying, but some years' study of the question has satisfied me beyond a peradventure, as the late President Wilson would say, that it has to be accepted. Once we grasp these facts, for example, in the boot and shoe trade where both countries use mainly the same machinery supplied by the United Shoe Machinery Company of Massachusetts, operated by the same kind of power, the net result of labour applied to raw material is substantially different, the output per worker per week for the United States, in the last figures available, is £3 10s., while the United Kingdom is £1 7s. 4d. It follows that neither fiscal systems nor area nor protected markets can of themselves account for this great discrepancy in the productivity of labour. I want to make this point absolutely clear because so much follows from it.

America's superiority in the creation of wealth in the form of manufactured goods, demonstrated by the official census of production, has little to do with the cost of raw materials, facilities of transport, or protection of markets. The census starts after the raw material has been delivered to the factory and deals with nothing but the value added to that raw material by the labour of man. The United States worker enjoys three times the wages of the British worker because he is producing three times the wealth. If it were not produced, it would not be there for him to enjoy. Surprising as it may appear to the British worker, it is a fact that the whole of the American continent is firmly wedded to the belief that as production rises wages increase and profits increase with wages. The American lives in an atmosphere of unconquerable optimism and feels himself a citizen of the greatest country in the world. He believes that nothing can stop the march of progress. And he is right and all the facts and figures of the last fifty years show him to be right.

On this side of the Atlantic we are failing not from lack of

* More information on this subject can be obtained from *America's Secret*, by Ellis Barker, published by John Murray, Chapter 7.

resources nor from lack of experience or ability or organising power; no country in the world has contributed so much to the history of industrial invention and industrial progress. We are failing to hold our place in the world's markets from lack of faith and lack of vision, and from a deadening and depressing economic outlook.

The Prime Minister, speaking the other day, said: "What ultimately determines international relations is what people feel and what they think."

It is what people think more than anything else that makes for industrial progress or decline. We must make the British people realise, as they have never yet done, how great are the opportunities which Providence has placed in our hands, how immense is the task of colonisation and development which the Empire affords and how sure are the rewards of industry if we only have faith in ourselves.

It is because we lack faith that one million unemployed are unmoved by the thought of rich openings for brains and energy to be found, not merely in the British Dominions, but in every corner of our dependent Empire.

No medicine could be more salutary for our present despondencies than a new movement of active co-operation between all the peoples of the Empire actively determined to develop our common heritage more efficiently, more rapidly and more thoroughly than we have ever yet thought of doing. To obtain that co-operation in full measure, the modification of our fiscal system is essential.

Would it not pay us to submit to some further restrictions on our freedom of trade with countries where trade becomes more and more difficult for us if by so doing we could vastly extend the markets which are still open to us? Would it not mean, on balance, a far greater freedom of trade than is possible for us in any other way?

The policy of the Empire Crusade is a policy of faith, hope, and work. The foundation stone of that policy is the rock bottom fact that the British Empire contains within its boundaries every material factor necessary for the full and abounding prosperity of its peoples. Neither in the quality of our manhood and our womanhood, nor in our resourcefulness, our resolution, or our organising ability do we lack any element necessary to compete successfully with any other country. The prime need of British trade at the present moment is to secure larger markets for our products and full-time work for our unemployed. It can be done. Difficulties there will be, but they will not daunt us. We believe that we are starting a movement of closer co-operation, of more practical goodwill among the Commonwealth of British peoples which nothing can permanently defeat.

CHARLES A. MCCURDY.

COMPROMISE AND THE AUSTRIAN CONSTITUTION.

I FEEL greatly obliged to THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW for having invited me to say a few words on the present situation in Austria. No other public appears to me so likely to have a full comprehension of the situation in Austria as the British public; for in the history of no other nation have there been so many moments of terrible danger, and no other nation has shown more courage in approaching the most complex and seemingly insoluble problems. Again and again there is "a sea of troubles," ever again there are panic-mongers crying out their wares with a strident ringing of bells; but finally, without anyone knowing exactly how it was possible, the country carries on, the vitality of the nation triumphs over the defeatists, and a political productivity provides for new forms which are by no means always the outcome of long deliberation. The case is similar in Austria, albeit on a smaller scale. For how can a country like ours develop the gigantic strength and self-assurance, the inner steadfastness and the courage of a ruling nation? Yet with all due deference we, too, can point to the fact that, ever since the times of the Monarchy, our nation has grown used to pursuing its path undeterred even under the pressure of the most abnormal conditions or fantastic dangers, without giving up the hope of a satisfactory issue.

There is barely another instance in the history of the world of two States such as Austria and Hungary, States of altogether different composition, with different ideals and different manners of living, being governed for a space of fifty years by the selfsame monarch, on the whole quite peaceably and constitutionally and not by the supremacy of the one over the other, but on the basis of perfect equality. And where else is there an instance of a country which, like pre-war Austria, comprised a medley of nationalities of the greatest disparity of race and culture on an area of great extent, and nevertheless managed in the face of the greatest difficulties to carry on its existence and, what is more, in many respects even to be held up as a model of equal rights for its component nationalities? This does not mean that many very serious mistakes were not made, nor yet is it suggested that, after the perpetration of the world war and after so many serious upheavals, such an unduly complicated political formation could have any further right to existence.

In pointing out that we, too, consider optimism the only reasonable and possible attitude to assume in the face of dark clouds which often obscure the horizon, I believe I have already furnished

a certain rough outline of the present situation. He who would gain a clear and unprejudiced outlook on the situation in Austria, without superficiality and without party phrases, must always bear in mind that Austria possessed what was perhaps the most radical Social-Democratic Party to be found on the entire Continent. I am far from identifying all the responsible leaders with these radical tendencies; but I could make a whole collection of the speeches, writings, and treatises of prominent representatives of the Party who have preached class-war in its most virulent form. In this connection the Social Democrats by no means seriously aspired to a dictatorship of the proletariat, not, that is to say, during the last few years, although the Linz programme gave rise in this respect to very serious misunderstandings. But their avowed political maxim remained the same throughout—on no account to suffer a split in the Party into Moderates and Independents, as in Germany, or into Socialists and Communists, as in other countries. Unity makes for strength, it is not to be denied; but it may also be true that amalgamation besmirches, and that from the very desire for uniformity the elements of duplicity are ultimately born. We may dispassionately discuss this question of duplicity since it is partly already a matter of the past, the Social Democrats having materially moderated their policy of late.

What is the fundamental problem to be solved in the case of Austria? In the first place the problem of financial regulation. When Dr. Seipel brought salvation for Austria from Geneva in the form of the League of Nations loan, he was treated by the Opposition as a traitor. The Reconstruction Bill, it is true, was sanctioned by the Opposition, but with no less a degree of obstruction than was engineered by Hugenberg against the Young Plan. Is it conceivable that such conflicts should pass without entailing a rankling bitterness? Then came July 15th, 1927, that terrible day, apparently the outcome of Radicalism. Ninety persons were killed, the whole country was in an uproar, and the provinces seemed upon the point of waging open war upon Vienna. When, however, the day of reckoning came in Parliament, the Opposition refrained from drawing a demarcation-line between the moderate elements among their followers and the incendiaries. Once more all was sacrificed to the idea of "sacred unity," which was stronger than that of political prudence. These events led to the formation of the *Heimwehr*. Long pent-up bitterness found its vent.

This preamble will assuredly not interest your readers so much as the question as to what is now about to happen in Austria. Are the reports true which speak of the danger of civil war, of an imminent sanguinary revolution? I must admit I never seriously believed in the possibility of revolutionary disturbances in our

country, nor do I believe in it now. Whoever knows the leading personalities will know that all of them are seriously and honestly anxious to put an end to the crisis. Whoever is not wholly influenced by outward appearances and upset by the reports of the moment will know that all the extravagant speeches and announcements, and what we cannot but designate as irresponsible and malicious gossip, must be taken with quite a handful of salt. The *Heimwehr* leaders themselves are fully aware that they can do nothing in Austria in opposition to the State authority; they know that the resignation of Dr. Schober would spell chaos; they know that it would mean the fight of all against all and the total dissolution of the State. Can anyone believe that even men who are not exactly Mussolinis, and possibly have not the characteristics of certain other dictators, would invoke such dire possibilities without being absolutely forced to do so, i.e. without an offensive from some other side? How could they possibly risk Austria losing all foreign credit and all economic outlets and entailing a flight of capital and economic ruin? No reasonable person can assume it of them. Just as little could it be supposed that the Social Democrats would prove so obstinate as to preclude even a passably acceptable compromise in regard to the Constitution, a compromise such as has already been drafted. For the responsible leaders of the Social-Democratic Party are aware that they have gone too far in every respect, politically and socially, theoretically and in the Press. They have, therefore, now altered their taxation policy and have in general considerably diluted the wine of their original programme, a fact which must be gratefully acknowledged. Indeed—and this is particularly to their credit—they themselves first set up the programme of disarmament which is undoubtedly one of the most urgent requirements of Austria.

Any of your readers, however, who are versed in history will know that the reaction to revolutionary excesses rarely occurs until the excesses in question are already over. The swing of the pendulum in the opposite direction always turns out a much more serious matter than reason and justice would require. We need but think of the events after the restoration of the Stuarts in England or after the restoration of the Bourbons in France in proof of this assertion. Thus the *Heimwehr* movement has passed from a defensive into an offensive stage; but no Government save one based wholly on folly could permit it to break down all barriers and turn into a national and European danger.

What is it that the Government desires? It is not for an independent journalist to defend them. The *Neue Freie Presse*, whose editor I am, serves no party and no Ministry; it stands for legality and the most energetic opposition to all excesses. Never-

theless any right-minded person must recognise that Dr. Schober is a man of clearly pronounced will and absolute adherence to the Constitution, a fact which even the Social Democrats concede. His strictly matter-of-fact attitude is proved by the fact that years of agitation against him in Parliament and in the Press have never induced him to depart by a hair's breadth from the path of purest common sense. This agitation was so violent that one Social-Democratic leader publicly called him a murderer and that a resolution was passed providing for the establishment of a municipal guard, only for the purpose of spiting the State police and their Chief. Yet he not only never had any intention of taking revenge, but showed such uprightness and steadfastness of character that he was finally elected Federal Chancellor with the pronounced benevolent sufferance of the Social Democrats—another point speaking in favour of the latter. Greatly as the Social-Democratic Party disapproved of the reform of the Constitution, they never uttered any suspicion that Schober might desire to get the Bill through by illegal means. It will be objected that, if he had no desire to revenge himself on the Social Democrats, there was no reason for him to sponsor a Bill which was bound to cause such an outcry, nor yet to suffer the formation of armed units and the speeches of their leaders. To this I should reply that the Government was most vitally interested in making the Bill public as speedily as possible even with all its shortcomings, primarily for the purpose of thereby putting an end to the internal pressure exercised by the *Heimwehr* leaders, and secondly because the protest of the Social Democrats clearly showed the *Heimwehr* what resistance they would meet with if they insisted on their exuberant and exaggerated demands. The *Heimwehr* were made to see that they were, after all, not the only ones to be considered. They had to recognise that even the extraordinarily low spirits of the Social Democrats did not give them a charter for the 100 per cent. fulfilment of their claims. The Government showed the *Heimwehr* that their threats were of no avail, so that, willy-nilly, there was no other expedient than a compromise. It would naturally be hypocritical to deny that many of the enactments of the new Constitution reflected the tremendous haste with which it was drafted. The degree of unrest among the public had risen so far that something had to be done; and financial distrust was already so great that, for the moment at any rate, only "deeds" could bring relief. Bismarck once said: "There are situations in political life in which it is better to do something wrong than nothing at all." Perhaps Dr. Schober was in such a position.

Nor must the circumstance be overlooked that politics in Austria must be managed according to principles differing from those in

other countries, such as Great Britain, France, or Germany. Nowhere else is the Opposition so compact and the majority relatively so weak, nowhere do the statutes afford the Government less possibility of combating obstruction and terminating endless debates. Our Social Democrats would never suffer the introduction of a regulation providing for the exclusion of one or more members. A revolution would break out if any attempt were made to remove a refractory member, and similarly the Social-Democratic Party would rebel if we had an Upper House effectively authorised to frustrate laws. Therefore any Government desirous of putting through an important law must have recourse to bargaining, that is to say, it must start by demanding more so as finally to obtain less. This is what happened in regard to the Tenants' Protection Bill, which, after a deadlock of five years, was finally settled this year by months of deliberation in the form of a compromise. It happened, too, in regard to the reform of the Federal Finance Act, and again in regard to the Reconstruction Bill, the stipulations of which were completely changed in the course of the dealings with the Opposition. This maxim has obviously also led to the present demands made on the Social Democrats, which go beyond what the Government itself hoped to attain. Therefore it was altogether unpsychological and a misinterpretation of the truth if these laws, which were nothing but clay awaiting treatment at the potter's hands, were stigmatised in advance as the outcome of a reactionary and absolutist mentality. Dr. Schober is not a reactionary; he is not even a stickler for authority, and general surprise was evinced at the speed with which certain objections made by the public against individual legislative paragraphs were given consideration.

What the new Constitution stands for may be summed up as follows: Austria had hitherto a President who had the functions of a rubber stamp, to use an expression of Mr. Bernard Shaw. This automaton is now to be changed into what a President is in any other country in the world, a Head of the State who is a man of flesh and blood with—to some extent—a will of his own. In cases of urgent necessity, moreover, which have already been formulated by law, the Government, in accordance with the Chief Parliamentary Committee, is to be empowered to issue certain enactments which will immediately become law, but will subsequently be submitted to Parliament as soon as it reassembles. Furthermore, there is to be an end to the anomalous position of Vienna in its dual character as city and Federal Province, whereby any appeal against the findings of the Vienna Municipality is obviated, seeing that an appeal to its only superior, the Mayor, is nonsensical. Finally, the composition of supreme courts of law is to be changed,

inasmuch as the judges are no longer to be politicians, but in the first place experts and men from the Bar. There was surely nothing criminal about this, nothing that could not be enforced without bloodshed. If for the time being the ruling parties suffer the continuance of the semi-military formations in general and *Heimwehr* in particular, it cannot reasonably be denied that they are mainly actuated by the consideration that the split among the bourgeois and the want of stamina in many politicians justifies a certain strengthening element and that the organisation of the Social Democrats calls for a counter-organisation on the other side. I myself, however, am firmly convinced that as soon as the question of the Constitution has been happily settled, it will be possible to deal with this most difficult and most delicate of all questions in such a way as will lead to its complete solution. All these phases of development are certainly very embarrassing and have considerably disturbed business life, but it is quite impossible to stop half-way; there is—and this is also the opinion of the leading Social Democrats—only one possibility, namely that of attaining a full pacification by an improvement of the political atmosphere. There is meanwhile nothing worse than constantly dinning an account of a patient's maladies into his ears, especially during an operation.

Nothing is more harmful than to raise some radical outcry to the rank of an important and trustworthy report on European events, nothing more nonsensical than to nail up in public what has been said in excitement. Only a thorough knowledge of individual psychology and only lasting occupation with a country can justify a judgment; and if a country is so in need of help as is Austria, so humiliated by all and so devoid of self-assurance, it is painful that such mistakes should be made, especially if those that make them are old friends. If Austria is helped financially, unemployment will diminish and in particular the serious crisis of agriculture (which is one of the causes of the *Heimwehr* movement, since many young men who are out of work seek to find employment and gain by "playing at soldiers"). If Austria is materially helped, over-taxation, which eats up no less than 30 per cent. of the income of every Austrian, will decrease and the feeling of despair among the middle-class in particular will be allayed. The fight for the floating plank of the shipwrecked vessel will come to an end in time. For three years past Austria has been applying for a credit; for three years investments have had to be paid for out of current income; year by year the expenditure of the State has increased, in the current year by no less than 147 million shillings. Though revenue keeps pace with this increase, the tension is unquestionable, and the loss of the individual at the expense of the community is not to be concealed. We should certainly have been better pleased

if, instead of approaching political questions, the Government had turned its attention to economics. But it must be frankly admitted that without the aid of foreign countries nothing, or next to nothing, can be done in this direction. The process of rationalisation and concentration continues without the help of the Parliamentary factor. Economy can only be effected if it were possible to afford the unemployed other means of livelihood and if trade and traffic, which at present suffer not only under the customs tariffs but also by reason of social and political encumbrances, could be increased. These are from 30 to 50 per cent. heavier in Austria than in Czechoslovakia, and the banks work on the basis of a coefficient of outlay which is much higher than is the case in some other countries. Very little of importance could thus have been done to lift Austria out of the slough, even if the question of the Constitution had not been raised. But in that case political unrest would have assumed still more frightful forms and chaos would probably have resulted.

May Austria therefore be permitted to fight and worry its way through, and may the Austrians, with their centuries of culture, be relied upon gradually to assimilate and tame the more radical elements! The country may best be helped if rumours are not only not spread in its disfavour, but if the progress which it has happily effected is also recorded. Thus, with exemplary acceleration, Austria has provided itself with a very serviceable agriculture, it has attained quite prodigious success in sugar cultivation, in the production of milk and butter, in cattle-breeding, and in the beer industry. Our heavy industries have reached the highest degree of technical exploitation and introduced every improvement to be found in Germany. Austria has a currency which is beyond reproach, it has a budget with surprisingly satisfactory resources, and in spite of the breakdown of the Boden-Credit-Anstalt its main industries have suffered no material loss. May this country therefore not be judged according to certain sensational headlines, but may it be accorded constant serious attention! In that way its crisis will be understood and its present state of apparent unrest interpreted as it should be, in the sense of a necessary process of transition in a development which, though sad, is not without signs of progress.

BENEDIKT.

Editor of the *Neue Freie Presse*.

CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA.

THE question of the reunion of Christendom has been a subject of debate in all branches of the Church for many years past. A great impetus was given to it by the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and it seemed at one time as though, as the result of that Conference, the question had come within the range of practical politics. The Bishops' appeal for fellowship, their frank recognition of others than Anglicans as members in the universal Church of Christ, and their acknowledgment of non-Episcopal ministers as having been manifestly owned by the Holy Spirit as a means of grace seemed to indicate a real new departure and to lift the whole subject into a larger and more hopeful atmosphere. Since 1920, however, the atmosphere has decidedly cooled down. Further conference has revealed a hardening of temper on both sides and a good many differences have emerged. Many Anglicans have been more concerned to explore the possibilities of reunion with the Roman and Eastern Churches than with the Free Churches at home; while the Free Churches have been concerned to note that among many Anglicans there was very little readiness to give practical effect to the suggestion of the Lambeth Conference or to re-establish relations in the new spirit there revealed. At the same time the movement towards reunion has taken other forms, with the result that the Methodist Churches in this country have come together and are now about to unite, while the reunion of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland is now an accomplished fact. As regards the wider question, however, it may be said that, while there are still among the leaders in all the Churches many who are enthusiastic advocates of reunion, the rank and file of the Churches are lukewarm and content to pay lip service to the idea.

Into this situation the proposals for reunion in South India have come almost like a bolt from the blue. It has always been recognised that the problem of Christian unity in the mission field is much more acute than at home, and many have entertained a suspicion that the young Churches in countries like India and China would in this matter probably set the pace for the older Churches at home. It stands to reason that these young Churches must resent being tied by denominational differences which, well-rooted in the history and religious experience of this country, are altogether alien to the new Churches of other lands. The disunion thus created is, in India at any rate, little short of a scandal, and if ever a real Indian Church is to be built up, it will need to be on the positive truths of the Christian evangel rather than on the ecclesiastical differences and preferences of

English Christians. The question has been discussed in South India for the last eleven years, with the result that a scheme of union has been proposed and is now being submitted to the Churches concerned, and in effect also to the Churches here at home. This scheme will be discussed at the Lambeth Conference in 1930, and the attitude which the Bishops take up to it will profoundly affect the prospects of reunion both here and abroad. The Churches taking part in the scheme are the South India United Church (this Church is the result of an earlier reunion movement which brought together the Churches in South India and Ceylon connected with the Presbyterian and Congregationalist Missions both of England and America, and certain Churches connected with the Basel Evangelical Mission), the Anglican Church in South India, and the Wesleyan Methodist Church in South India, and the proposal is that these three great bodies should become one under the scheme which a representative committee has created and is now submitted to the various contracting parties for their consideration.

The basis of the scheme of union is as follows:

The acceptance of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation and as the ultimate standard of faith. The acceptance of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as witnessing to and safeguarding that faith and as containing a sufficient statement of the faith for a basis of union, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

In regard to the ministry the uniting Churches agree that there must be a place in the new Church for Presbyterian and Congregational elements, but that the organisation of the Church will ultimately be Episcopal. They accept:

The historic episcopate in a constitutional form as part of the basis of union, without intending thereby to imply, or to express a judgment on, any theory concerning episcopacy.

Further, they agree that

Ministers of the uniting Churches in the area of the union shall be acknowledged as ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments in the united Church, each retaining the standing which he had before union in his own Church, provided that such minister assent to the basis of the Union and accept the Constitution of the united Church.

It is the deliberate intention of the united Church that none of the ministers or members shall

Because of the union forgo any rights with regard to inter-communion and inter-celebration which they possessed before the union.

And finally

The uniting Churches agree that it is their intention and expectation that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the united Church will be an episcopally ordained minister.

For the thirty years succeeding the inauguration of the Union,

The ministers of any Church whose missions have founded the originally separate parts of the united Church may be received as ministers of the united Church, if they are willing to give the same assent to the Basis of Union and the same promise to accept the Constitution of the united Church as will be required from persons about to be ordained or employed for the first time in that Church. After this period of thirty years, the united Church will consider and decide the question of such exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry.

The proposed scheme of union is carefully elaborated to cover all matters of Church government and order, and this no doubt is very necessary in the case of young Churches in the mission field. The only really crucial points in the scheme, however, such as are likely to cause discussion in the home Churches are those relating to the episcopal government of the Church and the status of its ministers. The scheme, on the whole, has the great advantage of recognising from the outset the conscientious convictions of the different parties to the proposed union. It aims at being fully comprehensive, and it does not require that any minister should repudiate his previous orders or subject himself to reordination, or that any members of the united Church should be subject to any form of worship which would hurt their consciences. While the present writer cannot claim to speak for the Free Churches of this country, he believes that they would be very willing to acquiesce in some such scheme as this if it could be shown that it represented an urgent and unanimous desire on the part of the native Indians who are parties to the scheme. Their own profound belief in religious liberty would make them hesitate to deny such liberty to Mission Churches abroad, but they are faced with a real difficulty in the conflict of opinion which seems to exist in regard to the native Indian feeling on the subject of the proposed scheme. There have been conflicting reports as to the extent to which it is a spontaneous outcome of native feeling or has been engineered by English and American missionaries. The missionaries themselves, again, do not seem to speak with one voice. Some are whole-heartedly in favour of the scheme, while others, though not actively opposed to it, are decidedly critical and are urging that it be modified in certain directions before it is finally adopted. On the other hand, certain Anglican leaders in this country—notably Bishop

Gore and others who think with him—are definitely and actively opposed, arguing that “the adoption of such a scheme would and ought to split the Church of England.” Bishop Palmer, late of Bombay, who is himself a High Churchman, is equally emphatic in favour of the scheme, and in a recent letter to *The Times* has strongly criticised the attitude taken up by Bishop Gore and his followers. To the plain man, therefore, it may appear that the scheme on the whole, seeing that it is criticised by those who may perhaps be regarded as extremists on both sides, may be taken to represent a fair middle opinion and should therefore be accepted as in its general principles moderate and sound.

From the point of view of the Free Churches it is felt that the scheme is open to criticism from one or two sides, and most Free Churchmen would no doubt wish to be reassured in regard to the following points. First, while it is taken for granted that the united Church of South India, if it comes into being, will be free and autonomous, there seems to be some doubt as to whether sufficient freedom is provided for the individual congregation. There has been already in India some discussion on this point, and it is not unlikely that the scheme may be somewhat modified in this direction. At the same time, it has to be recognised that in the young and untried native Churches provision for guidance and even control by responsible persons or bodies would be quite a fit and proper thing. Secondly, in all the discussions which have taken place in this country with regard to reunion it has been conceded by the Free Church representatives that in any reunited Church the government should be episcopal in form. It has, however, always been insisted upon (and this has been accepted by Anglicans) that the episcopate in question should be constitutional and that episcopal ordination should not be assumed to carry with it the belief in what is generally known as apostolic succession. Bishop Palmer in his letter to *The Times* says, “It is not necessary to demand as a term of union that all those who unite should hold Bishop Gore’s theory of the apostolic succession. It is enough that they should accept the fact of the historic episcopate, just as it is enough that men should accept the Lord’s Supper without agreeing in their theories about it.” That is no doubt a very real concession from the Anglican point of view, but it is one which still causes a good many misgivings among Free Churchmen. In the South Indian scheme it is frankly stated that while any government of the Church is to be episcopal, no theory of episcopate will be required of anyone. The effect of this, of course, will be that there will be two theories of the episcopate and two interpretations of ordination existing side by side in the reunited Church. It is argued that these two theories

already exist side by side in the Anglican Church at home, and there is therefore no reason why they should not so co-exist in India. It must be remembered, however, that present conditions in the Anglican Church are the result of a long history, and it is one thing to acquiesce in a condition which has thus grown up and quite another thing to start a new Church upon the same basis. Free Churchmen are not so impressed with the unity amid diversities which already exists in the Anglican Church as to wish to perpetuate it in any reunited Church. They feel that union on such terms is not likely to be very happy or very lasting. Although it may be the only form of union possible at the present time, those who enter into it should do so with their eyes open and should be thoroughly alive to the necessity of creating a spirit of charity and mutual understanding such as will readily override these fundamental differences.

Thirdly, some Free Churchmen, though by no means all, feel a difficulty in accepting the credal basis of the reunited Church. They realise that some general agreement on the fundamentals of the Christian faith may reasonably be required of those who enter any scheme of reunion, and they would probably be willing to accept the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as expressing in general terms the fundamentals of the faith as they were once conceived. At the same time they feel the danger of setting up standards which are at least in form antiquated, and which contain, as well as the essentials of the faith, certain elements which cannot be regarded as essential and as a fact are no longer accepted as true. They have no invincible objections to declarations of the faith, but they are deeply concerned that such declarations should not become in any shape or form "impositions of faith," to use an historic phrase. They would greatly prefer, therefore, as the basis of union a simple general statement of the main things most commonly believed among Christians, leaving the parties concerned to express these things in their own and more modern terms. This may seem to many to savour of over-scrupulousness, but the whole history of the development of Christian thought seems to indicate the real necessity that there is to avoid any forms of phraseology which may require mental reservations on the part of those who accept them and fail to state clearly and truthfully the things which they believe. The greatest care on such a matter as this seems to be required in the case of young Churches just emerging from heathenism.

Fourthly, other criticisms of the scheme take the form of a general *caveat* against any schemes of reunion that are based upon organisation rather than upon unity of the spirit. It is widely felt that all the reunion movements which are so marked a feature

of our modern Church life and consciousness have been, as it were, engineered from the top. They represent the aims and ideals of men who have long thought over the subject and discussed it from every point of view; they represent also a kind of tacit assumption that, if one uniform organisation can be discovered and the various Churches concerned brought within it, a real union will have been achieved. Now there is very little doubt that the best kind of unity cannot be attained in this way. What is needed is a movement from below upwards—a spontaneous expression of the spirit of unity pervading the whole of the Churches concerned and finding for itself outward expression. To use a familiar illustration, the unity that is needed is not that of a bundle of sticks tied together with a band, but that of a tree and its branches all springing out of the one root. To the average man who has no special interest or concern in the matter, the Indian scheme seems to be over-organised and indeed to be organisation and little more. The present writer believes that this criticism is not altogether fair nor does it do justice to the very real spirit of unity which pervades the Churches in South India. At the same time the objection is a legitimate one on general grounds, and it is most desirable that the spirit of unity should be cultivated in all the Churches, for it quite certainly cannot be forced upon them by any combination of leaders, however powerful.

It is greatly to be hoped that in the discussions which are sure to take place in the immediate future difficulties and objections such as those indicated above and also those which have been suggested from the Anglo-Catholic point of view may be very carefully considered. None of these objections, however, really affect the main point at issue, namely the desirability and even urgency of taking some definite and practical steps towards the reunion of Christendom. The South India scheme is worthy of the closest examination and the most serious attention from all those who are concerned with the future of Christendom both in this country and throughout the world. It has been spoken of as a straw showing which way the wind is blowing, but it is much more than that. It is likely to become an acid test of the sincerity of those who are pleading for union whether at home or abroad. It cannot be lightly set aside, and the home Churches will need to walk very warily in connection with it lest a worse thing happen. It would be disastrous for the scheme to be in any way crabbed or turned down by the Churches or the missionary societies here at home. The issue is ultimately one that can and must be decided in South India and nowhere else. That the home Churches should advise and criticise goes without saying, but the ultimate decision is not with them. They can do very much to help on the cause

of union by the attitude which they take up with regard to this scheme. By their treatment of it they can make quite clear their own desire for and interpretation of reunion, and if their advice is given in the right spirit they may be able to modify and improve the South India scheme. But they will need to make haste slowly, to deal with the whole question in a thoroughly Christian spirit and to remember throughout the wise words of the late Temple Gairdner: "Unity when it comes must be something richer, grander, more comprehensive than anything which we can see at present. It is something into which and up to which we must grow, something of which and for which we must become worthy."

W. B. SELBIE.

THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS.

IN the articles which have appeared in the magazines and the daily Press this question has usually been approached from the historical point of view. Much has been written of contraband of war and blockade, of armed neutrality and continuous voyage, of the Declaration of Paris and the Declaration of London. I do not, however, propose to discuss the technicalities of sea law. It seems to me sufficient to set forth, and I shall try to do so as fairly and clearly as possible, the positions taken up by those who advocate the Freedom of the Seas and by those who are opposed to it, and to show why the view of the former is to be preferred.

The line of argument used by those who are opposed to the idea is that this country has attained her position in the world by command of the sea, which has enabled her first to protect our commerce and secondly to prevent necessary supplies of war material and food from reaching the enemy; that the exercise of full belligerent rights which is implied in this policy has in fact been claimed and exercised by all nations when the real test of war came, and must be insisted on in the interests of security; that we must maintain sufficient armaments to protect our commerce and to enforce our belligerent rights wholly if possible, or, if not, to the extent that our relative strength in armaments will allow. International action is ruled out on the ground that it would fail us when the crisis came. Now I have no wish to deny that this policy has worked well in the past and that even in the late war it carried us through, but it did so by a very narrow margin. On account of the submarine menace our cruisers were unable to protect our mercantile marine, with the result that our food supply was greatly restricted and seriously imperilled, while the measures taken to enforce an economic blockade of the enemy were the source of constant friction with the United States. It is full time that we took stock of the situation and made a definite attempt to adjust our policy to the changed circumstances of the day.

For a long time past the Command of the Sea has been the traditional policy of this country. In former times indeed it was the only means of protecting our mercantile marine and our food supplies. Even if we had made an agreement with other nations that peaceful commerce should freely sail the seas, there was no means of enforcing such an agreement in time of war. Only twenty years ago Mr. Asquith said, "There is one conviction which the people of these islands hold with unshaken unanimity, that in the maintenance, unquestioned and unquestionable, of our command of the seas is to be found the best safeguard alike for our interests as a nation and for the peaceful intercourse of mankind." Yet we

have gradually by force of circumstances been compelled to reduce this safeguard. In times gone by the unchallenged naval superiority of Great Britain enabled her not only to give security to her commerce but to blockade enemy ports and cut off supplies of munitions and of the necessities of life. For these purposes a standard of naval strength was maintained. At one time it was "two keels for one," i.e., double that of the next strongest Power. Then it became a Two-Power standard, or equality with the two strongest Powers. And now the whole position has changed with the acceptance of parity with the U.S.A. It may be unpleasant to have to admit that we no longer retain the command of the sea, but it is foolish not to recognise facts and to cry with the Navy League, "Nelson gave us the command of the sea a hundred and twenty years ago: are we going to keep it?"

It is no doubt true that as an island Power importing a large proportion of her food supplies and of the raw material of her industries the interests of Great Britain in world trade are far greater than those of any other country. For us the security of our commerce is a matter of life and death. With others interference with foreign trade may occasion only temporary loss and inconvenience. And for this reason resentment is sometimes expressed regarding the policy of the United States in claiming equality of naval armaments. America, it is said, is to a great extent self-contained. Her food and raw materials are produced in the country itself, and owing to her distance from Europe she is herself invulnerable. She can rest secure in the future as she has done in the past without maintaining large naval forces. Why then does she now desire them?

The reason is that America depends not indeed for her existence but for her prosperity on her foreign trade, which is now just about equal to that of Great Britain herself. She has achieved a standard of living unequalled in any other country, and she is determined, if possible, to maintain that standard. She fears that it will not be maintained if neutral commerce is interfered with in case of a European war and, since it is the teaching of history that the extent to which neutral commerce is liable to interference depends largely on the relative naval strength of belligerent and neutral, she intends to be in a sufficiently strong position to enable her to safeguard her rights. She has told the world plainly enough that she will not submit to the irritating restrictions imposed on commerce in the Great War. To a Power with world-wide interests such restrictions are humiliating, and since she has four or five times the wealth of Great Britain, she sees no reason why she should put up with them, and is prepared to undergo large expenditure to avoid them in future. This is the genesis of the Cruiser Programme which has caused so much controversy in America, one party advocating it in

the supposed interests of national prosperity, the other deprecating large armaments as inconsistent with the wider policy of world peace. But it is the former party which has won the day, for the Senate passed the Cruiser Bill in January last by 68 votes to 12.

Whether then we do or do not appreciate the reasons underlying the American claim for parity, the fact cannot be ignored. It is argued in some quarters (see recent correspondence in *The Times*) that we are not concerned with what America does. Her navy is not directed against ours or ours against hers. War with America is unthinkable. Let her build what ships she will, and let us build what in view of the international situation at any time we consider we need. Though her navy may be nominally equal to ours, yet with our chain of naval stations, our great mercantile marine, and our splendid seamen, we shall still command the outer seas, and shall be able if at war to enforce a considerable measure of our belligerent rights. But it is quite clear that such a policy would not secure our vital interest—the safety of our trade, our imports of food and raw material, and the exports by which so many of our people live. We are now to be reduced to fifty cruisers as compared with the seventy which Lord Jellicoe asked for at Washington in 1921, and at Geneva in 1927, and with the far larger number which we had before the war. But the protection of commerce grows more difficult day by day. The exploits of the *Emden* and the *Wolf* showed in the late war what commerce raiders could achieve when we had undisputed command of the sea. And the submarines which sank over nine million tons of shipping were only held in check by the collection of merchant vessels into convoys. Since the war all naval Powers have been constructing submarines of greater size and power, and in a future war their range would be far wider. The same is the case with fast fighting aeroplanes, under the protection of which commercial planes would be able to bomb convoys of merchant ships or smother them with poison gas. To afford security to our commerce by our own efforts it is necessary that we should command not only the sea but the air and the water under the sea.

The second advantage which it is hoped to retain by such a policy is the power of blockade, of throttling the enemy by depriving him of the munitions of war and of the necessities of life. But here also the position has changed. Continental railways make one unit of the greater portion of the world, and supplies can come in by land. We cannot blockade a continent and, though no doubt we could inconvenience and hamper an enemy by blockading his ports, it would be hardly possible by this means to bring him to terms. Nor can we nowadays rest quietly undisturbed in our island fortress while we apply the screw through our naval forces.

Attacks from the air would hamper all our activities and might make our own position impossible. Moreover, it is clear that this policy would be unacceptable to other nations. Senator Hale, in introducing the Cruiser Bill in the American Senate, produced a chart of British naval stations and said, "These stations give Great Britain a strangle-hold on the commerce of every nation in the world." Such a policy would indeed be a negation of the principle of reduction of armaments to which all nations who are members of the League are committed. For if we claim for our national purposes the control of the distant seas by naval strength other nations must have their compensation in land and air armaments.

How then is our vital interest, the safety of our commerce, to be assured? Lord Grey in his *Memoirs*, after discussing the causes of the war, said: "No enduring security can be found in competing armaments and in separate alliances; there is no security for any Power unless it be a security in which its neighbours have an equal share." And this points to the solution of the problem. It is only through international action for the organisation of peace that security can be achieved.

If then we wish that our commerce should sail the seas unmolested in time of war, we must agree that foreign commerce, whether enemy or neutral, should have the same privilege: we must agree to the seas being free to all, to the principle of Freedom of the Seas. It is an old subject of controversy with America. It was the main issue, aggravated by the high-handed activity of our press gangs, in the war between the two countries in 1812. And though in the American Civil War the Federal Government, finding itself in possession of a stronger navy than the Confederates, enforced full belligerent rights to the prejudice of neutral commerce, the United States returned at The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 to its old policy. At the second of these conferences the proposal for Freedom of the Seas was put to the vote and carried by 21 to 11 votes, though the noes included not only Great Britain, but France, Russia, Japan, and Spain. It was thus inevitable that in the Great War the question should be raised in an acute form, and that interference with neutral commerce should be the cause of great friction between America and Great Britain. In 1916 feeling in America was so strong that Congress voted power to the President to take drastic retaliatory measures by means of prohibition of loans and restrictions of exports, and in the same session passed a vote for 137 new vessels of all classes, the chief object of which was to place America in a position to enforce her neutral rights. It is stated in Colonel House's *Papers* that Lord Grey confessed his fear that the United States might convoy her merchant vessels with warships, and this would mean either raising the blockade or war

with America. The crisis was tided over by mutual forbearance, and in the following year the ruthless submarining of ships carrying American citizens was the immediate cause of her entering the war on the other side. Having done so in order to defeat militarism and so ensure a lasting peace, she soon realised that all measures were legitimate which would help to shorten the war, and joined in enforcing drastic restrictions of neutral commerce. But President Wilson, in the Fourteen Points in which under the name of Peace Terms he enunciated certain principles for the future conduct of world affairs, laid special stress on the Freedom of the Seas. The second of these points was "Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas outside territorial waters alike in peace and war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants."

When Germany in 1918 agreed to an armistice on the basis of the Fourteen Points and the Allies were asked to accept them, Mr. Lloyd George at once objected to the clause regarding Freedom of the Seas. Colonel House records in his diary how he stated that if it were not accepted, the United States might have to make a separate peace with Germany, and his attitude was confirmed by a telegram from President Wilson, who said, "We are pledged to fight not only Prussian militarism but militarism anywhere." The dispute nearly wrecked the armistice, but it was ultimately agreed to defer the matter till the Peace Conference. When this conference took place President Wilson was busy with problems of frontiers and reparations and the organisation of the League of Nations and, since he thought that there would be no future wars except to enforce the arbitrament of the League, he did not press for a consideration of the question.

But public opinion in America has no such faith in the League. It believes that there may be future European wars in which the United States will be a neutral, and feels that she can no longer suffer a situation in which the rights of neutrals are at the mercy of any Power or Powers. Either then there must be an agreed law of the sea or else America must build a navy strong enough to enforce what she considers her rights. The connection between the two questions in American minds came out clearly in the discussion of the Cruiser Bill. For immediately after the Bill had passed there was carried by 81 votes to 1 an amendment which recommended that "treaties should be negotiated, prior, if possible, to the meeting of the conference on limitation of armaments in 1931, with all the principal maritime nations on the conduct of belligerents and neutrals in war at sea."

Unless a settlement of sea law is arrived at no agreement limiting armaments can avert the risk of future war. Within the four

corners of the agreement the spirit of competition will be there, each naval Power naturally seeking by improvements in design, machinery, and armament, to be relatively stronger than the other. An example of what can be done in this way has been recently furnished by Germany who, within the limit of 10,000 tons allowed by the Treaty of Versailles, has produced a "vest-pocket battleship" which in speed, endurance, range of fire, and armour defence is approximately equal to one of our largest battle-cruisers.

The actual terms of an agreement on sea law cannot with confidence be predicted. The original American claim at The Hague Conference was for freedom of traffic excluding contraband of war, the right of search and also of blockade of ports being admitted. But presumably because in the late war by various orders in council nearly all goods, including food, cotton, and bunker coal, became contraband, and no distinction was any longer discernible, President Wilson made a wider claim and included all merchant shipping on the high seas whether belonging to a belligerent or a neutral. Whether this will still be the American claim can only be known when the matter is discussed. America, like Great Britain, is a naval Power, not a land Power, and her interests in sea law should be the same. She will have to consider whether if at war with some State in South America, for instance, she will be ready to forgo the advantage she would have in bringing naval pressure to bear on her adversary by stopping the introduction of supplies and of munitions of war. If the claim is still that put forward by President Wilson the question will arise: How is the export of munitions to countries at war to be stopped?

In the case of a war begun in violation of the League Covenant the economic measures taken by the League would, of course, prevent the import of munitions. Though America is not a member of the League, she would no doubt conform to the general consensus of world opinion. The case is specifically provided for in President Wilson's Second Point, and it is unthinkable that America would put her commercial interests before the maintenance of world peace. But the case of a "private" war must be considered, for by the notorious gap in the Covenant nations still retain some legal right to engage in "private" war. The Kellogg Pact itself is subject to reservations and, even if there had been none, no machinery has yet been perfected by which grievances can be remedied and the risk of war removed. Until this is done, private wars may take place, and their case must be considered. The solution seems to be that each country which manufactures munitions should agree to prohibit their export to countries at war, or in the alternative accept some system of international certification of exports. In February last Senator Capper presented to the Senate a resolution empower-

ing the President of the United States to lay an embargo on the export of munitions to any State, and presumably such a power would be exercised against any nation making war in contravention of the Kellogg Pact. Senator Borah, in a statement to the *New York Times* in March, 1928, is reported to have said, "It is quite inconceivable that this country would stand idly by in case of a gross breach of a multilateral treaty to which it is a party." The action taken might go further than a mere embargo on munitions. Sir Thomas Holland in his Presidential Address to the British Association in August called attention to the fact that "the only two nations that can fight for long on their own natural resources are the British Empire and the United States," and said that "if they agree in refusing to export mineral products to those countries that infringe the Kellogg Pact, no war can last very long."

But the essential point is an understanding with America regarding the aims of Naval Policy. Our interests and hers are the same, the protection of commerce and the maintenance of world peace. Such an understanding implemented as it would be by similar agreements with other nations would give us the security we want and would be the greatest contribution ever made towards the organisation of peace. The meetings between the Prime Minister and the President of the United States which have recently taken place have created an atmosphere of friendliness between America and Great Britain, and that is the best security that, in the words of the joint statement issued to the Press, "the old historical problems will be approached from a new angle," and that the conversations which are now to be initiated will result in a lasting settlement. As General Dawes wrote in 1921, "On Anglo-American relations depend peace and order and progress in the world. With unity of understanding between the two great English-speaking peoples the foundations of the civilisation of the world will remain unshaken."

SELWYN H. FREMANTLE.

MODERN MANCHESTER.

IF a stranger asks a Manchester policeman which tram he ought to take, the policeman will not answer without adding some such observation as that the city's tram service is the largest in the world (he will not say it is the most unwieldy), or that its clearing house deals with more money than nine other provincial centres put together. If again you dare to suggest to any Manchester citizen that any Manchester view is out of date, you are reminded at once of the old tag about "what Manchester thinks to-day." To speak at a meeting in praise of a candidate from the south still elicits the cry: "A Manchester man is good enough for us."

There are historical materials to justify much of this local arrogance. The Manchester school of politics was narrow in its conceptions of empire and of national defence. It was often inhuman in its worship of individualism, and too selfish in its aspirations. It did, however, stand for manly doctrines of self-help and liberty which are sorely needed in our time. Outside politics, the city has reason to be proud of infinite achievement. Its pleasure in music, art and letters; its interest in education; its support of boy scouts, girl guides and lads' clubs; its charities; its great success in trade and industry; its ship canal, are all indefeasible titles to fame and honour. Above all, its services in the great war were worldwide and glorious, fulfilling the prophecy of *Coningsby*: "Rightly understood, Manchester is as great a human exploit as Athens. . . . It is the philosopher alone who can conceive the grandeur of Manchester and the immensity of its future."

Nevertheless, those who have known Manchester in its days of luxury before the war, and of restlessness in the short trade "boom" after its close, understand the gravity of its present problems and the reality of its decline in fortune. To some extent the decline is veiled. Like every other industrial area in England, the steady rise in the general wellbeing of the working class has meant greatly improved schools and health services, better clothing and nourishment for the poor, healthier conditions, more holidays, and a far wider range of cheap amusement. Moreover, a majority of Manchester people are middlemen, not producers—depending on the prosperity of merchant houses, banking and shops, rather than on manufactures or heavy trades, and this class, though earning relatively less real income than before the war, are comparatively much less beset by the haunting fear of unemployment and penury. It is largely their interested and inflexible adherence to free trade which secured themselves and the country against the

possibility of a higher cost of living. There is, therefore, no parade in Manchester of either distress or unemployment.

Still, in spite of outward comfort and of the show of ease which always accompanies the existence of many thousands of regularly employed men with very small families and numberless motor-cars, Manchester to-day is no longer the proud and affluent Manchester of 1914. The causes of the depression in the cotton industry are well known, and are deeper and more permanent than the over-capitalisation mania in the early years after the war. Its old oversea markets have been gradually closed by virtue of the growth of foreign textile manufactures under the protection of tariff walls. Its best markets, India and China, are deluged with Indian and Japanese cotton goods made by ill-paid labour, working long hours with mill machinery supplied by Lancashire engineering firms. The same competition, fostered by tariffs in India and by the piracy of English designs and marks, pursues the Manchester merchant throughout Asia and Africa. Until the blessing of the Local Government Act relieved the Lancashire mills of three-quarters of their rates, the burden of high rates aggravated that of high taxes in their effects on the cost of production. When it is remembered that nearly all the cotton goods manufactured in Lancashire are merchanted and made up in Manchester, the reaction on its people is obvious. The cotton trade carries too much capital and too large a population for an age of contracting markets. The other local industries—engineering, rubber, coal, transport—are not sufficiently prosperous or expansive to absorb the surplus labour left unemployed by the stagnation of cotton.

For these reasons Manchester is changing. So long as its merchant houses can afford to keep their staffs and to indulge only in very limited "combines," the clerk class is not in grave risk of losing its jobs. There is, however, in Manchester a mass of casual labour wholly outside the cotton industry and the skilled occupations of middlemen, whose chances of work have become narrowed by the evolution of English trade, and who have neither the enterprise nor the will to migrate. No one who knows the girdle of residential Manchester immediately round the area of warehouses and business property can help feeling that this is the home of the last residue of the people to be caught up in any trade revival. As new houses have attracted the more prosperous families to leave the suburbs nearest town, so the homes which they have left are now tenanted by the better-off inhabitants of the slums. The slums remain slums. Many houses in these poor streets are relics of the first half of the nineteenth century and were once peopled by the wealthy. They are still sometimes imposing and have large rooms; but they are normally crowded with families or have

become common lodging-houses or "hostels" or "refuges." The patience of dwellers in these districts is wonderful. In summertime the streets have often a cheerful air. People sit out on the well-scrubbed doorsteps. Thanks to outdoor relief and unemployment benefit, they are not in grinding want. They can enjoy gossip about sport and films without too miserable a sense of destitution. Even in the winter, when the whole area looks utterly dismal, they never lose heart. Gathering by the kitchen fires, they talk about football or listen to wireless. But while they are patient and even sometimes contented, they are nothing more than that. The cast of character which in Victorian days used to be stimulated by ambition to get on, which debated on science and religion, supported mechanics' institutes, believed in self-education, and even bought books and tickets for lectures, is now seldom found here.

In this passive mood of thousands of people lies the secret of Socialist successes in this type of north-country town. The old faith in self-help which made Lancashire what it is, and which played so vivid a part in the making of England's industrial greatness, is almost dead. Certainly the rising generation of men and women look more and more to the State or to the municipality for comfort and succour at every stage in their careers from the cradle to the grave. The Conservative Party lost many seats in the north last May, not (as is sometimes alleged) on account of poor propaganda or of defects in organisation, but because its belief in individual effort made it impossible for it to compete with Socialism in its promise of universal bounty. The lure of pensions for every widow, of "a million houses to let" at rentals not exceeding "five shillings a week," of maintenance at full wage rates of all persons out of work, swept the gullible and the dependent into the ranks of the Socialist voters. To be subsidised and kept by so-called "Labour" at the cost of the working community seemed to them more attractive than to set to work themselves. The phenomenon is natural enough among a population specially liable to hard times and wholly uneducated for political thought; but it marks the distance which Lancashire has travelled since the days of *laissez faire*. Those days were indeed in many ways dark and grim; but they were coloured by a universal confidence in man's own vigour and enterprise. Mrs. Gaskell wrote of "dear, busy, earnest, noble-working Manchester." The Manchester school's creed was hard, but it made men. Poplarism appeals to compassion, but it turns men into beggars.

Another sign of changing times is the growing isolation of the employing class from the life of the city. More and more they take advantage of the modern expansion of means of locomotion

to live far from town. More and more are they diverted by trade anxieties during the day and by the relaxations of suburban and semi-country life during the evening from care and concern in public affairs. Even such "well-to-do" people as still live within the actual boundaries of the city are often apathetic or Liberal, and therefore averse to take any exertion to maintain the old Manchester ideals of conduct and character among the mass of the people. This class reads the *Manchester Guardian* and imagines that Liberalism and Socialism are, as that great paper argues, only variants of a common creed of "progress." Progress to what goal? Sometimes, when the complete reliance of the poor upon the "generosity" of the State is brought home to one by their whole-hearted absorption in this single aspect of modern politics, one despairs. Can such a people carry on the torch of empire-builders? Can it still fulfil the duties and exercise the functions of a ruling race?

Happily no large community is wholly of one type. The most hopeful aspect of Manchester life to-day is that we find, even in the midst of its most necessitous areas and most dependent population, men and women who still have faith in their own efforts, and to whom England is more than a vast organisation to distribute outdoor relief. Again and again in the decayed "black listed" church schools which are the commonest places for public meetings in the poorer districts of Manchester, we find that the old fires of patriotism are still burning. Young men usually put on their caps and either shuffle out of the hall or drone the "Red Flag" when "God save the King" is sung; but public spirit is alive and active in thousands of families whose past experiences have brought them in touch with some branch of national service. Mr. Clynes has himself commented on the fact that nowhere do Conservative colours or Union Jacks make a braver show than in some of the poorest homes in slum areas. In all such homes the old Lancashire tradition of independence still lingers. Boys and girls are still brought up with the idea of carving out careers for themselves. Parents are still unconverted by the new school of thought which seeks to impose on a free people a uniformity of subjection to outside control, direction and support. They believe in themselves and their country. They wear their medals on Armistice Day. They distrust the agitator. They sing "Land of Hope and Glory." They even send sons into the army.

A second source of confidence lies in the still widespread acceptance of religious influence. The schoolchildren's processions at Whitsuntide are wonderful illustrations of beauty and discipline. So long as these pageants reflect a real belief in things of the spirit, and so long as the provision and upkeep of denominational

schools still evoke the loyalty and elicit the self-denial of masses of people, there will not be wanting a sense of loyalty to the community and a serious interest in the purposes of life. These are precious assets. They save Manchester from being submerged by the pure materialism of later day politics. Many voters ask only one question at an election: "What do you promise to give me?" It is something that some electors also ask: "How is your policy going to affect national character?"

Another useful factor in persuading an observer to believe that Manchester will revive is the prevalence of good feeling. In spite of the growth of Socialism, there is little real desire for social upheaval. There is indeed far too much good sense and good humour to give much scope to the anarchist. Many Socialists prefer to call their party "the Labour Party." It sounds less revolutionary. In most Manchester divisions, though not in all, speakers still obtain a fair hearing for constitutional opinions. Indeed, their audiences, however hostile, are often both generous and patient. Perhaps in no other area of industrial England have the relations between employer and employed been normally more harmonious, and the sense and practice of fair play are natural results. Besides, war experience brought all classes together in a common cause, and it is not yet forgotten by the generations who shared it. There is no finer element in the political life of Manchester than the absence of any deep feeling of feud and hatred between parties or classes. Moreover, the charity of Manchester people is boundless. It is a frequent practice for quite large families already burdened with money troubles and embittered by unemployment, to adopt the abandoned babies of neighbours. In peace as in war, the people help each other. Indeed, no one who has served with Manchester men in action, or who knows the normal life of these drab streets in time of peace, can fail to be impressed and humbled by the constant self-sacrifice of the poor. It is lamentable that the over-industrialisation of England and the shrinkage of her foreign markets to-day should cloud the lives of men and women whose characters are so often noble. Because of these brighter features which irradiate the darkness of modern Manchester it is still possible to throw off the pervading pessimism of to-day, and to look forward to Manchester's recapture of its old confidence in its people and its future.

Three things are essential. First, it is vital to devise means by which the local trades can regain sufficient custom to employ the mass of its population. For this, we can only rely on the resource and inventiveness of the leaders of industry. Lancashire wants nothing from the State. Moreover, there is no magic in the so-called "rationalisation" by "combines" of trades which

owe everything to their intensive division of labour. The average business man, in Manchester wants as conditions precedent to any restoration of prosperity the maintenance of peace in industry, and the continuance of the late Government's policy of lessening the burden of taxes and rates. For the rest he does not look to the State, except as a negotiator for liberation from oversea tariffs. He relies, as in this part of England he has always relied, on his own ability and courage.

Secondly, the cure for the growing decay of self-reliance lies in education. The history of Lancashire is the refutation of all the economic doctrines which form the basis of the Socialist appeal. The skill and enterprise which have carried its goods into every corner of the world would have been stifled had the lot of the worker been rendered no more attractive than that of the idler, and had the capacity of the masters been thwarted by the load of costs required to pay for uneconomic relief works and for too profuse "social services." The spirit of adventure is worth more than faith in State support. It is saddening indeed to see that the stoutest opposition in Manchester to Mr. Baldwin's gospel of hard work comes from the young men, but they have had the misfortune to embark on life in an era of declining trade. With better times will come greater hopes.

Thirdly, there is much need that the employing class should lend a hand in public work. Most Manchester constituencies are peopled wholly by the workers. Their loyalty to the best ideals of the nation is often magnificent. It is, however, difficult for them to withstand the constant pressure of Socialist propaganda in the factory and the streets, week in, week out, without being reinforced by the knowledge and heartened by the leadership of men of education. Apart from the duty of officering territorial units, there is no nobler field for social service in Manchester than the task of leading the workers in the fertile field of municipal and Parliamentary politics, and of fostering their capacity and judgment in public affairs. It is indeed the most vital task in any democracy; and nowhere more than in Manchester, where economic forces and the influence of the motor-car have tended in recent years to construct geographical and social wedges between the relatively rich and the poor.

If Young England attempts to grapple with this task in Manchester, as it needs to do in every city in Britain, Manchester will win back its place in the forefront of national effort. Then we may again quote in its honour Carlyle's description of the town as "every whit as wonderful, as fearful, as unimaginable as the oldest Salem or prophetic city." An area so prolific in chapels might fairly claim such a title.

GERALD HURST.

THE RETURN OF WOMEN TO MEDICINE.*

TO many people, indeed perhaps to most, the idea of women studying Medicine and becoming medical practitioners is of recent date, beginning with such early pioneers as Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell and Dr. Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, sixty to seventy years ago. In reality the practice of Medicine by women is as old as the hills, and from the beginning of time they were quietly and efficiently tending the sick and binding up wounds. Many women doctors were in practice in ancient Greece and Rome. CEnone, the wife of Paris, for example, had the gift of healing, and when he was mortally wounded, having left her to go off with another woman, he sent for her. Tennyson in "The Death of CEnone" makes Paris say: "Save me: Thou knowest, taught by some God, whatever herb or balm may clear the blood from poison; My life and death are in thy hands." She refused to heal him, but when he died, as the result of her neglect, she killed herself. The Cornish Princess Isolde was a doctor, and in the third act of Wagner's opera the dying Tristan feverishly awaits her coming, not only as his lover, but as his doctor. "Kommt die Aertzin nicht?" he says, when the shepherd boy returns from his long gaze over the sea.

It has always seemed to me that there is a good deal of evidence for the Book of Ecclesiastes having been written by a woman doctor. The authorship is attributed to Kohelith, the feminine of the Hebrew word teacher. It certainly shows signs of having been written by a somewhat disillusioned person—a state not altogether inconsistent with the experience of a practitioner of the healing art of some years' standing.

In the Middle Ages learning was not widely diffused. Not being regarded as a gentleman's accomplishment, it was to a certain degree left to women. Ladies of the mediæval households were both nurses and doctors. Miss Kemp-Welch, in *Six Mediæval Women*, describes a day in the life of one of them which reads rather like the day of a woman general practitioner. Many heads of nunneries studied Medicine, notably St. Hildegarde, who wrote the most famous book on Medicine of her time. Then there was the great medical school of Salerno where, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, women as well as men taught, wrote, and practised Medicine and Surgery. The great quartet of Salerno were:

Ganoponitus—who wrote on surgery.

Petronellus—who wrote on internal disorders.

Trotula—who wrote on gynæcology and obstetrics.

* Part of an Address given at the London (Royal Free Hospital) School of Medicine for Women. October 1st, 1929.

Roger of Parma—whose great book on surgery is signed and dated 1180.

Doubts have been thrown on the existence of Trotula, but not on that of the three men. Certain German doctors have tried to prove that Trotula was not a woman, but merely the name of a book by a man—Dr. Trottus—a person clearly invented for the purpose.

In the twelfth-century romance, *Le Lai Des Deux Amants*, by Princess Marie of France, the heroine tells her lover that she has a rich aunt who has studied for the past thirty years at Salerno and completely acquired the art of Medicine. She will certainly be able to compound electuaries to give him strength for the trials by which he may win his lady's hand. The romance of Gawaine and Gawin tells how the knight, wounded in his first fight with a giant, was "healed at a fair castle by two maidens, and they also restored to health his lion."

In the Via Sacra round Athens we constantly see Greek inscriptions, such as "To Basile, the Woman Doctor," "Thecle, the Woman Doctor lies here." Many a marble slab erected to women doctors by grateful patients has been found in Ostia, the Rhone Valley, in Spain and Africa. At Merida, Spain, there is one with the following inscription:

To Julia
Age 45
Incomparable Wife
Best of Doctors
Most Holy Woman
Cassius Philippus
Her Husband, on account of her merit
Erected this Memorial.

Galen mentions Aspasia, from whom he copied many prescriptions, and Cleopatra, a famous gynæcologist, another of his colleagues, from whose books everyone copies, without, of course, mentioning her name! There must have been women doctors in Egypt for thousands of years.

A Latin author of the age of Augustus relates that at one time it was forbidden in Athens for a woman or a slave (note the conjunction) to study Medicine. Whereupon a certain woman cut her hair and, dressed as a man, practised Medicine with such success that the men lost many of their patients, and were so angry that she would have been condemned for breaking the law had not the women burst into the courts crying: "You are no husbands of ours but our enemies, if you condemn her who has found salvation for us." Thus the law was repealed. The jealousy shown in this story is not quite unknown to-day.

Bologna had in the eighteenth century at least seven women professors. One Maria Dalle Donne was appointed Professor

of Obstetrics by Napoleon, probably the only act of justice he did any woman. There were many medical women in Italy, Germany, France, England, Spain, and Poland who practised or wrote before the revival of the nineteenth century, but after the fifteenth century the number of women practising Medicine became fewer, and finally almost disappeared.

In Elizabeth's time Anne Cooke, who became Lady Bacon, and her sister Mildred, Lord Burghley's second wife, were both skilful in surgery and distillation of waters. Sir Thomas More earnestly wished that his daughter might spend her life studying Physic and the Holy Scriptures, and during the Stuart period the sense of public duty so noticeable in the learned ladies of Tudor times found expression in the study of Medicine. There is scarcely a description of the upbringing of girls which omits all reference to the study of Physics. At home mothers instructed their daughters and lady doctors took apprentices. Margaret, the celebrated seventeenth-century Duchess of Newcastle, was neglected by her husband, and the uncle who had brought her up took her to the "Metropolitan City," as he termed it, and had her taught Physic and Chemistry as a consolation. We read in Mrs. Elizabeth Walker's biography that she was very competent in "Physic and Chyrurgery." At her death her medicine store contained vomits, purges, sudorificks, cordials, pectorals, almost all kinds of syrups and strong and simple distilled waters. Some women doctors had a fashionable reputation. John Evelyn supped in the city with a gentlewoman called Everard who was a very great chymist. And obscure country villages had their female practitioners.

When Medicine became more of a science and less of a mystic empirical art, the men of science declared that women were incapable of learning it and gave them no chance to prove the contrary. The old prejudice as to the mental inferiority of women was helped by a new prejudice that every woman possessed of unusual skill was a witch. A large number of women were put to death and others ceased to practise. In France it took 300 years of struggle to exclude women from the profession. In Henry VIII's reign a law was passed preventing women from practising unless they were approved by a Bishop, who should call unto him four physicians and four surgeons. Apparently no women were approved, but some of them still continued to heal people without payment. The passing of the Medical Act of 1858, though a great advance in many ways, made it impossible for women to practice Medicine unless and until a university or corporate body with power to examine would grant them degrees.

The onslaught on the barred gates of the citadel of Medicine

began when women demanded higher education for themselves. It was no isolated movement. Looking back, it is almost impossible to believe that many things that are now mere matters of course should have been refused to women just because they were women. Coincidentally with the determination of women to regain their practice in Medicine, Midwifery, and Surgery, came the movement for the improvement in the status of nursing; and just as the Great War helped not only medical women but the whole feminist movement, so it was Miss Florence Nightingale's efforts during the Crimea that raised the whole nursing profession to another plane.

Of the pioneers in the women's medical profession I propose to mention only three: Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, Dr. Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, and Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake. Elizabeth Blackwell's name was entered on the British Register in 1859. She was thus the first woman physician in England as well as America. Born at Bristol in 1821, she moved as a child of eleven with her family to the United States. Here her father died when she was seventeen, leaving his family unprovided for in a strange land. Like many others in a similar plight, Elizabeth took to teaching. When she was twenty-six a friend chanced to say: "You are fond of study, why not study Medicine? If I had been treated by a lady doctor my worst ordeals would have been spared me." This remark decided her, and after many vicissitudes she became the first woman medical student at the Medical College of Geneva in New York State. Miss Blackwell got her M.D. in 1849, in America, and being in practice in Great Britain prior to 1858 the Medical Act allowed her to register as a doctor. This attracted much attention in the medical and literary Press, and *Punch* advised all young ladies

Whose highest skill is but to play,
Sing, Dance, or French clack well,
Reflect on the example, pray,
Of excellent Miss Blackwell.

Mrs. Elizabeth Garrett Anderson attended one of Dr. Blackwell's lectures and was fired to take up Medicine. After trying in vain for admission to schools and colleges, she was allowed to attend some ordinary classes and for the rest paid heavy fees to the professors for private instruction. She was finally allowed to gain some clinical experience at the Middlesex Hospital, but her success aroused jealousy and she had to leave, going to the London Hospital, where she did not make the mistake of doing better than her men competitors.

The third woman, and in some ways the most brilliant, with a large measure of genius, is Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake. You might possibly feel indifferent to the other two ladies, but you either

disliked her intensely or you would be prepared to go with her to prison and to judgment. Her treatment and that of the other redoubtable six in Edinburgh is history. Suffice it to say that Miss Jex-Blake, following the highest advice of old, "When they persecute you in one city flee ye to another," decided to remove her activities to London. Mrs. Garrett Anderson and Mrs. Thorne (one of the Edinburgh seven) thought that the time was not ripe for the formation of a women's medical school in London, and that it would be better to take the foreign degrees open to women and work as unregistered practitioners. In the end Miss Jex-Blake won and the London School of Medicine for Women came into being, with Mrs. Thorne as Honorary Secretary and Mrs. Garrett Anderson as one of its lecturers.

Let us now praise famous men: those who were sufficiently enlightened to see the justice of allowing women to carry on whatever work they felt they could do. In the very early days, nearly 200 men doctors signed a petition in favour of women. Sir James Paget was one of them, although he did not quite approve. He wrote to Mr. Stansfeld—"I intend to vote against hindering the entrance of women into the medical profession. I think them sadly mistaken in wishing for it, but I see no sufficient grounds on which they can be justly or usefully excluded." Mr. James Stansfeld's claim to enter the army of famous men is that he was the most active agent in persuading the Royal Free Hospital to open its doors for practical training. Another great man was Dr. King Chambers. He urged women to work as unregistered practitioners and be ready to submit to examination when called upon. Dr. Anstie was yet another champion. He held the office of Dean of the School for three months, and when he died, just before the classes opened, it seemed as if the movement might be wrecked. But it was based on eternal justice and nothing could stem it.

His successor, Mr. Norton of St. Mary's Hospital, occupied the post until 1883. Dr. William Allen Sturge, Lecturer on pathology from 1877-80, and his wife, Dr. Emily Bovel, will always be remembered; and among other famous names are those of Dr. Buchanan Baxter, whose bequests of books founded the School Library, Mr. Stanley Boyd, Lecturer in anatomy, and Mr. Alfred Langton, chairman of the Royal Free Hospital, who bought the land adjoining it and handed the title deeds to Dame Louisa Aldrich Blake as an intimation that his gift was to extend the facilities for the medical education of women. These are but a few of the famous men and women, living and dead, who were not only on the side of the angels, but went through a very great deal to enable the present-day young woman to find herself where she is. They indeed laboured that she might enter into her labours with peace and quietness.

JANE WALKER.

THE DECLINE OF MYTH.

THE present age seems preoccupied with itself: its literature attempts to give to the time its very form and pressure.

The novel, which has held for over a generation a tyrannical supremacy over literature, has abetted this endeavour to reduce critical expression to an unending transcript of the contemporary consciousness. It is true that the novel has such a plasticity of form that generalisation is here even more than usually dangerous. Works in prose, approaching the sermon at one extreme and the poem at the other, have been named novels. Yet it is not unjust to believe that the novel form has been partly responsible for our enslavement to our own time. Poetry and the drama can be realistic; Alexander Pope and Mr. John Galsworthy have shown us in various ways how those effects can be achieved, but neither of those forms can absorb the topical with the facile faculty of the novel of contemporary life. So much else that is slag matter can intrude without apparent impropriety into the novel. The novelist may ally himself with the economist on the one hand and the psychologist on the other: already we have a small shelf of novels on the general strike, while the modern analysis of the rank desires of mildly abnormal characters descends upon us

Thick as autumnal leaves that strow the brooks
In Vallombrosa.

The reduction of literature to a minute transcript of contemporary experience has brought amongst us an atmosphere unhealthy to poetry, and the production of great poetical work has become the outstanding desideratum in the literature of our time. The poet often possesses a lively understanding of the spiritual entity of his time, but he removes himself from the dross of its details and attaches himself to that central body of vital thought which the shapeless entanglements of a thousand appendages are apt to obscure. The business of the poet, as Matthew Arnold has said, is not with externals but with essentials. The detachment of poetry, allied with its intensity, preserves some gesture towards permanent realities even when the contemporary material with which it has been in contact is shoddy and insecure. In such a way did Shelley in *Prometheus Unbound* contrive to detach from the topical polemic of his time an image of reality that has marmoreal permanence. As W. P. Ker has written:

while Godwin's *Political Justice* is a prose prescription for the future reform of the world, Shelley's *Prometheus* is a poetical revelation of the world as it really is in the mind of the poet. It is not talk about Ideas; it is more than allegorical personification. It is reality; active and living beauty made effectual in articulate speech. It is what it represents; the triumph of the spirit over all baseness.

Shelley approached this same question critically in his *Defence of Poetry*. There he distinguishes admirably between the value of prose fictions and of the great poetic interpretations of legend.

A poem is the very image of life expressed in its eternal truth. There is this difference between a story and a poem, that a story is a catalogue of detached facts which have no other connection than time, place, circumstance, cause and effect; the other is the creation of actions according to the unchangeable forms of human nature. . . . Time, which destroys the beauty and the use of the story of particular facts, stripped of the poetry which should invest them, augments that of poetry. . . . Hence epitomes have been called the moths of just history; they eat out the poetry of it.

The poet to achieve this detachment, this serenity amid passion, must either confine himself to lyric breaths of poetry or, if he is to produce some larger work, find some story or myth through which the essential images of his mind may gain concrete and external existence. The poetry of our own time, with some few notable exceptions, has chosen the way of brevity: it is as if the creed of Edgar Allan Poe had developed into an established dogma. "I hold," Poe wrote, "that a long poem does not exist. I maintain that the phrase 'a long poem' is simply a flat contradiction in terms." No one will deny that much energy has been directed to contriving large shapeless hulks of verse which we would willingly sacrifice to the immaculate perfection of a lyric by Shelley or Keats or the best of the moderns. This does not dispose, however, of the great tradition of the massive work in poetry, nor is comparison between the *Iliad* and an elegy, between *The Dynasts* and a poem from *The Shropshire Lad*, either useful or warrantable. The head carved on a cherry-stone, even if the craftsmanship be perfect, cannot be compared with the Parthenon. Nor is it easy to assign to general causes this decline amid us of the long, substantial poem, once considered the most noble of artistic achievements. The economist would probably find practical reasons enough: the poet must live and the circulating libraries have helped to diminish the sales of poetical work. Poetry is a subsidiary profession and the lyric is its natural output. Such conditions are undoubtedly contributory, but behind them there looms the possibility that for a generation or more we have lost contact with myth and the great stories of the world. In a time when science has made the remote past as familiar to our imagination as yesterday's dawn we have lost contact with our immediate past, with the legends of Greece or Charlemagne and Arthur, and even, for many of the younger generation, with the stories of the Bible.

This change of imaginative background is not a sudden product of the last decades: we can trace its origins into the middle of the

last century. Matthew Arnold, in his preface to his *Poems* of 1853, recognises the increasing demands of the contemporary on the creative minds of his time and makes his protest against it. "The present age makes great claims upon us: we owe it service, it will not be satisfied without our admiration. I know not how it is, but their commerce with the ancients appears to me to produce, in those who constantly practise it, a steadying and composing effect upon the judgment not of literary works only, but of men and women and events in general." Further, we find an example of the misfortune of this increasing preoccupation in the poetry of Tennyson. He strove towards the ideal of a long poem, but he was unwilling to trust his myth or story as an "excellent action, appealing to the great primal human affections." From the very first he felt that the story of Arthur, one of the great stories of the world, must come into close topical contact with the values of his own time: "a truth looks freshest in the fashion of the day"

. . . this old imperfect tale,
New-old, and shadowing Sense at war with Soul,
Ideal manhood closed in real man,
Rather than that grey king, whose name, a ghost,
Streams like a cloud, man-shaped, from mountain peak,
And cleaves to cairn and cromlech still; or him
Of Geoffrey's book, or him of Malleor's, one
Touch'd by the adulterous finger of a time
That hover'd between war and wantonness,
And crownings and dethronements.

And so the story of Arthur degenerates into a study of nineteenth-century morality, and Gawain, whom Chaucer knew as a symbol of "olde curtesie," becomes a mere type of wantonness; and Tristram and Iseult, in whom one of the greatest of the world's romantic stories is enshrined, descend to images of lewdness. Tennyson, strangely enough, could have found examples within his own earlier work of the right method for the treatment of myth. He isolated the figure of Ulysses from Dante's *Inferno*, and combining that with his own memories of Homer contrived a blank verse poem through which the living reality of heroic courage radiates as does the transcendental brightness of Shelley's mind from the *Prometheus Unbound*. In his earlier days he had even trusted to the legend of Arthur, and in the lyric *Sir Launcelot and Queen Guinevere* captured the quality of the great story he was later to entangle in the values of his own age:

As fast she fled thro' sun and shade,
The happy winds upon her play'd,
Blowing the ringlet from the braid:
She look'd so lovely as she sway'd
The rein with dainty finger-tips,

A man had given all other bliss
And all his worldly worth for this,
To waste his whole heart in one kiss
Upon her perfect lips.

The decline of myth cannot be dissociated entirely from the decay of classic education. We have broken with a tradition of humane teaching which had served us from the sixteenth century. It may be that we have removed from our midst much that was arid and stale in our educational method, but have we not lost at the same time the myths and stories which for some three centuries had formed the imaginative background of our poets and their audiences? In the century of Shakespeare's birth the mists lifted from Olympus: the gods themselves and the heroic figures of the classical age, after a long period of neglect, moved amid us in England with easy, familiar gesture. It was not that men found these names of myth and legend in text-books and memorised them as they might memorise rules of grammar: they chose them rather as symbols to which their thoughts and passions could be referred. Mercutio, a critical intellect of some nicety, was disturbed by the familiarity of the commonalty with the names of classical legend: "Laura to his lady was but a kitchen-wench; marry she had a better love to be-rhyme her; Dido a dowdy; Cleopatra a gipsy; Helen and Hero, hildings and harlots; Thisbe, a grey eye or so." Yet this very familiarity found for the poets a society in which their adaptations of myth could be appreciatively received. The Elizabethans were perhaps more exuberant than orderly in their relation to myth. Lyly in a sportive mood brings Neptune to Lincolnshire and finds comedy in the story of Erechtheus. Shakespeare, who knew his Homer as did Keats mainly through Chapman's translations, places his own values on the heroes of the Trojan wars. Helen for him was the "strumpet" that began the strife, and he somewhat condemns the blind folly of men whose reason is so overruled by passion that they will fight for such a wanton. Spenser, the gentlest of all the Renaissance figures, seems to find a loveliness in all tales, mediæval or classical, and he mingles them with the mild beauty of his own mind until they appear in the lazy splendour of the *Faerie Queene*. How poor the Elizabethan age would have been had it not ransacked the treasures of legend and sent out the mind upon what Charles Lamb described as "the vast, and more than Indian voyages, to bring home rich pearls, outlandish wealth, gums, jewels, and spicery." It is true that the search for legend was trammelled during these centuries with the more dangerous attempts to seek classical forms in poetry: "the ghost of a Vergilian epic" haunted many of the poets of the

time and diverted them from the more direct and imaginative presentation of the legends they had grown to recognise.

The simple truth lies in the fact that the legends which have for three centuries been a part of the normal mental background of thinking people have fallen into neglect. The loss of the Greek language is only part of the loss: it was never possessed by many of our poets, by Shakespeare or by Keats, but they knew the legends as did all men of their time who were interested in letters. This change in the landscape of our minds not only stifles new poetic expression through these myths and stories, but it is leading many of the younger generation to find a strange unhomely atmosphere in the work of the greatest of the past. No age that pretends to an appreciation of poetry can neglect the work of Milton; no great poet since his time has failed to appreciate the superlative quality of his verse. Yet Milton's poetry will become as strange and unintelligible as the design of some old gown if we were to produce a generation totally unfamiliar with classical story. Milton, in one of his sonnets, writes:

Lift not thy spear against the Muses' bower:
The great Emathian conqueror bid spare
The house of Pindarus, when temple and tower
Went to the ground; and the repeated air
Of sad Electra's poet had the power
To save the Athenian walls from ruin bare.

The source of suggestion of the lines was as an open book to Milton's readers. A generation that traces the allusions only in the dusty recesses of dim recollection or, still worse, finds no recollections whatsoever called forth by the passage, will lose the qualities of the greater part of Milton's poetry.

Milton, it may be urged, is an exception; his knowledge of classical poetry wider and more exact than any other English poet. Undoubtedly this is true, but Milton does not empty the obscurities of his classical knowledge into his poetry. In the main his references are such as could be followed without much conscious mental effort by the cultured men of his time. No one will suggest that Keats is a pedantic classicist: the enthusiasm for classical myth which found expression in such phrases as:

. . . Endymion,
The very music of the name has gone
Into my being,

found its information in translations and in Lemprière's *Classical Dictionary* rather than even in a cursory study of original sources. Yet Keats's poetry, like Milton's although not to the same extent, will grow cold and frigid to those who have passed out of the atmosphere of classical legend. The fragment *Hyperion*, that admirable torso

of an epic, in which we find the expression of Keats's mature outlook on life, will grow into an ungenial wraith unless this knowledge of the legend which endues it with a pattern remains preserved. The legacy of the poetry written within the memories of this classical tradition is the one which of all our heritage of literature we can the least afford to lose, and yet, unless some change of educational discipline and mental environment comes amongst us, we seem in some considerable danger of seeing it pass away.

Glory and loveliness have passed away;
For if we wander out in early morn,
No wreathed incense do we see upborne
Into the east, to meet the smiling day.

It may be urged that the possibilities of classical myth have been exhausted by our poets and that an age such as our own, full of new conditions and new possibilities, must exploit some new system of legends to express its more urgent purposes. One is met here at once with the difficulty that a poet cannot easily adopt legends with which his national audience is unfamiliar. In Scandinavian literature, more particularly in the Icelandic Sagas, the peoples of Western Europe possess a group of legends, equal at least to classical stories in their grandeur and variety. These legends have been variously and skilfully adapted by English poets, but the absence of imaginative association attached to them for an English audience has led to an almost uniform lack of general appreciation. What emotional recollection can a poet hope to raise by such names as Loki and Gudrun, Bodli and Regin? Some of Thomas Gray's most interesting work was accomplished in his English rendering of Norse legend, *The Descent of Odin* and *The Fatal Sisters*, but his fame rests rather on the more decorative language and commonplace sentiment of his *Elegy*. The same fate has attended William Morris's far more ambitious work on Icelandic themes; his rendering of the Laxdaela Saga as *The Lovers of Gudrun*, and his *Sigurd the Volsung*, the finest achievement in the whole of his poetry, have gained but moderate success. It may be that the figures of the Volsunga Saga are too cruel and inhuman for our modern imagination, but one is driven to feel that part of the inadequacy lies in the attempt to adjust a new myth to an audience that is not adequately familiar with its outline.

It would be foolhardy to prescribe any remedy for this decline of myth: poets wander where they will and no theoretical generalisation will hold them within its formula. Our educationists who fondly believe that English poetry is an adequate exercise in the humanities for a democratic education may be reminded that most of the great poetry of the past is unintelligible without a study of

the classical forms and legends which largely disciplined its creation. The release of such poetic minds as dwell amongst us from the pressure of their age is more difficult to conceive. So much of our literature seems an apotheosis of the newspaper reporter: the most cunning reproduction of the immediate present, its problems and its desires. Mr. W. B. Yeats, in an essay written thirty years ago and republished in the *Ideals of Ireland*, suggests a possible method of emancipation for the poetic imagination. "I believe," writes Mr. Yeats, "that the renewal of belief, which is the great movement of our time, will more and more liberate the arts from 'their age' and from life, and leave them more and more free to lose themselves in beauty, and to bury themselves, like all the great poetry of the past, and like religions of all times, with 'old faiths and myths and dreams,' the accumulated beauty of the age. I believe that all men will more and more reject the opinion that poetry is 'a criticism of life' and be more and more convinced that it is a revelation of a hidden life." It may be that such things will happen. The legends of Arthur and those of Greece are not the only ones with which the audience of poetry in England can be made familiar. Shakespeare showed that periods of English history have the same epical quality of imaginative suggestion as the older myths possessed. Mr. Thomas Hardy revealed that the story of Napoleon as he envisioned it in *The Dynasts* possessed something of the same universality of suggestion. The Old Testament contains many groups of incidents which may be revealed to our age, without a shadow of irreverence, as a living reality. History may become our myth: its poetic interpretation, the imaginative achievement of a new generation. Thomas Nashe, in one of his lyrics, has some brave lines which may be quoted here as a summary of this argument:

Beauty is but a flower,
Which wrinkles will devour:
Brightness falls from the air;
Queens have died young and fair:
Dust hath closed Helen's eye.

"Brightness falls from the air." Within the sad magic of the phrase one seems to glimpse an age in which even the name of Helen will be unknown.

B. IFOR EVANS.

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE AND MADAME DE STAËL.

SOME time in the year 1803 Bonaparte resolved to put into execution his projected invasion of England. We hastily dotted our side of the Channel with Martello towers, ran out canals behind the sea-front, and drilled the militia on the village greens. Our preparations for defence were considerable. But they were modest compared with what was going on in France. The country was agog. At last perfidious Albion was to be humbled. It was an old score going back to Jeanne d'Arc and Picquigny and the Hundred Years' War. Whole stretches of forest in the Dauphiné and the Vosges and Artois had been knocked down to provide timber for the flat-bottomed boats which were to take the invaders to some point, as yet unknown, on the English coast. The First Consul was proud of these boats. They were his idea. He came to Boulogne and strode about the "chantiers" measuring them off with a yard-stick. So, at any rate, it was reported in Paris. When the weather was favourable rehearsals of the "descent" were carried out on the beach not far from Boulogne. The invaders swarmed victoriously over their own sand-dunes. But the local fishermen were sceptical. They knew the Channel and thought poorly of the strange craft imagined by the military. Bonaparte had provided for all emergencies. His troops had instructions to plant vegetable gardens by their encampments. The vegetables were planted and eaten the year after by the invaders: and that was the beginning and end of the adventure. Yet whoever had predicted this outcome in the summer or autumn of 1803 would have been thrown into the sea. On the roads of Picardy were strung banners: "Route de Londres," they said, or "Un bon Vent et trois heures."

This popular clamour was in part spontaneous. Great things were expected of the young Alexander. But in part also it was the result of a carefully organised campaign. Bonaparte had risen swiftly to power: yet his situation was still precarious. To cope with an entangled situation the First Consul had recourse to what his enemies called ironically "distributive justice." He struck at each party in turn or at all simultaneously, deporting Jacobins and Royalists with great impartiality. The only party which was not irretrievably maimed by his dexterous amputations was that of the moderate liberals at the head of which was Mme. de Staël. These liberals insisted on constitutional government: and that was the last thing Bonaparte intended to give them. To prevent them from inflaming public opinion he muzzled the Press and appointed a special bureau whose duty it was "to tell the public in the morning what it had to think during the day." A

good deal of the national feeling against England in 1803 had been cunningly manufactured by this means. Mme. de Staël herself was not personally hostile to France's new ruler. She had begun by liking him. When he came to Paris in December, 1797, after his Italian campaign, she had been the first to welcome him. In her mother's salon (she was the daughter of the Swiss Necker who had begun life as a banker and had risen to fame as Minister of Finance in the last days of the old régime) she had sat on the knees of the garrulous "*philosophes*" of the eighteenth century, and learned that her business was to guide the people. To her it seemed, therefore, at the outset of the new century, that Bonaparte had been sent by God as a natural collaborator. She pursued him everywhere, even, if we are to believe the somewhat scandalous memoirs of the period, into his bathroom. ("Le génie n'a pas de sexe!" she explained.) But her assiduity had been vain. By 1802 the First Consul had dismissed all her liberal friends from his Tribunat (the second chamber of the new government), had concluded a Catholic Concordat with the Pope, and declared publicly that if Mme. de Staël returned after that year to his capital he would have her removed by the police. "Tell the woman," he had said to his brother Lucien, "to get out of my way. Else I will break her!"

These words were duly reported to Mme. de Staël at Coppet, whither she was in the habit of withdrawing for the summer months. She kept out of the way for eighteen months, from April, 1802, when she had left Paris, until September, 1803. By that time she had a hunger for the capital that could no longer be stayed. She, in turn, planned her "descent." "Towards the autumn of 1803," we read in her memoirs, "I thought Bonaparte had forgotten me. I received letters from Paris saying he was wholly taken up with his expedition against England." Accordingly, on Sunday, September 20th, she had her carriage brought round to the main gate, and with two of her children and a friend she drove up the slopes of the Jura and down over the plains of Burgundy to Paris. Judging by the rate of travelling in these days she must have reached the outskirts about the 26th. This visit of hers and its unsuccessful outcome are not without historical importance. Being unsuccessful, she left France for Germany and Italy and later England, taking her liberalism with her and preaching it on the way. She kept preaching it until 1814, by which time her private quarrel had been taken over by Europe. Bonaparte did not break her. Indeed, it might be contended—though this is a bold view—that it was the other way about. Whatever opinion be formed on this point, the story of her exile, as it can be put together from her letters and memoirs and from official records, is still worth

reading, the more so as it is, apart from history altogether, a very good and very human story.

Mme. de Staël knew it was quite useless to attempt to conceal her movements from her enemy. His spies were everywhere. Her friends had taken a house for her in the tiny village of Maffliers, some six leagues from Paris. Thence she wrote to Bonaparte with a great show of ingenuousness, promising to stop *ten* leagues outside the capital (her ideas of distance were approximate), to say no word concerning politics, and to depart when her business was finished. Her husband had died in the previous year, leaving behind him a pile of debts. His creditors had sent their bills to her, and these provided her with the necessary pretext for her journey. She begged for two months for the settling of these money matters, with a proviso, tentatively appended, that she hoped for a full pardon and permission to stop for good.

There was no answer. But she too had her informants, and it came to her ears that the First Consul had merely said: "I won't answer her." Her spirits rose accordingly: this silence was a favourable omen. It meant that Bonaparte did not dare turn her out. She resolved to wait a few days at Maffliers and then remove to Paris. Her visitors were numerous. From them she gathered the latest gossip and whiled away her abundant leisure in concocting budgets for her father, Necker. She sent these under cover to her publisher, Maradan; and, thinking she had eluded the censor, discussed the "infamous corruption" of the new régime. A week slipped by thus. On October 4th she was still at Maffliers and a little anxious. It was a delicate situation: and it was extremely difficult to know what to do next. If she carried out her project of bold invasion, she might be thrown out neck and crop. On the other hand, Maffliers was as dull as Switzerland and as unprofitable. After some hesitation she resolved to play a strong but rather risky card. One of her nearest neighbours at Maffliers was the First Consul's elder brother, Joseph Bonaparte, who had an estate at Morfontaine. So far Mme. de Staël had refrained from paying her respects, for she knew the brothers were not at the moment on the best of terms. But suspense overcame her reserve. On October 4th she wrote Joseph a long letter in which she poured out her troubles, implored his help, and promised to be "the most prudent person in the Republic" if only she were allowed to stay.

On the evening of Friday 14th *Vendémiaire* or 7th October there was an ominous development. Such news as had come to her during the preceding days had been disquieting. With extraordinary unanimity her visitors had told her she would soon be arrested. When a door opened, Mme. de Staël went deathly pale, and when

a sound of horses's hoofs could be heard on the road outside her whole body began to tremble. She tells us so herself: for she never made any pretence to physical courage. Every day she sent a messenger to the capital in search of news. On Friday her messenger came back with the information that she was to be arrested the following morning.

On one condition: *if she were found at Maffliers*. Whatever was implied in the condition it plainly meant that she would be arrested if she were found at all. Accordingly Mme. de Staël resolved she would not be found. She made off at dead of night with her children to the house of a certain Mme. de la Tour, of whom we know nothing except that she conceded the hospitality demanded, and was therefore a courageous as well as a kind-hearted woman. Mme. de Staël's first thoughts, as always, were for her father. She scribbled a short note to acquaint him with the sinister turn of fortune:

Well, *mon ami*, the worst has happened. Madame de Vaines, it seems, told the First Consul that Maffliers was only six leagues from Paris, whereupon he wrote to the *Grand Juge*: I am informed that Mme. de Staël has arrived at Maffliers, near Beaumont. Please advise her through her friends and so as to avoid any scandal, that if on the 15th *Vendémiaire* she is still in that place, she will be conducted back to the frontier by *gendarmes*. It is not my intention she should remain in France.

Her second letter was for Bonaparte:

Citizen Consul,

I was staying peacefully at Maffliers on the strength of the permission you were good enough to give me to reside there when I was told that gendarmes were coming to arrest me and my two children. Citizen Consul, I cannot believe it. You cannot wish to make me the subject of such cruel notoriety. You would be giving me a line in your history.

You would break the heart of my old father who, I am sure, in spite of his great age, would come to ask what crime I had committed, what crime his family had committed to deserve such barbarous treatment. If you wish me to leave France, give me a passport for Germany and allow me a week in Paris to collect the necessary money for the journey and so that I may take my daughter, aged six, who is tired after the journey here, to see a doctor. In no country in the world would such a request be refused.

Citizen Consul, it is surely not of your own impulse that you thus persecute a woman and two little children. A hero protects the weak. I implore you once more, grant me a full pardon; let me live in peace in my father's house at Saint-Ouen. It is near enough to Paris to enable my son, in due time, to begin his studies at the *École Polytechnique* and far enough away not to attract visitors. I will leave in the spring when the weather is more suitable for my children.

In conclusion I do beg you, Citizen Consul, to consider well before you cause this hurt to a defenceless subject. By a simple act of justice you can awake in me gratitude more deep and lasting than is given you for many favours.

Either Benjamin Constant or Mathieu de Montmorency was dispatched in hot haste with this last letter to Morfontaine. Joseph Bonaparte promised the messenger that the missive would be laid before the First Consul at Saint-Cloud early the following morning. And having received this assurance, Mme. de Staël betook herself to bed.

Bonaparte was in something of a dilemma. A week since he had learned of Mme. de Staël's arrival and had decided to ignore her presence. She had taken on herself to come to Maffliers, and at Maffliers she could stop, an exile at the gates of his capital. Mme. de Genlis, however, a member of the new "bureau de la presse," reported that the roads to Maffliers were now crowded with people on their way to visit Mme. de Staël, and that the First Consul's disapproval of the lady seemed in some mysterious way to have given a fillip to her social prestige. His spies, official and unofficial, were full of her eloquence and verve. This scandalous popularity made it difficult to act. She could not be bundled out of the country. Nor could she be allowed to remain. Consequently she must be induced to go. But how? that was the problem. He decided to speculate on her nerves. Knowing that she was eager for some inkling of real news as to her ultimate fate, he saw to it that such news was duly brought to her. He further desired that Mme. de Staël's most intimate and reliable friends should be the bearers and sponsors of it. The chief of police saw Mathieu de Montmorency, the friend who had accompanied Mme. de Staël from Coppet, and spoke of the imminence of her arrest. But Mathieu was an old hand. He knew that the official mind does not seek to express itself through unofficial channels without good cause, and he kept this gratuitous information to himself. Others, however, were more guileless. The cunning Benjamin Constant played into Bonaparte's hands, asking Fouché for the information that Mathieu refused to disclose. Fouché supplied him with very full details with which he posted to Maffliers. The result we have already seen.

Mme. de Staël spent a most restless night. We have said she went to bed. But in reality the greater part of the night was passed listening at the window with her waiting-woman. She kept hearing the imaginary clatter of horses' hoofs. Just before dawn she dozed off to be awakened by drums sounding *reveillé* in a neighbouring camp. Presently, she had to dress and go downstairs to explain her nocturnal arrival to her mystified hostess. After some show of

politeness she withdrew again to her room to await the result of Joseph's visit to Saint-Cloud. Having time to kill, she went on with her explanations to Necker :

Desmarests, the first secretary to the Grand Juge, went to see M. de Montmorency and he flatly refused to have anything to do with the delivering of such a message to me. I have just written the Consul asking for a passport for Germany and eight days in Paris to get money and take Albertine (her daughter) to a doctor; I also proposed spending the winter at Saint-Ouen which M. Teinat offers me, and I believe Joseph will deliver my letter this morning. I await the outcome without much hope and am near losing my head with sheer despair. *Pauvre ange*, one way or another I shall see you again soon. You never imagined, did you, that your daughter would be taken off by *gendarmes*? I think I'll spend the winter in Germany but I will come back to you by June at the latest. I said in my letter to the Consul that you yourself would come to Paris to ask what crime your family had committed to be so barbarously treated. I said too he was giving me a line in his history. All this business is not of his making but he is egged on by my enemies and he lets himself be influenced. No one would have been more grateful had he but granted the most elementary justice. *Cher ami*, send me your blessing, I never needed it more. I am hiding in someone's house. Auguste (her son) stopped behind with the servants. The children, poor things, cried, wondering what crime their mother could have committed. I will finish this letter in an hour or two and send it to Paris.

She hoped that in an hour or two Joseph's answer would have reached her. But the minutes dragged on without any sign. She kept Mme. de la Tour in play by a brief appearance in the salon, whence she presently returned to her room to ponder over the chances of success of the elder brother in his gallant mission. But her brain was in a whirl. So she took up another sheet of paper and worked out the problem in the form of a further postscript to Necker :

It seems certain that Joseph and his brother are far from being agreed. The First Consul would like him to be Chancellor. Joseph declined, saying he would only take a post that gave him real power, meaning that of President of the Regency when the Consul is absent. He asserts that his brother treats him very badly and has him spied on; also that Bonaparte was wrong in declaring war, that the proposed invasion of England is a touch-and-go business and that he, Joseph, would like to see his own position assured in case Bonaparte is killed. All that is perfectly reasonable and Lucien backs him up. He also added that he did not like the way I was being treated and, at his request, Lucien spoke to the Consul. So I was hopeful enough and still am, since Joseph has promised to act and since he said that, in my place, he would go to Paris. But yesterday Mme. de Vaines (I have since been told it was not she) declared the First

Consul seemed much astonished that I was only six leagues away from Paris when he imagined it was ten, and swore if I came any nearer he would send four *gendarmes* after me to take me back to Coppet. You see I make no comment. What is more, and worse, Benjamin went to see Fouché, who told him that tomorrow the 15th *Vendémiaire* four *gendarmes* would come to fetch me here and take me from police-station to police-station until we reached the frontier.

That is not the whole of her postscript. After this analysis of the situation she settled down to gossip. Such was the force of habit and of character that even now she could not keep from becoming scandalous on the subject of the projected invasion of England. Her pen wandered on, touching here and there on delicate topics, returning every now and then to the main problem of her immediate future, occasionally suspended while she listened for the arrival of news from Saint-Cloud. She was just beginning to recount some disrespectful details concerning the third consul Cambacérès when a note came from Joseph :

Madame,

I received your letters (i.e. *her letter to the Consul and her explanatory covering note to Joseph*) : I went expressly to Saint-Cloud this morning and did all that I could and that my affection for you gave you a right to expect, but I do not think I succeeded. The First Consul closed our conversation by saying : *I will see the Grand Juge to-night*. Please forgive me for having so ill responded to the confidence you place in me and which I merit by my *conduct* for you.

We have no document to evidence on the point, but we may safely conclude that Bonaparte was in no way pleased to see his brother turn up on the Saturday morning at Saint-Cloud with Mme. de Staël's letter and his own expostulations. We do not know what he said to Joseph (except what Joseph reports in the note we have just read) : but the facts were that the lady was still in France and the job of frightening her out of it only half, if half, done. It did not appear that her submissiveness was likely to take the form of a precipitate departure. A second dose of the treatment seemed to be required. Unwittingly, with his note, Joseph himself administered it. Bonaparte knew very well that his brother would convey his message with anxious precision. So he weighed his words well. He was oracular and mysterious. "I will see the *Grand Juge* to-night."

Meantime Mme. de Staël had interpreted his mysterious reply exactly as Bonaparte had intended, that is to say, as the official and personal confirmation of the vague rumours that surrounded her and as a reiteration of the threat they contained. But the conclusion she drew was not the one he had intended. Indeed, it was exactly the opposite. Bonaparte had very approximate notions concerning the

mentality of his enemy. He had reduced her psychology to the concision of a police dossier. She was a fomenter of public disorder. That was the positive side of the description. Also she was a woman. This last fact determined his line of attack : force or the semblance of force, a rattling of drums under her windows, the nightmare of physical violence. But beyond that his calculations did not go. He assumed that if she were frightened, really frightened, she would run away. She certainly was not made of triple brass. Her imagination made havoc with her nerves, and they with her head. But there was one fear so great within her that it actually struck her down so that she sank inert to the ground like a beast at bay, the fear of being driven out of France for good. In the clutches of this dread she was as one paralysed, neither able to think nor act. For three years this fear had haunted her. Night after night she had dreamt of naught else. Her hunted desire had bitten deeply into her soul, so deeply as to become a primary instinct. Even if she had wished it, she could not have taken upon herself the initiative of departure. To such a pass had Bonaparte reduced the proud theorist of human perfectibility.

In her grief there came to her the imperious need to be with friends. She could not wait for the blow to fall at Mme. de la Tour's. And as there was nothing to lose now that all was lost, she could choose the companions of her last days. A tinge of defiance crept into her despair. As there was no hope, so there need be no scruple. Her prudence had been ill rewarded. To please Bonaparte she had gone to Maffliers. Now she would please herself and go to Mme. Récamier's at Saint-Brice. They had told Bonaparte that the roads to Maffliers were crowded with friends on their way to visit her. She would now do the visiting ! Bonaparte was afraid of scandal. She was to be turned out of the country discreetly ! Turn her out they might, but they would have to be clever to manage it with discretion, now she had thrown discretion to the winds. She would not be arrested in the dark and hustled away surreptitiously. Whatever happened, the country would know of it. She would make a cry and a clamour that no official proceedings could stifle.

In this frame of mind she reached Saint-Brice. There, before a select company of friends, she related her week-end, read aloud her letter to the Consul, her letter to Joseph, Joseph's answer, and even some tit-bits from her budget to Necker. She let herself go, wept, declaimed, protested. Her words did not go unreported. Soon the whole of Paris knew Mme. de Staël's letter to the Consul by heart, just as it knew the wording of Bonaparte's order of exile. She had written him, it was said, that he would "stain his good name," that her venerable father would "come in person to inquire what had

been his daughter's crime," etc. We find these very words recorded by the informers of Louis XVIII in the news bulletin which was sent periodically to the exiled sovereign.

These tactics were perhaps better than Mme. de Staël knew. She used her weapons and Bonaparte his. Against the machinations of authority she loosed a tempest of righteous eloquence. Paris watched with real excitement the last act of the drama.

Bonaparte was not long in getting wind of Mme. de Staël's new line of behaviour. He had his eye on Juliette Récamier and knew whom she received and when and why. Only a few months previously he had ordered her to close her salon. Her house was a hot-bed of intrigue. It was the home of an unofficial opposition which was gradually coalescing round the person of Moreau. What the Moreau opposition lacked was colour and some call on the public sympathy. It would not do for Moreau to declare he was as good as the First Consul: facts were against him. But he could assert himself as representing a more liberal conception of government. The First Consul knew very well that would be Moreau's line. And it was with something approaching white fury that he heard that Necker's daughter was now fanning the flame of revolt in Mme. Récamier's house. For three days he had her watched. On the third day, Wednesday, October 12th, his spies saw her leave in her carriage and trailed her to Maffliers. On Thursday Bonaparte told the *Grand Juge* to strike. If there was still any possibility of inducing the lady to go peacefully, that possibility must be carefully exploited. But if she refused to go, she must be made to go. There was still risk either way. Her exile might strengthen the opposition. That was a chance. But it was a certainty that her presence in Paris would strengthen it still more.

We may suppose that General Moncey, whose business it was to execute these instructions, did not anticipate that this diplomatic whisking away of a notoriously demonstrative lady was likely to go off without a hitch. Between Bonaparte and Mme. de Staël he was between the devil and the deep sea. His imagination does not seem to have been of the liveliest. For the decision to which he apparently came was that he had better re-stage the *coup* of October 7th, which had been so far efficacious that Mme. de Staël had fled from her house in the middle of the night. With a little more luck she might fly right out of the country. On the evening of Friday, October 14th, exactly one week after the first *alerte*, she was again gossiping absent-mindedly with her pen: "I can't conceive the Consul's wishing me to go and not having me told so by the *Grand Juge*. It is such an easy way. I can't tell how true or otherwise the things that are reported to me may be. I have heard

nothing since his last words to Joseph: 'I shall see the *Grand Juge* this evening': and as I have received no order, it seems to me I ought to wait." At that moment the bearer of the daily news-bulletin walked in. His news was precisely the same as on the preceding Friday. But Mme. de Staël's panic had given way to languor. "I have just heard I am to receive the order to-morrow, but with every form of politeness." Somehow or other General Moncey had found the right note. There would be no question of hurting her dignity. Indeed, the ceremony of expulsion would be a solemn tribute to her importance. She would be escorted out of the country like a queen. These consoling suggestions weakened her defences. She felt it would be unworthy of her in these circumstances to make a scene. "I await the order—whatever happens I am strong enough to go through with it, and there will be no uncivil wrangling." At 4 o'clock on the Saturday afternoon Lieutenant Gaudriot of the *gendarmérie* of Versailles rang the bell of the main gate at Maffliers.

Mme. de Staël's demeanour was worthy of the occasion. She was dining with three friends. From the dining-room the road could be seen, and the company had watched with interest the movements of this grey-clad man (for the lieutenant had been forbidden to wear his uniform out of deference to Mme. de Staël and in order to comply with the consular injunctions concerning the avoidance of scandal). They had seen him dismount and ring. Mme. de Staël went out to meet him. She was no great nature-lover. But when nature provided the background for such drama she was prepared to look at it. For the first time since her arrival she noticed that the garden of her hired house was beautiful. An autumn sun was sinking behind the black trees. Nature seemed to have understood the situation and provided for it impressively. Gaudriot, her *vis-à-vis* in the drama, was equally appreciative. He was not a common *gendarme*, for great care and misgiving had been exercised in the choosing of him. He was a gentleman, eminently pacific of disposition and the father of a family. Further, he had some literature. At a pinch he could put up a discussion on Mme. de Staël's own works. With the utmost discretion and an air of deferential apology he presented the long-awaited order.

Having signified that she did not propose to offer any improper resistance, Mme. de Staël proceeded to take possession of the situation. She pointed out that discretion commanded the absence of any undignified haste. There could be no question of hustling her off to the nearest police-station. She was neither a drunkard nor a conscript. Gaudriot agreed to the fact and the conclusion. The carriage presently drove up to the door. The lieutenant timidly climbed in after Mme. de Staël and the children. As they jolted

along the exile became confidential. She warned the literary *gendarme* of the dangers of literature. This, she said, is the sort of thing it leads to. Meantime her coachman had his instructions. While Gaudriot was being lectured on literature the carriage swung off to Morfontaine, where a note was left for Joseph, and swung off again to Saint-Brice, where Mme. de Staël got out, leaving her guardian under the care of the children. Here Mme. de Staël had a stroke of luck. Junot, Bonaparte's brother-in-law, was at Saint-Brice and was struck by the sad nobility of her bearing. She hinted to him that there was still time for him to use his influence. Then the coachman headed for Paris. It turned out that Mme. de Staël's foresight had not stopped at the hiring of a house at Maffliers. She had also bought one in Paris in the rue de Lille: here the carriage came to a halt, and Gaudriot was invited to make himself at home, which he did in some bewilderment, and wondering whether the official "sans éclat" could be stretched to cover this incursion into the capital. He was soon to be more bewildered. Mme. de Staël had not been half an hour in her new home when the street was blocked with carriages. Candles were lit and a large and brilliant company sat down to dinner. Mme. de Staël's sad dignity had vanished. She was madly hilarious and not unlike the bacchante to whom her critic Fiévée had compared her. She made play with her black eyes and the bold *décolleté* of her shoulders. The empty room echoed noisily to her sallies. She poked fun at Gaudriot and eyed him archly, while her conversation became a rapid stream of devastating allusion. For one brief moment the Directoire lived again.

She had asked for three days' grace. Twice daily she put off her literary *gendarme* with a deprecatory smile, which he returned with diminishing cordiality. Bonaparte meanwhile told Junot and Joseph to go to the devil. Joseph called on October 17th to express to Mme. de Staël his final regrets and bid her farewell. She sent him back to his brother with the message that she had heard that a number of citizens who, for various reasons, had incurred the Consul's displeasure, had been accorded the privilege of residing twenty leagues outside Paris, and that as a *pis-aller* she would be prepared to accept twenty leagues herself. She then turned to her passport. It had been made out with great dispatch and handed to her by Gaudriot. There was room for quibbling here. The passport stated that she was the widow of a Swedish subject, but not whether she was entitled to claim the privileges of French nationality or not. According to an article of the new Code Civil, she was. She quoted the article and returned the passport for further examination. Then, as Gaudriot was getting hourly more restive,

she gave him a date, promising to leave on the morning of the 19th at 9 a.m.

On Tuesday 18th, she remained in bed; and Gaudriot was informed, tentatively, that Mme. de Staël was indisposed. She had been able to think of no other means of postponing the evil hour. And indisposed she was, if not in body, at any rate in mind. This exile which to many seemed a light thing was to her "death in miniature." The invalid's room was invaded by sympathisers with whom she discussed her case. The hubbub subsided only when Gaudriot appeared on one of his two daily visitations. Mme. de Staël's manner to him had become pettish. The guests of the house knew him as Bluebeard, because of his plaintive cry: "Aren't you coming yet?" But Bluebeard was not to be discouraged. Jeers were not likely to turn him from his patient purpose. At this point Joseph Bonaparte was again announced. Fate had a weakness for Mme. de Staël: it caressed and smote her alternately. It knew her weakness for the *panache*. Her game was played out. History would record that she was removed from France because she displeased the First Consul. But it had also to register one final instance of her power. Joseph had nothing to say of his brother, but on his own and his wife's behalf and as an expression of his own opinion, he invited the victim to his house at Morfontaine. Mme. de Staël gulped down her satisfaction and accepted: "a strange fate to be exiled by one brother and be the guest of the other"; and an elegant, if temporary, solution to her dilemma. She smiled blandly on Gaudriot. Next morning, to the latter's profound satisfaction, her carriage drove off at a smart pace along the Strasbourg road, and her guardian returned to Versailles to report to his chief that he had brought his surveillance to a successful close. The chief of the *gendarmerie* of Versailles wrote to this effect to General Moncey, chief of the Paris police, and the latter passed on his letter to the *Grand Juge*, who forthwith informed the First Consul that, "in conformity with the intentions of the government," the tempestuous lady had left. The *Grand Juge* added that the exile had been so entirely amicable and resigned "that Lieutenant Gaudriot did not deem it necessary to have her accompanied by a *gendarme*."

If the discreet lieutenant had looked over his charge's shoulder at the note she scribbled on the last morning, he would have been less sure of having fulfilled the government's intentions:

Wednesday morning.

I am leaving for the house of an angel of mercy, the dear sister I mentioned (Joseph's wife), and there I will decide.

Mme. de Staël felt she had scored a point. In a sense she had. She had proved once more how, as Bonaparte himself declared, she

"went to people's heads." Unfortunately this kind of demonstration was worse than superfluous, particularly when the subject of it was a member of the First Consul's family. Joseph, in inviting Mme. de Staël to Morfontaine, had consulted his own vanity rather than her interests. He intended to show his younger brother that he was not afraid of him. Very soon his guest had the uneasy feeling that her own game was played out and that she had become the pawn in another. She tried ineffectively to console herself by looking on her visit to Morfontaine as an act of courtesy towards the Consul's family. Surely by coming to Joseph's house she made it clear she was no conspirator. But that Bonaparte very well knew. He had never considered Mme. de Staël as a conspirator, but rather as the largely unconscious creator of the kind of atmosphere in which conspiracy flourishes. No conspirator worthy of the name would have confided his secrets to her; but he might catch from her the afflatus required for action. That was the danger: and that was why Mme. de Staël's presence in Paris was permanently undesirable.

Maffiers had been depressing: Morfontaine was a tomb of *ennui*. At Maffiers she had seen her own friends: at Morfontaine she saw Joseph's. "I met only members of the government, I breathed the atmosphere of authority, of that authority which had become my enemy, and the simplest laws of politeness forbade my showing what I felt." A symptom of her depression is a melancholic interest in the natural beauties of the park at Morfontaine: "I spent hours looking at the gardens of Morfontaine, which are amongst the most beautiful in France, and whose proprietor I then thought to be a very fortunate man." For the first time in her life she was really alone. The creatures of the new authority were not the loquacious courtiers she had always known. They were silent, enigmatical, dangerous, like the new France and the new master they represented. The revelation that Morfontaine brought to her was that the times had changed and that she had not changed with them. She suddenly felt old. The stream of life which she loved had turned and was receding from her. Here her courage broke. She waited without hope for Bonaparte's last word. "I shall know my fate in two or three days," she writes on the 21st, "and whether it is to be Germany or the twenty leagues."

Bonaparte left her almost a week at Morfontaine before answering her request for permission to reside twenty leagues from Paris. The game was played and he had won; or so he thought. The bird was in the cage kindly provided by his elder brother. His anger had vanished. On the 23rd he told her she could choose between Lyon, Bordeaux, or Dijon. The message came to her on the 24th.

The following morning she was on her way to Germany.

D. G. LARG.

MIGRATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

THERE is a theory that our present economic troubles are due directly to the war. It is a pernicious theory, and the non-success which has attended the remedies hitherto applied is convincing evidence of its wide acceptance. But let us leave the question of cause for a moment and consider the effect. Broadly speaking, we find ourselves with an increased population and a market for our products which has not grown in proportion. The inevitable results are unemployment, increased taxation, greater costs of production; and the consequent loss of foreign markets completes the vicious circle. Competition in existing markets is likely to become keener as time goes on, and day by day the solution of the problem becomes more and more urgent. What, then, is to be done? The answer is, we must either reduce the population or create entirely new markets. Either alternative can only be achieved in one way, namely, by migration of our surplus population.

Disabusing our minds of the aftermath theory, let us hark back to the question of cause. In 1913 the total emigration of British subjects to all countries outside Europe was 389,390, and in 1927 it was 153,500. If the old rate of emigration had continued in 1919 and thereafter we should have had 1,225,000 fewer people and would have reduced the number of men in this country by no less than 981,000. This figure, approximating as it does to the figures relating to unemployment, is significant. Much has been done to stimulate emigration during the last few years, but experience has shown that unless development can be accelerated efforts to increase migration merely produce an example of putting the cart before the horse. Furthermore, the possession of capital is the first and foremost condition with which the settler must comply. To admit to any district more settlers than could be absorbed into employment would be fatal, and the absorption capacity of each individual colony or dominion has been definitely ascertained. This absorption factor depends on the rate at which development is carried out, and in some places, but to a lesser degree, on industrial development. Under present conditions development must be slow, because the cost of road and railway construction, except by slow and gradual degrees, is prohibitive. No other nation possesses such vast areas of undeveloped country as we do, and it is an urgent matter that they should be populated by Anglo-Saxons, for a preponderance of alien immigration into our colonies would be the first unmistakable indication of our decay as a nation; a fact recognised by the United States if not by ourselves, as evidenced by their recent action in readjusting their immigration quotas.

On the one hand, then, it is essential to rid ourselves of our surplus

population; on the other hand, our undeveloped areas are calling for that population. No bridge exists, and it can only be built by a great national effort commensurate with that exerted during the war, that is to say, by the organisation of a great colonial migration (as opposed to emigration) on a scale unprecedented in our imperial history. Such migration would entail the taking over and equipment for settlement of a sufficient area or areas to maintain a white population approaching one million in number within a specified time of, say, seven years. The term "equipment" is intended to include the construction of the necessary main and branch railway lines, roads, and official buildings, and to provide agricultural machinery, livestock, seed, and other necessities, as well as to survey and mark out the rural and urban settlements. It is further suggested that during the carrying out of the constructional work in the chosen area or areas the migrants should be selected, given instruction in order to fit them for their future occupation, and provided with a subsistence allowance from the time they volunteer until they have made sufficient progress to be fitted to migrate. Free passages would be necessary as well as supervision and financial assistance until they had made good. The numbers accepted for such instruction would be regulated by the progress in construction made overseas.

Before going into the question in more detail it might be as well to anticipate the first two questions which will be raised, namely, the possibility of obtaining a sufficient number of volunteers, and secondly the cost of the scheme. With regard to the former, reference must be made to the conditions under which the majority of the potential colonists are now living. It would be difficult to paint a picture of the mental tortures to which these men are exposed, and the possibility of migrating would be attractive to them if they could be sure of obtaining employment. If they could be satisfied that, not only would they find employment, but that they would receive a free training and be provided with those things necessary to put them in the position of small capitalists, they would be further attracted. If further enticement were necessary the special allowance above unemployment pay which they would receive during training could be enhanced, and Government could obtain full security for such expenditure by the enlistment of the volunteers under conditions similar to military enlistment. That large numbers of volunteers would be available is evidenced by the fact that 8,449 harvesters sailed for Canada last year and the number of volunteers was far greater. It is interesting to note that only 6,878 men returned to this country, although remaining in Canada was not encouraged.

With regard to capital expenditure no remarks of a general nature could be constructive. Calculations would have to be based on a

very close and detailed study, but we can arrive at approximate figures by consideration of expenditure which has been incurred in sundry new countries. The cost of railway construction can only be determined after the land has been selected and decisions have been arrived at with regard to layout and mileage. Perusal of the working results of the colonial railways shows very clearly that the revenue-earning goods traffic does not increase in direct proportion to the mileage of line operated; the former tends to increase at a more rapid rate than the latter, and this is particularly noticeable with railway development in what may be termed the middle stage, namely, when progress is such that junctions to important centres are being effected. Only two examples are given below, but they will suffice to show the effect of mileage on the trade of the country:

KENYA AND UGANDA RAILWAY.

	1926	1922	Increase.
Total expenditure on capital account	£14,483,587	£7,445,525	£7,038,062
Total open mileage	1,128	776	352
Train and engine mileage ...	3,693,941	1,921,827	1,772,114
Passengers carried	991,754	576,489	415,265
Tonnage of revenue-earning goods traffic	641,776	325,852	315,924
Total earnings	£2,058,710	£1,092,488	£966,222
Total ordinary expenditure ...	£1,216,773	£952,784	£263,989

GOLD COAST RAILWAY.

	1927-8	1922-3	Increase.
Total expenditure on capital account	£8,432,831	£6,994,442	£1,438,389
Mean mileage operated ...	480	334	146
Train and engine mileage ...	980,746	798,100	182,646
Passengers carried	1,728,493	1,345,694	382,799
Tonnage of revenue-earning goods traffic	733,303	460,605	272,698
Total earnings	£904,817	£877,893	£26,924
Total ordinary expenditure ...	£603,089	£398,340	£204,749

Thus, within obvious limits it is safe to assume that, given a country of sufficient fertility and suitable climate, the production capacity per unit area will be directly proportional to the mileage of railways in operation. The population, therefore, which a new country is able to support will depend solely upon that mileage, and it follows that the expenditure necessary on railway construction will bear a definite relation to the population which it is required to support.

Now let us consider some figures relative to the Union of South Africa. The exports for 1928 are estimated at £100,000,000 and the imports £80,000,000. The population is approximately 7,500,000 and the area of the country 470,000 square miles. The whole of this

population is served by 14,000 miles of railway and 7,400 miles of road motor services. The total cost of these railways and motor services together with the cost of all the harbours amounts to approximately £147,000,000. That sum is less than three times the amount spent on unemployment relief in this country during the past year. If we were to imagine the whole of the Union of South Africa to be completely undeveloped and unpopulated we could use the present conditions as an example of what could be achieved by railway, harbour, and other construction costing £147,000,000. By simple proportion we can arrive at an indication of the probable expenditure on the whole of the transport facilities necessary to ensure the success of a scheme such as I have put forward. Little purpose would be served by quoting the costs of transport services in other Dominions or Colonies as any exact estimate would have to take into account the topography of the area concerned, the density and distribution of the settlers, the nature of the products of the land, and the situation of the area relative to existing railways or ports.

The land selected must be fertile and have a climate suited to Europeans. In addition it must be such that the maximum area can be served by the minimum mileage of railway, and if possible the railways should be so disposed as to serve strategical purposes as well as purely commercial ones. The location of the townships should be arranged so that each serves as a centre of an approximately equal area, and due consideration must be given to the availability of water supplies and sanitary conditions. This investigation and the constructional work based thereon is bound to take some time which would give an opportunity for the trying out, under practical conditions, of any forms of secondary transport showing promise. In the meantime arrangements should be made in this country for the selection of the volunteers, their training, and the arrangements necessary for their sustenance during the period of training.

That a certain proportion of the migrants in any colonisation scheme are bound to be failures is inevitable. In the West Australian Group Settlements it was found that the least percentage of failures occurred amongst the assisted settlers. A larger proportion of the full paying British settlers were failures, and amongst the British settlers who migrated before the agreement the proportion was even greater. Native Australians were also included in the scheme, and these were found to be less satisfactory than the British settlers. The lesson to be learnt from the figures published in connection with the Western Australian scheme was that a higher percentage of failures is inevitable in the earlier stages, the administration may be inexperienced, schools and hospitals may not be erected, and the

local residents may be somewhat critical or even hostile. Last, but not least, there are no contented settlers on hand who have made good and can relate their experiences. It is found that unless children are engaged at school during the day their quarrels are taken up by their parents and serious dissensions occur. It is of urgent importance, therefore, that schools and hospitals should be erected in the very first instance, and a number of the highest class migrants should precede the main body by a considerable period. The necessity for efficient transport does not arise until the land becomes productive, and delay in development need not occur on this score.

The selection of the migrants is of great importance, particularly during the early stages of the scheme. It has been found that, after physique and character, temperament is by far the most important factor; some migrants cannot settle down without the facilities of urban life, but in a scheme such as this there would be ample employment for them in the townships. Some cannot eliminate the wage-earning feeling, and in the Australian Settlements it was found that these were tempted away from the agricultural work by the apparently higher wages to be obtained on road construction. Perhaps it should be remarked here that while failures are inevitable during the progress of any colonisation scheme so the major number of settlers progress and a demand for labour is automatically created. In the Western Australian group settlements there are 1,290 assisted British families, and 376 families paid their fares and went to Australia before September 25th, 1922, when the scheme under the Empire Settlement Act started. There are now 5,000 children. The following provision for schools and hospitals is described as ample. There are fifty-nine schools erected at a cost of £34,800 and maintained at a cost of £13,728 per annum, and six hospitals costing £16,400 and maintained at a cost of £6,994 per annum. These figures serve as a good indication of the expenditure which would be incurred in school and hospital services.

One of the most important steps to be taken in the early days of settlement would be the provision of stores and the regulation of prices. Private stores would spring up very quickly, but it is to be anticipated that the prices charged would tend to be high, causing discontent amongst the settlers, and necessitating an increase of sustenance payments, unless some form of control was instituted. Not only will the volunteers require allowances for subsistence on this side, but they will require assistance until they are in a position to sell the products of their farms. This subsistence allowance will not be difficult to determine during the training period; it can be made dependent on the progress shown by at first paying the minimum sum possible, and subsequently paying bonuses to those show-

ing special aptitude and keenness. On the other side, however, difficulties are to be anticipated. In Australia each man was paid £3 per week during clearing. This was found to put a premium on idleness. Subsequently a system of piecework was inaugurated under which parties of men of a group (mutually selected) were told that on a certain acreage being cleared to the satisfaction of the authorities a certain payment would be made. This payment was calculated on the basis of enabling an average man to earn £3 weekly. As a result, some men earned as much as £9, and rate revision was necessary, with the usual result. It was found that piecework spoilt the communal idea of the whole scheme to some extent, and as it is likely to lead to forms of trade unionism and a consequent segregation of the different classes; it is not to be recommended.

To be successful, colonisation on this scale would have to be carried out on the group system. This would not only simplify organisation and engender a healthy competitive spirit amongst the various groups, but it would also enable preparation for reception to proceed in an orderly manner. The fact that the more senior the group the less remote its ultimate location would be, and vice versa, would stimulate early enlistment and facilitate co-ordination.

Now as to cost of settlement. A preliminary investigation of the whole question would be necessary, followed by the appointment of a committee of director-trustees. This committee, preferably composed of business men unconnected with any Government Department or Political Party, should be responsible to no other Minister except the Premier, and to him directly. The trustees should be salaried, but their remuneration should depend upon the progress and result of colonisation. As a first step, a publicity campaign would be necessary. Assistance from the Press in this direction would be forthcoming, and the outlay would be comparatively small. The grant now made to the Empire Marketing Board could be allocated for publicity purposes, and the provincial staff of the War Savings Committee could be utilised for propaganda purposes. The local labour exchanges would require little modification to serve as enlistment centres. The methods to be adopted for preliminary training in this country would require careful consideration. It must be borne in mind that this is not an emigration scheme in the ordinary sense, namely, we are not sending specially selected settlers to a new country, but carrying out a mass transfer of population of all ages and occupations without rejecting those whose health is not first class. The expenditure on the central organisation would be comparatively insignificant, that on the training of the volunteers would also be small, for the reason that allowances made during training would be counterbalanced to a great extent by the reduction of disbursements under the Unemployment Insurance Act.

Next comes the question of the shipment of migrants and their transport to their new environment. This would amount to a large sum; but during the time they are in transit no subsistence payments would be necessary, and there is again a large set-off in the relief which they would have been receiving had they continued to remain unemployed in this country. The first settlers, however, being of the "Public School" or "Officer" type, and not being in receipt of the dole, would entail a greater net expenditure per head than the normal emigrant, but their numbers being comparatively small, no very great outlay would be called for. Figures relevant to the cost of settlement on the land or in townships are obtainable from schemes which have been already carried out, but in their consideration due weight must be given to the high proportionate charge of small or comparatively small schemes as compared to one of this magnitude. The only settlement comparable in dimensions of which the writer is aware is that carried out in Greece under the ægis of the League of Nations. The almost insuperable difficulties encountered in Macedonia and Thrace are not applicable to a properly organised and premeditated migration, but if their variety would admit their inclusion here, they would serve not only as an indication of what can be done, but also as encouragement to those desirous of solving our unemployment problem by the application of constructive proposals. Actually 1,200,000 refugees have been provided for—partly in agricultural pursuits, and partly in urban occupations—at a cost of some £10,000,000. The actual outlay according to a recent report was as follows:

Agricultural Settlement:			
Establishment expenses	...	£7,944,000	
General expenses	...	£780,000	
			£8,724,000
Urban Settlement:			
Establishment expenses	...	£1,185,000	
General expenses	...	£23,000	
			£1,208,000
			£9,932,000

- The figures for urban settlement are not of great assistance, in view of the fact that many of the refugees were able to provide for themselves either on account of the fact that they possessed capital or because they became absorbed in existing industries. The figures for agricultural settlement, on the other hand, are a very useful indication of costs. These include a large amount of topographical work, irrigation, boring for wells, construction of aqueducts, canals, roads, and bridges, and the ploughing of large areas of land in order to enable the refugees to have at their disposal lands ready for cultivation.

tion at the earliest possible moment. The effect of deep ploughing has been to create vineyards in the Salonica plain on land where nothing has grown within human memory but briars and thistles. In addition to the above, a considerable amount of machinery has been supplied to the refugees.

Having gained an insight into the probable cost of a mass migration scheme, the next question that arises is how the necessary money is to be raised. Whether unemployment, or rather the cost of unemployment, will increase or decrease during the course of the next fifteen or twenty years if emigration proceeds at its present rate, is a matter of opinion. We must, however, remember that a very large proportion of our former overseas customers are now manufacturing for themselves with the advantages of low rates of pay and long working hours. This is a tendency which is likely to increase rather than decrease, and which has been particularly noticeable recently. Let us take an optimistic view and assume that the cost of unemployment, whether it be in the form of doles or relief work, will remain approximately steady for the next ten years. The amount spent in that time would be £500,000,000. If we were to assume that a reduction of 5 per cent. per annum in expenditure were to take place for a period of twenty years the amount paid out (not including interest) would total approximately £647,000,000.

Now what would be the effect of a mass migration on unemployment? In the first place a large proportion, say one-third, of the unemployed would be placed directly into productive work. The large orders for railway material, agricultural machinery, etc., placed in this country by the directors of the scheme would go a long way to promote an industrial revival. From the very commencement the prospect of future orders would engender a more optimistic spirit amongst manufacturers with beneficial results, and the placing of the orders would cause an immediate reduction of unemployment. Furthermore, the settlement would supply a new, and not inconsiderable, market for our manufactured goods, and at the same time provide us with a means of restoring to this country its normal rate of migration. The funds expended on goods supplied to the settlers, unlike money spent on doles, would be recoverable because it must be a *sine qua non* that each settler should commence to pay for what he had received as soon as his holding or business became productive. Each settler should hold his land under a redemption mortgage, the instalments of capital and interest on which would be remitted for a specified period. The value of the land to-day is nominal, but its value when an adjacent railway had been constructed would be very greatly increased. Now if the assessment were based on some intermediate figure the settler would profit by acquiring land at a price below its economic value, and the Government would profit by receiv-

ing payments for land which to-day is valueless. These payments—spread over a considerable period though they might be—would far more than recoup the Mother Country for any excess of costs of colonisation over saving of unemployment expenditure.

It is held by the Chinese that an Empire dependent for its existence on the spreading of its population over new territories is doomed to failure, and that stability can only be obtained by fixed frontiers ensuring automatic regulation of population by what they regard as natural laws, e.g. famine, pestilence, or flood. Be this as it may, though cause and effect may have been different, we became dependent on migration from the day that Wolsey initiated his European policy. If we were content to revert to the position of the Spain or Portugal of the present day, and we were sufficiently stoical to apply the Chinese principle, then unemployment could be cured in a very short time. Though, however, we are unlikely to comply with either condition, we are undoubtedly tampering with natural laws by paying doles to the non-productive section of the community under the camouflage of the word "insurance." An insurance company which is unable to show a trading profit must either go out of business or it must raise its rates. The country, however, can adopt neither alternative. Relief work, considered from first principles, is only a disguised form of dole. If the work is essential it is carried out in the ordinary course, if it is not essential, then, having regard to the economic situation of the country, it should not be carried out at all.

This leads us to the only possible conclusion, namely, that the cure for unemployment is migration. First, we must make up leeway by one determined effort, and having caught up with arrears, we must ensure that migration shall continue at a very easily determinable rate to such effect that unemployment shall be banished from this country once and for ever. The political party which has the courage to place this question of unemployment and its solution in the forefront of its programme will gain from every section of the community such enthusiastic and patriotic support as has not been forthcoming since the early days of 1914. There is only one form of Nationalisation which could be acceptable to every Englishman, and that is Nationalisation of Migration.

JOHN ROBERTS.

NEW LIGHT ON COLUMBUS?

SINCE the late Henri Vignaud launched his voluminous attack upon the generally accepted story of the discovery of America—an attack of which the justice is still debated—the classical version of the life and character of Columbus has been assailed at almost every point. Little that was once taken as axiomatic now remains undisputed. Some writers deny that he was born at Genoa or anywhere else in Italy. Some represent him as an ignorant adventurer who unscrupulously availed himself of information derived from an obscure pilot. Some hold that he was a despicable fellow who, having accepted invaluable help from a generous friend, rewarded that friend by trying to blast his reputation when he was no longer alive to defend himself. Some have protested that Columbus richly deserved every misfortune that fell to his lot, and that Ferdinand and Isabella, so far from treating him ungratefully, showed the most extraordinary forbearance towards him. If some continue to regard him as one of the noblest figures in history, others describe him as an habitual liar, as vain, self-seeking, avaricious, and mean, as a man who saw in his great undertaking nothing more exalted than a money-making proposition.

The authors of these new versions of the story, however, are agreed only in wishing to amend that version which was once so universally received. They differ widely concerning the form which amendment should take, as to which part of the classical story should be rejected and which retained. Some declare that Columbus was an Italian, but not a hero; some that he was a hero but not an Italian; some that he was neither. Those who deny that he was born at Genoa dispute among themselves as to his actual birthplace. Those who hold that he was a charlatan are not unanimous as to the form which his charlatanism took. New variants are constantly appearing, until there will be soon as many versions of the story of Columbus as there were heresies in the Byzantine Church. One very recent writer has argued that Columbus only called himself Christopher in order to indicate that his real name was that of the precursor of Christ, John Baptist. The same writer assures us that when Columbus reached America in 1492, he was merely revisiting a land which he had already discovered, although he abstained from mentioning the fact, almost as if he feared that the news would be received with some such comment as that made upon it by a seventeenth-century Spanish writer, who declares that the one thing certain about the discovery of America is that, as result of it, "the world is no richer and no saner, and the span of human life no longer."

NEW LIGHT ON COLUMBUS?

81

For much of the controversy which has arisen about him, Columbus himself must be held ultimately responsible. Speculation is almost inevitable concerning a man who carefully refrains from writing his own name at the end of a letter or anywhere else. Columbus was such a man. He preferred to sign himself either by his title, "El Almirante," or by a curious cypher:

.S.	.S.	.S.
X	M	Y
Xpō FERENS (or xpō ferens)		

which has been frequently explained and never solved. It hardly suffices to regard this strange habit as a mere flight of fancy or as playfulness on the part of a man who was never otherwise known to be playful. It is, perhaps, not enough to treat it as an exhibition of religious fervour or as a simple manner of writing his title, "SubScripSi Cristoforus Almirante de las Yndias," the suggestion of Herr Streicher, the latest exponent of the mystery. It seems to be unkind to regard it as evidence of insanity, as Cesare Lombroso did, and to be somewhat extravagant to suppose, with Guisepppe Fregni, that it is a statement of his origin, name, and achievement, the "A" standing for America and the whole cypher meaning, "The undersigned is Columbus of Genoa, by name Christopher, who, setting out from Saltés, discovered America." Columbus did compile a "Book of Prophecies," but there is no evidence that he was himself a prophet. There is some plausibility in the contention that the signature was a kind of Baconian cypher, intended to convey some information which could not be directly communicated and to supply the clue to a secret, otherwise carefully concealed.

This contention is certainly supported by the fact that, whatever else he was or was not, up to a certain point Columbus was the very embodiment of reticence. In all his numerous writings—and the fondness of Columbus for writing passed into a proverb—he never mentions his father, his mother, or his wife. If he names his birthplace at all, it is only in a single passage in a document not in his handwriting and of doubtful authenticity. His own son was not sure where his father was born. Concerning his career, prior to his coming to Spain, Columbus is, indeed, somewhat more communicative, but he does not supply anything like a connected story, and he makes no statements the accuracy of which can be readily checked. His various statements are not always easy to reconcile with one another; in some cases they seem to be at variance with apparently established facts. His earliest biographers, who knew him personally and had access to all his papers, are really little more illuminating; Columbus certainly never supplied them with complete details concerning his birth, parentage, and early life. No fugitive

from justice, eager to baffle pursuit, could be more careful than was Columbus to envelop his past in a cloud of doubt. It is little wonder that the existence of a "secret" should be suspected and, naturally enough, attempt after attempt has been made to penetrate that "secret." Such attempts have been both ingenious and bold, and the author of each one of them has been fully convinced that only to himself, and to those who agree with him, has the hidden truth been revealed.

Among the first to claim that he had solved the mystery was Celso Garcia de la Riega. In some sixteenth-century documents his uncle had found mention of a family called Colon, the Spanish form of Columbus, as being resident at Pontevedra in Galicia. Inspired by this discovery, and possibly filled with hope that he might exalt the fame of his native province, Garcia de la Riega searched carefully through a volume of old manuscript documents, of which he was the happy possessor. His diligence was amazingly rewarded. In various documents of the fifteenth century he met with the names, in their Spanish form, of Domenico, Susanna, Bartholomew and Blanchetta, the reputed father, mother, brother and sister of Columbus, as well as that of Nicholas Oderigo, a name also borne by an intimate friend of the discoverer of America. Best of all, perhaps, there was a reference to Cristobo de Colon, who could be none other than Christopher himself. With such materials upon which to work, Garcia de la Riega found it a simple matter to reconstruct the early life of Columbus and to lay bare his "secret." According to the version which he produced, and which other writers have embellished, the family of Columbus originated at Pontevedra, his father being a Gallego and his mother a Jewess, Susanna de Fonterosa. Christopher had been already born when Domenico took part in a riot, during which he burned some houses and was therefore obliged to take refuge in Portugal with his wife and child. There Bartholomew was born, as—according to Garcia de la Riega—is recorded by the contemporary Italian writer, Gallo. At a later date, the two brothers went to Genoa to seek their fortune and prospered sufficiently to be able to make a home for their parents. The whole family being thus established in Italy, it came to be supposed that they were Genoese. When Columbus sought the help of Ferdinand and Isabella, he dared not reveal his true origin; Gallegos were in bad odour at Court, his father was wanted by the police and his mother by the Inquisition. He therefore kept silence and allowed it to be believed that he was from Italy.

But, despite his reticence, his "secret"—so Garcia de la Riega and others declare—is no secret to those who study the facts of his life, and who have the wit to put two and two together. Columbus received the strongest support from Jews; a number of Jews sailed

with him on his first voyage; his rather exuberant literary style reveals his Hebrew blood. He constantly used words drawn from the Galician dialect; in the West Indies, he chose names for places which were reminiscent of Galicia. He declared that if his direct heirs failed, an heir was to be sought "aqui," "here," that is, in Castille, and "en otro cabo del mundo," "at the other end of the world," which must obviously mean Galicia. Señor Rivas Puigcerver found further evidence in the word "Guanahani," supposed to be the native name of the first island discovered by Columbus. According to him the truth is that "on the night of October 11th, 1492, one of the many Jews who were with Columbus was on watch at the bow. He thought that he saw land and cried, 'i, i,' 'land, land.' Another of his race, who was at his side, asked, 'Uena?' 'Where?' 'Hení,' replied Rodrigo, 'Uena hení,' 'There is land over there.' When Columbus landed, he asked a Jewish interpreter what the natives called the island, and Luis de Torres, who did not understand them, replied, Guanahani." This incident is not recorded by Columbus or by any of his contemporaries.

The theory of the "Galician-Jewish" origin of Columbus was enthusiastically received in some quarters, but it will not bear any critical investigation. It rests mainly upon the materials found at Pontevedra: expert examination of those materials showed that all the vital documents had been mutilated, that every one of the really significant entries is in a later hand than that of the body of the document in which they appear, and that some of these entries are obviously in quite modern handwriting. The very foundation of the theory is thus destroyed, and it becomes hardly necessary to insist that the name Colon was so common in Spain that its appearance in Galicia has no significance; or that there is no evidence for the supposed migrations of the family; or that the place-names might be equally well regarded as being reminiscent of Andalusia or Catalonia; or that the Spanish Jews of the period did not talk Hebrew. As for the passage in Gallo, if a third-form schoolboy construed "frater ejus minor natus in Lusitania habitavit Ulisbonæ," "his younger brother was born in Portugal and lived at Lisbon," he would richly deserve a whipping.

Much contempt has been poured upon the "fantastic" Galician theory by Señor Luis Ulloa, the exponent of another version of the origin of Columbus and of another explanation of his "secret." According to this writer, the discoverer of America was John Baptist Colom, a Catalan of noble family and a relative of the French corsair, Coullon, whom the Italians called Colombo. He fought for Catalonia against John II of Aragon and served under Coullon. His ship having been sunk in an engagement with some Genoese merchantmen, Columbus escaped to land and lived for a

time in Portugal. He then took part in a Danish expedition to Iceland and beyond. Returning to Lisbon, he found there many Genoese eager to be avenged on those who had attacked their ships and, in order to escape them, he hid his identity by calling himself Christopher, an anagram of his real name and also a compliment to the Danish king. When he made his application to Ferdinand and Isabella, he could not reveal that he had been a rebel, while if he had admitted that he was a Catalan, Ferdinand would never have allowed him to attain the position to which he aspired. Señor Ulloa does not make it quite clear when he supposes that Ferdinand learned the truth, but as soon as he did so he laboured to make Columbus appear as a man without nationality. The king was petty enough to force the municipality of Barcelona to omit from their records all reference to the reception of Columbus on his return from his first voyage, while he was directly or indirectly responsible for any contemporary statement suggesting that Columbus was an Italian. Ferdinand secured, according to Señor Ulloa, the wholesale suppression of genuine and the wholesale fabrication of spurious documents, and the pyramid of lies thus set up was raised still further by Luis Columbus, "the degenerate grandson" of the discoverer, by the parties to the sixteenth-century lawsuit concerning the Columbian inheritance, by venal historians, and by bigoted believers in the Genoese origin of Columbus.

For support of this theory, Señor Ulloa relies mainly on a reconsideration of materials already well known. He stresses the fact that in the earliest references to Columbus in Spanish documents he is called Colomo, the Castilian form of the distinctly Catalan name, Colom, and that he only became known as Colon when he concluded his agreement with the sovereigns. Even after that he is called Colom in the headings of the first printed editions of his letter announcing his return from his first voyage, and Señor Ulloa suggests that the lost original of that letter was written in Catalan. He makes much use of the depositions of the two parties in the sixteenth-century lawsuit, pointing out that the Italian claimant admitted that Columbus was originally known as Colom and that his arms were those of a Catalan family, while the Spanish claimant wholly failed to prove her contention that he was of Genoese origin. Señor Ulloa discovers a marked similarity between the religious ideas of Columbus and those of the Majorcan, Raymond Lulle; he notes the appearance of Catalan words in the writings of Columbus and finds memories of Catalonia in the place-names given by Columbus in the West Indies. He summarily dismisses all evidence which might seem to tell against his theory as the obvious product of malice or ignorance.

Anatole France once remarked that no statement is quite so

unassailable as one for which there is no evidence. To a great extent, the theory advanced by Señor Ulloa is in the happy position of resting only upon the *ipse dixit* of its author. The documents in which Columbus appears as Colomo are mere records of payments to one who was then only a hanger-on at the Court; it is as reasonable to suppose that the form of the name was a clerk's error for Colombo, as to suppose that the true form was here curiously preserved. As soon as Columbus became at all important, he became also and remained Colon in all Castilian documents. It is probable that the letter, reporting his return, was first printed at Barcelona; the appearance of Colom in the heading and of Catalan words in the text is just what might have been expected from the inexperience of a Catalan compositor, at a time when proofs were not read. The evidence for the relationship between Columbus and Coullon consists of a vague statement by Columbus, "I am not the first admiral of my family," and of the explicit assertion of his son. The value of the latter may be gauged from the fact that in the same passage, Ferdinand Columbus says that his father was also related to another Colombo, who was actually a Greek. There is not the least evidence that Columbus was called John Baptist or that Christopher was an assumed name, or that he took part in the Catalan revolt, or that he was ever in Danish service. He never showed the least interest in Catalonia and quarrelled with such Catalans as went to the New World with him, a circumstance which Señor Ulloa explains by declaring that these men were sent out by Ferdinand to spy on the admiral. The allegations of wholesale fabrication are merely allegations. The fact is that, in the absence of any clear statement by Columbus in his own handwriting, a case may be made in support of almost any theory of the origin of the discoverer; attempts have been made to show that he was a Portuguese, a Frenchman, an Irishman, and an Armenian. It only remains for some ingenious writer to show that he was really an American who discovered the New World because it was his native land.

Señor Ulloa has done something to prepare the way for such a writer by arguing that Columbus had already visited America before 1492. He points out that Columbus sailed to Iceland and a hundred leagues beyond it in 1477, in which year, according to a map of 1534, a certain Johannes Scolvus visited Greenland. It is impossible, continues Señor Ulloa, that there should have been two expeditions to Greenland in one year, and since a hundred leagues beyond Iceland, measured in the right direction, would bring the voyager to Greenland, it is obvious that Columbus and Scolvus are one and the same. Here is the explanation of the otherwise astonishing fact that in his capitulations with the sovereigns, prior

to his first voyage, Columbus asked for certain rewards for the discoveries which "he had made." The document is the authentic version and there is no possibility of an error by a copyist, while it is idle to suppose, as did Vignaud, that Columbus was merely boasting. He must therefore, says Señor Ulloa, have been to America before 1492, and the occasion was obviously that of the voyage of 1477, when he must have sailed down the American coast to Haiti. The fact that he had crossed the Atlantic before his supposed first voyage is suggested by the knowledge of the winds and currents which he showed, and by the steady course which he followed, while there is other evidence that he was quite familiar with the West Indies before 1492. Unfortunately for this theory, however, Señor Ulloa did not notice that in the document upon which he relies Columbus is given the title of Don, which he did not receive until 1493, and that therefore, although the document is dated 1492, it cannot have been written in that year; a royal secretary would not dare to confer upon anyone a title which had not been granted to him. It is also at least improbable that anyone could have made the voyage which Columbus is alleged to have made in the ships of that period.

The new versions of the life of Columbus, indeed, which have been put forward in opposition to the classical version, require to be supported by something more like real evidence before they can carry conviction to any who are not already convinced. Much the same may be said of the attempts to redraw the character of Columbus. Of these attempts, by far the most entertaining is that of M. Marius André, whose method may be illustrated by one example. He makes Columbus ask Luis de Santangel to support his application to the sovereigns. Santangel, who was a Jew, looks at the matter from a business point of view and questions whether there is any money in it. But, "Slaves!" he whispers to Columbus; Columbus nods approvingly, and the deal is completed. M. André then points the moral: to Columbus, the discovery of America was desirable only because a slave trade might be developed; all his talk about his desire to convert the natives was mere hypocrisy, intended to hoodwink the pious queen. But this is mere libel. Columbus did suggest that cannibals should be enslaved, but only after he had discovered their existence in the West Indies. He did later send slaves to Spain and did suggest that the trade in slaves might be developed, but that was only after his second voyage. To suggest that from the very first he had the enslavement of the natives in mind is to bring an unwarranted accusation. By means of similar imaginary conversations M. André brings out other points in the character of Columbus, ultimately producing a picture of a man half insane, half criminal. By not

dissimilar methods, Roseely de Lorgues long before had shown Columbus to be a fit object for canonisation.

It is none the less true that the complete history of Columbus is yet to be written and that his authentic portrait has yet to be drawn. The classical version requires much correction; the deal has passed when the accounts given by the earliest biographers of the discoverer could be accepted without reserve. But the task will not be achieved by the use of mutilated documents, stringing supposition upon supposition, or by adopting the method of the historical novelist. By following such courses, the truth is not revealed but obscured, and the elucidation of the "secret Columbus," if secret there be, is not hastened but postponed.

CECIL JANE.

A CHARGE OF DESPOTISM.

IT is an unusual event in this country for a Judge of the Supreme Court to pronounce decided views in public on a matter of political controversy. In the United States it is a common occurrence for judges to publish works relating to legal and constitutional questions; but in England the holders of judicial office have for long imposed upon themselves a convention that they should abstain from taking part in the public discussion of matters in regard to which public opinion is likely to play an important part. Lord Hewart has dissociated himself from this tradition with no uncertain voice. "I will be no party to the doctrine," he said, in a recent speech, "that a Lord Chief Justice is condemned to a lifelong and compulsory silence on the affairs of State." This book,* his publishers remind us, is in effect a sequel to that speech. From that point of view alone it is a landmark.

Lord Hewart's book is in effect a protest against the acquisition by government departments of powers of a legislative and judicial nature which recent legislation has conferred on them. There has been for some years past, he writes, "a persistent influence at work which, whatever the motives or the intentions that support it may be thought to be, undoubtedly has the effect of placing a large and increasing field of departmental authority and activity beyond the reach of the ordinary law." The field of activity referred to consists of legislative and judicial powers relating to such matters as education, housing, town planning, social insurance, and public health. Of the nature of the "persistent influence" the Lord Chief Justice gives no hint. He observes that the growth of the system of subordinate legislation by the departments has proceeded side by side with a great increase in the number of public officials; but no suggestion is made of the social causes underlying either the one phenomenon or the other.

What Lord Hewart does emphasise is the extent to which the new tendency is in conflict with the older principles of the Constitution. Those principles, according to the orthodox doctrines laid down by Dicey in his *Law of the Constitution*, are the Sovereignty of Parliament and the Rule of Law. The Rule of Law, Lord Hewart explains, means that everyone, whatever his position, Minister of State or government official, is governed by the ordinary law of the land and is personally liable in a court of justice for anything done by him contrary to that law; and the plea of "Act of State" is not a permissible defence in respect of such wrongdoing. All this, of course, is undisputable—as, indeed, would be any statement of the law laid down by the Lord Chief Justice of England. The

* *The New Despotism*. By the Rt. Hon. Lord Hewart of Bury. Ernest Benn. 21s. net.

ordinary law of the land governs us all. But it is also true that the law draws a sharp and fundamental distinction between the liabilities of a Minister of the Crown and those of a private citizen. I can sue a private employer for the wrongful acts of his servant committed within the scope of his employment. But if I am injured through the wrongdoing of a servant of the Crown, I cannot sue the Crown: I am left, so far as the law is concerned, with a remedy against an impecunious postman or policeman. But, says Lord Hewart, "in practice the Crown as a general rule pays any damages that may be recovered against its servants for wrongful acts committed in the course of their public employment." I have italicised the words "in practice" in order to draw attention to the Lord Chief Justice's insistence on the practical working realities rather than the legal theories where the older principles of the Constitution are concerned.

When he comes to discuss the newer developments we are given a less objective view. Not only does Lord Hewart deny that there is in England anything which can properly be called Administrative Law, but he declares that it would be "a strange misuse of terms if the name of Administrative Law were to be applied to that which, upon analysis, proved to be nothing more than administrative lawlessness." He reiterates this charge of lawlessness again and again. To employ the terms administrative "law" and administrative "justice" to such a system as we now have developing is "really grotesque" he says in one place (p. 44). The so-called administrative "law" in this country, he continues, is not really a system at all, but is simply "an exercise of arbitrary power in relation to certain matters, which are specified or indicated by Statute, not on any definite principle but haphazard, on the theory, presumably, that such matters are better kept outside the control of the courts, and left to the uncontrolled discretion of the executive and its servants" (p. 46). "Nothing," he says elsewhere, "is more repugnant to the English mind than that authority should be irresponsible or uncontrolled" (p. 25).

Is the administration which exercises these semi-judicial and legislative powers in fact irresponsible, lawless and uncontrolled? Lord Hewart assumes that it is. He apparently disregards, or dismisses as unimportant, the control over the executive exercised by Parliament and public opinion. The Cabinet, he observes, is as a general rule the real legislative power. Parliament merely confirms the proposals of the Cabinet, which in turn does little more than register approval of the decisions made by the departmental officials—the true despots. Hence the "New Despotism."

Looking at the matter impartially, it is difficult to see why we should regard the discretion of a judge, who is independent and

virtually irremovable, except for serious misconduct, as less "irresponsible or uncontrolled" than the decision of a civil servant, whom we may fairly regard as no less anxious to serve the public welfare, but who in the case of a serious error may be dismissed without notice by a superior Minister responsible to Parliament. Somewhere on the Treasury Bench there is a Minister who can be made to answer for the potential misdeeds or wrong decisions of every civil servant; but apart from that there is little reason to believe that civil servants are less susceptible to public opinion than the judges. When scandalous allegations of improper conduct were made against the police the House of Commons asserted its authority at once. If we wish to arrive at a true understanding of the matter we must ask, as we are entitled to ask, not whether the administrative departments have wide powers of discretion, not even whether those powers are uncontrolled by the courts, but whether the departments are in fact guilty of "administrative lawlessness." Lord Hewart holds them guilty; but there is little evidence, apart from a few instances arising during the war or under D.O.R.A., of any real abuse of power. His indictment may be true, but there is no substantial evidence to support it as yet. It is an extremely significant fact that the great outcry against the increased powers conferred on the executive has come, not from the public, but from the legal profession. It is the judges and the lawyers who denounce most bitterly the "encroachment" of the Executive into the legislative and judicial fields.

It is important above all else to approach the whole question with an open mind free from preconceived opinions as to the immutable necessity of any particular division of powers, or the need to resist "encroachment" in this or that direction. It is easy to fall into the habit of thinking that the various organs of government have vested rights in the performance of particular kinds of functions. But in truth all our constitutional arrangements are only provisional attempts to satisfy the needs of the community; and all claims to monopoly of jurisdiction must wait upon the public welfare. The public weal is the one and only valid test; and he would be a bold man who would ascribe immortality to the constitutional principles which Dicey believed to exist in this country. To speak of the "encroachment" of the executive on the provinces of the legislature and the judiciary is in any case a misuse of terms. In the first place, as I have shown elsewhere,* those provinces have never been separated, either in the past or in the present, with even an approximate degree of rigidity. In the second place, the changes in jurisdiction of which complaint is made, are taking place, not in relation to the more mature activities of the State, but in regard to

* See my *Justice and Administrative Law*. *Passim*.

the newer functions of government. There can scarcely be "encroachment" on land which has not previously been settled.

This brings us to the heart of the matter. The constitutional arrangements which Dicey described and the Lord Chief Justice wishes to see restored, grew up during a time when the activities of the Government were almost entirely of a regulatory character. The State kept the ring and maintained a policy of hands off while private individuals asserted themselves freely. The great mass of the laws, apart from those relating to crime, were of the "self-operating" variety; that is to say, they conferred rights and duties on private individuals and left their enforcement to the initiative of the private citizen, who could use the machinery of the courts. Nowadays the State acts, not only as judge and policeman, but also as doctor, nurse, schoolmaster, trader, manufacturer, insurance organiser, house builder, town planner, sanitary engineer, railway controller, and in a hundred other capacities. The conception of government has changed from the negative one prevalent in the days of *laissez faire* and has become positive in a new sense. It is this fundamental tendency which constitutes the "persistent influence" that has increased so largely the powers of the administration. Lord Hewart perceives the existence of a "persistent influence," but does not analyse its nature and significance. He even implies that the determining factor in the whole movement is the lust for power of civil servants.

Two further questions arise. The first is whether we are indeed being subjected to a régime of administrative lawlessness. I do not myself believe we are, although it would appear at first sight, as Lord Hewart argues, that immunity from control by the Courts of Law necessarily involves an anarchical absence of all effective restraint whatsoever. New forms of law, legal tissue "in the making," always appear at first as manifestations of extra-legal absolutism: witness, for example, the growth of the equitable jurisdiction of the Courts of Chancery. There is a considerable amount of evidence to suggest that a new system of true administrative law is even now growing up in the body politic.

The second question is whether the old and obvious correctives will suffice to meet modern needs. Many controls will have to be formulated if the administrative jurisdiction is to be kept within proper bounds and disciplined to accord with the temper of the people. But it is doubtful whether those controls will be the old ones of review by the courts of executive decision on the one hand, and express approval by Parliament of all quasi-legislative activities on the other. No sane person desires or intends to tolerate despotism, be it new or old. But in attempting to secure control over the executive, we must take care not to deliver ourselves to the despot-

ism of frustration, inefficiency, and the discredited system of constitutional "checks and balances."

The remedies proposed by the Lord Chief Justice are as follows. First, the repeal or amendment of all the worst of the offending sections in Acts of Parliament. Second, the prevention of similar legislative misdeeds in the future by means of committees in each House of Parliament charged with the sole task of examining every Bill in order to observe "whether and in what respect its provisions may have the effect of increasing the power of the bureaucracy, and whether and by what contrivance that power is to be made irresponsible." It is further suggested that each leading newspaper should appoint an able member of the editorial staff to scrutinise, with a similar object, regularly and as a matter of course, every new Bill submitted to Parliament. In this way, "If the Bill contains the ingredient which it is desired to detect, to expose, and to destroy, well-timed publicity and well-directed opposition should effect their purpose." The object of these proposals is to render all legislative regulations made by government departments under statutory authority subject to approval or confirmation by Parliament, and to enable every ministerial decision to be challenged in a court of law.

A committee has recently been appointed by the Lord Chancellor, after consultation with the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, "to consider the powers exercised by or under the directions of (or by persons or bodies appointed specially by) Ministers of the Crown by way of (a) delegated legislation and (b) judicial or quasi-judicial decision, and to report what safeguards are desirable or necessary to secure the constitutional principles of the sovereignty of Parliament and the supremacy of the law." The Earl of Donoughmore is the chairman, and the committee includes among its members distinguished civil servants such as Sir Warren Fisher, Sir John Anderson, and Sir Claud Schuster. There are no judges on the committee, but the legal profession is represented by three practising King's Counsel, Professor Holdsworth, and three prominent solicitors. The inclusion of Professor Laski is a guarantee that the committee will be certain to be confronted with the full implications of its task from the widest point of view. By the appointment of this committee the constitutional position of the executive has definitely become one of the foremost political issues of the day. It is to be regretted that the committee's terms of reference lay down in advance the principles on which its recommendations are to be based. But it is to be hoped, and indeed even prophesied, that the committee will find it impossible to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion merely by applying to the changed circumstances of to-day the doctrines enunciated by Dicey nearly half a century ago. *A priori* conceptions are no longer helpful in the

present situation, and whatever is to be done must be done by the light of a comprehensive knowledge of executive needs and after a searching inquiry into administrative practice. Professor Barthélemy, the Dean of the Faculty of Law in Paris, relates how many years ago Dicey said to him, "We know nothing about administrative law in this country, and we wish to know nothing." Such a remark could scarcely be made to-day by anyone who is alive to the vital social problems of our time.

WILLIAM A. ROBSON.

THE OLD AND THE NEW BANK OF POLAND.

WHEN the reborn Polish State, after a period of disastrous paper-money inflation, reformed its currency in 1924, one of the most important phases in the work of monetary reform was the creation of a Bank of Poland on a basis of private subscription. By a great effort of Poland's citizens of all ranks, the Bank, with a capital of 100,000,000 *zloty*, came into being. Having weathered another crisis, which overtook the new currency after a time, the Bank of Poland now stands secure as the solid foundation of Poland's financial stability. It has recently been strengthened by the influx of \$70,000,000 of American capital, and is benefiting by the advice of an American financial expert, Mr. Charles Dewey, who sits on its board of directors. When the new Bank of Poland opened its doors in Warsaw in 1925, a tablet was placed above them commemorating the fact that a Bank of Poland had already existed a hundred years ago, and that the record of its achievements was a worthy example to the new Poland in the field of national finance.

That first Bank was founded in 1828, and existed as a separate and independent institution in Russian Poland for nearly sixty years. The centenary of the foundation of the Bank, with a new free Poland in existence and a new Bank of Poland at work, afforded occasion to pay well-deserved homage to its historical predecessor: this has been done by the production of a sumptuous folio volume comprising the history of both institutions.* Some of the facts recorded in that centenary publication may not be devoid of interest to foreign readers, as illustrating the connections between the economic history of the Polish nation and its political fortunes in the nineteenth century.

The idea of creating a Bank of Poland on the model of the Bank of England had occupied the brains of some of the best statesmen even in the last decades of the old Poland before the partitions. Projects to this effect made their appearance in the "Four Years' Parliament" (1788-92), which reformed the Constitution of the country before its final downfall. But the hastening of Poland's political ruin at the hands of her powerful neighbours prevented these projects from maturing. When, in consequence of Napoleon's campaigns, a small Polish State appeared again on the map, first as the Napoleonic Duchy of Warsaw, then after 1815 as a Kingdom of Poland in personal union with Russia, the Bank project once more was mooted in the successive Parliaments of 1818 and 1822. But

* *Bank Polski (1828-1928)*. Warsaw, Printing Office of the Bank of Poland, 1928. (Chapters on the old Bank by Dr. T. J. Buczkowski; on the new Bank by Dr. H. Nowak.)

the state of the Treasury, after the long and devastating period of wars, was not such as to allow the plan to be realised. The budget of the Congress Kingdom continuously showed a huge deficit; the means for the endowment of a Bank of Poland were wanting. What was wanting likewise was the individual initiative of a financial politician of genius. This later and most important factor finally appeared upon the scene in the person of Prince Francis Xavier Lubecki, perhaps the most gifted finance minister whom Poland ever produced.* His first achievement after his appointment to the Ministry of Finance of the Congress Kingdom was to consolidate the kingdom's large debt and to establish the balance of the budget by the unpopular but efficient means of drastic taxation. On the secure basis of this preliminary reorganisation of the kingdom's finance he proceeded to realise his idea of a Bank of Poland. He submitted the project to his colleagues in the government and obtained their authorisation, as well as a grant of 100,000 Polish *zloty*. Thereupon he set to work at once to draft the Statutes of the new Bank with the assistance of his able fellow-worker, Count L. Jelski, who was afterwards to become the Bank's first President.

The vital problem in founding a Bank of Poland under the troubled post-war conditions was to attract private capital to it. Lubecki succeeded in this by guaranteeing to all deposits placed in the Bank freedom from every kind of taxation, exemption from seizure for debt, and the security of the State against all loss of capital. The issue of notes was rigorously limited to the amount of the Bank's fundamental capital, and the repayment of the consolidated national debt was insured by mortgaging all the State's sources of income and all its possessions. In a similarly simple and sweeping way the authority of the new Bank was raised above that of all other financial institutions in the land, so as to give it a privileged position. All the money put in trust for minors, or deposited by order of the court pending decision in a lawsuit, was to be placed in the Bank of Poland. So was the stock of ready money owned by religious orders, churches, and insurance societies. By this means, a considerable influx of capital was obtained. In addition to the sums flowing into the Bank from private sources, the sale of State securities on foreign exchanges produced more, and besides this the Bank itself, from the very beginning of its existence, began to yield substantial profits. The first year resulted in a profit of 10 per cent. of the capital invested. By the end of the second year (1829) the capital of the Bank amounted to the total of 30,000,000 *zloty*, the sum aimed at by its founders. The succeeding

* His financial policy found a worthy historian in the late Stanislas Smolka, Professor of History in the University of Cracow, who dealt with it in a large work (*Polityka Lubeckiego*, 2 vols., published by the Polish Academy, Cracow, 1907).

years continued to add to the profits, which, between 1828 and 1841, equalled a total of 79,000,000 *zloty*.

The financial solidity of the Bank of Poland was so evident from the outset that immediately after its foundation the Bank received numerous offers of credit from the greatest financial powers abroad, such as the various branches of the House of Rothschild. Very soon, however, that financial solidity was to be put to the severest test. Barely two years after the opening of the Bank the political tension in Russian Poland led to the outbreak of the insurrection of 1830. The insurrection was the work of young military conspirators in the Officers' Training Corps, and Lubecki was one of those of the older generation who could not bring themselves to share the enthusiastic hopes of the youngsters. Accordingly, he left the country for St. Petersburg, never to return. But his work remained behind. It was owing to him that the small Congress Poland, undertaking a presumptuous war against the whole gigantic power of the Russian Empire, did so with a well-filled treasury and an ordered financial system; and it was due to these fundamental assets no less than to the valour of the soldiers that the national war, against all the probabilities of the case, went on with a considerable measure of success for nearly a year. The Bank of Poland never showed its soundness so triumphantly as it did in the midst of the storm of 1831. To us of the present generation who have lived through the catastrophe of inflation in most European countries during and after the World War, it is particularly surprising to learn that never, throughout the insurrectionary year, did the Bank stop the exchange of its notes for gold at par. It was certainly on account of this firmness of Poland's financial position as much as for political considerations that the negotiations of the insurrectionary Polish Government for a loan of £4,500,000 from English sources were crowned with success—a fact which has not been much noticed by historians, and which well may seem amazing when recalled in the utterly changed European situation of to-day.

Unlike most other free institutions of Congress Poland, the Bank survived the insurrection. Towards the end of the war year its treasury was temporarily transferred to Toruń (Thorn), but soon afterwards it returned to Warsaw. The Russian Government, reorganising its Polish province politically by the so-called "Organic Statute" of 1832, allowed the Bank of Poland to continue its work under its old name and with its former independence, and it was, in fact, during the three decades between the two insurrections, in the years from 1832 to 1862, that the Bank unfolded its most fruitful and beneficial activities for the development and progress of Russian Poland.

In organising the Bank, Lubecki had realised at once that in the

ruined state of the country after the Napoleonic Wars a Bank of Poland would have a far wider range of tasks to fulfil than the corresponding institutions in other lands. The Bank of Poland, according to Lubecki's plan, was not only to conduct the financial business of the kingdom, but, being the largest reservoir of capital and the largest source of credit in the State, it was to serve as the main factor in the revival of agriculture, the promotion of trade and industry, and the development of communications. In order to keep the Bank authorities in touch with the economic life of the country, Lubecki caused a paragraph to be inserted in the Statutes of the Bank under which six delegates of the Warsaw Chamber of Commerce were to act as advisers of the Bank with the title of "Commercial Counsellors."

The results of this far-sighted policy—a policy not bounded by fiscal horizons, but envisaging all the most vital economic needs of the people—were soon forthcoming. Russian Poland, in the course of the nineteenth century, developed into the chief industrial district of Russia, supplying the whole vast Empire with manufactured articles of all kinds. That important historical fact had its roots in the original policy of Lubecki's Bank, and the policy of high protective tariffs which Russia adopted was only a powerful additional factor in later development. All departments of mining and of manufacture in the quickly industrialised country are found, on examination, to owe their beginnings largely to financial assistance from the Bank of Poland. The Bank founded or financed ironworks, machine factories, cotton and woollen cloth mills, linen factories, beet-sugar factories, paper mills, flour mills, bakeries, lime kilns, brickworks, factories of cement, of soap, of tobacco. Among the principal industrial undertakings founded by the Bank or materially assisted by it in their beginnings, some of the best-known factories of Central Poland are extant to this day, such as the linen factory of Zyrardów, near Warsaw; the machine factory in Warsaw itself, now owned by the firm of Lilpop, Rau, and Loewenstein; and the ironworks at Ostrowiec. Also the large textile factories of Łódź—the "Polish Manchester"—founded as they were mostly by German immigrants, would not have come into being without generous credits from the old Bank of Poland.

Next to industry, mining enjoyed the particular fostering care of the Bank. Long-neglected mines in various parts of Poland had been revived, and new ones opened up, through the initiative of Congress Poland's Minister of Mines and Industries, the enlightened and wonderfully many-sided scientist, writer, and social reformer, Stanislas Staszić. But these State-owned mines suffered from bad administration and constantly worked at a loss. In 1832 the Administrative Council of the Kingdom turned the State mines over to the

Bank, and under the administration of the Bank they soon began to yield profits and to flourish. The great development of the coal-basin of Dabrowa, in the south-western part of Russian Poland, begins in this period of Bank administration. Not only coal mines, but zinc works, blast-furnaces, foundries, and machine factories clustering round the coal basin, are set in motion by the Bank; and one centre of the iron industry at least—the “Bank Ironworks” (*Huta Bankowa*)—retains in its very name a trace of the manifold and epoch-making activities of the Bank of Poland in this its heroic period.

In the sphere of communications, both by land and water, the record of the work done by the old Bank is no less remarkable. The construction of waterways, to link up the river systems of Poland with each other and with the sea, had been hopefully begun during the great national revival of Poland in the era of enlightenment. That short period of productive activity having been broken off by Poland's political catastrophe, the canals, like many other undertakings, remained neglected and unfinished, until the Bank of Poland took them under its control. It was the Bank which completed the “Augustowo Canal” uniting the Vistula with the Niemien and providing an important water highway, chiefly for the export of timber from Eastern Poland, in the direction of the old Baltic port of Libau.

As for communications by land, the Bank, by order of the Government, built in a short time no less than six main roads traversing important parts of the country, and a large number of by-roads. This work, like much else that the Bank had in hand, was not interrupted even during the insurrectionary war of 1831: the Russian prisoners of war taken in the course of the campaign were profitably employed in road construction. Soon afterwards the early railway age opened up another field of initiative for the economic activities of the Bank: it was the Bank which organised the joint stock company for the building of what was to be the principal railway artery of Russian Poland, the so-called “Warsaw-Vienna Railway” from Warsaw to the industrial regions in the south-west of the province, and on through them to the Austrian frontier.

Finally, the Bank never forgot to extend its protection to the oldest and still the fundamental industry of Poland, viz. agriculture. It provided credit facilities for the purchase of agricultural machinery; it built large storehouses for corn in Warsaw and at Wloclawek; and, after the ravages of the war of 1831, it financed the import into the country of 30,000 head of cattle. Apart from the systematic support given to manufacturing and agricultural production, the Bank, of course, constantly fulfilled a purpose more germane to its essential character as a financial institution, by

assisting the growth of commerce through all the various credit operations for which the practice of the older Western European banks of the same type provided precedents and examples.

The activities of the Bank of Poland, as we have seen, had not only survived the insurrectionary calamity of 1831, but entered into the period of their fullest development after it. The forces of political repression had not interfered with its work, and in the late fifties and early sixties it even seemed that the growth of economic prosperity would bring a growth of cultural and political self-government in its train. However, the constructive efforts in this direction made by Count Alexander Wielopolski, the most distinguished politician of Russian Poland in that period, were thwarted by contrary currents emanating from the St. Petersburg bureaucracy, as well as by the impatience of the more hot-blooded and more radically-minded sections of the population. The Thirty Years' Peace which had followed the rising of 1831 was broken by another insurrection in 1863-4, and the inevitable disastrous end of that second armed movement was necessarily followed by more sweeping abolition of all the liberties and distinctive institutions in Russia's Polish domains. The “Vistula Province” (*Privislinye*), as Russian Poland soon came officially to be called, was gradually turned into an ordinary Russian administrative district under a Russian Governor-General residing in Warsaw. This time the Bank of Poland did not remain unaffected by the all-embracing political process of thorough Russianisation. It was made more and more dependent on St. Petersburg, and simultaneously began to lose its former economic importance for the country. Ultimately it was formally changed, together with all its branches in the provincial towns, into an organic part of the network of branch offices of the Russian State Bank, spread all over the Empire.

Such was the end of the first Bank of Poland. In surveying, across the intervening gulf of time and events, the half-century of its manifold and successful activities, we realise fully to-day how much they contributed to making Russian Poland that uncommon and somewhat paradoxical spectacle which it presents to the eye of the historian: a country politically oppressed, yet economically prospering. The admirable record of the old Bank of Poland thoroughly disproves the opinion widely held that it was only to the protection of, and incorporation in, the Russian Empire that the Kingdom of Poland owed its favourable economic development. This superb record of Polish economic self-help also disproves the common fallacy that the Poles, known as a nation of romantic idealists, are constitutionally deficient in business capacity. The new Bank of Poland of 1925 is, in fact, like the new Polish State, not a wild and baseless experiment, but the inheritor of a tradition which it has

reason to be proud of, and of which it is endeavouring to prove worthy.

The renewed life of the Bank of Poland has begun under infinitely more favourable political auspices than the old Bank enjoyed a hundred years ago, but the economic difficulties are no less grave. In fact, the economic difficulties are considerably wider in range and deeper in intensity to-day because the World War has wrought much greater ravages than did the Napoleonic Wars, and the economic organisms affected by it are, after a hundred years of technical and commercial progress, much more complex than were the social structures of 1828. In a profoundly changed economic world it cannot be expected that the reborn Bank of Poland, besides its principal concern of currency regulation, can take upon itself alone the whole variety of tasks of economic development which the old Bank performed. The financial support of the industries of the country has been entrusted, in the new Poland, to a separate Bank which is likewise privileged and, to some extent, controlled by the State, viz. the Bank of National Economy (*Bank Gospodarstwa Krajowego*), and side by side with it yet a third great institution has arisen recently which takes the vast and important domain of agriculture for its special province: the Agricultural Bank (*Bank Rolny*) founded in 1927. Between them, these three outstanding financial institutions form the pillars of the new Poland's economic fabric, and divide the labours which Lubecki's creation, the old Bank of Poland of 1828, so efficiently and, indeed, gloriously carried out single-handed during the best part of the nineteenth century.

R. DYBOSKI.

Cracow University, Poland.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE CALAMITY OF THE CHINESE GENERALS

THE mixed comedy and tragedy that for many years have characterised the almost daily life of Chinese generals, politicians, and people, seems to be far from having spent itself. A year ago it looked as if the wars were over; but those who took the appearance of China at its face value were taught, not for the first time, that they ought to have known better.

The atmosphere and temperament of Chinese affairs are so different from those of the West that they do not cease to exert a certain fascination, morbid and horrible as it may be, over the Western student. The story of what happens in China is fantastic, yet real. It seems odd that a great and ancient people should not jump at even half a chance of stopping a civil war that has blazed intermittently for more than eighteen years; it is odd still that the perfect chance of stopping it that was presented to them a year ago was let go with apparent unconcern, and the disastrous muddle allowed to continue.

At the end of 1928 Nanking seemed to be setting up a peaceful, ordered Republic on the ashes of the civil wars. At the end of 1929 a ring of disgruntled generals were encompassing the overthrow of Nanking, and as these lines were written it was difficult to assess how serious the danger was. By what process had the promised Chinese stability been undermined during 1929? It seems more practical at the present time to study the internal condition of China rather than her foreign relations, whether with Russia, Japan, or Great Britain; for until there emerges a definite, strong organisation in China competent to act for China, Chinese foreign policy can have no more substance than the morning mist.

It was on October 4th, 1928, that "The Organic Law of the National Government of the Republic of China" was promulgated in Nanking. Even competent observers, for all the cynicism that had been thrust upon them by their past observations, now abandoned doubt and assumed that the civil wars were at an end. A central government had established its authority. It had based that authority on a new constitution drawn up by itself for the purpose. The Preamble to the Organic Law stated that the Kuomintang Party was supreme, that it had created the Nationalist Government and would direct its administration. The formula wore the comforting complexion of something settled: "The Kuomintang of China, in pursuance of the Three People's Principles [i.e. of the late Dr. Sun Yat-sen] and the Five Power Constitution of the Revolution, hereby establishes the Republic of China."

J. L.

m 56, M 62

M 62.137

"The Party, having swept away and removed all obstacles by military force, and having passed from the period of military conquest to that of political tutelage, now must establish a model government based upon the Five Power Constitution to train the people, so that they may be able to exercise their political powers, and to facilitate the Party in hastening the handing over of such powers to the people.

"Accordingly, the Kuomintang, in fulfilling the duty of direction and supervision of the Nationalist Government devolving upon it by virtue of its history, hereby formulates and promulgates the Law governing the Organisation of the Nationalist Government."

Within a week of the promulgation of that constitution the first constitutional government of the new China was completed. On October 10th, 1928, Chiang Kai-shek took the oath as President of the National Government of China, and made a speech appealing for the people's loyalty to the principles on which the Kuomintang Party had developed. He outlined the course of the revolution now ended, protested the loyalty of the Government both to the Kuomintang Party and to the people in general, pleaded for a stern rejection of the Communist doctrine of class-war and of the civil divisions that had been produced by military rivalries. He also appealed for the institution of a new cultural order, in which the old superstitions should be dropped and should be replaced by scientific knowledge.

Mr. Wang, the Foreign Minister, lost no time in getting to work. He had already, before entering upon his constitutional office, negotiated a settlement with France of the dispute resulting from the Nanking incident of March, 1927, the terms of which were announced on October 17th, 1928. Mr. Wang on October 1st, 1928, had addressed a Note to the French Government expressing his Government's regret for the material and personal damage and indignity inflicted on French subjects, stated that effective measures had been taken for the punishment of the culprits, and proposed the setting up of a joint commission to assess the material damage. The French Government, which loves reparation commissions, accepted the proposal on the same date, whereupon Mr. Wang's Government paid a deposit of \$50,000 to the French Consul-General at Shanghai on account of the sum ultimately to be paid.

On October 28th, 1928, the National Government issued a detailed programme of domestic reform. It provided for a reduction of the army in accordance with the sound principle that "militarism is the cause of our national bankruptcy," for the abolition of all irregular levies such as *likin*, for currency reform, and

for the setting up of a new national tariff. At the same time Mr. Wang was negotiating with Japan, Italy, and Great Britain a form of settlement and compensation for the Nanking outrages of March, 1927, with a view no doubt to paving the way for the negotiation of new tariff treaties. Mr. Locker-Lampson on November 14th, 1928, stated in the House of the Commons that the Government was at that time engaged in negotiating a tariff treaty with Nanking, an incidental effect of which, if concluded, would be (he observed) the automatic recognition of the Chinese National Government.

There seemed little doubt that the recent phase of Chinese civil war was a thing of the past. Mr. Wang started an intensive process of treaty-making, which quickly led to the signing during November and December, 1928, of treaties with Great Britain, Norway, Belgium, Italy, Denmark, Portugal, Sweden, and the Netherlands. Even the Bias Bay pirates felt the breeze from Nanking. On November 16th twenty-one pirates were executed at Hankow as a result of the attack which had been made on the China Steam Navigation Company's s.s. *Shasi* on November 3rd. The quality of the work now embarked on by Nanking was typified by the treaty which was signed with Great Britain on December 20th, 1928. It was signed at Nanking by Sir Miles Lampson and Dr. C. T. Wang, and constituted a complete recognition by Great Britain of Chinese tariff autonomy. The signing of the treaty implied a recognition by Great Britain of the new Chinese Government.

For the rest of the year the new China appeared to be uniformly serene in temper. In January, 1929, as if to test that serenity, a small civil war broke out in Szechuan, but it ended quietly in the overthrow of a general. The rebels' simple object had been achieved, and the ripple on the face of China passed over. Towards the end of February, however, another civil war with a similar origin blazed up and spent itself in the Kwangsi faction of Wuhan. It ended, or appeared to end, on February 21st in the eviction of Lu Ti-ping, the Governor of Changsha, by the Wuhan Council on the alleged ground of his inefficiency. In this case, however, the end was not so simple as had been the case at Szechuan; for it happened that the suppressed general had been nominated to his post by none other than the Nanking Government. Now in China generals may be set up or suppressed without much disturbance. When, however, a new government is beginning to fashion order out of chaos, and the object of an apparently insignificant civil war happens to be its own creature, wounded pride begins to make itself felt. The central government was tempted to regard the matter as a *casus belli* against the Kwangsi faction of Wuhan.

n other words was tempted to stultify itself and to defeat its object by engaging in civil war, forgetting that the whole theory of its major purpose was to put an end to civil war.

It soon emerged that Nanking could not control the craving for war that seems to have infected the blood of the Chinese politicians. The Government restrained itself for four weeks, until the National Congress of the Kuomintang had been negotiated, and then promptly took action (March 26th, 1929). Civil war again loomed on the horizon. In the first week of March Chiang Kai-shek was reported to be moving a force of 150,000 against Hankow, and a force of 100,000 was said to be massed against him. It was in this grim circumstance (March 6th, 1929) that Sir Frederick Whyte accepted the post of "political counsellor" to the National Government. He wisely retained his independence by stipulating that he should not be paid for his services.

During the following fortnight both sides appeared to be straining on the leash. All the Chambers of Commerce, the associations of bankers, and other business men submitted manifestos to the central government and to all the provincial governments appealing to them not to restart the civil war. It is one of the abiding mysteries of the world how finance, banking, and commerce continue to function in China, where the very basis of such activities, namely public confidence in their continuity, seems on a superficial view to have been destroyed. The explanation appears to be that the Chinese genius maintains a firm distinction between essentials and non-essentials, and regards civil war as belonging to the latter category.

The blow fell on March 26th, when Chiang Kai-shek and the Presidents of the five Government Committees signed what was called a "punitive mandate" to be put into force against Wuhan. The punitive mandate, if it meant anything, meant war. It stated that the three Kwangsi leaders, Li Chai-sum, Li Chung-jen and Pai Chung-hsi, were thereby dismissed from their posts, and warned Wuhan that if its forces continued to advance, an attack would be launched by Nanking. War, however, was averted by one of the familiar phenomena of Chinese quarrels, namely the wholesale defection of one or other of the opposing armies. It often happens in Chinese wars that the troops of one side, whose pay happens to be in arrear, change over at the critical moment and become the troops of the other side. The face of the battle is thereby distorted, becomes unrecognisable, and the battle stops because no one knows what to do or where to shoot. Such a thing happened on April 4th, 1929, when one of the Wuhan generals walked over with his army to the side of the government, whereupon the headquarters of the side he had deserted promptly decided to surrender, and the war was

over before it had really begun. Hardly any blood was shed. On the same day the Wuhan command evacuated Hankow. Marshal Chiang Kai-shek landed in Hankow on the following morning and the Kwangsi authority was formally transferred to the central government. By a familiar stroke of irony the new authorities asked the British rear-admiral to lend the services of the British marines for the prevention of looting, looting being the normal concomitant of Chinese victory. All that they obtained, however, was a promise that a British naval force would be landed in case any danger arose to British lives or to British property. On April 9th shipping was resumed on the Yangtse in normal proportions, and Hankow resumed its normal life.

Although on this occasion there had been hardly any loss of life, and no looting, yet these weird collisions between the scattered Chinese armies had to be paid for under the surface by the Chinese people, whose capacity for suffering is almost as great as that of the Russian people. When the storm between Wuhan and Nanking first blew up, a weary voice was raised in protest, as if to show that even Chinese patience is not inexhaustible. A Hankow newspaper, the *Sin Min Pao*, on March 4th published an article entitled "Don't Provide Communists and Militarists with an Opportunity." The writer made a strong plea against the threatened war, the tone of his argument being typified by the sentence: "Could an emaciated and broken China survive another period of anarchy?"

It is not an easy job to be President of the National Government of China. Chiang Kai-shek had reason for doubting the loyalty of many a general who could move troops and cause a diversion at any moment. Marshal Feng Yü-hsiang, for instance, had for a long time specialised in a technique of exquisite blackmail against Chiang Kai-shek. He could always be relied on to take any opportunity of making mischief, was always willing to call off his mischief at a price in cash, but reserved full liberty to repeat the experiment whenever a new opportunity presented itself. No sooner had it become probable that some sort of contest of strength would develop between Nanking and Wuhan than Feng began manoeuvring for position. He happened to be Minister of War in the Nanking administration. On March 12th he telegraphed his resignation of that post and failed to attend the Third National Congress of the Kuomintang that met three days later (March 15th) in Nanking. While the Congress was sitting the four provinces he controlled (Kansu, Shensi, Honan, and Shantung) telegraphed a manifesto to the Congress criticising the organisation of the Kuomintang and giving notice that they refused to be bound by its decisions. When on March 26th Chiang issued the "punitive

mandate" against Wuhan, Feng made two moves. He first announced that he intended to remain loyal to the central government, and proceeded at once to move a strong force towards the scene of the Wuhan-Nanking war. Nobody could know, probably Feng himself did not know at that stage, on which side he intended to fight, his protestation of loyalty being an obvious tactical measure designed to keep open his line of political retreat. On Feng's record, it was recognised in Nanking and in Hankow alike that no inference could be drawn from what Feng said or did as to what he would ultimately say or do. On March 31st Feng, with the same sinister correctitude as before, informed Nanking that seven of his divisions were advancing on Hankow down the Peking-Hankow railway. It later transpired that Chiang Kai-shek had at this stage paid to Feng the sum of £500,000 as the price of his "loyalty." It is little wonder that Chiang Kai-shek on April 10th circularised the various parts of the country by telegram to point out that in his view it had become necessary to organise a thorough campaign against what he called the "counter-revolutionary and reactionary" influences within the Government itself. He added wearily that he himself intended to resign his post after he had pacified Hankow.

After the Hankow fighting was over, and in answer to certain current and readily understandable gossip that his loyalty to Nanking was not above suspicion, Feng Yü-hsiang sent out a circular telegram to all and sundry protesting his loyalty and adding the information that the recent movements of his troops had all resulted from orders issued to him by Chiang Kai-shek himself. That telegram probably caused no surprise to any of its recipients, for it is one of Feng's abiding qualities that when an issue is decided, he feels it deeply if any doubt should be cast upon his unwavering loyalty to whichever party in the end happens to be victorious.

The National Government, however, for its part, now felt strong enough to clip a little from the wings of the wayward Feng. Although Feng had originally been promised the control of Shantung after the Japanese evacuation, it was announced in Nanking on April 19th that the National Government now intended itself to take over the control, and that government proceeded to appoint its own director to the port of Tsingtao. There had been more or less serious trouble in Shantung since the beginning of the year. The Japanese occupation of the Shantung railway had cut off northern Shantung from effective control by Nanking, and the resultant state of anarchy suggested to another disgruntled general, Chang Chung-chang, the ex-tüchün of Shantung, an opportunity for a little mischief of his own. He landed at Lungkow from Dairen

on February 19th with (it was said) more than 20,000 troops. He added every bandit, hooligan, thief, or irregular soldier he could find still further to swell his numbers and succeeded in capturing Chefoo on March 27th. Nanking at that time had its full attention trained on Hankow. When the Hankow revolt was put down and Nanking was free to deal with Chang Chung-chang, the latter's hooligans foresaw a sporting chance of defeat and promptly went home, leaving their commander high and dry. Chefoo was duly recaptured by the Nanking forces on April 23rd and Chang Chung-chang unconcernedly went back to Dairen.

During April the scattered and defeated Wuhan troops wandered about the Middle Yangtse valley causing what misery they could. British and other foreign shipping found itself under purposeless fire, British property was destroyed, British subjects injured and maltreated. A grim footnote to these and former like events took the form of an official statement issued in Peking by the International Famine Bureau to the effect that the number of people estimated to be starving in China amounted to 50,000,000: more than the entire population of the British Islands. It was further made known that the amount of money spent by the Chinese authorities on the alleviation of distress bore only a minute proportion to the sum that had been collected by them for that purpose. It is one of the inconsistencies of the Chinese character that whereas in banking, commerce, and national commitments abroad one finds a high standard of financial honesty (higher, for instance, than the French standard), little sanctity is assigned by the politicians to funds publicly collected in China for exclusively Chinese purposes. Such funds are regarded as fair game for party purposes.

If the post of President of the Chinese Republic had its unpleasant aspect, it also had its aspect of danger. At the end of March, for instance, the Hupeh authorities accused Chiang Kai-shek of having done to death one of the dismissed leaders of Wuhan, namely Li Chai-sum, and addressed a telegram to the Nanking Government, that is to Chiang Kai-shek himself, stating that "Chiang Kai-shek has betrayed both his party and his country and deserves death. This is not the first time that he has been responsible for the death of eminently virtuous men and plunged his country into the horrors of [civil] war. His guilt is clear. It is our duty to urge all our fellow countrymen to rise up and destroy this arch-criminal and bring back peace to our land." Who would be President of China?

The epitaph to the Nanking-Wuhan civil war seemed to be written when on May 3rd three of the defeated Hupeh generals, Hu Tsung-tuh, Hsia Wei, and Tao Chun were carried in a British gunboat to Woosung, whence they sailed in exile to Hongkong.

Again, however, it was the unexpected that happened. Nanking, thinking no doubt to double the assurance of tranquillity in Wuhan, decided to frighten General Huang Shao-hung (otherwise known as Wong Shiu-hung), the Governor of Kwangsi, against ever restarting the trouble. He was warned on May 3rd that he must at once submit himself to the orders of Nanking, and a time limit, expiring on May 6th, was given for his compliance. He was told that, if he did not comply, military measures would be taken against him. General Huang, however, decided not to be frightened, but instead to accept fight. He began at once to mobilise his forces and plunged into operations. He invaded Kwangtung, and advanced to within thirty miles of Canton. This and a second attempt at revolt by another Kwangsi general were however successfully dealt with by the end of May. By that time the attempt of the Kwangsi faction to assert an independent authority appeared to be crushed.

In the meantime Marshal Feng had drawn renewed attention to himself, first by a certain original move in his administration of Honan, where, in order to improve his liquid resources, he took the unorthodox step of collecting four years' taxes in advance; secondly he began again to worry Chiang Kai-shek by certain sinister-looking movements of troops, accompanied by the destruction of bridges on the Peking-Hankow line and the stopping of trains. Chiang Kai-shek telegraphed (May 17th) to Feng for an immediate explanation of his conduct. Receiving no answer to his telegram, he summoned a meeting of the War Council (May 18th), which decided to issue a "subjugation mandate" against Feng Yü-hsiang, and on the same day Chiang Kai-shek's Chief of Staff, Ho Ying-ching, made a public speech at Hankow in which he virtually stated that Nanking had declared war on Feng Yü-hsiang. On the following day Feng took a step that was typical of his method. A manifesto was issued, not by himself, but by his generals, headed by Han Fu-chu, denouncing Chiang Kai-shek, demanding his resignation, and appealing to Feng to undertake a punitive expedition against him. With such an object no doubt in view Feng took steps to maintain his army (the Kuominchun) in fighting form. Nanking gossip freely asserted that he had spent large sums of money (which had been collected for the purpose of famine relief) in buying munitions and paying his troops. On May 23rd the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang retaliated by passing a resolution at an Extraordinary Plenary meeting whereby Feng was expelled from the party and deprived of all his offices and of membership of the Governing Councils, and whereby the State Council was empowered to issue another "subjugation mandate" against him. The mandate was

duly issued by the Government on the following day (May 24th). It denounced Feng as a rebel against the Government and against the Kuomintang, dismissed him from his offices, ordered his arrest wherever he might be, by whoever might have a chance of arresting him, and went on to accuse him of having signed a secret treaty with Russia, and of being in the pay of Moscow to the tune of 5,000,000 roubles a month. (On May 29th an official statement was issued in Moscow denouncing that allegation as a "gross and ridiculous fabrication.")

If the moneys known to have been received by Feng during the past twelve months by such means as blackmail on Nanking and the misappropriation of funds applicable to quite other purposes were added to the sums alleged to have been received by him from similar and other sources, his liquid funds must have reached a scale comparable to that of the British budget. Feng, however, does not add to his work by drawing up any budgets. He certainly took himself seriously so far as his quarrel with Nanking was concerned. On May 22nd he published the text of a telegram which he had addressed to the world in general, but in particular to the Great Powers, appealing for their neutrality in the impending struggle between himself and what he called the "illegal Nanking Government," which, he maintained, had ceased to represent the country. In support of his argument he submitted that the Third Congress of the Kuomintang party had been packed by the nominees and supporters of Chiang Kai-shek.

The next important diversion was caused by Yen Hsi-shan, the Governor of Shansi, who with Chang Hsueh-liang had been appointed to command armies against Feng. Yen Hsi-shan promptly began to play a double but mysterious game, with the result that neither Feng nor Chiang knew whether he was for or against them. At one point he appeared to be toying with the rôle of mediator between the two. A little later (June 12th) he was officially reported to have informed the Nanking Government that he had arranged to meet Feng during the next few days, and that they were both going to travel abroad together. Thereupon Yen was relieved by Nanking of his Governorship of Peking and Tientsin. It next emerged that Feng was playing as double a game with Yen as he had played with every other general with whom he had come into contact. He refused to meet Yen, but allowed Yen the privilege of arranging with Nanking for his (Feng's) solitary journey abroad. The journey abroad was to be undertaken for the sake of Feng's health, which was reported to be bad. It is a remarkable circumstance that at nearly every crisis of Feng's career, and they are many, his health is reported to be bad; and his health improves the moment a definite outcome of the crisis

becomes visible. In this case, through Yen's offices, Feng made a highly satisfactory deal with Chiang. It cannot be doubted that Chiang for his part regarded any deal as satisfactory which involved the export of Feng from China: but it seems strange that his native Chinese simplicity was strong enough, after all its trials, to believe that Feng really would be exported. The agreement was surprisingly one-sided. Chiang Kai-shek agreed to cancel the order for Feng's arrest, and also agreed to pay to Feng (Feng, as we have seen having a genius for being paid) a sum equivalent to £300,000. Ostensibly the money was to be used by Feng for the payment of the arrears due to his troops. If the pay of his troops really was in arrear, then many other sums raised by him for the purpose of paying his troops must at the last moment have been diverted to other purposes. Chiang, moreover, agreed to reorganise Feng's forces on behalf of Feng: in other words to maintain intact the means at Feng's disposal for causing further mischief in the future.

It was in July that the Sino-Soviet crisis reached its climax in the dismissal from their posts of the Russian officials of the Chinese Eastern Railway. It happened that Feng reappeared on the scene at that precise moment, this time in the rôle of peaceful negotiator. He wanted a sort of peace conference with Chiang, apparently forgetting that an agreement had already been reached. It is true that, since the agreement was reached, certain suggestions had been circularised among Feng's army to the effect that they should go over to Nanking. The suggestions had emanated from Nanking and had been circularised by Yen. The next step in this surprising muddle was that Yen met Chiang for a conference in Peking (June 30th) to discuss the reorganisation of the military administration of the north-west province. Yen took the occasion to ask leave again to accompany Feng on his foreign travels, an odd request in view of its context and of what had happened before. Marshal Feng Yü-hsiang in the meantime took up a position at Taiyuanfu, preferring to negotiate by telegram than by personal contact. On July 3rd Chiang refused Yen's request that he should travel abroad with Feng. Yen thereupon went into the Peking Hospital for five days' illness, and on coming out (July 8th) announced that he accepted Chiang's rejection of his request. He further announced that he and Feng would postpone their journey abroad, and would devote themselves to the disbandment and reorganisation of their armies. Feng telegraphed his agreement with what Yen had said to Chiang. Chiang thereupon returned to Nanking, having failed in his object, if his object had been to sterilise Feng.

The condition of general chaos provided a striking background

to an eminently sound article which appeared in a Tientsin paper (*Ta Kung Pao*) on June 13th. The following is a summary of that article: "It is widely realised that the failures of the past and anxieties as to the future are both due to the precariousness of the means of livelihood and to financial stringency—intimately related problems. In the past, after a period of anarchy, China's statesmen acted on the principle that the only way to re-establish industry on a firm basis was to reduce taxation and reorganise finance. In recent years after the end of the European War all the Powers concentrated on reorganising their finances; if they did not reduce taxation at least they reduced its most onerous incidence; further, they discontinued the war precedent of reckless borrowing which only added to the people's burdens and increased the cost of living. This is recognised as the only sane plan after the close of abnormal conditions. In 1927, when Mr. Hoover was Minister of Commerce, he warned the statesmen of the world that the only way to abolish war was to refrain from making any loans other than for the purposes of reconstruction or productive undertakings. The Japanese Economic Association recently passed a resolution to the effect that future loans must be restricted to remunerative enterprises and that their amount must not exceed a figure which would allow of their being repaid.

"In the past eighteen years the Republican Government, in spite of opportunities, has effected no reduction in the cost of the army or of Government; so far from reorganising their finances they have merely added to the people's burdens in the shape of taxations and loans. The difficulty of procuring the means of livelihood has already steadily increased with the exception of a period during the war when exports were booming.

"When the Nationalist Government was consolidated they had an exceptionally favourable opportunity; but famine and rebellions in Wuhan and Kwangsi have made it hopeless to expect the Government to effect any reduction of taxation or liquidation of indebtedness. We can, however, at least look for no further increase of taxation or borrowing for military requirements. Otherwise the day for deliverance for this sorely stricken people is indeed remote.

"Fears of the infiltration of Communism and a rising of the old militarists are negligible; but a national government which, during this period of reconstruction, continued to increase taxation and made more loans for military exigencies would be a danger to the State. The people could not stand it and would run all risks in their desperation; for every Communist removed, a thousand would take his place, and for every militarist exterminated a thousand would spring up. It is better by good finance to clarify the source of the stream than to employ an army to dam its flow."

Canton from Nanking, and the wavering generals of the south (for Chinese generals always waver when something new takes place) decided, no doubt on the strength of the 60,000 aforesaid, to remain loyal to Nanking. The Nationalist forces were therefore able to break the Kwangsi revolt before Chang Fat-kwai had made contact with them. When Chang captured the Kwangsi capital on October 9th, it was already too late, and he had to turn his forces again to the north.

By October 16th the National Government, having consolidated its position on the Canton front, recalled its troops from the south, and stationed them on the Yangtse in readiness to meet the danger from the north. Feng's tactics were true to type. He did not show his hand, but worked through a subordinate general. That subordinate burst into revolt in due form, initial manifesto and all, and marched south. In the meantime Feng and Yen Hsi-shan, the Governor of Shansi, who had now become identified with all Feng's works, sat on the fence, neither openly supporting nor disowning the rebellious subordinate. At one moment (October 15th) Yen reported to Nanking that he had taken Feng prisoner, explaining that he had done so in order to preserve the peace of Northern China. Whether he did take Feng prisoner, whether, if so, he did it against Feng's wish or with Feng's connivance, are speculations of which the truth can never be known. Probably Feng and Yen had as much, or as little, ground for trusting each other, as Chiang had for trusting either. The clearest fact is that Chiang himself left Nanking on October 28th to take command on the Yangtse front. As he did so, he took the remarkable step of appointing Yen Hsi-shan to be Vice-Commander-in-Chief of the Government forces. If his object was to test Yen's sincerity and force his hand, he failed in that object, for Yen, with the same imperturbable air of mystery as before, refused the post of Deputy Commander-in-Chief on the ground that he wished to remain neutral. The story of these Chinese generals is nearly unbelievable. Yet it is true. To claim "neutrality" in a civil war waged between loyalists and rebels—for the National Government was a definite formal entity—was in itself, if the matter be thought out, an act of rebellion. But the degrees of loyalty and shades of meaning in words have become in China a form of finesse unnoticed because habitual.

Chiang Kai-shek now appeared to accept the issue with Feng Yü-hsiang as no longer avoidable. He issued a manifesto in which he stated that the Nanking Government had tried, and had failed, to reach agreement with Feng by political means, and that it was now necessary to settle with him by decisive military means. At the same time he accused Feng of being in league with the Russians outside the country and with the Communists inside the

country. A close censorship was at once imposed on all military information. Rumour, therefore, became more than usually exciting. First, there were Nationalist defeats; next, Kuominchun defeats; next, a report that both Feng and Yen had been captured. The latter report could be dismissed as untrue, because there was ground for believing that Feng and Yen had retired together to Shansi, where they were living in peace, having left the conduct of operations to their subordinates.

During the first three weeks of November there was much rumour, but little reliable information, about the activities of the various generals. On November 6th, for instance, it was rumoured that Yen-Hsi-shan had decided now to accept the post of Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the Nationalist forces, as offered to him a second time by Nanking. Feng at the same time countered that rumour by a statement that Yen was working with him against Nanking. On the following day he thought of something cleverer. He now announced that Yen had, indeed, accepted the post of Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the Government forces, but that such acceptance was a "well-meaning fabrication" analogous to the telegram in which some weeks earlier he had announced to Nanking his capture of Feng. While these propagandist rumours and telegrams were competing with each other, certain movements of troops were undoubtedly taking place. Not only was the Kuominchun moving southwards, but Chang Fat-kwai's "Ironsides" were moving towards Kwangsi, one of the Kwangsi generals having decided to rebel against Canton and to throw his weight on the side of Chang.

During the remainder of November and the first half of December the domestic news from China consisted of contradictory reports of the successes and failures of the three chief warring groups—the Nationalist forces under Chiang Kai-shek, the "Ironsides" of Chang Fat-kwai in league with the now openly rebellious Kwangsi forces, and the Kuominchun of Feng Yü-hsiang. The only comic relief was provided by a report (November 24th) that the Kuominchun had deliberately and in a friendly spirit retired to the west in order to allow Chiang Kai-shek to occupy Loyang without unpleasantness, and that the Nationalist differences with the Kuominchun being now thereby composed, Chiang had returned to Nanking. Such pleasantries were welcome to the historian, even though it made no difference to the chronic tragedy of Chinese politics. There seems to be no end to it. The Manchu dynasty fell before a revolution which started on October 10th, 1911. The revolution, degenerating into habitual civil war, has continued ever since. When on October 4th, 1928—almost exactly seventeen years later—a new National Government with a new constitution was set

up, one hoped that peace might descend upon a distracted country. At the end, however, of another year, peace is still as far as ever from realisation. A leading article was published in the *Tientsin Ta Kung Pao* of October 10th, 1929 (the date being purposely chosen) under the ironic heading "Congratulations on the Anniversary of the Republic." The writer recalls that a year ago he wrote a similar anniversary article, in which he pleaded for the reform of public finance, the abolition of illegal taxation, the enforcement of the law and the suppression of bandits. "But," he writes, "nothing has been done in any one of these directions—conditions are even worse than they were a year ago. In spite of official promises of amelioration the plight of the masses remains deplorable. That there is widespread famine with no adequate relief measures, and several provinces devastated by drought and floods, may not be entirely due to bad government, but it is certainly not the fault of the people. This year's civil wars have certainly hindered the introduction of the tutelary period of government; but they are in no way responsible for the duplication of posts, for the poor results achieved, for the failure to eliminate corruption or assure the independence of the Courts. All these have nothing to do with military operations. The result is that to-day there is a feeling of anxiety and pessimism very different to the joyous hopes and expectations which prevailed at this time last year."

A week later (October 18th, 1929) a Shanghai paper, the *Sin Wan Pao*, published an article that might well serve as an epitaph to the year's tragedy. It was headed "A Great Calamity," and was typical of many newspaper descriptions of the terrifying condition of the north-western provinces of China. The article quotes a report of a Famine Commission in Shensi to the effect that the whole district of Fu Feng had only 160,000 inhabitants, of whom 50,000 are now dead and 30,000 have fled. It continues: "In the country 80 or 90 per cent. of the houses have been destroyed, and in villages which formerly housed eighty or ninety families only three or four now remain. The number of children drowned and abandoned is appalling. From the statistics of this one district the plight of the whole province of Shensi and other provinces may be gauged. The natural remedy would be to send food to the famine districts and organise a relief fund; but with no facility for transport there is nothing to do but watch the unfolding of the tragedy. And this is only the beginning of autumn. In a short time the rigours of winter will increase the sufferings of these unfortunate people."

GEORGE GLASGOW.

December 15th, 1929.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
1. THE INDIGNANT FAIRIES. By J. E. G. DE MONT-MORENCY	117
2. REVIEWS LORD D'ABERNON ON GERMANY; THE BLOODY ASSIZES; THE POEMS OF C. E. MAURICE; THE CAMBRIDGE MEDIÆVAL HISTORY; A CHINESE LADY.	124
3. SHORTER REVIEWS: "The Life of Napoleon"; "Guide to the best Historical Novels and Tales"	135
4. NOTICES OF BOOKS: "The Causal and the Casual in History"; "The Hawbucks"	136

THE INDIGNANT FAIRIES.*

(VIRGINIBUS PUERISQUE.)

THE Professor of Modern Mythology had come, as his wont was, to stay for Christmas at Greenwood Chase with the Foresters and make up a house-party that would be incomplete without him. The years were flying and his vast hairy head was greyer and his huge beard was greyer still than in the Christmas times when he was faced with the poor fairies who became the rich fairies. When the first experience happened his cousin, Diana Cecilia Forester, was unmarried, and they saw, or thought they saw together, the poor fairies feed and save the last little nephew Jimbeau. When the second experience happened Cecilia had married the Professor's great-nephew and it was on this Christmas that the Professor had that strange experience in which he was given the Gold Key which opened, so to speak, the door which shuts us out from our Dead Ones.

Various Christmases passed and nothing else happened, though Cecilia and the old man talked ceaselessly in the firelight of their "dreams," as they called them. "The hairy Ogre," as the fairies had called him, never came again into the realm of fairyland; but they had left their "riches," their message of eternal hope, with

* *The Poor Fairies.* Literary Supplement, January, 1921. *The Rich Fairies.* Literary Supplement, January, 1922.

him, and he wondered wistfully at certain intervals of his busy life of scientific research and his ceaseless peering into the mystery of things, whether he should ever "dream" again, whether he should ever see again and handle the Golden Key and enter the Unknown Garden where (he remembered his "dream" that happened when he was wide awake) he found himself again with his father and mother, his brothers and sisters, his old far-away forebears in a reunion that did not seem strange at all, found himself in a world that was fashioned of every loving thing and every loving thought that ever had been his. He wondered whether the sorrows of his lonely life, the wife that he had lost almost before she had been won, the only child that had passed from the certain glories of Academe into the hecatombs of genius that a war of patriotism demanded, he wondered whether these sorrows that he kept in his own heart would, could, be turned to joy in the garden with the Golden Key. Was Faith possible, was it consistent with the scheme of things that he and his fellow-thinkers, the Brotherhood from the Thales and Plato to his own time, had been slowly moulding? But the Poor Fairies and the Rich Fairies never came, though Cecilia and her troop of little ones (fairies themselves) talked of them and wondered where they were.

The old man had been looking forward to his Christmas at Greenwood Chase with his sturdy great-nephew, the man of guns and hunting and work on the Bench of Magistrates, the man to smoke with and talk with over the pleasures and duties of country life. But he yet more looked forward to his talks with Cecilia, who still teased him, though in a gentler fashion, on his perpetual pipe (seventeen pounds consumed in a year at a cost that was enough to endow a cot), his vast stature that bulked huger and huger, and his alleged brutal belief in the material comforts of life, his love of the great wines of which so little are left, the 'thirty-fours and the 'forty-sevens. There were half a dozen bottles left in the cellar at the Chase (he remembered) and he could talk of the days when they drank the superbest of all wines, the vintage of 1820. Yes, he was getting very old, and he loved to be teased by Cecilia and to be reminded of the things that did not matter—the great wines, for instance, of a materialistic century. As he travelled in the train, clad in his ancient and appalling ulster (for the cold had come at last and snow was falling), he thought of all these things with a grim smile, and he thought, too, of the fairies that were no more, of the "dream" and the Golden Key.

He thought of other and seemingly deeper things, of the conclusion that mathematicians and physicists like himself had at last reached, that the world which they had been building up from observed phenomena, and from the application to such phenomena

of mathematical laws which not only explained the phenomena but led by such explanation to new ranges of knowledge which, in its turn, led to the ascertainment of other phenomena that had been out of reach of eye and thought, that this universe was, after all, a world of symbols, and that underlying it were secret things into which the mind, as a methodic instrument of research, could never peer. He was alone in his first-class carriage—that was his Christmas luxury—and he smote his vast knee with his vast fist as he thought of this new conclusion, the conclusion that the Greeks had come to far more than two thousand years ago. "Symbols after all," he grunted, "but symbols of what? If the eternal unknowableness of things is an intellectual fact; if, after all, the universe which we have discovered is symbolic, a mere creature of the intellectual mind explaining reasonably the drift of things, the use of things, the passing show of which we are momentary spectators or perhaps eternal spectators, there must be realities underlying the Mind of Man which not the Mind but the Personality can touch. It may be that the whole of this passing show, this almost infinite sphere where light travels hundreds of millions of light-years to come back to its own starting place, exists for Man only. If so Man, the Person, can find out what Man, the Mind, has shown to be unknowable." And the old fellow fell fast asleep to be awakened, in a moment (it was five hours), by Cecilia, who had detected the sleeping monster the moment that the train stopped at her lonely station.

"You are a thoroughly naughty monster," said Cecilia breathlessly, "sleeping like this; missing your lunch and missing your station and missing your fairies and not doing your share of lugging out your suitcases. You ought to be labelled 'this side up without care.'" By this time they were in the car and the train was out of sight, though a ghostly reminder of its existence remained, a wreath of smoke against the paling pure sky and the red southerly sun. The storm had ended, and the whitened ground and a sharp nip of air showed Christmas was near at hand. It was a lovely evening and as they penetrated the winding woodland road the exquisite lacework of the bare trees, and especially the silver birch, seemed a veil dropping from a serener world by the agency of what Browning calls "unseen hands." Avenue after avenue showed the sunset, the tenderest apple green shading into apple blossom, and then into the gold and red of the ripe fruit. Some pheasants flew across the track and the sunset lit up their marvellous plumage. A tinkle of tender bird voices greeted the gloaming, and a big speckled thrush sang of things to be. As they came into a great clearing a multitude of rabbits showed their white tails and vanished, while a huge hare (that beast of witches, no vermin this!) sped in front of them along the track and then, just

as they neared the home woods, an antlered stag and a doe watched them from an avenue, and as they raced, with no speed limit, past the noble beasts the last rays of the sun touched their luminous eyes. "We were too fast for them. They had not time to bolt," said Cecilia as she swerved round the track and broke from the Chase woods into a vale of ponds and straight uphill home. "Wasn't it a ride?" said Cecilia as they went in to tea. "There was one thing missing," grumbled the old man. "Perhaps," she said sadly, "but wasn't it wonderful?" "Nature is wonderful, puzzling, sad, and there was one thing missing," grunted the Professor, now wide awake.

At last tea was over and the Monster's great cup had been emptied five times and he was smoking the smoke of the blessed in perfect peace, since Cecilia was busy putting other fairies to bed. The Professor rarely read the papers, he took little interest in current events other than discoveries of physical and anthropological facts, which he could cull in various learned journals. But on this occasion he had been asked by his hostess to read a certain passage in *The Times* newspaper of earlier in the month. It referred to a pontifical pronouncement against Fairies by the Teachers' College of Columbia University in the United States of America. "*Fairyland delenda est*," said the great journal with mocking emphasis. The Professor, after reading the announcement, shook his great head of hair as a dog shakes his after a cold immersion and swore a fearful German oath in a roaring voice to hide his emotion. The sound might have brought down the ceiling and, in fact, brought down Cecilia. "I was waiting for your whisper," said she. "I thought it would affect you. But why in German, why not in French or, better still, in Welsh?" "When I swear I always swear in German. The huge collocation of syllables are heard far and near." "Yes, even in my nursery." "Yes, even in the bottomless pit to which I consigned the whole Teachers' College of Columbia University. Imagine their impudence and consider the state of the American secondary schools." The old man roared again and yet again, and the last time in old Goidelic Welsh, the tongue of the fairies (he said with a grimace). "But why are you so angry," said Cecilia with simplicity as the Professor settled in his easy-chair and emitted clouds of smoke, "you once said that science is the only thing that matters." "That is true, but science includes all that is knowable, and I don't know that your fairies—" ("our fairies," said she by way of verbal interpolation) "—our fairies are unknowable. By 'knowable' remember, my dear child, I don't mean only the things that we know by means of our symbolic knowledge of the physical universe, but things that we know which our universal geometry says that,

so far as it is concerned, we can never know." He was orating on the lines that he had been pursuing when he fell asleep. "I don't know what you mean," said Cecilia, "you must tell that stuff to Jim. He is a magistrate and convicts poachers. He will understand." "Your belief in your husband's capacity is remarkable," said the Professor drily, "and, anyway, what have I said that concerns poachers, a class of men whom I have always admired as perpetual protestors against an absurd law?" "Well," said Cecilia, cocking her head in the firelight and looking slyly at her great-uncle, "well, I suppose our fairies are poachers: you can't fit 'em in with your scheme of things, the redoubtable American College of Teachers has condemned them as 'utterly ridiculous.' In these circumstances I ought not to see them, or if I see them I should hale them, a pocketful of them, before Jim's Bench." "Ah! but that is all over," said the Professor. "No, it is not all over. They have come back and not only are they helping me again with my children now, but apparently they have read *The Times* or have heard me read it to Jim." "Do you really mean to say that they are about again after all these long six years?" "Yes, and their clothes are worn, terribly worn, though as neat as ever. Look, I am making them, not five, but ten suits. My fame has gone abroad. They are hungry, too. Dry summers make poor nuts, and they are living on beech nuts, poor stuff at the best." "But how do you know all this?" said the Professor sternly.

He was alert again. He felt surging up in him the old distinction of knowing through the agency of the brain and feeling through the agency of the personality. Then he remembered the Golden Key that the unseen fairy had handed to him when he was brooding full awake over his Christmas bedroom fire. He heard her words again as she said, "O faithless one, why are you weeping, you who are old and wise? Is it Death that you are afraid of?" He remembered that he had been thinking with tears over all that Death had taken away, thinking of his life, of intellectual triumph emphasised by tears, by losses and silences intolerable. Wide awake as he thought, though the voice warned him that he must not mingle this "dream" with his "science," he used the Golden Key and entered the Golden Garden of tender reunion. Then he thought again of the latest conclusion, that there were deeps of reality which must be for ever closed to the Silver Key of science. After a long pause he asked Cecilia again how she knew that the fairies who had learned the meaning of Death had come back. But she had gone back to the nursery and her fairies. So he smoked on to the music of crackling logs, thinking of the fancifulness of things and that superb fancy of the poor fairies who had sung the folk-song which

they had learned from many generations of poor children in the woodland cottage, where the little folk hid in the fuel against the long chimney. They had found their friends, the little poor children who had grown up and died generation by generation, they had found them because they had found—God knows how—the Golden Key of the Garden of Life. "It must be nonsense," said the old man at last, "though it is curiously believable nonsense. And yet what does nonsense in this sense mean? To science it is no-sense, but then science has come to a dead stop." Then the first dinner bell rang and he went up to dress and then to meet the house-party and partake of a meal of which fairies do not dream, and of ancient port about the same age as the youngest of the poor fairies.

Strangely enough the after-dinner talk turned upon education and the decree of the Teachers' College. "For our part," said the Director of Education for the County, "I can't make out these American educationists. I don't suppose I believe in a scientific fashion in fairies, but I know that materialistic children brought up without reverence for the unseen will not be good citizens, since all realities are invisible. What do you say, Professor?" "Quite true, quite true," said that eminent man, "and what is just as true is that science can't get to the bottom of things. We have dug down almost as far as we can dig, but Personality lies under us and laughs at us. But the Americans will learn better in time. They are a very young people and have no tradition of reverence for things that we can feel with our souls, but cannot handle with our hands or our minds." "Oh! We must not say hard things about the Americans," said the genial host, "they are a great people." "Yes," said a retired ambassador, "they are a great people with an uncanny sense of what is sensible, but they, as the Professor says, are young." "Well," said the only American present, a man of science and of humour, "I agree in a sort of way, but you wait. We shall see the fairies, or at any rate what the fairies mean, better than most of you fox-hunting squires. We shall buy your fairies as well as your Sir Joshuas." So with a laugh they went to the drawing-room or other rooms to complete a well-fraught day with much talking and many hopes for the morrow's shooting. Cecilia went late to the smoking-room and found the Professor alone. The rest had gone to bed. "Early to bed and early to rise is an excellent maxim for young people, why are you not following it?" "And why are you not following it?" "Because I am finishing at last the ten suits. One must think of the poor, the poor fairies, at this season as they have come back. There is my tailoring! Nice, neat work, and as the day after to-morrow is Christmas Day they are only just in time. Eugh! how cold it is." She stirred

the fire and put out the electric light. The Professor was curiously awake despite his excellent dinner and satisfying talk. Would anything happen? Would somebody, something, take the clothes? "We are very sad," said a Voice, and it was not Cecilia's voice, "sad that we should have to be sold in order to make those queer people across the seas believe in us. Why should not the gentleman and his friends believe in us without seeing us, and buying us? We are very cold and very old, and we want clothes and we want food, but we will not cross the seas; no, not for acres of nice new nuts. We will not take your clothes, gentle lady, if you cannot protect us from the foreign gentleman." The voice ceased and Cecilia whistled. "He is not a foreign gentleman at all, he lives in New England, but he wants his people to believe in you." "Oh, but there are many fairies in New England," said the Voice, "and we will send a message to them if you like. We have ways of doing that. You see, we live in a world that clever people cannot understand. We went away into that world, but you seemed distressed, and the hairy Ogre seemed distressed, so we came back to your whistle, but it is a nicer world than this, a world full of those who got tired here, our happy friends. We were getting tired and went, but see, we have come to get our winter clothes and sing our winter song."

It would have amazed the American gentleman if he had seen ten little figures come at the sound of a tiny silver whistle and take the clothes away. Their eyes were bright but wistful, their clothes ragged but neat, but they had new caps, acorn caps of a delicious green, and new shoes made of chestnut skins with spiderweb closely interwoven many times. They were of all sizes from a man's thumb to a baby's thumb, and as they put on their new clothes they leaped with delight and ate crumbs with wide-eyed joy. They were wonderful fairies, because all the time they were singing a melody that no man had ever heard before, and Cecilia joined in the melody with a tiny humming sound—Saint Cecilia indeed. Then they joined hands and danced in the firelight on a little gold-bound stool, and the Voice said, "What shall we sing, shall we sing the old song of *Christ the Lord of Men*?" Cecilia nodded, and the hairy Ogre watched the strange scene, all the while thinking of the days that are no more.

All little volk, man, maid, and we,
Do zing of Him, a little child
Who lay amid the sweetest hay
Warm, though 'twas cold on Christmas Day:
We little volk his vaice did zee
Though winter wind was cold and wild
And snow fell fast that Christmas Day.

We are all little folk and still
 We see the Manger. Angel-like
 We watch him year and year about.
 If any folk have any doubt
 Behold our voices smile and fill
 With such a glory as would strike
 A doubter dumb when angels pray
 On a white-fashioned Christmas Day.

"That is the point," said the Professor. "We are little people, not grown up at all. Lead me to my nursery, Saint Cecilia, singer mild." And the company dispersed. J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

LORD D'ABERNON ON GERMANY.*

The first volume of Lord D'Abernon's record was acclaimed for its vividness and sagacity, and the second maintains the high level of its predecessor. The sub-title, "The Years of Crisis," denotes the character of the gloomy period, stretching from June, 1922 to the end of 1923, covered by this instalment. It is the story of the headlong decline of the Mark, arrested at the eleventh hour by a simple expedient which ought to have been adopted at an earlier stage. The Ambassador writes with sympathy for the German people, and his liking for several of the principal figures on the political stage is frankly expressed; but he never loses his critical balance, and he sharply blames the mistakes which they committed and for which their countrymen so dearly paid. The young Republic was fortunate to possess a counsellor at once so friendly and so clear-sighted.

Lord D'Abernon is at his best in analysis of problems and personality, and the little essays which open the volume are pearls of great price. The Introduction surveys reflectively the periods of illness, crisis, and convalescence through which Germany passed during the years he spent at Berlin. A brief study of the "French character" embodies a great deal of observation, and illustrates the immense difference of habit and outlook between England and France. "No real hatred even when enemies—no real comradeship even when Allies." The Personal Appreciations which follow will be treasured by future historians. The first is Poincaré, whose stubborn figure accompanies us throughout the journey. "He fought his case with determination, with obstinacy, blind to any interest other than that of France in the narrowest sense. He was not far from complete success. He was also not far from compromising the whole future of European pacification." Asquith

* Lord D'Abernon's *Diary*. Vol. II, *The Years of Crisis*. Hodder & Stoughton. 218.

pleases our author as much as Poincaré repels. "Breadth—kindliness—and a classical mind." Though temperamentally unsuited to the conduct of a war, he regrets that his proffered services were not utilised at the Peace Conference, where "his moderation, his firmness, his courage in facing temporary unpopularity, might have secured something more judicial than the Treaty eventually signed." The study of Mr. Churchill is full of admiration both for his powers and his character—"genial, affectionate, humorous, the best of friends, a generous opponent." The list of portraits ends with snapshots of Wirth, whom he cordially likes; Maltzan, whom he found a little too clever; Seekt, whom he greatly respects; and Stinnes, whom he detested.

The two main themes of the diary are the fall of the Mark and the invasion of the Ruhr. For the first he blames the Germans, and above all Havenstein, head of the Reichsbank, who with incomprehensible blindness continued to print paper money as a cure for the flight from the Mark. Lord D'Abernon is a financial expert; but it did not require financial genius to realise that the unlimited emission of uncovered paper is the road to ruin. He wrings his hands as he watches the rake's progress, for which Stinnes and other great industrialists, determined on reducing the cost of production, were in large measure to blame. In the autumn of 1923, when the financing of resistance in the Ruhr had knocked the Mark to pieces, Helfferich suggested a fresh currency, and the substitution of Schacht for Havenstein nursed the Rentenmark through the trials of infancy.

In his attitude to the invasion of the Ruhr Lord D'Abernon shares to the full the sentiments of his countrymen. It was a costly and colossal blunder, financially and politically, and many would hardly hesitate to call it a crime. Bonar Law and Curzon stood coldly aloof, and our Law Officers pronounced it illegal; but the unbending Poincaré, who believed in the efficacy of force as blindly as any Bernhardt or Ludendorff, plunged ever deeper into the morass. German resistance was both inevitable and hopeless. "Berlin saw nothing and considered nothing but the national honour." Our diarist speaks strongly, but not too strongly, about this deplorable episode. "Many of the arguments which were valid in 1914 against Germany," he wrote on August 20th, 1923, "are valid to-day against France. Indeed, this is an under-statement, for then the Triple Alliance was balanced by the Russo-French Alliance. To-day France and the smaller Entente is balanced by nothing. That is no reason for unnecessary quarrelling, but it is a powerful reason against still further increasing the dis-balance of power. Anyone who supposes that a French Government dominating the Continent, as Napoleon dominated it

after Tilsit, will remain friendly to England must be a poor judge of national psychology. . . . Desiring the maintenance of the Anglo-French Entente, I am compelled to desire the existence of a strong Germany." Lord D'Abernon is a good European, and that is why his services at Berlin, which these volumes modestly seek to conceal, were so valuable. In the next volume we shall see how the European spirit of Briand triumphed over the narrow nationalism of Poincaré to the great advantage of France no less than Germany, and how the courageous Stresemann, reciprocating the new spirit at Paris, brought his country into the Locarno Pact and the League of Nations.

G. P. G.

* * *

THE BLOODY ASSIZES.*

One of the most astonishing facts in the annals of the most worshipful company of historians is the way in which Dr. Titus Oates from his grave deceived Lord Macaulay. Macaulay had a very strong opinion about Oates. Oates had led, since his hurried departure from the Established Church, "an infamous and vagrant life." On the Continent he constructed "a hideous romance, resembling rather the dream of a sick man than any transaction which ever took place in the real world." Oates translated the romance in real life and gave "the Popish Plot" to the English world with great success, and many victims of this wholesale and vile perjurer were done to death, until Sir William Scroggs, the Lord Chief Justice in 1679, turned upon Oates and broke him in the famous Wakeman trial when the suggestion was that the Queen and Wakeman had conspired against the King's life. In 1685 Oates was brought to trial. The great Whig historian writes of the scene in Westminster Hall as follows in his famous *History of England from the Accession of James II*:

A few years earlier his short neck, his legs uneven, the vulgar said, as those of a badger, his forehead low as that of a baboon, his purple cheeks, and his monstrous length of chin, had been familiar to all who frequented the law courts. He had then been the idol of the nation. Whenever he had appeared, men uncovered their heads to him. The lives and estates of the magnates of the realm had been at his mercy. Times had now changed; and many who had formerly regarded him as the deliverer of his country shuddered at the sight of those hideous features on which villainy seemed to be written by the hand of God. It was proved beyond all possibility of doubt that this man had, by false testimony, deliberately murdered several guiltless people.

* *The Bloody Assizes*. Edited by J. G. Muddiman. William Hodge & Co., London. 10s. 6d. net.

Macaulay says later, in the same work, that

Oates was the founder of a school. His success proved that no romance is too wild to be received with faith by understandings that fear and hatred have disordered. His slanders were monstrous: but they were well timed: he spoke to a people made credulous by their passions; and thus, by impudent and cruel lying, he raised himself in a week from beggary and obscurity to luxury, renown, and power.

In 1691-2, Macaulay records, Oates, now pardoned and pensioned, trained William Fuller for another but abortive plot.

Of Lord Jeffreys of Wem—who had been the senior judge in the autumn Western Assize, the Bloody Assize of 1685—he declares that "the dispassionate historian will be able to make very little deduction from a vast mass of infamy with which the memory of the wicked judge has been loaded." This statement is followed by some pages of the vilest abuse that an historian ever showered upon man or woman. As a matter of fact Jeffreys was a great lawyer, as reported cases show, he was capable of and exercised extreme magnanimity in cases where a weaker man would have shown the very reverse. But it is really unnecessary now to defend Lord Jeffreys from the venom of his enemies, since (such is the irony which even cautious historians have to face) Macaulay drew his information about Jeffreys from the very man that he has so aptly described—from Titus Oates—from the *State Trials*, which were first published in 1719, thirty-four years after the Bloody Assize, from Lord North's life of Lord Guildford, and Lord Campbell's "excellent life of Jeffreys." Macaulay had not the least idea that the immortal Oates was largely at the back of all the slanders, greedily swallowed by White-Kennett, Burnet, and others.

For this reason Macaulay's account of the Bloody Assizes is monstrously unreliable. The only contemporary official evidence of the trial of Mrs. Lisle at Winchester was the brief notice in the *London Gazette* and Henry Muddiman's newsletter, which says "the tryal lasted long, so that it was about eleven that night when the jury brought her in guilty of High Treason. On the 28th [August, 1685] the Lord Jefferies, Lord Chief Justice, went into Court and passed sentence upon her and the rest of the malefactors." The report in the *State Trials*, published thirty-four years after the event, had no official merit, since the judge and the prosecuting counsel had been long dead, but, in fact, it gives no hint of any attempt of the jury to acquit Mrs. Lisle or of any threat by Jeffreys. Kennett and others were deceived by Oates's *Bloody Assizes* or the notorious contemporary Whig newsletters. The report of 1719 was too old to be trusted in details, and the author of the important work on the book called *The Bloody Assizes* says that

if the report of 1719 is not to be trusted "half the modern case against Lord Chief Justice Jeffreys falls to the ground."

Mr. J. G. Muddiman, an able legal historian, has done his work well. He has made in this book the Judges' Lists dealing with the Western Circuit of 1685 generally available and understandable. These were published in 1716 from an unknown source, but not until 1923 did they appear officially in the Calendar of State Papers. Mr. Muddiman states that these lists as compiled by the judges "are unworkable without the aid of the indices constructed by the present writer and printed in Appendix A." They are necessary for any adequate account of the circuit to which they refer. Great use is also made of the famous newsletters of Henry Muddiman, dealing with the period 1667 to 1689, now in the library of the Marquess of Bath. Lord Jeffreys' famous warrant to the Sheriff of Somerset for the executions is also printed, and full comments are made on the text, almost always unreliable, of *The Bloody Assizes*.

The origin of that infamous book is clearly described. In and before 1689 anonymous pamphlets flowed from the press and escaped censorship. "Dying speeches" of "martyrs" were a favourite subject, and early in 1689 Tutchin, an expert pamphleteer who was a rebel under Monmouth, or Dunton, the curious Whig publisher, published a small tract called "The Protestant Martyrs, or, the Bloody Assizes." Tutchin simultaneously issued "The Dying Speeches, letters, and prayers of those eminent protestants who suffered in the West of England," an exemplification of half-sheets already issued by him. This was followed by "The Second and last Collection of the Dying Speeches, letters, and prayers, etc." These publications were successful and they were followed by a volume entitled *The Bloody Assizes; or a compleat history of the life of George, Lord Jefferies, etc.* This was also issued in 1689 by Richard Janeway, "one of the most disloyal of the seditious printers of the times of Charles II." Titus Oates, *redivivus* and very trim, joined the Axe Yard coterie in Westminster in 1689 and Dunton, with the powerful aid of Oates and with Tutchin as editor-in-chief in that year, issued the third edition, with large additions of the book under the title *A New Martyrology; or the Bloody Assizes now exactly methodised into one volume*, Oates being one of the additional "Martyrs." "The 'Bloody Assizes' in its completed form has three principal writers, Oates, Tutchin, and Dunton." A fourth edition was published in 1692, and by this time the work had been swollen to some 600 pages. A fifth and last edition was issued in 1705 by John Marshall, it being then entitled *The Western Martyrology; or the Bloody Assizes . . . to which is added . . . the life and trial of Mr. John Tutchin*. It was this edition that Macaulay used.

Mr. Muddiman gives an interesting account of the Western Circuit of 1685. He notes that the temporary success of Monmouth "can only be explained by pointing to the persecution of the dissenters that preceded it." It was a foolish thing to have started technical prosecutions for conventicle-holding, and especially at Taunton the stronghold of dissent. The Duke of Monmouth took advantage of the sedition that those prosecutions were causing, and when he landed at Lyme Regis on June 11, 1685, he published a declaration (written by the Independent Minister, Robert Ferguson) asking for the support of the people on the ground of "one continual conspiracy against the reformed religion and the rights of the nation." Both Whigs and Tories in the west stood aloof. Monmouth was attainted by Parliament on June 16th; he was proclaimed as king at Taunton on June 20th. Six years before at Bothwell Brigg he had showed himself to be a skilful general, but he had against him Feversham, the nephew of Turenne, and Churchill, who defeated him decisively on July 8th at Sedgemoor near Weston Zoyland in Somerset, and one week later he was beheaded.

On the very day of the battle of Sedgemoor (so confident was King James) a commission of oyer and terminer and general gaol delivery was issued to Lord Jeffreys, the Lord Chief Justice, Sir William Montague, Lord Chief Baron, Sir Creswell Leuinz of the Common Pleas, Sir Francis Withens of the King's Bench, and Sir Robert Wright of the Exchequer. Some 2,611 persons, suspected persons, were presented by the Grand Juries in Dorset, Devon, and Somerset, among whom were the rebels to be tried. On August 25th, 1685, the Commission opened at Winchester, where Mrs. Lisle was tried and convicted. Her "dying speech," a pure invention, appears in the last three editions of *The Bloody Assizes*. Macaulay says that the Assizes opened in September, a curious inaccuracy. On Thursday, September 3rd, the judges were at Winchester, where no rebels were tried for their lives. On Saturday, September 5th, "the real business of the Assizes commenced at Dorchester," where sixty-eight men pleaded guilty and thirty not guilty, of whom one was acquitted. On September 7th 101 pleaded guilty and two not guilty who were acquitted. On the 8th eighty-nine pleaded guilty, on the 9th eight more were convicted, eight were pardoned (having brought in their certificates upon the King's Proclamation, eight other certificates being disallowed). Twenty more were tried on September 10th, upon which day all the Dorchester cases were sentenced. On the advice of Pollexfen, the prosecuting counsel, the mass of the prisoners pleaded guilty. It was very wise advice, but it was not, in fact, given by Jeffreys. On Saturday, September 12th, the judges arrived in Exeter and the Assizes opened on September 14th. On that day nineteen rebels pleaded guilty and

two not guilty and these two were executed at once. On Friday, September 18th, the Assizes opened at disloyal Taunton and, all pleading guilty, about 500 persons received sentence of death, but only three were executed at that date. On September 21st the judges went on to Bristol, but no rebels were tried there. On Wednesday, September 23rd, the last day of the sittings on the Circuit, the judges sat at Wells, when 541 rebels pleaded guilty and one not guilty, who was forthwith tried and executed. On September 26th Lord Jeffreys signed his warrant to the Sheriff of Somerset, Edward Hobbes, for the execution of 239 rebels condemned at Taunton and Wells. In fact the total number of the executions as the result of the Assize was almost certainly 251 in all, less than 10 per cent. of those actually sentenced to death. Though the traitors' bodies were quartered, in accordance with the barbarous law of treason, in all cases the operation took place after death. The fact that almost all of the rebels pleaded guilty shuts out conclusively the speeches attributed to Lord Jeffreys by Titus Oates and his companions. It was a Bloody Assize in very truth, and it struck terror and horror into the West of England, but the actual deaths were a small percentage of the deaths that would have followed if Monmouth had defeated Feversham and had been able to attack the centre of England in London. Mr. Muddiman's analysis of the contemporary material including the Judges' List of November 12th, 1685, is the best proof that *The Bloody Assizes* of Tutchin and Oates is a compilation that is valueless and dangerous for historical purposes. It is true that it gives correctly the number of executions, but that was a matter on which it would not have been possible to deceive contemporary observers.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

THE POEMS OF C. E. MAURICE.*

Mr. C. Edmund Maurice's poems, excellently edited by his wife, Mrs. Emily Southwood Maurice,* should attract attention, not only for their intrinsic simple merit that recalls a phase of Wordsworth's work, but for the body of doctrine which they contain that may be summarised in the words "strenuous peace." The lines dedicated in 1885 to Edward Plumptre (the Dean of Wells) strike early the full note of the peace which is in itself a war against ill. The Incantation, based on the records of English history, is a stirring piece of music recalling the warriors of peace; the lines to Edith Cavell bring back the memory and the ideals of that heroic woman. The ode to the Kyrle Society, founded in 1870 "with the

* *Poems*, by C. Edmund Maurice, edited by Emily Southwood Maurice. Methuen.

object of bringing beauty into the homes of the people and securing beautiful open spaces," is another phase of the struggle for the peace that must include beauty:

By each faithful heart's endeavour
Still to give despair the lie,
By the common hopes of England,
By the love that cannot die;
Brothers, we will work together
Till the scoffing world shall know
That God's sacred gift of beauty
Blooms for all who strive below.

Mr. Maurice loved beauty and loved romance, and we find those things interwoven into the simple texture of many of his poems. That is, indeed, part of the note of peace for all that he strikes, since peace without loveliness and without romance is the peace of an economic bee-hive. "Little Britain" was to him the natural home of beauty, and he strove to make it so in reality so far as the lives of men and women were concerned. To help others was in a sense the motto of his own life. The tribute that he pays, in serene verse, to that noble man, Frederick Denison Maurice, a name that will not die, is one that echoes his own aspirations. It is fitting to quote some verses of the poem:

He caught the dross that fell from us,
As our feeble thoughts we told;
And he touched our basest metal
Till it shone with purest gold.
He gave his hand to the stumbler;
Nor knew that he saved from fall;
For he still was gazing upward
At that vision which shines for all.

These lines give the essential qualities of the famous preacher of Lincoln's Inn who laid on a solid basis by pure idealism the best side of the educational and social reform of our own times.

* * *

THE CAMBRIDGE MEDIÆVAL HISTORY.*

The compilation of the chapters in and the editing of the sixth volume of the great *Cambridge Mediæval History*, which deals mainly with the consummation of the mediæval world in the thirteenth-century and the effective theocracy of the Papacy, must have been a task as difficult as it has been well performed. No man or woman, however great their personal grasp of the outstanding problems of mediæval life, could have knowledge enough to grasp in their

* *The Cambridge Mediæval History*. Planned by the late J. B. Bury. Edited by by I. R. Tanner, C. W. Previté-Orton, Z. N. Brooke. Volume VI. *Victory of the Papacy*. [With maps in separate case.] Cambridge: at the University Press. 50s. net.

intolerable multiplicity the details of the Western world in the thirteenth century. If ever the team-system applied to historical writing was justified, it was justified here since, while broad principles are at play, yet the formulating of those principles is entirely dependent on detailed knowledge of the operation of events in the inchoate nationalities of a Western world. These peoples were almost unconsciously engaged upon the problem of merging into a unity the inheritance of Imperial Rome, the essential democratic life of the so-called Barbarian tribes, and the feudalism which—a universal phenomenon observable in Africa to-day—overlaid with its cult of kingships and regulated chieftainships the various phases of a submerged democracy fighting, in town and borough and commune, for freedom.

Mr. Austin Lane Poole tells the students of the Germanic Empire in the thirteenth century, Italy and Sicily are dealt with by Professor Schipa and Dr. Previté-Orton, the England of Richard I and John is considered by Professor Powicke, the England of Henry III by Professor E. F. Jacob of Manchester. Professor Powicke crosses the channel and explains the France of Philip Augustus and Louis VIII, while the age of Louis IX, Saint Louis, is dealt with by Dr. Charles Petit-Dutaillis, and the Scandinavia of the thirteenth century by Professor Koht of Oslo. The immensely important theme of Spain is dealt with in his learned and attractive fashion by Dr. Altamira (who since his contribution to the second and third volumes has come from the University of Oviedo to be judge in the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague). Nobody but a great lawyer could have described thirteenth-century Spain. Poland is dealt with by Professor Kamil Krofta of Prague and Professor Bruce-Boswell of Liverpool, while Hungarian conditions are considered by the late M. Louis Leger. These various writers give the necessary political facts (so to speak) from which it has been possible to make generalisations of political and cultural movements.

But there are a series of important special chapters which supplement and give new meaning to the political facts. There is a too brief chapter on commerce and industry in the Middle Ages by Professor Clapham of Cambridge, and another on the northern towns and their commerce by Professor Henri Pirenne of Ghent. Despite the learning of these writers they, in the space allotted to them, could hardly do more than indicate the drifts of economic movement. The relationship of urban and rural economic movements alone might well have been the subject of a substantial chapter, while the part played by the servile population, and the gradual enfranchisement of that vast group by intermarriage with free women, would have made a chapter of primary importance

in the history of European political economy and the slow defeat of a feudalism that was becoming in the thirteenth century an uneconomic factor of society throughout Western Europe.

But the main theme of this great book is the triumph of the Papacy, and from that point of view the structure and the economics of the Church dealt with by Professor Watson of Oxford, the upgrowth of the mediæval universities dealt with (fortunately) by the late Dr. Hastings Rashdall, Mr. W. H. V. Reade's essay on political theory and the upgrowth of the Canon Law up to the beginning of the fourteenth century, Professor A. H. Thompson's paper on "Mediæval Doctrine to the Lateran Council of 1215" (an essay of special interest at the present time), Professor A. S. Turberville's chapter on mediæval heresies and the Early Inquisition, and Mr. A. G. Little's chapter on the mendicant orders form an extremely valuable contribution to a group of subjects that has not even to-day lost its vivid importance. In a final group we have Dr. Cranage's very useful paper on Ecclesiastical Architecture and Professor A. H. Hamilton's chapter on the military architecture of the period, the latter learned writer also giving us a valuable and welcome essay on the art of war to the year 1400. Specially to be welcomed is Miss Abram's chapter on chivalry, in some ways the clinching force of what was noblest in the lay life of the Middle Ages, while the volume closes with the late Miss J. L. Weston's important essay on the legendary cycles of the Middle Ages. The whole work is a great compilation of exact knowledge most skilfully edited and fitly opened by the important chapter by Professor Jacob on Pope Innocent III, one of the greatest men in European history. No doubt here and there criticism will be aroused by this and that theory derived from the carefully detailed facts. The doctrine of kingship involved the right to rebel against the king if the king was disloyal to the general system of which he formed a part. At the crowning point of feudalism it is evident that the ultimate authority was not in the king, but in the system of which he formed a part, and perhaps this is not made clear. But criticism of this type on purely technical points, criticism that may be repelled, is a small point. The editors, in their illuminating preface, state the historical position at the moment of the victory of the Papacy in exact and memorable language. It was a moment of balance; "the civilisation of the thirteenth century was an eminently natural product of that of the ninth and tenth centuries." The mediæval world at last was ripe to the core. Decay had already begun in Germany, but it is not yet fully manifest. The growth of law, of learning, the forcefulness of groups and communities, the internationalism of faith, law, learning, and chivalry, the vast strength of the Papacy are the triumph of ages of struggle. But there are

everywhere also faint signs of new things, of a new dawn that even the greatest thinkers of that great age (if we may possibly except Roger Bacon) did not foresee: yet "before that murky long-delaying dawn the gorgeous starlit sky of the Middle Ages was to lose its lustre." Nevertheless that age was destined to be the logical forerunner of ultimately more nobler things. J. E. G. DE M.

A CHINESE LADY.*

The Portrait of a Chinese Lady, by Lady Hosie, will bring back to many the pleasure of the author's former volume, *Two Gentlemen of China*, which introduced her readers to Chinese on an equal footing, and greatly helped to an appreciation of their qualities. But this new book will do far more than that, for it carries on the story through the most baffling and disabling period of civil war and strident political confusion still with all the cultivated human element uppermost. Behind the strife of warring generals and soldiery destroying civilisation, behind the press correspondents' daily record of armies on the move and of slaughter, of governments failing to govern and of misery from famine and distress, is the quick and ever-growing development of the people, not only of the educated classes and those who have visited the Western world, but of large numbers of the humbler people, the labourers and factory workers. In this very human story the awful conditions are not blinked, but instance after instance is given of better things coming and some already come, of ideas of hygiene spreading, of anxious factory owners making life more tolerable for their employees, of thoughtful educated people reaching out to the problems which lie before them.

All this sounds like another book on social reform, but it is really a happy record of the experiences and conversations of a warm-hearted woman who intersperses her intimate stories of the people she meets with delightful descriptions of scenery and crowds and journeys. The opening journey by an up-river steamer from Shanghai is vivid and unforgettable and introduces Lady Hosie and her ways at once. Again, here is an amusing little illustration quoted from a friend of the new interest in health and cleanliness:

We keep a coolie to draw my husband to office. If you please, he takes a bottle of water and a tin of tooth powder, and he spends the time of waiting in brushing his teeth. Ten years ago he had hardly heard of a tooth-brush. Now, all the rickshaw-men keep one under that flap hanging from the cushioned seat of the rickshaw.

In a chapter on "One Wife or Many," the Chinese habit of plurality of wives is discussed with the Chinese lady with every

* *The Portrait of a Chinese Lady*. Hodder & Stoughton. 21s.

consideration for sensitiveness of feeling and the customs of the past. In a chapter entitled "Buddha" there is an account of a visit to a "Retreat" where two long yellow banners written over with characters were hastily brought out for inspection.

They are our two prayer flags for the souls of all the men who died in the Great European War. There were thirty-seven countries involved. What an awful passing of souls! It is the least we can do to pray for them.

"Do you pray for them all?" I asked, considerably touched.

"All," he replied, "enemy and ally. Every year we hold two special days for them."

Musings and reflections draw all these incidents and conversations and impressions together into one fascinating whole, full of sympathy and understanding, full of hope for the future, a real Christmas book. *The Portrait of a Chinese Lady*—and Mrs. Sung is full of charm and of wistfulness—is the portrait of China in its present state of transition, not a photograph, not a series of snapshots, but a picture painted for the enjoyment of the artist.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

This is a very intimate life of Napoleon Bonaparte by Dmitri Merezhkovsky, translated by Catharine Zvegintzov from the Russian.* The account of Napoleon's life from boyhood to death, drawn from many sources, makes interesting reading, especially so since one would hardly have expected a sympathetic record from a Russian. The silent and self-contained character of Napoleon, which was shown in early life, even in his school days, prepares the reader for the most remarkable *dénouement* possible to be conceived of in times that we call modern. The story of Napoleon will ever possess a fascination, and he still wields his extraordinary will-power over foe and follower, more than a century after his death. Dreaded as he most assuredly was in the summit of his success, he was wept for in his degradation at St. Helena, a mighty soul, cribbed, cabined, and confined. Obsessed with the craving of conquest and the crash of arms, he overran Europe, demolishing and replacing kingdoms and crowns, with outstretched arm to the East, all for a country of which he was no son: at times he was called a charlatan, and at times he was in fact a visionary and a seer; he drew up a code of laws which has outlived him and all his victories, and remains to-day his living memorial in the modes of many nations, the lasting emblem of his greatness when all his kingdoms have dissolved into air. He knew that right government must be based on righteous laws, and the legacy that he left has magnified his name. Napoleon himself said at St. Helena that his code would outlive his forty victories, but it is well also to remember that he created a new Europe out of the slough of the eighteenth-century world and opened a definitely new epoch in the history of mankind.

* *The Life of Napoleon*. J. M. Dent. 7s. 6d. net.

Mr. Jonathan Nield is to be congratulated on the appearance of a fifth edition of his well-known *Guide to the best Historical Novels and Tales*.^{*} The book was published in 1902, and the successive editions have grown in size and value. As the fourth dates from 1911, there was urgent need for the present work, which is much more than a revision. Over 1,400 items, we are told, have been weeded out, while 1,160 have been added, and the output of historical fiction is surveyed down to the end of 1927. Indeed, the author describes it as "virtually a new book." The novels, numbering between two and three thousand, are each briefly but sufficiently described, and are classified according to the period with which they deal, beginning with the pre-Christian era and ending in the twentieth century with the Boer war and the Boxer rising. A Supplementary list of "semi-historical" novels contains not only books such as *The Amber Witch*, *Thais*, and *The Scarlet Letter*, which one would expect to find in any list, but also works merely illustrating the life of the author's time, for instance, *Tom Jones*, *Evelina*, *Pride and Prejudice*, *Middlemarch*, and *Robert Elsmere*, which one is surprised to meet in such company. The massive volume concludes with a bibliography and very full indices which greatly enhance its value. This monumental work is indispensable to students not only of the historical novel but of the novel itself. It is also a tempting field in which to browse, and readers in search of suggestions will find welcome guidance.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Mr. John Buchan has never written anything more brilliant or suggestive than "The Causal and the Casual in History,"[†] which is the title of the Rede Lecture for 1929. His message is summarised in the following sentence: "The historian is wise if, like the Romans of the early Empire, he admits Fortuna and even Sors to a place in his Pantheon, and concedes the eternal presence of the irrational and the inexplicable." This declaration is supported by a series of illustrative might-have-beens which play havoc with the pseudo-scientific conception of completely rationalised history. "We must have these theories, and they explain a great deal, but they do not explain everything. . . . The romantic accident cannot be expelled by the mechanical doctrine. It will still come out of the void, alter the course of history, and disappear before it can be classified."

* * *

Mr. John Masefield's new book, "The Hawbucks,"[‡] is a disappointing novel in the sense that many of the characters are overdrawn, although the actual plot makes quite good light reading. There are various discrepancies, however, which are apt to worry the reader. For instance, it is difficult to believe that any young girl, however beautiful and delightful, could cause such havoc among the men of a hunting district, including a somewhat fanatical clergyman; and, indeed, it is hardly in good taste to make a laughing-stock of one of the few people in his environment who has at heart the welfare of the people living wretched lives a few miles away.

^{*} Elkin Mathews. 30s.

[†] Cambridge University Press. 2s.

[‡] Heinemann. 7s. 6d.

EMPIRE FREE TRADE?

LORD BEAVERBROOK has launched his new Crusade. It has attracted some measure of support here and there. It claims to offer, if not the cure, at least a contribution to the cure of the economic difficulties which beset us. Those difficulties are so serious and so pressing that any proposal for a remedy, offered in good faith, demands a prompt and a careful examination. The policy itself has been simply stated. It is summarised by Lord Beaverbrook in one of his pamphlets in these words: "We propose to put a tariff wall round the Empire, taxing all goods that come from outside and allowing free interchange between the different peoples that acknowledge the sovereignty of King George."

THE PROPOSAL AND ITS NAME.

When we come to examine this proposition, the first and most obvious question that presents itself is—why should it be entitled to the name of "Empire Free Trade"? To at least an equal degree it is a policy of "Empire Protection." Indeed, its results, if it were put into effect, would extend the domain of Protection far more than the domain of Free Trade. Great Britain would be required to erect a new tariff against imports of every kind from all foreign countries; the Crown Colonies, with their substantial commerce, would be required to do the same. Even if the Dominions and India consented to abolish their tariffs on the goods from Great Britain and from other parts of the Empire, the amount of trade which would for the first time be subjected to tariff duties would be immensely greater than the amount of trade which would be relieved from existing tariff duties. "Empire Protection" would be the more expressive title. Lord Beaverbrook sometimes recognises this. On the front page of the pamphlet already quoted, the policy is frankly called "The New Empire Protection." That is a pamphlet entitled "The Farmers' Crusade"; it is intended for circulation among farmers; and it is interesting to note that it opens with the sentence, "The Policy of Empire Free Trade is in effect a new form of the Protection for British Agriculture which farmers have so long demanded."

As a rule, however, it is the Free Trade name and aspect, the free exchange of goods within the Empire, which is emphasised. By this means it is hoped that the mind of the electorate, which often cannot penetrate into the refinements of a policy, will consider, in a vague way, that the proposals as a whole are really an extension of Free Trade principles. Opposition will be conciliated, and the goodwill which attaches to the name of Free Trade will, in some degree, be acquired for the new movement. So the Emperors and

Kings of Europe, when after the Napoleonic Wars they formed their alliance for the unholy purpose of the suppression of liberty and the entrenchment of despotism, gave it the name of "The Holy Alliance." People who are engaged in some unpopular enterprise will often seek to attach to it a designation which, by suggesting the opposite of the object really in view, may possibly forestall criticism and will certainly confuse the unwary.

THE DOMINIONS AND INDIA.

In so far as this policy does seek to extend Free Trade, in so far as it aims at opening the ports of every part of the Empire to the free importation of goods from every other part, it can hardly fail to command, in this country, a unanimous support. Lancashire would rejoice if the Indian import duties on her cotton, which are responsible more than any other single cause for her present depression, were abolished. Our manufacturers of textiles and hosiery and boots, and of a thousand other products, would welcome a free entry for their goods into Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. Indeed they would have no reason to fear the competition in those markets of any other country of the world on equal terms. No doubt they could not expect to be successful in every department of trade in every market—the mass production of cheap cotton cloth in Japan, for example, or the highly perfected manufacture of motor-cars or typewriters in the United States, would always be formidable competitors to meet; and many other instances could be given. Yet in the future, as in the past, efficiency in production and enterprise in sale would ensure to the manufacturers of Great Britain, in general and in the long run, a successful commerce in the Imperial market.

Whether the prospect would be equally acceptable to the manufacturers in India and the Dominions is another question. Once accept the principle that a tariff is a legitimate and efficient method of promoting the prosperity and the expansion of industries, and you admit the soundness of the Protectionist case in India or in Australia. The economic argument which the Empire Crusaders continually use to support the reservation of the British market, for the motor manufacturers of Birmingham, for instance, against those of Detroit, or for the steel manufacturers of Tyneside against their rivals of Germany or Belgium, supports equally the Bombay millowners in their demand that the Indian cotton market should be reserved for them against their rivals in Lancashire, or the steel manufacturers of Australia when they ask for a monopoly of the Australian market against the long-established industries of Great Britain. If Protection is right for the Englishman against the foreigner, it is also right—from the economic point of view—

for the Indian and the Australian against the Englishman. And there is no indication that the political argument—the claim of a common Empire patriotism—is likely to outweigh the economic in deciding the action of the industrial interests which are there concerned, of the workpeople whom they employ, and of the Governments who support them.

- Free Trade within the Empire is desirable; certainly in the interest of Great Britain, and, as Free Traders believe, in the ultimate interest of the other parts of the Empire as well. But there is no reason whatever to think that this view is shared in those quarters. It is the industries of India and the Dominions that are directly affected by this part of the proposal. The policy cannot be regarded as having even entered the sphere of practical action until there are at least the preliminary signs that the peoples and Governments of those territories might be willing to accept it.

A CUSTOMS TARIFF FOR GREAT BRITAIN.

Let us turn now to the other aspect of the policy—"putting a tariff wall round the Empire." This involves, as its principal consequence, the imposition of customs duties on all imports from foreign countries into the United Kingdom, whether they are manufactured articles, or foodstuffs, or raw materials. The Crusaders frankly tell us that this is their proposal. From the Empire standpoint it is the duties on foodstuffs and raw materials which are of importance. Taxes on foreign manufactured articles are of little interest to the Empire countries, for they do a small trade in such commodities themselves, and are not likely to be successful competitors in the British market on any large scale in the near future. What is likely to be the effect of such a measure upon the commerce, the industry, the well-being of Great Britain?

The Crusaders lay emphasis, and rightly, upon the remarkable growth in the Empire production of staple foodstuffs and raw materials, and upon the service rendered to the Mother Country by the high quality and expanding quantity of those supplies. The fact is most welcome. It shows how much can be achieved by enterprise and intelligent direction without the smallest artificial help from protective tariffs. But the position remains that the United Kingdom still draws its main supplies from foreign countries. These are the facts:

IMPORTS RETAINED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, 1928. (£ millions)

	From the British Empire.	From Foreign Countries.	Total.
Foodstuffs ...	187	316	503
Raw Materials ...	71	197	268
	258	513	

Under these two heads alone, over five hundred million pounds' worth of commodities, utilised by our manufacturers or used as food for our people, would be subjected to tariff duties, almost all of them for the first time. How long would it take before these five hundred million pounds' worth could be supplied to us from within the Empire? Meanwhile, the price of the whole of our imports would inevitably be raised.

THE PRICE TO BE PAID.

Protectionists of all schools, and the New Crusaders among the rest, use every effort to persuade their public that taxing an article will not raise its price. The public know better. They view these specious arguments with profound scepticism. The question whether or not these proposals will in fact raise prices is the essence of the whole controversy. No doubt if, at some particular time, prices are falling from general economic causes and a duty is then imposed, the effect may be to prevent the fall reaching the consumer in the form of the cheapening of goods, without the price being raised above its former figure. This is what has been happening in this country with respect to several of the commodities affected by the Safeguarding Duties imposed in recent years. There has been a general fall in wholesale prices. Where there has been no duty the goods have become cheaper. Where there has been a duty the cheapening has been less, or has been neutralised. The consumer may not in some cases be paying more for safeguarded goods, of the same quality, than he paid previously, but he is paying more than he would now be paying if there had been no safeguarding.

It is contended, with regard to foodstuffs, that so much out of the price paid by the householder goes to middlemen, or, in the case of bread, to the millers, that a duty upon imported corn could easily be compensated from that source, without any increase in the retail cost. But there is nothing in these proposals to bring that about. Any combinations or understandings which may exist among the traders who handle the various products on their way, stage by stage, from the first producer to the ultimate consumer, would continue to exist, after the duties had been imposed, just as they existed before. Whatever toll they can levy now they would levy still. Indeed, it is the general experience that protective measures, by limiting sources of supply and restricting the area of competition, render easier the exaction of excessive profits as part of the price ultimately paid.

In relation to manufacturers there has been devised of late another theory, in the endeavour to defend Protection from the accusation that it raises prices artificially. It is argued that Protection, by ensuring a steady market, will enable establishments to

work full time instead of irregularly; that this permits more economical production; and that consequently a reduction of prices, instead of an increase, becomes possible. Obviously, it is more economical to work full time rather than short time. But that is a question of the organisation of an industry in relation to the extent of the demand for its goods. It raises the issue, not of Protection, but of rationalisation.

Under a Protectionist system you may have an industry badly organised, with too many producing units, the advantages of mass production neglected, irregular working, and profits dependent upon the charging of high prices. Under a system of Free Trade you may have an industry well organised, the processes efficient, the productive capacity adjusted to the demand, factories working full time, and good profits earned with prices at a reasonable level. The 33⅓ per cent. protective tariff for the British motor-car industry, for example, has not brought about its efficient organisation. The unnecessarily numerous patterns of cars, produced by an excessive number of separate manufacturers, still continue, with the result that a large proportion of those manufacturers are in a far from prosperous condition. Meanwhile, the British public pays much higher prices for its motor-cars than the American public pays for cars of similar standard, in spite of the higher wages customary in America. On the other hand, the absence of a protective tariff has not prevented British industries, such as the manufacture of electrical machinery or the manufacture of wallpapers, from organising themselves effectively, with the satisfactory results that might be expected to follow. In short, rationalisation is one thing, Protection is another, and the first is by no means dependent upon the second.

In one important particular, indeed, the existence of a protective system would be a reason against rationalisation. Every observer is aware that the concentration of production into the hands of a continually decreasing number of firms brings with it certain dangers to the public interest. It becomes easier to establish a complete monopoly, and monopolies may exercise their economic power to the disadvantage of the community at large. In so far as rationalisation means more efficient production, full-time working, lower costs, and lower prices, it is obviously all to the good. But in so far as it may use the benefits of its greater efficiency, not for the advantage of the consumer, but solely for the profit of the producer, and may even swell those profits further through the exercise of a monopolistic hold upon the market, rationalisation may result in serious public injury. Against this danger Free Trade is a defence. Let prices be put too high and competition is induced to enter from abroad. It is far more difficult to organise a universal

physically impossible to feed and to clothe our great population. Upon our indispensable export trade the Empire Crusade would inflict a double injury—first, by raising the cost of production here it would render it more difficult to sell our goods at a competitive price in every market abroad; secondly, by checking importation from foreign countries it would check the exportation which takes place in exchange. If you will not buy from the foreigner you cannot sell to him.

BRITISH TRADE AND FOREIGN MARKETS.

The Crusaders seem to attach little importance to markets outside the Empire. Lord Beaverbrook writes of "the European countries which, without buying the goods we have to sell, export large and increasing quantities of goods to us." Such a thing is, of course, an economic impossibility. The facts with regard to British exports to the principal markets, and to all the markets, in the Empire and elsewhere are these:

EXPORTS OF BRITISH PRODUCTS, 1928. (£ millions)					
Empire Markets.			Foreign Markets.		
	Manufactures only.	Total.		Manufactures only.	Total.
British India ...	78.2	83.9	United States ...	35.2	46.7
Australia ...	51.6	55.6	Germany ...	28.0	40.9
Irish Free State ...	21.2	35.0	Argentina ...	28.2	31.2
Canada ...	28.2	34.5	France ...	13.9	25.2
Union of South Africa ...	28.3	31.7	Netherlands ...	16.6	21.8
New Zealand ...	16.6	19.3	Belgium ...	9.2	17.0
			Brazil ...	13.6	16.0
			China ...	14.2	15.7
			Japan ...	13.8	14.5
			Italy ...	7.5	14.3
Total, British Empire (in- cluding Pro- tectorates and Mandated Territories)	275.7	327.7	Total, all Foreign Countries ...	303.2	395.9

The sales of close on four hundred million pounds' worth of goods to foreign countries are not without their importance to the employment of our people, to the provision of their food and of all the commodities that they need, to the general well-being of our nation.

It is upon the export of manufactured goods that attention is usually concentrated. The exportation of coal is a matter of great moment, as the experience of recent years has abundantly shown; but if a comparison is to be made with other countries it is right to take into account those branches of commerce in which the conditions

are more or less equal, and to exclude those that relate to natural resources, with which countries are unequally endowed. In manufactured goods, the British export trade, in proportion to population, is enormously greater than that of any other country. And it is remarkable that, over a period of years, the increase in our exports per head is also greater than that of any other country; in spite of the fact that we had the start of a generation or more in developing our industries, and that it might have been expected that our rivals would rapidly make up the difference.

The following are the facts, as stated by the President of the Board of Trade on July 25th, 1929, in answer to a Parliamentary question framed by that keen Protectionist, Sir Henry Page Croft. (I have added the last column, showing the increase during the period chosen.)

EXPORTS OF ARTICLES WHOLLY OR PARTLY MANUFACTURED, PER HEAD OF POPULATION.

	1880.			1928.			Increase.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
France ...	1	19	4	6	5	9	4	6	5
Germany ...	1	16	10	6	14	6	4	17	8
United States ...	10	1		5	3	4	4	13	3
United Kingdom (including the Irish Free State) ...	5	14	1	11	9	9	5	15	8

From this it appears that, while we have not preserved the overwhelming preponderance of fifty years ago, we still do nearly double the export trade in manufactured goods, in proportion to population, of any other country; and that the absolute increase during the interval has been greater here than anywhere else.

One particular fact may be added in this connection. In 1929, of all the ships that were launched, this one island produced 55 per cent. of the tonnage; all the rest of the world put together produced only 45 per cent. This astounding achievement would have been quite impossible if our shipbuilders had not been free to obtain their materials from any quarter at the cheapest rate.

"SINCE FREE TRADE IS NOT UNIVERSAL—"

That our trade might be still greater if foreign countries had not imposed duties on our goods is undoubtedly true. Their tariffs are clearly an injury to our commerce. But to impose another tariff at our own ports would not neutralise the injury. It would double it. Commerce is a reciprocal process. It is an inflow and an outflow of goods. Erect an obstacle at one coast-line and the current is restricted; erect another obstacle at the other coast-line and it is doubly restricted. Nor is it the case that our taxing the produce of

other countries, or threatening to tax them, can be relied upon to induce those countries to cease to tax our produce. That has not been the experience of the States which have tried the policy of retaliation. None of the Protectionist countries have been able to secure the free admission of their goods into any other Protectionist country. None of them have been able to obtain better terms for their trade than we now enjoy for ours. There is no reason to suppose that, if we were to imitate their methods, we should be able to surpass their results.

THE CLAIMS OF EMPIRE.

Certainly there is this to be said for the "Empire Crusade," that it is at least animated by a fine and inspiring purpose. Inadequate, indeed harmful, as are the means it proposes for the attainment of its end, the end itself is one of the greatest that can be sought. It is the close and permanent union of the States of the British Commonwealth. Whatever mistakes, and even misdeeds, may have been committed in the course of its history, the British Empire has unquestionably rendered great services to mankind. No impartial observer could deny that, if it had never existed, the world to-day would be a worse place than it is. And, in our own time, it stands in the main for internal and external peace, for intellectual and material progress, for an ever-growing political liberty. Any movement which seeks to preserve it, and to strengthen it for those purposes, pursues a lofty aim. But the question is whether the erection of a tariff wall around its vast boundaries would really conduce to the attainment of that aim.

I do not believe that to raise the prices of the necessities of life to the masses of the British people—and, however vehemently it may be denied, that would be the inevitable consequence—would strengthen their zeal for the Imperial idea. When the housewife, in her daily purchasing, finds that all kinds of foodstuffs have become dearer, and is told that this is in order to promote the development and unity of the Empire, she will not be made more enthusiastic for that cause. You cannot build an Empire patriotism on taxed food.

When, in Australia or in Canada, tariff changes are proposed, which adversely affect certain interests—however much they may work to the advantage of the diffused interest of the populations as a whole—it is doubtful whether devotion to the British connection would be stimulated thereby. And when controversial debates take place in the several legislatures—at Westminster, at Ottawa, at Canberra, at Wellington, at Pretoria—and various interests are set one against the other; when some are pressed to accept sacrifices for the sake of other interests in their own State or elsewhere in

the Empire; he would, indeed, be an optimist who would suppose that the cause of Imperial unity would be strengthened by the process.

THE EMPIRE AND ITS PEOPLES.

There is one other consideration which, to my mind, is even more important than any of these. Lord Beaverbrook writes that one of the grounds on which "the ideal behind the Empire Crusade" is founded is this: "We, who comprise the English-speaking peoples of the Empire, have ties of race, of loyalty, and of outlook," which should lead us to seek also an economic unity. But he appears to have overlooked a fact, which is not without importance, that four-fifths of the population of the Empire is not English, or even English-speaking, and has no ties of race, or, on that account, of loyalty or of outlook. Here we touch the most fundamental of the problems which face the Empire to-day and in the immediate future.

If the British Empire now commands, as it does command, the goodwill of hundreds of millions of Asiatics and Africans, it is because they can see that it seeks to bring, and does bring, real benefits to themselves. If that goodwill has been alienated among various sections, it is because the Empire is accused of aiming at power and profit for the ruling race, rather than at the welfare of the subject peoples, and because that accusation is believed. In these conditions, what is likely to be the reaction among the coloured races to the proposals of the Empire Crusade?

So long as the Empire is based upon liberal ideas—care for the interests of the native peoples, the extension of self-government as fast as the circumstances allow, no special privileges for British trade—it can rely upon a measure of loyalty among the great majority of its subjects, and upon acquiescence by its neighbours. But once the "tariff wall" is erected; once the populations feel that they are tied, by the power of the State, to the British commercial system; once other nations feel that their trade is shut out from a fourth of the globe because Great Britain thinks it to her profit to do so, there is likely to be a different sentiment both without and within. The intelligent and well-informed leaders of opinion among the Asiatic and African populations who live under the British flag will soon perceive that the Governments and the commercial enterprises of their territories are restricted to British sources for their imported supplies; that their railways and other public works, their manufacturers and their traders, are tied to Great Britain for the things that they need; that the peoples have to bear whatever increased cost may be exacted by rings and combinations among British manufacturers and merchants.

Straightway the complaint will be made in the native Press of scores of territories, in the discussions in thousands of towns and villages, that British Imperialism is exploiting the native peoples for its own profit; that they are no longer free to buy the articles that they require wherever they choose, unhampered by discriminatory tariffs; that the trustee of native interests is using the position that he holds to promote, not the welfare of his wards, but his own advantage. No accusation more destructive could possibly be made. It is not the path of Imperial patriotism to advocate a policy which would justifiably expose the British Empire to that attack.

The conclusion of the matter, then, is this. The policy we are examining makes two proposals—within the Empire it would promote Free Trade; externally it would establish Protection. The first proposal is desirable, but is not practicable; and the second is neither the one nor the other.

HERBERT SAMUEL.

COAL.

WE are once again face to face with the difficult problem of Coal, and economic difficulties are intensified by the addition of political issues. Politicians have made many attempts to solve these problems, but so far have only succeeded in increasing the difficulties. Once more Parliament has intervened, and after a sharp controversy the Government Coal Mines Bill has passed its second reading in the House of Commons by a majority of eight, and we are all wondering what will happen when the discussions are resumed on the re-assembling of Parliament. This breathing-space affords a convenient opportunity to look at the practical side of the question, and to disentangle the economic difficulties from the political issues.

Coal mining is an ancient British industry, and the records of the methods employed from early times can be plainly read in pits still producing coal. Old methods and new methods are working side by side. It is as though in the hosiery trade hand-frames were being employed to produce hosiery, side by side with modern factories equipped with machinery and working by power, and attempting to sell their products at a common price. There has been during the past thirty-five years as notable a revolution in the methods by which coal is worked as may be seen in any of the other great industries of the country, but strangely enough, at the same time, a considerable portion of the coal is worked upon old-fashioned methods.

The capacity for production of all these pits, ancient and modern, in the aggregate substantially exceeds the market demand, and therefore it is obvious that some form of rationing is essential. It inevitably follows from this over-production of coal and the eager competition to secure a share of the market, that unfair price-cutting results, and a considerable portion of the coal output is sold at a loss. Clearly joint marketing in some form is necessary. The miners as well as the owners are the victims of these erratic conditions. Hours of work are unduly long, wages low in many districts, and employment is irregular; therefore a serious attempt must be made to stabilise employment, shorten hours, and improve wages. Our basic industries are dependent upon cheap coal for their very existence, and the export of coal depends upon our ability to produce and sell at world prices. The problem is to secure cheap coal, a fair profit to the coalowners, and shorter hours and better conditions for the men. These can all be secured if the problem is approached from the right end.

The Coal Mines Bill, unfortunately, begins at the wrong end. It commences by taking the total output of coal from both obsolete

and efficient pits, then estimates the market demand, and distributes this by a quota percentage over all the pits in work—that is to say, a modern well-equipped pit, working the best seams, would probably have an allocation of 75 per cent. of its capacity, and this is done to enable an obsolete or inefficient pit to receive a similar quota. The marketing scheme is necessarily based upon a price that will enable the less efficient pits to produce coal at a profit. No comment is necessary to indicate the inevitable result of such a procedure.

Now about commencing at the right end. The modern fully equipped pit, working the best deep seams, which were not available until the discovery of modern appliances and machinery, can produce at least three times as much coal per man per shift as the old comparatively shallow pits, working the poorer seams then available. It would obviously be in the interests of the community that all the coal required should be produced under the best economic conditions, and we must get to this basis of production before we can intelligently talk about rationing and joint marketing. There does not appear to be any adequate inducement to spend capital upon new machinery or the sinking of new shafts, if the new Coal Boards have it in their power to charge the public prices that would yield them their profit by merely continuing to produce coal from all existing pits by the methods already in operation. It is interesting to consider what would have been the effect upon coal mining to-day if a Bill of this description had been passed say forty years ago. It is quite certain that the South Yorkshire coalfields would not have been developed, and the same may be said of many of the new areas where profitable seams have been discovered and modern pits provided, equipped with the latest machinery and appliances.

There is no reason to suppose that the last word has been spoken about colliery enterprise, and with adequate inducements to the mining engineer it is quite certain that colliery enterprise will see such improvements as will render even the latest achievements of the mining engineer backward and out of date. We cannot afford to stand still in any of our industrial enterprises, and certainly not in that of coal mining. We ought to be able materially to increase the coal output per man per shift, probably with less arduous labour to the miner engaged in the work. If we are to hold our own in the world's competition, it is vital that we should take advantage of all that skill and invention can achieve for us.

It is just as well to state frankly that the time has come when pits unable to produce coal at the same price as the well-equipped efficient pits should be closed. If left to the play of the market, most of these would long ago have automatically closed down.

They were kept alive by the demand for coal during the war, and by the temporary boom in coal that followed the war. Subsequently, they maintained a precarious existence by means of a State subsidy, and then by lengthening of hours, and are now hanging on in the hope of legislation that will either give them State assistance or enable them to levy tribute upon the community. By their very nature coal pits have only a limited expectation of life. There is the period during which they are being sunk and working towards their full capacity; a further period of full and profitable activity, and then the declining period in which their best seams are being worked out and their final decease is prepared for. The business of colliery-owners is to secure during the profitable term of years the return of their capital and interest thereon. If, by unfortunate circumstances, they are unable to do this, the loss must be borne by them. This is the condition of private enterprise, and it is not the function of the State to make good the losses of private ventures or to compensate those whose methods become obsolete by the advance of science and machinery. The basis of all private enterprise is that you must "make good" or "get out."

If this somewhat drastic procedure does not find favour, the objects may be achieved by stages in the form of amalgamations carried out upon a comprehensive scale. The first step, therefore, is the reduction of the multiplicity of controlling ownerships and amalgamation of pits upon carefully considered lines. This must not take the form of merely financial combinations, but real amalgamation for working purposes of various types of pits in convenient districts, and it is to these amalgamated groups that the quota for coal production should be allocated, and not to individual pits. These large groups of pits would then be under the control of competent and experienced men, who would re-organise and re-equip the pits and would be able to present a business proposition that would enable them to raise the requisite capital for carrying on their operations. Business methods would be adopted, and the bulk of the coal would be produced in the pits yielding the best economic results, but as part of the operations of large enterprises conducted on these lines, a useful place would be found for many of the pits of a lower economic standard of production, which could not stand alone, for subsidiary supplies of coal, for coking purposes and by-products generally, and, in many areas, to supply local requirements and so reduce railway charges. A scheme of this kind would, for a time, keep alive many pits that otherwise could not live in open competition, and their closing would be a gradual process and thus minimise the hardships of the miners employed therein, the ultimate purpose being the

production of all the coal required upon the most efficient and economic lines, with a continual stimulus to new and improved methods of coal mining.

These amalgamations must precede and not follow the scheme embodied in the present Coal Mines Bill. It is, therefore, imperative that clauses should be inserted in the Coal Mines Bill providing for the appointment of Commissioners, not merely to report, but with full authority to prepare schemes of amalgamation in which the interests of all parties should be fully considered. The coalowners should certainly have full rights of appeal to a competent tribunal, whose decisions should be final and binding. We should then have a logical basis for rationing of output, which could be effected without increasing the cost of production, and without stereotyping obsolete methods. The way then becomes clear for dealing with marketing, but the procedure indicated in the Coal Mines Bill requires very drastic changes. The fixing of prices and the distribution of coal cannot be left merely to boards of coalowners. This would constitute a form of monopoly never before contemplated in this country, and is open to grave and serious objections. If this principle were once adopted, there could be no logical objections to its extension to other trades. Why, for example, should not the butchers constitute themselves into a marketing board and fix the prices of meat, with State penalties for selling below these prices, and why should not the boot manufacturers and retailers adopt a similar procedure and penalise any shopkeeper who sold cheap boots? It may be urged that, in fact, many combines and rings already do this, but with essential differences; these are private arrangements always open to outside competition if they carry their methods too far, and with the most important distinction of all, that the penalties imposed are by voluntary arrangement and not upon the authority of the State, and therefore liable at any time, if abused, to break down. If these very arbitrary powers were granted to the coalowners it would probably not in the long run inure to their advantage.

Much play has been made during the discussion of the Coal Mines Bill of the alleged static condition of the coal trade of the world. It is, of course, quite correct to say that the percentage of increase in coal consumption the world over has slowed down, and that the world's demand does not now offer the opportunities for expansion of the coal trade that existed in pre-war times, but within the ambit of the world's demand there is a very substantial tonnage of coal that could either be gained or lost by this country; a sufficient tonnage, indeed, to affect the employment of very large bodies of miners, and even in our own country there is a very material difference between the demand that will exist for coal

as between high prices and low prices, and incidentally a wide difference between good times and bad times for the basic industries and for the men employed therein depending upon the price at which coal can be purchased. It is, therefore, an entirely false basis to assume that the market for coal is entirely static, and that even a small increase in price is unimportant and has no bearing upon the trade and employment of this country. The coalowners themselves will probably receive a rude awakening when they discover that the higher prices that they would be able to charge, if the Bill becomes law, are accompanied by a substantial reduction in the demand for coal, and that oil and other substitutes for coal receive thereby a stimulus that will make their competition even more formidable than at present, and they will discover to their sorrow that it is much easier to lose their markets than to regain them.

A marketing scheme we must have as a corollary of rationing. This should take the form of a central pool, controlled by a board representing the coalowners, the distributors, and the consumers, so that all the interests may be considered and the rights of each section of the community adequately protected. This marketing board should concern itself not only with pit-head prices, but should address itself to reducing the present excessive margin between pit-head prices and the prices paid by the consumer. It would then become a real selling organisation, taking up the business where the coalowner leaves it at the pit-head, and directing and controlling the distribution of the coal to its ultimate destination. All this can be efficiently done without the creation of any dangerous monopoly, and in view of the economies that would be effected, in both the production of coal and its distribution, it is manifest that the result would be cheaper and not dearer coal to the consumer. The most important result certainly would be the establishment of the coal trade upon a firmer and more profitable basis to the coalowners.

The coalowners' lot is not an enviable one. Sinking a pit is always something of an adventure. Geological reports may be entirely satisfactory; trial borings full of encouragement; mineral leases all that could be desired, and then, after a large amount of capital has been expended, troubles begin. Water appears in volumes that suggest the imminence of another Deluge; the most promising seams suddenly reveal faults, or, after opening out a seam at considerable expense, it tapers away into nothingness, and when all these capital expenditures are added together it is difficult to find a sufficient margin in the pit-head price to yield any sort of dividend upon the capital expended. Then the coalowner is exposed in a very special degree to the fluctuations of

trade both at home and abroad. If he has a good spell at fair prices, this is followed by a cycle of depression. If the average yields of colliery enterprise over a term of years are studied, the wonder is that anybody can be found to embark large sums of capital upon such hazardous enterprises.

In addition to these economic difficulties, the coalfields seem to have a special attraction for politicians to try their apprentice hands upon. Recent years tell a gloomy story of these doctrinaire experiments. There was the Government control of mines during the war, which left some very uncomfortable legacies behind; then the seven-hours day, followed by a falling market both in demand and prices; then a Government subsidy; after this, the disastrous stoppage; further legislation—the restoration of the eight-hours day, etc. It is not difficult to realise that, during these vicissitudes, such reserves of capital as the collieries possessed were all exhausted, and a heavy load of liabilities was piled up. Now, just as the collieries are recovering from these repeated shocks, and some improvement in the market is manifesting itself, along comes the politician again, with a whole series of new proposals. It is not surprising, under these circumstances, that the coalowners present a “stiff upper lip” and say—in effect—we have no knowledge of the burdens you propose to impose upon us, but our only protection is that you should give us powers to so limit our output and to charge such prices for our coal as will enable us to bear these new burdens and at least continue our precarious existence.

It is not fair, therefore, to accuse the coalowners of making exorbitant demands or of aiming at undue profiteering. Coalowners are not more selfish than other business men, and are quite as ready to enter into equitable arrangements as those who are responsible for the conduct of other great industries would be. They would be neglectful of their duty both to themselves and the men they employed if they allowed the existence of this great industry to be jeopardised by ill-considered legislation. The only way out of the difficult *impasse* is that all the cards should be put upon the table and a “square deal” made. In the amalgamation of pits suggested, and the marketing board to be set up, full and fair consideration must in justice be given to the interests of the coalowners, and unless they are given the opportunity of carrying on their business of coal mining without undue interference, and upon conditions that will afford them a fair return for capital embarked and the risks undertaken, we shall once more plunge the coal trade into chaos, with disastrous results to the entire community.

The question is naturally asked, what is to become of the miners

who would be displaced by the closing of the uneconomic pits? The problem is a very serious one, because not only would isolated pits be affected, but in many cases whole districts would suffer seriously by the closing of these pits. The public conscience rightly refuses to deal with these great problems purely from an economic standpoint, and insists that the human side should receive the fullest consideration. We cannot throw a large body of miners upon the scrap-heap, but in any schemes that are undertaken their interests must receive the fullest consideration. It is no use concealing the fact that more men are nominally employed in the collieries to-day than permanent regular work at good wages can be provided for, but no one acquainted with the present conditions in the depressed areas is prepared to say that to follow the present lines and allow matters to drift offers any solution of the difficulty. We must, therefore, face this problem and deal with it definitely and comprehensively.

The Coal Mines Bill proposes to authorise the owners to make a levy upon the tonnage of coal for the purpose of granting rebates to selected industries, or to assist the export of coal. No such provision as this would be required if we could get down to the basis of economic production of coal. Under those conditions we could regain our export trade without any form of subsidy, and certainly no rebates will be needed for any particular industry. This suggested levy on the tonnage of coal produced could much more wisely be devoted to assisting the displaced miners. There are several directions in which such a fund might be employed: the pension age of some of the older miners who have spent their lives in the pits could be antedated, and this would affect considerable numbers of men. The increased activity in the economic pits would absorb an additional number of men, and this fund might be used to effect the transfer of men from one district to another, and to assist in making the necessary housing provision. It is perhaps rather startling to suggest that the increased demand for coal and the closing of the uneconomic pits would call for the sinking of some well-equipped modern pits in the new coal areas, and work could be found for displaced miners in this connection, and permanent employment when the pits were in full work. It may be that some of the younger men would be glad of an opportunity of settling in the Dominions if funds were available to give them a real start there, and no better use could be made of the coal levy than this.

It may be urged that all this would be costly, but in human opportunity it would be money well spent, and at any rate it is better to pay a substantial price down to get rid of an ancient evil and put coal mining upon an economic basis, than to

saddle the industry for all time with uneconomic pits and obsolete methods of production. Temporary expedients are in the long run more expensive than a policy which boldly faces an evil and secures a permanent solution. We cannot put the coal mining of this country upon a satisfactory basis unless our scheme makes full provision for the welfare of the large body of men now employed in the pits. For those who constitute a surplus that cannot be employed in the reorganised pits, adequate provision must be made, and for the men who continue to be engaged therein reasonable regularity of employment must be provided, a living wage paid, and the hours of labour proportioned to the arduous and hazardous nature of their occupation. A well-housed, well-paid, and contented mining population is a basic condition of peace in the coal trade.

The President of the Board of Trade, who introduced the Coal Mines Bill, has devoted himself to the study of this problem during the past few months with a diligence and capacity that are worthy of the highest praise, but the time at his disposal has been insufficient for a full investigation of this most difficult and complicated problem, and it is no reflection upon his benevolent intentions to say that he has not as yet fully explored the situation. It is also quite obvious that all sides of the case have not been put before him, and that other interests must be consulted, as well as those with whom he has been in conference, before a satisfactory scheme can be evolved.

We shall never find a solution of our difficulties until we can remove this question from the arena of party politics. The knowledge and experience of men in all the parties are essential. No one set of political doctrines points the way, and this is not a case in which one side must win and the other lose, or with it we shall sacrifice the industrial interests of the country. There must be conciliation and compromise in the national interest, and party controversy must give place to co-operation and good will.

J. TUDOR WALTERS.

THE UNITED STATES, PARITY AND NEUTRALITY.

ANGLO-AMERICAN relations have never been more satisfactory. Statesmen reiterate this refrain and their people make a chorus in which there is no seriously discordant note. There are no outstanding disputes between the United States and Great Britain which give rise to ill-feeling. Of boundary difficulties there are none. The *I'm Alone* case fortunately stands alone. Commercial competition is not now more acute than usual; at least it is not talked about in terminology borrowed from war such as "conquest of markets" and the other stock phrases. The Senate has been unable to act on tariff revision and this important spring of international irritation is still dry. There are no difficult claims by nationals. The vexed question of debts has been settled and, while the bulk of intelligent opinion in the United States believes that that settlement cannot last, it provides no special cause of friction.

But two years ago the chorus was discordant and there were then few, if any, specific reasons. The ill-feeling that existed was largely psychological. It was encouraged (or at least not discouraged) by the temper of statesmen. The British Admiralty and the American Navy Department began to think of each other as possible opponents. Parity of capital ships had been fixed at the Washington Conference of 1921 and the competition was in cruiser and other categories, but this made it no less menacing. The Geneva Conference of 1927 called to discuss this problem resulted in a deadlock, the reasons for which are not now important; but the Powers came out of the Conference blaming each other for the failure. There followed the Anglo-French Naval Agreement. Sir Austen Chamberlain's idea in respect of this may have been well intentioned, but his method was unfortunate. The big navy people in the United States had their innings. The Coolidge administration sponsored a larger constructive programme and, even though the pressure of public opinion forced a reduction, the outlook was not promising. Secretary Kellogg's treaty renouncing war as an instrument of national policy was accepted by the Senate, but with many of the senators declaring that they considered it nothing but a gesture. Immediately thereafter Congress passed the Naval Bill so that the country might be more effectively prepared to use the instrument of policy which had just been abandoned. Then came President Coolidge's remarkable and never-explained Armistice Day speech. As Mr. Will Rogers, the most quoted American humorist, remarked: "The President must have eaten meat just before he made the speech."

During the last few months, however, a vast and happy change has come about. Competition has now been ended. Great Britain has accepted naval parity and the exact details are to be set down in a treaty which it is hoped will emerge from the London Conference. The visit of Mr. MacDonald was responsible for a truly remarkable wave of good feeling. Indications are not lacking that this good feeling is reciprocated in Great Britain. No matter what the results of the Five Power Conference, the *entente cordiale* between the United States and Great Britain should not become less cordial. Anglo-American friendship will continue, naval parity will be maintained, and competition will be ruled out irrespective of any special demands that Japan may make or any inability of France and Italy to agree on Mediterranean ratios. So far as Great Britain and the United States are concerned one may confidently anticipate that even the failure of the Conference will have no bearing on the dual naval agreement or on the maintenance of that spiritual comity which is all-important.

On the other hand, even if the London Conference succeeds so well that the incorrigible optimists are surprised, a large portion of the field of Anglo-American relations will still need to be examined and cultivated. As yet the statesmen (at least in the United States) have not put their hands to the plough. Only the unofficial publicists have discussed the crops which can be sown and harvested; for the plain fact is that naval parity between the United States and Great Britain and an *entente* of peoples—indispensable desiderata though these may be—will not of themselves suffice. The problem of peace and the terms of its perpetuation cannot be dealt with so simply. If the American and British navies were halved or quartered, and such an agreement was not implemented, their use against each other would only be less likely. This is not the goal that should be striven for. The all-important question is as to the policy of the United States in respect of issues with which it is not immediately concerned, but which may lead to measures calculated to preserve peace. Put in another way the problem is this: the United States has renounced war as an instrument of national policy. It must now proceed to examine its possible use of neutrality as an instrument of national policy. When Secretary Kellogg was explaining the Pact of Paris to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations he was asked this question: "Suppose some other nation does break this treaty, why should we interest ourselves in it?" The Secretary of State replied: "There is not a bit of reason." And the Senate went even farther in manifesting its indifference. It amended the Cruiser Bill of 1929 by empowering the President to begin negotiations with the view of securing a guarantee of neutral rights in wartime.

In short, there is no official recognition of the fact that by insisting on its neutral rights the United States could confer great benefits on a violator of the Kellogg Pact and make it difficult, if not impossible, for European States to apply the sanctions of the League of Nations Covenant. There has been no official discussion of the necessity of renouncing, or at least reconsidering, neutrality as an instrument of American policy which may aid and abet a State which breaks its pledge not to go to war. "Freedom of the seas" is a catch-phrase which obscures thinking, and it is not realised that American insistence on "freedom" might, under certain conditions, be legal but extremely immoral. This is the situation, and it may be worth while to set down in summary fashion certain pertinent considerations.

(1) Public Opinion. When President Wilson brought the League of Nations Covenant home from Paris he found American opinion unprepared for what it thought to be far-reaching commitments. There was a violent reaction which was much greater than the country (as distinguished from the irreconcilable senators) really wished. Since then, however, public opinion has always been in advance of the Executive and the Executive has been for the most part slightly in advance of the Senate. President Harding called the Washington Conference in 1921 only because he thought himself forced to do so. More than six months elapsed before the American State Department took any notice of M. Briand's offer of a treaty renouncing war. That Pact would never have been concluded if American public opinion had not been aroused. Unofficial publicists were responsible for stirring up such interest in the proposal that the State Department was finally forced to take notice of it and to continue the negotiations. Similarly, public opinion was responsible for the postponement of the first cruiser programme and the paring down of the second programme to fifteen 10,000-ton cruisers. The Navy Department was obviously more jingoistic than Congress, and Congress was willing to sanction larger expenditures than the country wanted. After he assumed office President Hoover needed no pressure in respect of his *pourparlers* with Mr. MacDonald, for the public opinion supporting him was already in existence. He needed only to follow rather than to lead it. It is not in speeches by members of the Executive or senators that one now finds discussions of what should be done to implement the Kellogg Pact or to supplement parity by machinery of arbitration and conciliation. The discussion and suggestions come from publicists and organisations outside of the Government, precisely as the outlawry of war proposals were adumbrated.

(2) Party Politics. So far as international problems are concerned politics in the United States is adjourned. This is not an unmixed blessing. Foreign policy should not be a partisan football, and when parties take opposing views there is the danger that continuity will not be possible to the degree that it is desirable. On the other hand, a moratorium on the discussion of international questions during campaigns means that there is not a full exploration of the problems at stake with alternative proposals presented. During the American presidential campaign of 1928 hardly a word was said on foreign questions. The platforms of both parties were so vague that the relevant sections could have been interchanged and few would have known the difference. The Pact of Paris was not mentioned save in terms of indiscriminating blessing. Perhaps because of the enchantment which distance sometimes lends, an American is inclined to see certain advantages in the party situation in Great Britain so far as the discussion of international questions is concerned. There was, during the last general election, a real cleavage between the Conservative and the Liberal and the Labour Parties. This brought real issues to the front and forced their consideration. In the United States, however, there is no such cleavage; and within the two parties, save for small bands of isolationists, there are few to speak out on international questions. This situation makes extra-governmental opinion more important than it would be were the parties announcing alternative policies. It means also that problems may not be thought out: that, specifically, when Mr. Hoover fails to say how he proposes to implement the Kellogg Pact, or when he makes a suggestion in respect of the immunity of foodships, there is no opposition criticism or alternative programme. The Executive, therefore, proceeds on the even tenor of its way and determines its own tempo unscrutinised save by extra-governmental agencies and publicists.

(3) The Senate. Whatever implementation of the Kellogg Pact is proposed will meet with rough "sledding" in the Senate. This is not the place to attempt any analysis of the body which Gladstone called "the most remarkable of all the inventions of modern politics." Were he writing now Gladstone would think this an understatement. There is no *liberum veto* in the Senate, at least by formal rule, but each senator is a *prima donna* and must be humoured. An overwhelming majority is willing to ratify the Protocol defining the special terms for the adherence to the World Court by the United States, but the opposition of a tiny minority in the Senate will delay action. Senator Borah thinks that nothing will be done until next winter. He may be wrong, but President Hoover has no inclination to urge greater celerity. There is not the slightest

chance that the Senate will consider consenting to the Optional Clause. American adherence to the World Court nevertheless will serve in a narrow way to supplement Article II of the Pact of Paris by which the contracting parties agree that the settlement of disputes "shall never be sought except by pacific means." The treaty does not specify any "pacific means." In addition to the World Court there will be available (so far as the United States is concerned) the conciliation machinery of the Bryan Treaty of 1914—an agreement which is strangely ignored but which potentially is of the highest importance. There will also be various arbitration treaties. The revised Root Arbitration Treaty of 1908 between the United States and Great Britain is now being negotiated. This may be even more emasculated than it was in its original form, when President Roosevelt called it a poor treaty. But the reservation of particular subjects as beyond the scope of the treaty will now be less important than formerly because of the renunciation of war. The Pact of Paris makes the use of pacific means compulsory. Even with the Senate in its present temper one further step may be possible. The Four Power Pacific Treaty, signed at Washington on December 13th, 1921, provides that if a controversy cannot be settled by diplomacy, and "is likely to affect the harmonious accord now happily subsisting between the high contracting parties, they shall invite the other high contracting parties to a general conference to which the whole subject will be referred for consideration and adjustment." There seems to be no reason why the Senate would not agree to such an undertaking as applied to Powers other than those signatory to the Four Power Treaty. Indeed the President could act by himself in any situation which arose; but to assert in a treaty the principle that the United States would have an interest in any threatened violation of the Kellogg Pact would be well worth while. It would serve to fill, in formal fashion, the gap which the Pact left in respect of the "pacific means" to be resorted to.

(4) The President. How far Mr. Hoover has pondered the incompleteness of the Pact of Paris is uncertain. He has used language which seems to refer to the problems, but his phrases have been general. He and Mr. MacDonald sat on their log in the Blue Ridge Mountains and discussed how they might contribute "something to the solution of the problem of peace in which all other nations are interested and which calls for their co-operation." In his Armistice Day speech the President declared that "we are interested in all methods that can be devised to assure the settlement of all controversies between nations." He then proceeded to limit the part that the United States would play:

The European nations have, by the Covenant of the League of Nations, agreed that if nations fail to settle their differences peaceably, then force should be applied by other nations to compel them to be reasonable. We have refused to travel this road. We are confident that at least in the Western Hemisphere public opinion will suffice to check violence. This is the road we propose to travel.

What we urgently need in this direction is a further development of methods for reference of unsettled controversies to joint inquiry by the parties, assisted by friendly nations, in order that action may be stayed and that the aggressor may be subjected to the searchlight of public opinion.

The spirit of this is fine and the hopes are admirable, but what, specifically, is contemplated? Attempts to define an "aggressor" nation or to distinguish between "public" and "private" war are ruled out. It would seem also that attempts to define "freedom of the seas" or to codify the international law of war to safeguard the rights of neutrals will likewise form no part of an American programme. The idea of codification finds considerable support in the Senate; but the more the idea is examined the more impracticable it will be found to be. Perhaps, however, the examination of the idea would be worth while. Senators would then discover a number of interesting truths. They would find that sea power is frequently a necessary counterweight to land forces. They would discover the fallacy of proceeding on the theory that the United States can remain neutral if war breaks out and they would realise that, on the other hand, the United States might wish to use its navy effectively—that is, unlimited by any regard for neutral rights. The Senate would learn also, as Mr. Philip Kerr has put it, that a policy of neutrality would tend "not towards peace but to convert every war into an Anglo-American war, for neutral rights can be enforced only by war or the threat of war. On the other side, the enforcement of absolute neutral rights would be to nullify all effective international action to deal with an aggressor nation or to prevent war." More than this, the powers of the world are thoroughly committed to the preservation of peace by the Kellogg Pact, the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Locarno Treaties, and the Four Power Treaty. Should the signatories of these undertakings begin to discuss the "law" which should (but will not) govern in the event that they come to war with each other? This consideration is not inapplicable to President Hoover's proposed immunity of foodships.

(5) The Outlook. More thought is now being given to the problem of preserving peace than at any previous time in history. It is realistic thought and it has result in astonishing achievements. The treaties and covenants which have been mentioned

mark greater advances within a decade than had been possible in ten centuries. Even the spectacular failures—the Draft Treaty of Guarantee and the Protocol—were milestones whose importance and lesson will receive increasing recognition. The world now looks forward to action by Great Britain and the United States, but parity and the limitation of navies, important though they are, will not be sufficient. American public opinion is favourable. Any treaty would be long delayed by the Senate, but a treaty is not necessary. Executive action—even executive words as to contemplated action—will suffice. The most important foreign policy that the United States has—the Monroe Doctrine—was put forward by the Executive alone. There could similarly be a Hoover Doctrine. It would declare the desire of the United States to consult instantly with Great Britain and the other principal Powers whenever any violation of the Kellogg Pact seemed possible and then to consider what its future course should be, untrammelled by out-of-date rules as to neutrality. After the Monroe Doctrine was announced Canning declared that he had "called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old." If British statesmen again call to the New World perhaps the result will be a doctrine of peace which will implement the Pact of Paris.

LINDSAY ROGERS.

Columbia University.

ITALIAN ART AT BURLINGTON HOUSE.

MY first thoughts on the Italian Exhibition questioned the wisdom of exposing so many pictures of inestimable value to the various risks consequent on their removal and passage; and the safe, though stormy, voyage of the S.S. *Leonardo da Vinci* has not succeeded in banishing my fears. But several visits to Burlington House leave me none the less with a sense of deep gratitude to the enterprise and courage of the organisers of the exhibition, and to the authorities who have so generously seconded their efforts, for providing a display of incomparable interest. To those who have seen most of the pictures *in situ*, the exhibition revives memories of intense pleasure, while the juxtaposition of works never before brought together offers a remarkable opportunity of revising one's judgments.

Many of the pictures inevitably suffer in their temporary *milieu*, for most have come from places where they had a considered and fitting position to face all the chances of ill-assorted neighbours on alien walls. In general, the hanging committee may be congratulated on a fine effort to achieve balance, in spite of the crowding consequent on the arrival of more pictures than were expected. The most debatable ground, in this respect, is Gallery III. An architectural treatment is almost essential for the effective hanging of so large a room, but the method adopted has undoubtedly been based on the selection of fine pictures, with little consideration of comparative scale.

It is enough to refer to Botticelli's *Venus* amid its smaller neighbours to illustrate our point. All the other pictures on the same wall are of high importance, but the contiguity of the *Venus* and Piero della Francesca's *Flagellation*, with such difference in the scale of their figures, cannot but be mutually detrimental. Few small paintings have so monumental a dignity as this *Flagellation* from the Ducal Palace at Urbino, but it needs isolation or congenial company to achieve it. The north wall is equally unhappy in spite of the triumphant procession of individual beauties in its Giorgiones, Raphaels, and Titians, and it remains for the two superb Titians at the east end (the so-called *Cornaro Family*, recently acquired by the National Gallery, and Lord Harewood's *Diana and Actæon*), and the series of larger subjects and portraits on the south wall, with the vast Tiepolo, from Edinburgh, as its centre-piece, to recover architectural balance. With the overcrowded rooms inseparable from these popular exhibitions, there is, of course, the excuse that a vista is seldom available, even though it be admitted that the more distant view of the larger pictures is essential to their proper enjoyment. And the single line along the north wall has at least

the advantage of placing all the paintings at a reasonable height. It is noteworthy that the more subdued colour and the larger average size of the pictures has made hanging easier in the later schools, an advantage which was certainly possessed by most of the Dutch masters of last year. And even the brilliance of the early Italian painters makes no greater effect on crowded walls than did the wonderful colouring of the Vermeer Room.

The real lacuna in the early Italian schools is, of course, large works of mural decoration. There are many small pictures of great interest in Gallery I, but few that arouse feelings comparable to the works of Giotto in Florence, Padua and Assisi. Without regard for the great names as such, I propose to pass through the galleries, noting some of the most beautiful examples, pictures and other works, that I could wish to retain in my memory, not for critical study, but for enjoyment.

With Cimabue of Florence, Duccio of Siena, and Pietro Cavallini of Rome (1-5, and 8), the forerunners of Giotto, we are on uncertain ground, and the most satisfying picture in preservation, no less than in qualities of colour and expression, is Lord Crawford's *Crucifixion* (5), whoever its author may be. There is nothing exhibited to represent adequately the classical strength of Cavallini, whose recently uncovered frescoes in St. Cecilia have led scholars to rewrite the artistic pedigree of Giotto. It seems probable that Giotto was in Rome about the year 1300, engaged, among other things, on the mosaic *Navicella* of which only a restored fragment is preserved in the portico of St. Peter's. An interesting record of its composition is a drawing, probably done in the fourteenth century, which is lent by Lord Northampton (426).

If Giotto is equally unrepresented, his spirit pervades the beautiful little panel lent by Lord Lee of Fareham (17). It is intensely expressive, superbly composed, and monumental in dignity, though less than nine inches square. Giotto's Florentine succession is well shown in several little panels by Bernardo Daddi, the *Marriage of the Virgin* from Buckingham Palace (15) being a brilliant example of his simplicity of design and bright colouring; the figures are shortened to a more natural length, indicative of the more direct study of life of which the contemporary Siennese school offers the most attractive examples. Simone Martini and Pietro Lorenzetti, of the generation junior to Duccio, are both well represented, Martini in a miracle of refinement, the four panels from Antwerp (52), Lorenzetti in the largest and most impressive picture in Gallery I, the *Birth of the Virgin*, from the Opera del Duomo, Siena (57). Simone Martini was settled at Avignon in the last years of his life, and is of particular interest to us for the influence he exercised on French and English art of the period. In these

years he also had the friendship of Petrarch, and one wonders if his drawing of Laura, spoken of in sonnets 49 and 50, will ever be found or identified.

Considerable interest for their reflection of contemporary scenes lies in the two pictures illustrating the life of St. Bernardino of Siena, that of Vecchietta (71), who had no doubt seen and heard the Saint preaching, and the slightly later panel attributed to Neroccio di Bartolommeo (63). And for charming illustration, in which the Sienese excelled, the little panel of the *Journey of the Magi*, by Sassetta (64), lent by Mr. F. Maitland Griggs, of New York, is a pure delight. Except for the Italian landscape, one might imagine a contemporary scene from the Canterbury Pilgrims.

The south wall of Gallery I is dominated by the large *St. Chrisogonus on Horseback*, by the early Venetian, Giambono (22), and other works in this room that I would specially note are the Lorenzo Monaco, lent by Captain Spencer Churchill (65), the enchanting *Virgin and Child*, by Stefano da Zevio, from Rome (30), and Jacopo Bellini's *St. Jerome*, from Verona (38). The *St. Jerome* is perhaps the most epoch-making picture in the room, painted with a command of form and a simplicity of design and colour which are comparable with Piero della Francesca. Amateurs should never forget that one of the greatest treasures of Italian art in England is the large sketch-book by Jacopo Bellini in the British Museum. Jacopo Bellini was one of the truest harbingers of the great advance in the science of drawing which characterised Italian art as the fifteenth century progressed. In the second gallery we are at grips with this advance, and with many vital experiments in new modes, in works by such painters as Uccello, in the predella from Urbino (86), Piero della Francesca, in an impressive, though somewhat impassive, *Virgin and Child with Angels*, from the same place (134), and Antonio Pollaiuolo in his fiery *Rape of Deianira*, from Yale University (123). The *Virgin and Child with Angels*, lent by Christ Church, Oxford (126), once attributed to Piero della Francesca, has more charm than the authentic example, but presents a curiously delicate type of face and elongated figure alien to the master's work.

Examples of great beauty are offered by Fra Angelico's *Virgin and Child*, from Pontassieve, Florence (82), and by the two important Filippo Lippi, the large *Annunciation*, from Rome (88), and Sir Herbert Cook's tondo of the *Adoration of the Magi* (93), from which Botticelli must have learnt so much. And for types of subtle fascination few things can compare with Alesso Baldovinetti's *Virgin and Child* from the Louvre (99), and the *Angel of the Annunciation* by Melozzo, from Florence (113).

Apart from the typical Botticellis, such as the *Virgin and Child*,

from the Poldi-Pezzoli Museum, Milan, there is his astonishing little panel of *La Dorelitta*, from the collection of Prince Pallavicini, Rome. Beautiful in colour (a lovely harmony of light rose and grey), and monumental in simplicity, it moves no less through the intensity of its expression. Except for methods typical of the century (the indented line on panel prepared with a gesso ground), and a figure characteristic of Botticelli, it might belong to any period, so universal is its appeal. But if a late work of Botticelli, belonging to the period when this eminently pagan artist fell under the spell of Savonarola and became one of his weeping brethren (*piagnoni*), it probably represents a biblical subject, such as that of the Levite's concubine, wronged and weeping outside her seducer's door.

Two other works of this gallery inevitably claim our attention, the profile portraits from Milan and Berlin (119 and 122). The lady appears to be the same in each, but portrayed to all seeming by two different artists. I feel unable to offer any judgment of their respective artists, of which there are such various conjectures, but comparison with the portrait of the *Duchess of Urbino*, in Gallery III (199), makes me as favourable to the earlier suggestion of Piero della Francesca for the Berlin picture as to the more recent attributions to Pollaiuolo or Domenico Veneziano. The little panels of Domenico Veneziano near by (Nos. 128 to 132) give little help in this problem. The *Annunciation*, from Cambridge (130), with its simple classic court, grey with rose-coloured cornice, and vista on to an enclosed garden, is one of the most delightful pictures in the room.

In Room III we reach the climax of interest, and Botticelli's *Venus* rises above the crowds of onlookers as the presiding goddess of the exhibition. This canvas, as well as the *Spring*, was done some time after 1477 for Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco de' Medici, for whom Botticelli also drew his designs to Dante, of which one example is lent by Berlin (450). How distant such work from the fresh and vigorous genius of a Giotto; it is art already pervaded with the emotional complexities of a sophisticated age, of a mind that seems to have a certain twist in its outlook on life, a brooding melancholy that fears what the future has in store. For all that its enchantment is not lessened, but rather enhanced in its poignant appeal to the feelings of this somewhat distracted age. It is neither tonic nor anodyne, but an almost forlorn cry of beauty that cannot be satisfied. In its simple breadth and light scheme of blue, grey, and rose, how strongly the *Venus* contrasts with the brilliant elaboration of the little classic *Calumny of Apelles* (141); and with the wonderful *Wedding Feast of Nastagio degli Onesti* (135), from which Millais must have drawn inspiration for his *Lorenzo and Isabella*.

For miniature handling comparable with the Calumny, there are several works of astounding perfection: the Triumphal Cars on the reverses of Piero della Francesca's portraits of the Duke and Duchess of Urbino (198), the *Annunciation*, attributed to Pesellino (194), the *Virgin and Child* by Crivelli (201), a marvel of tempera technique in faultless preservation, the little *Hercules* panels by Pollaiuolo (196a and b) with their remarkable force of drawing (as visible here as in the rapid sketch in the British Museum), and Mantegna's *Judith* from the Widener collection (186). Several of the other examples by Mantegna exhibited, e.g. the *Crucifixion* from the Louvre (231), most fortunately shown with its companions of the *Agony in the Garden* and the *Resurrection* from Tours (230 and 232), are of the same character, which tends to lack the qualities of pigment required in works of this larger scale. Mantegna's full power seems to me better shown either in the small *St. George*, from Venice (147), which imposes itself as a work of colossal dignity, or in larger designs carried out in a freer style of painting, such as the *Triumphs of Cæsar* at Hampton Court. An example of this freer handling on canvas is the *Virgin and Child* from Milan (138), with its touching simplicity, and the extraordinary study of the *Virgin and St. John mourning over the Dead Christ* (140). The latter remained in Mantegna's studio till his death, and I cannot but feel that he or his patrons were right in regarding it a technical study in perspective rather than a satisfying representation of a moving subject. For finished portraiture of the fifteenth century there is little to surpass Ghirlandaio's *Giovanna Tornabuoni*, lent by Mr. Pierpont Morgan (189), a panel version of the same profile which occurs in the frescoes of St. Maria Novella, Florence, inscribed with a couplet from Martial (X. 32, ll. 5, 6), which Mr. G. F. Hill has rendered:

Could mind and 'haviour be by art express'd
This were of pictures all the loveliest.

In Gallery IV there are several other fifteenth-century portraits of interest, notably the two by Piero di Cosimo from The Hague (254 and 258), that of the architect Giuliano da San Gallo, somewhat German in its type, and the *Portrait of a Musician* attributed to Cosimo Tura from Dublin (242). I cannot think that the suggested attribution is happy. Might it not be by Francesco Francia, and conceivably a portrait of the Bolognese litterateur and musician, Philotheo Achillini, who appears to be represented in an early engraving by Marcantonio, the *Guitar-player* (B.469)?

The portraits on the north wall of the large gallery give a remarkable picture of the development from the clarity of design and colour of the fifteenth century to the more atmospheric treatment of the full renaissance. Raphael carries the quattrocento tradi-

tion to its highest point in the portraits of Angelo and Maddalena Dossi (159 and 161), miracles of reticent handling and harmonious colour, while the famous *Donna Velata* from the Pitti (160) comes nearer to the Venetian ideals in its emphasis on the painting of the ample white sleeve. Whether by Giorgione or not the supposed *Portrait of Antonio Brocardo*, from Budapest (155), is a wonderful example of the new chiaroscuro methods, and still more subtle in its scheme of black and grey is the early Titian portrait from Copenhagen (166), with its charming glimpse of evening landscape in the background.

The subject pictures on the same wall, and on the screen, are equally illustrative of historical development. The noble *Transfiguration*, by Giovanni Bellini, from Naples (151), still belongs to the quattrocento in its clear-cut design, but has already sacrificed a little of the earlier clarity of colour for the emphasis of solidity by chiaroscuro. It is possible that the sacrifice may seem more than it actually was owing to the manifestly darkened condition of the pigment. Then the famous Giorgione from the Giovanelli Palace, Venice, called the *Tempest*, somewhat artificial in its composition, and far less satisfying than the same artist's *Concert Champêtre* in the Louvre. Another remarkable picture ascribed to Giorgione on the same wall is the *Adulteress before Christ*, from Glasgow (162), anticipating the later baroque in its exaggeration of rhythmic motion.

It is interesting to compare the early Titian from Antwerp (158) with the National Gallery group, painted at least forty years later. The Antwerp picture is a remarkable anticipation of the master's more grandiose compositions, but its impressiveness seems partly to fail through the figure of St. Peter being diminished in dignity by the brown mantle thrown about the hips, reducing the effect which might have been achieved by a greater breadth in the lower part of the dark rose cloak.

As perfect in its composition as anything in the gallery is the little *Esterhazy Madonna* by Raphael, from Budapest (195, on the screen). It is almost like a drawing in its economy of pigment (especially in the figures of the children), and the simple planes of colour contribute towards the spaciousness of its impression. I have already referred to several of the pictures in Gallery IV; many of the others are by painters whose style tended to mannerism, though with no loss of charm. Such are the powerful works of Cosimo Tura, the leading spirit of the Ferrarese school, notably the impressive *Pietà* of lunette form (211); the romantically treated mythologies of Piero di Cosimo (234, 235), and the finely strung figure studies of Signorelli, e.g. the *Flagellation*, from the Brera (244). The fragment of an unknown *Descent from the Cross*, lent

by Lord Muir-Mackenzie (251), shows Signorelli in his most powerful vein, on a scale comparable with his work at Orvieto.

In Gallery V we have a rough division between the great Venetians on the north wall and the Milanese on the south, with various examples of other North Italian schools interspersed. Influence from Flanders in the development of painting in oil is seen in Antonello da Messina, and his *Portrait of a Poet*, from Milan (278), recently released by the restorer from his false fancy-dress, is one of the most striking pictures in the show. Giovanni Bellini is well represented by three fine Madonnas, the central picture from Bergamo (280) being one of his most satisfying works. His talent for illustration is seen in the charming series of *Five Allegories*, from Venice (282), and similar qualities are manifest in several of Cima's little panels (288, 289, 290, 297), which tempt one to regard him among the chief inspirers of Venetian book illustration. Carpaccio joins the same company with his delightful piece of contemporary genre, the *Two Venetian Courtesans* (299).

The Milanese paintings exhibited are happiest when the face or figure is shown against a floral or foliated background, such as Luini's *Madonna del Roseto* (318) and *Susanna* (317). The *Virgin and Child*, from Budapest (326) is another very lovely example immediately inspired by Leonardo, if not partly by his hand. The portraits form a striking group, but the Milanese tendency to silhouette against a dark background seems to me to add naturalistic emphasis to the detriment of a harmonious picture. Most notable are two portraits by Ambrogio da Predis, that of a young man with mysterious grey eyes, bearing the motto *Vita si scias uti longa est* (321), and the *Lucrezia Crivelli* (323). Among the lesser pictures of the same room the little panel of the *Scourging of Christ*, from Edinburgh (264), has a peculiarly decorative quality in its clear scheme of composition and gentle harmony of greys and blue.

Galleries VI and VII are most remarkable for their portraits; several stately Moronis, that of *Gian Girolamo Grumelli* (347) being a lovely harmony of rose against a grey architectural background; the richly tailored young man by Romanino, from Budapest (362); the imposing *Schiavona*, by Giorgione or Titian, lent by Sir Herbert Cook (385), a magnificent Paul Veronese (397), and the *Andrea Doria*, the sombre masterpiece of Sebastiano del Piombo (405), almost lost in the comparative darkness of its temporary home. Among the most noteworthy subject pictures are Lord Lee's *Death of St. Peter Martyr*, by Giovanni Bellini, of particular interest in relation to the National Gallery version, the Giorgione *Adoration of the Shepherds*, lent by Lord Allendale (395), a glowing Palma Vecchio, from Venice (377), Sir Martin Conway's Lorenzo Lotto, *A Maiden's Dream* (403), an idyll of haunting beauty, a little

Tintoretto, like tapestry in quality, lent by Mr. Thomas Loyd (358), and several examples by Dosso Dossi, of such diverse attraction as the Hals-like *Jester*, from Modena (351), and the *Circe*, lent by Sir Joseph Duveen (407).

There is no diminution of interest in the three rooms devoted to the late sixteenth- and to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century art (X, XI, and the Architectural Room), but my notes must be sternly limited. Bronzino's *Adam and Eve*, lent by Lord Crawford (748), and Guido Reni's *Atalanta and the Golden Apples*, from Naples (726), are both, in their own manner, full of rhythmic beauty. Guido Reni has earned some opprobrium for exaggerated sentiment, but his detractors need only see the *Portrait of his Mother* (725) to grant him qualities of real distinction. A greater sinner for his many insipid pictures, Carlo Dolci, must also be allowed respectability for his portraiture of *Sir Thomas Baines* (728). It is equally pleasing to welcome the great Academic, Annibale Carracci, in the unaffected and homely rendering of the *Holy Family in the Carpenter's Shop*, lent by the Duchess of Suffolk (741), which Millais himself might have emulated. In several painters of the late sixteenth and earlier seventeenth centuries we are confronted with near relationship to Dutch art, notably in the *Girl Asleep*, by Domenico Feti, from Budapest (735), and in that charmingly fresh study, the *Head of a Girl*, lent by Mr. Colin Agnew (733), which might almost be by Vermeer, though it is attributed to Orazio Gentileschi, an artist his senior by two generations, who worked in England in the last dozen years of a long life (about 1635-47). If cut down a few inches at the foot by some prudish owner it might originally have tallied with the description of a Gentileschi in Charles I's collection "upon a thick board, the picture of a woman with her left breast naked, her right breast covered with part of her smock." And in Cavallino's *Tobias*, from Rome (758), there is much that reminds one of the types and style characteristic of several Dutch painters of the period, such as Flinck, Carel Fabritius, and Vermeer himself.

Other subjects of particular interest are the early Caravaggio, from the Doria Palace (734), as clear-cut and brilliant in its composition and colour as anything he did, and the most effective pyramidal group by Piazzetta (775) which forms so fine a centre-piece on the north wall of Gallery XI. More remarkable still *La Burla*, of Franceschini (803), which anticipates the eighteenth century in its bold use of white, and even turns one's thoughts to Manet in the brilliance of its outdoor light. Though he died in 1689 he is most fittingly placed in a rococo milieu, with Tiepolo and Pietro Longhi for his neighbours.

Apart from the immense canvas in Gallery III (178), with its

interesting continuation (179) (which seems to be better by itself than in its original company), and the smaller subjects in the Architectural Room, G. B. Tiepolo is represented by a portrait which would hold its place beside the best Moronis, that of the crimson-gowned Venetian Procurator, Giovanni Querini (754). And another full-length portrait in the same room, Pompeo Batoni's *Thomas William Coke*, lent by Lord Leicester (760), is a most harmonious study in white and rose which easily bears comparison with Gainsborough.

The small Architectural Room, full of light, both in itself and in its pictures, is one of the chief joys of the exhibition. The three large Canalettos on the east wall form a most imposing group: the view of *St. Michele and Murano, Venice*, from Windsor Castle (790), painted with a freedom akin to Guardi, and like him also in its deep grey blues; the two views of London, lent by the Duke of Richmond (789 and 792), of surprising power, in spite of the minute and occasionally monotonous drawing of details. The smaller view of Venice, *The Grand Canal* (793), lent by Comm. Leo Goldschmied, is perhaps as fine an example of Canaletto's style as could be found, precise in its drawing, yet no less lovely in its qualities of pigment and atmosphere. Neighbouring drawings show that he was a far more convincing draughtsman with the brush than with the pen. The freer touch of Tiepolo, Guardi, and Piranesi succeeds better with the slighter medium (as is well shown by such splendid drawings as Nos. 832, worthy of Rembrandt, 834, and 826). Guardi's painted work is less imposing than Canaletto's, but the attractive examples exhibited show him an artist of even greater verve and versatility, with his society genre (the *Gala Concert*, from Munich, 807) as well as his Venetian scenes. The little *Venetian Lagoon*, from the Poldi-Pezzoli Museum, Milan, is a most enchanting impression of deep grey blues, such as Whistler must have emulated. The masterly precision of Canaletto recurs undiminished, though generally in a setting of more sombre tone, in his nephew and pupil Bernardo Bellotto, and he could not be better shown than in the *View of Verona*, lent by Lord Powis (768).

I mentioned a few of the eighteenth-century drawings which are placed beside contemporary pictures in the Architectural Room, but can do no more than refer to the superb collection of Old Master drawings brought together in Galleries VIII and IX. The Florentines of the fifteenth century, the great masters, Leonardo, Raphael, Michelangelo, Tintoretto (to mention only a few), can be studied here in their most intimate moments, in works intended for their own study in the development of their larger works, and the amateur who cares to see the artist at work should make himself familiar with these studies, and others of no less interest, which are

now exhibited in the British Museum. The one example which demands mention is the Leonardo Cartoon (630), a possession of the Royal Academy, and one of the greatest glories of Italian art in England. For this, and for the early Michelangelo marble relief (508, exhibited with the drawings in Room VIII), the Diploma Gallery deserves more pilgrims than it usually attracts.

I cannot conclude without a reference to the varied interest of the objects in the South Room, glass, majolica, embroidery, decorative panels, little bronzes (such as the superb *Hercules and Antæus*, by Pollaiuolo, 941), a magnificent choir-book from the Laurentian Library, Florence (939f), and to the other illuminations and painted playing-cards exhibited in Galleries VIII and IX. But the climax of the whole exhibition is only reached in the Central Hall, where one's expectations of Italian generosity are entirely outdone by the actual presence of three of the greatest sculptures of modern times, from the Bargello at Florence, the three representations of *David*, by Donatello, Verrocchio, and Michelangelo. The *David of Donatello* at repose, with sword at rest; the Verrocchio, a figure full of nerve, with dagger prepared for action; the Michelangelo, a masterpiece of power, comparable with the famous *Captives* of the Louvre, which were planned for that tragedy of frustrated ambition, the tomb of Julius II.

A. M. HIND.

SLAVE TRADING IN CHINA.

LORD DAVIDSON of Lambeth surprised the House of Lords in May, 1925, by saying that there was not the slightest difficulty in buying slaves anywhere in China, and that even in Shanghai slavery was rife. This statement attracted so much comment that it is well, in view of recent events, to reproduce it in full:

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 black 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 Hong Kong the position is different, but I am told that in Shanghai, even with its European zones of influence, slavery is still rife.

Since that day in May, 1925, evidence of the sale of children and young people in China has accumulated, which, when fully disclosed, will undoubtedly startle civilisation. Lord Davidson's statement in the House of Lords has now received most striking and authoritative confirmation in a White Book* issued by the British Government. This White Book contains several dispatches from the Governor of Hong Kong, who is quite naturally concerned with defending a condition of administrative *laissez-faire* in the Colony and Protectorate of Hong Kong. In order to do this he has been in communication with British Consuls in China, and the contention that slave owning and slave trading have been abolished in China will not survive the publication of the British White Book. One of the most striking letters received by the Governor of Hong Kong is from Mr. Russell-Brown, His Majesty's Consul at Amoy. Mr. Russell-Brown declares that whilst in theory slavery has no existence in China, "in actual fact it is in force from one end of the country to the other." The Consul goes on to say that girls are everywhere bought and sold by means of using the euphemism "adopted daughter." The Governor of Hong Kong, Sir C. Clementi, commenting on this correspondence, declares that "unless the buying and selling of girls is stopped in China, nothing can be done in Hong Kong which will have much effect."

* Cmd. 3424.

WAR AND SLAVERY.

Perhaps the most startling feature of slavery in China is the evidence of its increase due to internecine warfare. Before the outbreak of recent wars Mr. Coates, a missionary of twenty years' experience in China, put the number of slaves at something over 2,000,000—"At a very moderate estimate there are 2,000,000 of these slave children in China." Since that date it is quite obvious that there has been a substantial increase. In most backward countries war has always led to pestilence and famine. The continued wars of China have been alarmingly productive of famine and pestilence, and in turn seem to have compelled the Chinese to sell their children on a scale hitherto without precedent. As Mrs. Dymond, another missionary, says: "The great recruiting agents for slavery are famine, plague, and poverty." The growing volume of material which is now available includes several letters from experienced missionaries depicting the system in one form or another. It is unfortunate, however, that in most cases the missionaries ask that their names shall not be published. A missionary in one of the central provinces writes:

In some cases the girls are well and sufficiently clothed and fed, and treated well, but from what I have seen, or from inquiries made of Chinese, I fear that most slave girls are very hardly and very often cruelly treated. I have personally come across cases of unimaginable cruelty, which I am told are by no means isolated instances.

The correspondence of missionaries differs in detail, but there is unanimity on the following points:

- (1) That the system of purchasing girls in China is universal; (boys are also now being sold);
- (2) That they are usually "set free" by disposing of them at about eighteen years of age;
- (3) That the treatment of the slaves varies widely from genuine adoption to forms of unimaginable cruelty.

It is perhaps surprising to find that the trading in slaves is practised so openly. Certain missionaries in China are seeking advice upon the advisability or otherwise of purchasing slaves to set them free. This question is couched in language which draws aside the veil slightly and shows the nature of the slave trade:

It was suggested . . . that we should buy little girls who are marked for sale on the streets by having wisps of straw plaited into their hair . . . but some felt that we would be likely to increase both the trade and the prices if we bought them.

In her interesting book* just published upon the situation in China, Mrs. Dymond, in a chapter on Slavery, gives one instance illustrating the alarming extent of the traffic:

* Yunnan.

During a terrible famine, 4,000 little girls were carried pack-saddle twelve days' journey to the capital city and sold.

Mrs. Dymond makes it clear that the trade is now quite openly done by mentioning that markets for the sale of children are held in several towns in Yunnan. Other missionaries also emphasise the fact that children can be bought, as Lord Davidson said, in all parts of China. It is not denied that slave trading is practised throughout China, but it is sometimes urged, albeit half-heartedly, that the Administration takes no official part in these transactions. This contention cannot be sustained. An interesting case demonstrating Chinese official complicity occurred quite recently. In July last the *Daily Mail* correspondent in Hong Kong reported the purchase of a 14-year-old girl for £17 10s. This case came to light through an allegation of cruelty to the girl, and it was stated that the actual sale had received the seal of the Canton Police Office! The attention of the British Colonial Office being drawn to the case, Lord Passfield inquired into it and found that the facts as reported in the *Daily Mail* were correct: "The adoption deed was in the usual Chinese form bearing the stamp of a Police Station in the Chung Shan district of Kwang Tung."

The apologists of this system of slavery in China and Hong Kong defend it upon the familiar slave-owning grounds: (a) It is a beneficial institution because the slaves are treated kindly; (b) The slave girls especially like the life they are called upon to live; (c) Those who denounce the system are just an ignorant body of irresponsible faddists. It is no doubt true that many of the little slaves are treated with kindness and consideration, but the available evidence of cruelty including actual cases makes a formidable indictment. If one takes only the established cases, the massed misery and suffering of these wretched slaves is sufficient, as Mr. Coates says, to electrify civilisation with a spasm of horror.

Individual cruelties which would electrify any country in Europe with a spasm of horror hardly awaken the mild comment of a single street in China's grand modern republic. Floggings, suspensions, the pouring of boiling water over the hands, the amputation of a finger-joint, gagging and tying up for torture with hot irons, and similar cruelties are not uncommonly practised upon these children.

Mrs. Dymond, writing of another part of China from that of Mr. Coates, says:

Slaves are tortured to death by the hands of merciless opium fiends, who go to unspeakable lengths in cruelty when their craving is unsatisfied. Some are hacked to pieces, pinched with red-hot tongs, boiling oil poured down their throats, hung up by their wrists, and for these dreadful deeds no punishment is meted out.

The files of Chinese papers frequently contain cases of cruelty which throw a flood of light upon the question of treatment. Taking three of these cases at random:

"A" is a Mui Tsai of sixteen years; medical evidence in the Police Court showed that there were eighteen distinct bruises on the child's body, that the marks were deep in the skin. Her owner used her for household work, and as a water-carrier. In addition to her household work she earned as much as 40 cents a day, which she always carried back to her owner.

"B" is the case of another Mui Tsai in the Kowloon territory. The Magistrate in his judgment said he found that the defendant had shamefully overworked the girl, but that the treatment did not amount to gross cruelty. The Magistrate, however, drew attention to the fact that for "two and a half months the girl had worked at the knitting factory every night for 10½ hours without a break, standing practically the whole time."

For this, the wages were 35 cents a night, but the girl never touched a cent of it. On going home, if such a place could be called "home," in the early morning, the girl must have been thoroughly exhausted, yet she had to carry water or do other household work before she rested.

"C" is a little slave girl found crying in the street. Upon inquiry it was found that she was suffering from "multiple injuries." The house of the owner was searched, and two documents "relating to the sale of the girl" were discovered. Medical evidence was that the injuries had been inflicted with a blunt instrument. The girl had been bought by a slave trader in Tung San in China and sold in Hong Kong Colony. Her owner had paid 175 dollars (£17 10s.) for her.

The following are the main features which seem to be established now beyond doubt: (1) The system is maintained by the purchase of the children at a very early age, these children being used by their owners for domestic and factory work, coupled with "social" demands made upon the girls by the men in the family. (2) That in spite of assertion to the contrary, the system leads to great cruelty and moral degradation. How can this revolting system be abolished? The British Administration in Hong Kong can do much in the Colony and in Kowloon. Lord Passfield echoed the view of every right-thinking British subject when he telegraphed to the Governor the other day that public opinion in this country will not tolerate the continuance of the existing situation in Hong Kong. Let it be accepted that the system cannot be abolished in a day or even a year, but a beginning can be made. The first step is that which Mr. Churchill ordered in 1922, namely the preparation of a Register of all Mui Tsai in the Colony and Kowloon. The second, the provision that wages must be paid to all Mui Tsai. The third, a legislative limit imposed upon the hours these little children can be made to work. Finally comes the

more difficult question of the brothel supply. The Governor of Hong Kong asserts with a good deal of emphasis that the supply to the brothels is not derived from the Mui Tsai.

It is very necessary to state emphatically that the Mui Tsai system is not a regular source of recruitment for prostitution. . . . Mui Tsai are by training not suited for use as prostitutes.

This emphatic assertion is not accepted by many people in Hong Kong, moreover it seems strikingly at variance with the proclamation of the Governor himself :

Girls are warned that they must not leave their present employers until they have some employment to go to for fear they should fall into the hands of procuresses.

The attitude of British Secretaries of State leaves little to be desired. Lord Kimberley, Mr. Churchill, and now Lord Passfield, have expressed their condemnation of this system of slavery in the strongest terms. . . . It is now disclosed that Mr. Churchill in 1922 dispatched the most vigorous telegraphic instructions to the Governor of Hong Kong :

Mui Tsai. I am not at all satisfied. Unless I am able to state that this institution does not involve the slightest element of compulsory employment (which is the essence of slavery) and that every Mui Tsai of a certain age is in law and in practice free if she wishes to leave her adopted parents or employers, I cannot defend its continued existence in a British Colony. . . ."

When in 1922 the Governor of Hong Kong replied that he could not carry out Mr. Churchill's instruction to bring this system to an end within one year, Mr. Churchill wired back to the Governor : "I cannot consent to defer its issue" (the Proclamation of abolition).

Not the least astonishing part of the Hong Kong question is that in spite of these vigorously worded telegrams nothing was done, and the system was allowed to continue until 1929. It cannot be a matter for surprise that Lord Passfield should now have told the Hong Kong Government :

After making all allowance for the difficulties in bringing the system to an end, which are described at length in your dispatches, it is my duty to inform you that public opinion in this country and in the House of Commons will not accept such a result with equanimity, and that I feel myself quite unable to defend a policy of *laissez-faire* in this serious matter.

One would like to believe that this attitude of *laissez-faire* on the part of the Hong Kong Government has been abandoned. But from the somewhat intemperate language of the members of the Hong Kong Legislative Council, there is reason to fear that Lord Passfield will have some difficulty in securing whole-hearted

co-operation in the abolition of the system of Mui Tsai. It is unfortunate that in this respect the Governor of the Colony should have allowed himself to use language for which it is difficult to find a precedent in British Colonial history :

I desire to associate myself with the Unofficial Members in resenting the offensive and foul-mouthed libels on the Chinese race which have been a feature of the British Press on this subject.

But upon the major question of slave owning and slave trading in China it is clear that Chinese opinion must be won over to the cause of abolition. Happily, signs are not lacking that the Chinese themselves are beginning to realise that they cannot live side by side with Western nations on the same plane of civilisation whilst this moral cancer corrupts the body politic of China. The recent regulations for the abolition of slavery are some evidence of this awakening, although there is only too much reason to fear that they are almost a "dead letter"; but their promulgation is significant. The Canton Proclamation of 1927 contains eleven articles, of which the most important are as follows :

ARTICLE 1.—Within three months from the publication of the present regulation, all district magistrates must present a report to the Provincial Government concerning slavery within their administrative district.

ARTICLE 3.—Slaves have the right to denounce their masters if the latter act in contravention of the present regulation and compel them by menace to remain in their service.

ARTICLE 4.—Commerce in young girls with a view to making them domestic servants is prohibited, and any contracts to this effect are void in law.

ARTICLE 6.—Ill-treatment of such children is forbidden. Their masters shall send them to school from the age of 12 to the age of 16, and shall provide for their marriage before the age of 22.

ARTICLE 7.—The taking of such girls as concubines by their masters is prohibited.

The Hong Kong Government asserts that this Cantonese Proclamation has never been carried out. The Governor of Hong Kong quotes* Dr. S. W. Ts'o, a member of the Hong Kong Legislative Council, as saying :

These regulations are but dead letters. . . . As a matter of fact, the buying and selling of girls is still going on in China. . . .

But it is to the League of Nations that we must look for *International* action under the new Anti-Slavery Convention. Lord Cecil, acting as *Rapporteur* upon this question in 1925, said, when submitting the draft of the Convention, "the term 'similar con-

* White Book, Cmd. 3424.

ditions' at the end of sub-paragraph (b) is intended to include . . . the enslaving of persons disguised as the adoption of children." M. Palacios, the Spanish delegate at the last Assembly, paid handsome tribute to British public opinion for its modern crusade against slavery—the League looks to Britain to maintain this moral lead. Let us prove worthy of this international expectation, and each do our bit to set the slaves free!

JOHN H. HARRIS.

FRANCE'S "LITTLE BIT OF IRELAND."

ELEVEN years ago President Poincaré and Marshal Foch entered Strasbourg and there was opened a delirious honeymoon between France and the recovered provinces. However Germanified individuals might have become under forty-seven years of Kaiserdom, there was no sign of it that day. Amid a Niagara of emotion Alsace and Lorraine came back. *Poilus* hugged *Alsaciennes* in full war-paint, and *Alsaciennes* hugged *poilus*, and the grand *kermesse* of intoxication endured for over a week. Something of it still continued, I recollect, when four months later and still in uniform I managed to "wangle" a trip on a correspondents' gala train from Paris to Strasbourg in conjunction with Monsieur Millerand's taking over of the High Commissionership. What days! What nights! The dancing, the prancing!

From the day of Armistice local hopes had run high. Spiritually, the Alsations had never been at one with the *Pickelhaube* and they were heartily glad to see the last of it. The French were easier, *plus gentils*, more cultured, too. And they had won. Glancing across the Rhine at a Germany in chaos and with a gigantic and ominous question-mark confronting it, Alsace felt singularly sheltered under the Tricolour, besides all this gorgeous sentiment! In that pulsating hour there may have been some who doubted, hung back. What of France's dispensing with the Concordat? And would she allow as large a measure of local self-government as Berlin had done? Yet such voices, if raised at all, were drowned in the exultant enthusiasm. France had won. Alsace was on the winning side. Who would have it otherwise? *Vive la France!*

To-day it is only sober truth to say that in Alsace and that part of Lorraine nearest the frontier that came back—the Moselle department—the majority is as ardently out for Home Rule as was Ireland in the less acute days of John Redmond twenty and more years ago. Not that one wishes to carry the Irish parallel further than it rightly goes. There are distinct points of resemblance. The Alsations themselves, while much more stolid and less temperamental, have something of the Irish in them. They are stubborn and suspicious. They delight in being dramatised. They are largely agricultural and are devoted to tradition and the past. They are "agin the government" every time. And they are devoutly beholden unto their priests. But there the resemblance ceases. The Alsations were undoubtedly glad to a point of cheering to have the French. No such phenomenon is recorded of similar Irish welcome to the English. Alsace was for two centuries willingly a part of France. Ireland was never willingly a part of England. The point is worth making, since already some writers

are calling Alsace "France's Ireland." "France's little bit of Ireland" might be nearer the mark. (In parenthesis, I shall use the term "Alsace" throughout. This should be read to denote the three disaffected departments, Haut-Rhin, Bas-Rhin—constituting Alsace—and the Moselle, which is a sector only of Lorraine.)

What has happened to make Alsace tepid to a degree that perhaps the oftenest-heard local slogan is: "*Los von Paris!*"? Perhaps half of the trouble is indicated by the wording of that slogan. Alsace considers, and thoughtful Frenchmen now admit, that application of the time-honoured Paris centralisation to the regained territory has been a failure. As is known, no European country is more ruled from and by its capital than France. But something else might have been thought out for these highly independent Alsatians than trying to govern and treat them as if they were akin to the other eighty-three departments of the Republic, long grown used to Paris direction and where no delicate process of transplantation from one culture to a second would be in progress for many years. So argue wise Frenchmen after the event—such as the journalist Edouard Helsey, perhaps the chief authority on "*le malaise Alsacien*" and whose lawsuit with the autonomist leader, the Abbé Haegy, at Colmar, two years ago, became a *cause célèbre*. True enough, two important *gestes* were made by the French Government early on. Monsieur Millerand was sent as High Commissioner to Strasbourg, suggesting a different régime from the rest of France. And Monsieur Briand refashioned a form of Concordat with Rome. Yet all too soon Alsatians began to get restless and to complain of the new order. Things were not working out as they had hoped—not at all. But it is impossible here, nor is it necessary, to trace chronologically events of the past decade. The simplest way is to formulate Alsace's material and spiritual grievances as they exist to-day and in the guise of Strasbourg addressing Paris, somewhat after this style:

"We regret it, but we have made a mistake. We are still fond of you and in certain eventualities desire nothing more than to remain in the French Republic. But you must know once for all that in some material senses we were better off under Germany and that these material things count increasingly as one has had one's fill of sentiment. We are matter-of-fact customers who know which side our bread is buttered. We miss German method and organisation. Everything ran so smoothly under them—the public services, the law courts, our daily lives. No unnecessary vexations. And everything was clean and orderly. We didn't care for them, but these are facts. The Germans were clever. They reserved the pick of their officials in every sphere for the territory they took in 1871. It was the aim of every ambitious German civil

servant to get to Elsass-Lothringen. The pay and conditions were purposely made so tempting here. We benefited by all this; perhaps we even became spoilt. It was clever. It didn't win us. But it was clever. And you now must bear the odium of comparison. What did you do? Did you send us the finest in France? Did you even give us Alsatians a shot at helping run our own affairs? No, you did not. Organisation and psychology are not your strong points; we have learnt to know that. But was it wise to flout us at the very outset by naturalising at one fell swoop no fewer than 125,000 German nationals in order to get them to carry on the public services, notably the railways? You said that, having been oppressed for so long, we were not up to the mark. That was unfortunate. Nor did the army of Germans, suddenly become French overnight, serve your purpose. Under unmethodical French control the public services deteriorated and deteriorated. Look at them to-day compared with what they were! The trains late and the stations unkempt. Disorganisation in the post office. The streets and public places untidy. A general atmosphere of confusion born of over-attention to petty detail. We do not get on with your functionaries sent us from the interior (a key phrase denoting the gulf with Paris). They do not understand us, or try to. In many small ways they impinge on our local habits and customs, as do the rules and regulations emanating centrally from Paris. It is as if you were colonising us rather than treating us as a partner and equal. Especially do we dislike the *dossier* system of prying into our private lives. Your little bureaucrats seem to spend too much of their time procrastinating and getting us to fill up endless forms. And for all this we have to pay far heavier taxation! We expected at least lots of jobs and rewards. Instead of this we have been ruled and regulated by a mass of second-rate functionaries from the interior controlling a horde of naturalised Frenchmen who remain entirely German at heart. It is an odd return for nearly fifty years of faithful waiting!

"You think if you parade round France a few girls dressed up as *Alsaciennes* that that's sufficient. Sentiment's all very well, but not too much of it. It fogs essentials. Furthermore, we have not liked the attitude adopted to our people when they travel in France. Half the time they are either laughed at or called 'Boches.' And if our dress and customs so amuse you, we are sorry. Finally, you are largely an irreligious, amoral land, and we intend that our children shall be brought up as they have always been, not under your anti-religion laws, but as strictly practising Catholics. A lovely example of tact you gave when you opened up tolerated houses in an intensely devout province such as this!"

[The tolerated houses are now closed, but their installation was on

a par, for defaulting psychology, with sending very dark troops into the Rhineland. Germany will hand down the latter episode in horrid (and largely exaggerated) lore for generations unborn. Similarly in Alsace to-day, whenever a French national wanders from the strict path, the thing is trumpeted grotesquely abroad. Should a French governess be found kissing the son of the house, all Alsace hears of it and nods: "*Quelle charmante Parisienne!*" If a French business man "puts over" a sly affair with the believing agricultural community, tongues leap at once to branding and accusing generalisation.]

To conclude with Strasbourg's litany of complaint:

"So what we want is this. Complete fiscal, administrative, local government, and parliamentary autonomy within the cadre of the Republic. We have as much right to self-determination as Czechoslovakia or Poland, for we are neither French nor Germans, but a tribe apart; but we do not press for that. We had hoped for better things. Now we ask that you at least grant us similar status to that which we were rapidly acquiring under the Prussian *Stathalter*. It lay within our power, had we been tractable, very soon to have enjoyed similar independence to a Saxony or a Württemberg."

Having thus tabulated Alsatian grievances, the next obvious thing is to inquire who are "we."

The leader and moving spirit of the autonomist movement is the Abbé Haegy, a shrewd, calm priest who lives in a nuns' convent at Colmar and inspires an anti-French Press trust. He is the man France fears—not the spouting autonomist deputies who demand to speak German in the Chamber and who have been sentenced (and released) periodically for their anti-national activities. The Abbé Haegy is the man, the De Valera, if you will. The Colmar suit ended with his saying "*Vive la France!*" and in his shaking hands with Helsey, but the latter insists that the priest has not swerved one iota since in his pro-German propaganda, and relates a saying of the good Abbé's once, when the superiority of French culture was sung to him: "Alas, it is the rose about to die which has the sweetest perfume." The priesthood in Alsace occupies as important a rôle as the priesthood in Ireland.

Forming a "common front" with them, much to the indignation of the French, are the local Communists—no insignificant force in the industrial country round Strasbourg and in the Moselle. Thirdly, there is the *Union Politique Républicaine Nationale*, a considerable body of public opinion. The Socialists have not identified themselves with the autonomists. But were a plebiscite held to-morrow on the "*Los von Paris*" issue, there is small doubt what would be the result. Recent elections have been sufficiently eloquent on this score.

We may now turn to the attitude of the French. The French confess to having committed faults in administration, as they confess to not having paid sufficient attention to the differing Alsatian character. But they detect two influences which, they insist, have coloured the whole autonomist movement and caused Alsace to exaggerate its alleged ills: Rome and the *Reich*. If we apply the same simple method as that of Strasbourg addressing Paris, the capital retorts:

"But, wait a minute! Give us a chance! Give us at least twenty years for remaking Alsace French. After all, you had forty-seven years of Germany, every Alsatian under sixty was brought up as a German, and three-quarters of them did their military service as Fieldgreys. We cannot perform miracles in a night, even we Frenchmen! We have been magnanimous to you. Our revalorisation of your mark at 1 fr. 25 centimes was no light affair. We have released or acquitted Alsatian political culprits (a form of leniency the Alsations mistake for weakness). Under France you are extremely prosperous, both industrially and commercially. We do not interfere in Alsatian life and it is a lie to say that we obstruct the practice of the Catholic cult. We allow ten hours of German instruction per week in the schools. But we will not allow more, or bilingualism. Think for a moment, had Alsace been taken over by Mussolini. Look at the Austrian Tyrol. How much Austrian instruction is allowed there in the schools? What Mussolini intends to bring about in a very few years—the Italianisation of the Austrian Tyrol—we are content to spread out over decades, if need be, in order not to make things sudden for you. Many would say our fault has been undue leniency. We *know* that the priests are working for separation from France. We *know* that the *Reich* is subsidising the propaganda against us. But up till now we have held our hand. We may not always. Understand that we will never grant autonomy, recognising it as being the thin end of the wedge leading inevitably back to the reincorporation of Alsace in the *Reich*. We are not used to this 'Dominion status' business and we are not going to make a beginning now. Why, within no time we should have Bretons and Basques and Catalans and Flemings and Lord knows who demanding the same rights! We are belatedly copying the Germans in sending the best civil service talent to Alsace; we hope to devise some new form of High Commissionership which will meet local requirements; and we intend that Alsations shall increasingly be employed in the conduct of public affairs in Alsace. But, as three departments of France, the Haut-Rhin, the Bas-Rhin and the Moselle shall integrally remain!"

Thus the problem lies with the future. The Abbé Haegy remains in his position. The French are advancing with sweet reasonable-

ness, but with a sterner régime in their files if need be. To the foreign observer—and this is the one opinion here vouchsafed—it seems bad policy for the French to join such bitter issue with the Alsatian priesthood. All the books appearing on the subject lay practically the whole responsibility at the door of the clergy, without whose encouragement the *Reich's* propaganda, it is argued, would avail little. This may be an overstatement. In any event, history shows that in the long run the lay power seldom succeeds in getting the better of a priesthood sunk deeply in the soil as it is in Alsace. Some half-way bridge has to be found. One can understand the bulk of the Alsace clergy not taking to the new régime with particular joy. German priests, for one thing, are the best paid in Europe, as they also enjoy the highest status. Furthermore, these Alsatian priests look across the Rhine at that very devout South German Catholic *Bloc* which once numbered 80,000,000 and from which they now find themselves separated . . . to be, instead, in the hands of a Republic whose lay laws are notorious. The French had an exceptionally difficult and ticklish job in tackling this clergy. Have they done the best they could?

I have left the *Reich* to the last since in many respects it supplies the most arresting sidelight on the whole problem. In August, 1922, at his villa outside Munich, General Ludendorff read out to me the German revenge file. ("Read" is hardly the word: rather he barked it.) This file set forth that Germany would demand the reconstitution of the former German Empire in its entirety *except Alsace-Lorraine*. Even this fire-eater and *Putsch* expert admitted that they had gone for ever. And as if in substantiation of his view, Locarno was signed three years later—by which the *Reich* undertook never to seek to alter its Western frontier by force and recognised French permanency in the two provinces restored to her. Since then a marked change has come over the German attitude. A considerable public opinion has decided that Alsace can be wheedled from French influence. Where once it was bankrupt and an unenticing spectacle indeed, Germany now is aware that Alsations are glancing at it—Germany's—oncoming prosperity, that old-time prosperity. Moreover, there is no military service in Germany. How awkward to have to do a period in horizon-blue! Yes, there might be several concrete advantages in a return to Germany: "after all, you Alsations know well that you have more in common with us racially than you have with the French! Why, look at your *Bier Keller* of an evening! Nothing but beer and laughter and song and German! So different, so very different, from the French *café*!"

During their forty-seven years' tenure of Alsace the Germans practised the Roman *commercium et connubium*, and to-day tens

of thousands of German families are tied to Alsace by bonds of blood and interest. This prime basis of propaganda the Germans are turning to full account. Germany now acts the mourner for her lost *chérie*. On the sentimental side "Alsace Days" are growing in number all over the *Reich*; a "Village of Remembrance" named *Elsasserhauser* has been constructed almost within sight of Strasbourg; and one would not mind betting that a German *Déroulède* is on the way, and that in the not-too-distant future some equivalent to the famous draped Strasbourg statue of the *Place de la Concorde* will arise in Berlin. In the meantime the *Reich* is bending every effort—the French know this through their *Sûreté* officials—to further anti-French sentiment in the three disaffected yet highly prosperous departments. Germany occultly sustains societies in Strasbourg such as the *Erwinia* and the *Heimatbund*; it shovels across marks (one equalling six francs); it inundates Alsace with German newspapers, and subsidises a good half-dozen publications printed in this sector of the Republic.

In conclusion, the advent of André Tardieu implies application to the Alsace problem early in the New Year. This cannot be solved like Ireland by the materialisation of French and Alsatian counterparts of a Michael Collins, a Birkenhead, a Cardinal Logue. But it may be considerably eased by a Tardieu—who was the best Minister of Public Works France has had in years—bestowing upon Alsace the pick of everything materially, by his sitting hard down on the Communists (a favourite pastime of his), by his producing the firm hand in the velvet glove for Alsations themselves, and by an astute re-approach on the religious side. It is likely that there will be a revival of some form of High Commissionership, with more and more Alsations taken into the public service.

FERDINAND TUOHY.

lish, for our better instruction in his religion : a delicate man with an indomitable scholar's spirit. But for our clearer apprehension, Professor Soothill has omitted the repetitions—yet given enough to show how they occur. He says : " The story-teller knew his hearers. A single word would pass meaningless over their minds. To an unlettered audience his method of detailed illustration had greater value." The Western reader, however, can now follow the main thesis and enjoy the parables and wonders of this " jewel-book," without wading through pages of eschatological marvels and lists of saints, or jewels, or diseases, far longer and more recurrent than the genealogies of the Bible.

The particular version of *The Lotus* in use in China was translated into Chinese from the Sanskrit of its unknown author, by the monk Kumarajiva, in A.D. 406. He was perhaps an Indian, or a Bactrian of Central Asia, and his translation is in very beautiful and scholarly Chinese. The original author says everything twice over : first in sonorous and rhythmic prose ; and then in verse, as if, like Cædmon, he must perforce sing what he has seen. Many of the turns of speech are reminiscent of the endearing simplicity of earlier eras. It is a very great work, both of religion and of literature, as is apparent, even in translation ; and *The Lotus* presents special difficulties. For in it, as in other Buddhist writings, terms are used theologically. How does one translate the word " Grace " into another tongue—supposing one has a clear-cut connotation of it oneself ? What different meanings it had to Luther and to Newman ! Yet at its root, for both of them, it held something of delight in its meaning, something of " the pity for the living " of Buddhism. There is what one might call a Doctrine of Grace in *The Lotus*. The Father seeks out his travel-worn, ignorant son, and lifts him into comfort and well-being. Buddha of his deep generosity emits his Ray of Enlightenment to 18,000 worlds and persuades and wins erring men. Yes, and in *The Lotus* Buddha is compassionate to women, despite the fact that " the body of a woman is filthy and not a vehicle of the Law." He lifts his mother and his aunt and their followers up to Buddhahood. To be sure the bodhisattvas must not consort—

With female disciples
Fond of banter and laughter.

But there is the half intimation that in Buddha there is no male or female. To the young, too, he stoops.

Even children who, in play,
Gathered sand for a Buddha's stupa
are sure of final Buddhahood.

The Lotus is a species of New Testament of Buddhism. The Hinayana School, whose followers dwell mainly in Ceylon, Burma, and Siam, will have none of it. To them it is heretical. Neither it nor kindred sutras were doctrines ever given by Sakyamuni himself, they say ; but inventions of the unorthodox, and contradict his words. Professor Soothill thinks that the Hinayanists are historically justified. The Mahayanists reply that their doctrines were given in Sakyamuni's later years, after the Hinayanist Scriptures. Sakyamuni had to lead men gradually into greater truths. He was not lying, says the writer of *The Lotus* : and gives exquisite parables to expound this. One allegory is *The Magic City* :

A great company of pilgrims are travelling to a " Place of Jewels," but they must pass through a perilous and difficult road, i.e. the ways of mortality and delusion. They have a wise guide, but they become greatly exhausted. Fearful, lagging, they beg to turn back. Then the guide raises a Magic City, over three hundred yojanas in extent, and bids them enter. The company flocks in, joyfully thinking they have reached their goal. (Thus did Sakyamuni preach the good news, which the church of the Hinayanist possesses.) Yet this City is but a halting-place towards the Eternal Blessing ; given to hearten them. When the pilgrims are rested, the guide makes the Magic City vanish, and leads them on to the true " Place of Jewels," which, after all, is not much further.

This reasoning and apologetic appear many times, as also the insistence that the Sutra is a very sacred scripture. The apprehension or repetition of only one phrase of it leads to Buddhahood.

Unlike the Hinayanists of the Lesser Vehicle, the followers of *The Lotus* hold by an " Eternal Buddha, of whom the earthly Buddha was but a temporal manifestation." Nirvana is not the Final Attainment, either for Buddha or mankind. In the Sutra, Buddha returns from his Nirvana and says he told his disciples Nirvana was the end, because they could not bear more. Now he preaches and shows that he is Eternal Light and Eternal Life—Amitahba, although that name, the most famous of Buddha's names in the East, does not actually occur in *The Lotus*. He has become the Tathagata—The Buddha-That-Shall-Come—in his power of spirit omnipresence.

The Dwelling of the Tathagata is the great compassionate heart within all living beings ; the Robe of the Tathagata is the gentle and forbearing heart ; the Throne of the Tathagata is the spirituality of all existence.

Sakyamuni's original " call " is described. He looks on Mankind :

In the perilous round of mortality,
 In continuous, unending misery,
 Firmly tied to the passions
 As is a yak to its tail;
 Smothered by greed and infatuation,
 Blinded and seeing nothing;
 Seeking not the Buddha, the Mighty,
 And the Truth that ends suffering,
 But deeply sunk in heresy,
 By suffering seeking riddance of suffering
 For the sake of all these creatures
 My heart is stirred with great pity.

The Hinayanists preach a doctrine of redemption by works: as did Sakyamuni, they say. The Mahayanists envisage the final redemption of all, and from the lowest reaches of hell. Whence came this universalist idea? Possibly through Persia; but no one can say. The Tathagata is—

The Father of all worlds, who forever brings to an end all fear, despondency, distress, ignorance, and enveloping gloom, and brings to perfection boundless knowledge, strength, and courage. He is born in the world to save all living creatures from the fires of birth, age, disease, death, grief, suffering, infatuation, darkness, and the three poisons, and to teach them to obtain Sambodhi—i.e. Perfect Enlightenment.

Everyone has not the capacity to realise this. Still, Buddha gives to everyone alike.

To give rest to all creatures,
 I appear in the world.
 And to the hosts of the living
 Preach the pure Law, sweet as dew.

Sariputra, "born from Buddha's mouth," so rejoices in the wonderful news that he fears at first it may be the voice of Mara, the devil, deluding. Then he recognises Buddha, and cries:

Now hearing Buddha's gentle voice,
 Profound and most refined,
 Expounding the pure Law,
 My heart is filled with joy.

The Lotus itself is a metaphor of the universe, each flower a world: from the spiritual lotus-flower springs a soul or life. The Buddha, Ancient of Days, who ages before went into Nirvana, now re-appears in the sky, showing that he is evermore alive. He invites Sakyamuni Buddha to come up into the sky and share his lion-throne: that they may behold the great pageant of a celestial durbar. Buddhas and bodhisattvas flock from all the universe.

One delightful monk, called "Never Despise," sees in every creature a prospective buddha and reveres him, despite the persecutions of his fellow-monks, who, however, will eventually also see

their mistake, repent, and become buddhas. Again and again the author tries to describe eternity: and the Western reader wearies of the repetitions of the numberless, infinite, boundless, hundreds, thousands, myriads, kotis, nayutas of kalpas, or æons. In one startling passage Buddha puts forth his tongue, "every pore shining with light," and it reaches 18,000 worlds. The rewards of the righteous are better conditions in his next re-incarnation. In the succeeding "karma," "his teeth will never be dirty, bad, or yellow. . . . He will be re-born possessing elephants." Of the Buddha "Radiance of the Law," it is written that in his domain of "Excellent Purity," the ground will be "level as the palm of the hand, free from hills and valleys, runnels, and ditches." Even thus in the Kingdom of God the rough places are to be made plain. In his skies "Men and gods will meet and behold each other. . . . Their food will be Joy in the Law, and Gladness in Meditation." Above all, the disciple must cultivate the Steadfast and Serene Life.

Let him who would preach the Sutra
 Renounce an envious, angry, proud,
 Deceitful or false mind,
 And ever do upright deeds;
 He should disparage none,

But ever be gentle, patient,
 And compassionate to all.

Gentleness, patience, compassion—very truly against such there is no Law, either of Asia or Europe.

Turning to Mrs. Ayscough's version of Tu Fu, the Chinese poet of the eighth century, one is struck by the same note of sincerity and of emotions common to all of us to-day. Mrs. Ayscough has apprehended that a poet speaks his experience: and she has left Tu Fu to paint his own portrait with but few explanatory remarks. Sometimes he sings of some incident years after it happened: but she puts it in its right chronological order. She has rendered signal service by her skilful and scholarly grouping. We have a continuous process and can watch the man grow. She lets him recount the actual events of his life, such as Chinese love to tell: and includes his liking for rice boiled with cress or peeled chestnuts, and notably his unabashed appreciation of wine. This last reads strangely to us of to-day, who know China's abstemiousness in drink. However, it seems to have brought Tu Fu considerable illumination.

Mrs. Ayscough has her own method of overcoming the inherent difficulties of translation, in which so often the life of the creative work is missed through over-attention to words. In *The Lotus* the difficulty was theology. In Tu Fu's poetry, so famous in China, there is first the Chinese "ideograph" or "character." The author has

had the lines printed with pauses, partly to represent the actual hum and breath of a Chinese scholar chanting them. Then she takes such true pleasure herself in the mind-pictures which Chinese ideographs call up through their eyes to Chinese scholars, that she has tried to give us the ideas embodied in them. To us a Chinese "character" is a strange conglomeration of cabalistic strokes. To a Chinese scholar it is a lovely thing, painted with a fine camel's-hair brush: and it brings nearly always two and often more mental visions to him. The scholar reads a character and says the monosyllable "nio." Translated into our thought and usual speech it means "oppression." But the picture of the ideograph is of "a tiger's claws." A tiger was painted on the spirit-wall guarding the entrance to the residences, or yamens, of Chinese officials, warning them not to devour their people's life as a tiger devours blood. "Oppression" carries the idea of a heavy weight. Its counterpart in Chinese is "tiger's claws": and Mrs. Ayscough has preserved this Chinese picture-thought.

The purist may object that no language retains the primitive meaning of its roots. We speak of Oxford and rarely think of an ox at a ford, unless we see the coat of arms of Oxford City. We smile to hear it translated into "niu ch'in"—"ford of the ox"—by a Chinese translator. For the same reason, the purist objects to Tientsin being translated into "Heavenly or Natural Ford." He says that, to the Chinese, the idea of the river's ford no longer means much. It has been obliterated by the thought of a large and dusty industrial city. Still, to a Chinese scholar, as to a Ruskin in our literature and to all poets, ideographs and words have life in themselves. Mrs. Ayscough's unusual presentation of their Chinese values certainly keeps the picturesqueness of Tu Fu's lines: and attempts to convey to a Western reader something of the sense-impressions and vitality they possess for his countless Chinese admirers.

Tu Fu lived an interesting life. Disappointments and success, war and imprisonment, peace and court favour, mingle the whole way through. We are unconsciously taken back to the China of many centuries ago. Its civilisation was still centred in its north-west corner before the great ebb began towards the warm and fertile south. Hunting, riding, flying a falcon, were Tu Fu's physical enjoyments: pastimes as redolent of ancient wildernesses to modern China as they are to us of modern England. We realise the life of Mediæval England in the allusions of Chaucer. The Chinese say, "The history of the times may be read in the poems of Tu Fu." Again, he was like Western poets and writers, from François Villon to Goldsmith, in that he was often in poverty and dependent on the kindnesses of patrons or appreciative friends.

His "elbows were patched." Touching is the scene evoked when, having at last obtained a certain recognition at Court and been made "Poet Laureate" with emoluments, he returns home with his court dress. His little daughters are shoeless and ragged. "I, the honourable old scholar, harbour passionate resentment," he writes. He pulls off his grand robe to patch their fustian. This poem is one of the best known in Chinese literature. A celebrated Chinese commentator ends by saying "that his emotions when reading the poem were so poignant that tears could but flow."

In front of the bed are two little girls:

Their clothes, torn and patched, barely pass the knee.

From the sea-picture bordering my robe I tear waves, billows;
I alter the position of the old embroidery, fold it here, turn it there.

Purple love-pheasant, and water-sprite, half tiger, half man,
Are turned upside down on the short coarse woollen coats.

He moralises on his poverty:

Our talents are great: we are the present Leaders of Poetry;
It is mortifying our households are poverty-stricken, our official rank contemptible!

We starve and freeze, servants treat us with scant courtesy;
Our faces in the prime of life have become those of venerable old men.

"Nevertheless," he says with satisfaction, "we will be remembered by the children of our brains, when the fat and the rich will be forgotten."

Of course, being a poet, Tu Fu takes a certain pleasurable interest in his sorrows. He writes on another occasion:

My tears are like ripples of golden moonlight.

He goes to see the old stone tablet at Yen Chou with the ardour of the born antiquarian. It is a link with Confucius who lived so many centuries earlier. Thus might we pay a visit of homage to the ruins of Athens.

Tu Fu acquired friends, and of every estate, wherever he went. He is troubled when he cannot return hospitality suitably. Once he has sat and eaten by the side of a man, even at another's table, their souls must by nature be a trifle kin for always, it seems. Love, as we name it, the romantic surge of deep emotion between man and beloved, does not enter Tu Fu's calculations. We think it the quintessence of poetry: it moves the West to song, lyrical or dithyrambic, according to the individual. Tu Fu sings no epithalamium on his wedding day. He considers his wife's virtues and steadfastness as normal wifely qualities. He occasionally mentions his grief at the adversities which she has to endure.

She is a useful woman, and as pleasant in her homely toil as the women he sings of as they wash clothes on the hill-sides. He likes to see his daughters at toilet, painting their eyebrows, putting on colour. When the Conscript's Bride makes her plaint, it is because if her young husband is killed she will have no rightful place in the clan, either in this world or the next. She does not propose to die of love for him, personally.

THE NEWLY MARRIED CUT APART

(The Woman Speaks:)

The trailing rabbit-silk clings to wild chrysanthemums and hemp,
Therefore its outspread shoots do not reach high.

A maiden given in marriage to a fighting man,
Were better cast away beside the road.

Unworthy One's position is not yet clearly defined;
How can I lift two hands in reverence before husband's mother,
husband's father?

Mrs. Ayscough's method of translation, each group of words translating one ideograph, has brought out the vigour and virility of the great Chinese poet. Smooth translations undoubtedly give the sense of polish and the *mot juste* which are so distinctive of Chinese literature. But perhaps because of polished translations Europe has had the mistaken fancy that all Chinese poetry is the plucking of lute-strings; very charming and melodious, but thin and a trifle falsetto. The Chinese are as passionate in despair, as fiery in determination, and as fierce in their loyalties as any other race. Tu Fu pleads in no delicate exotic phrases with the Emperor who is not content with the size of his domains, and who sends out pressed conscripts to conquer the lands of the Outer Barbarians. His *Hsing* are full of these cries of soldiers forced to fight, and of those who will mourn them.

WAR CHARIOTS—A HSING

lin! lin! chariots jangle; *hsiao! hsiao!* horses snort;
Men move forward; at his hip each wears arrows and a bow.
Fathers, mothers, wives, children, all come out to say farewell;
Dust in clouds: they cannot see the near-by Hsien Yang Bridge.
They drag at the men's coats, fall beneath their feet, obstruct
the road, weeping;
Sound of weeping rises straight; divides the soft white clouds.

At frontier territories blood flows like waters of the sea;
To open those frontiers is the unceasing desire of the Military
Emperor.

Propriety is outraged; the stronger women grasp the hoe, the plough;
Grain springs on dykes, in fields: divisions East and West are wiped out.

Moreover, soldiers of Ch'in again endure hardships of battle;
They submit to being driven on, as though they did not differ from dogs or fowls.

Even if the elders ask questions,
How dare conscript soldiers express resentment?

A daughter is born: we still can give her in marriage, keep her as a neighbour;

A son is born: he is buried without rites among the one hundred grasses.

New ghosts are perplexed at wanton ill-usage; old ghosts cry;
Dark sky, wetting rain; sound of their cries—*chiu! chiu!*

The Chinese speak of Tu Fu's "great chastity," meaning his "inviolable administrative honour." He was a true "lynch-pin in the chariot" of the State, when he became Censor. They particularly admire his conduct over Fang Kuan, a general who met the Barbarian armies with the approved military strategy. He made a four-square of his oxen, and placed his men about it. Alas, Heaven sent an unpropitious dust-storm. The enemy swept down on the army, and slew 4,000 of his men. Tu Fu deplored the loss of the men, but thought Fang Kuan unjustly used when he was disgraced by the Throne for his defeat. For months he steadily fought Fang Kuan's case, and finally turned his back on the Court and its self-indulgent, weakly ruler, and incidentally his own emoluments, in the cause of what he considered justice.

Tu Fu has humour.

Early Autumn, Overpowering Heat; Writing-table piled high—as usual.

Every annoyance! from the depths of night innumerable scorpions;

Then, too, in late Autumn, many flies circle.

The restraint of my girdle drives me mad, I could give a great howl;

Why should the under secretary be thus hustled! things come just as usual!

And he loved Nature. Here is an exquisite cadence:

The wild goose drops as a dead leaf drops, and floats on cold waters;

Our hearts and understandings are knitted to Tu Fu, scholar, administrator, distressed citizen of a distressed country. He is very like ourselves.

DOROTHEA HOSIE.

PARADOXES AND PEACE.

IN the two thousand millions of years which scientists now tell us have probably elapsed since the birth of our world, the last thirty years have a very special significance. What a speck of time this is can be better realised by the analogy of a cinematograph film. It is calculated that if the history of the world had been photographed from the beginning and reduced to the length of three weeks for its production, only about ten minutes of that time would be occupied by the history of *mankind* on this earth, and only the last two or three minutes since the life of Christ. In that last ten minutes there have at very rare intervals been mortal seers who have had a vision of a warless world. Such were Akhnaton, the heretic King of Egypt in the thirteenth century B.C. who lost his Palestinian possessions rather than sin against his vision of peaceful relationships between men. Such, too, was William Penn, to whom fell the extraordinary opportunity of working out his theories of trust in uneducated Indians and of fair-dealing instead of force, an experiment whose success is too little remembered.

But only in the last thirty years has the conception of a world unity, built up on mutual understanding and international law, become anything but an idealist's dream. By his rescript the Czar Nicholas II made 1899 a famous date in history. The first Hague Congress, despite its very human failings, was the first attempt to bring together political representatives from all the world to consider matters untouched by national frontiers and interests. It fell quite naturally to discussing the laws of war, unconsciously realising that war was paradoxically the chief common interest, the dominating factor in international life. But out of it sprang, too, the idea of an international panel of judges, ready to be called on to arbitrate in case of the emergence of a conflict, and so to ease the path to peaceful settlement, which even in the nineteenth century had often been resorted to with such excellent results.

This impetus towards the substitution of reason in world affairs was not sufficient to overcome that in the opposite direction towards increase of armaments, and the World War seemed to extinguish all hopes of advance. But from these quarrelling parents the poor little League baby was born, inheriting qualities from both strains, qualities which are very clearly apparent now that the child is nearly ten years old. Let us return to consider them at a later stage.

The signature of the Pact of Paris may be considered the last fact in our survey of these important thirty years, giving expression quite clearly to the widespread desire for peace, which is thereby admitted openly and without shame. From which it would appear

that the leaders of world thought have accepted the conception of a world community. Looking around and seeing, instead, chaos, they admit that their vision needs realisation, and are setting themselves to the task of adjustments in political organisation. Or we may put it to ourselves another way, that whereas formerly adventure and glory were associated with war, they have now got to find their scope in work for peace. But that this transition is only just at its initial stage is brought vividly before us by the paradoxes in our present-day thinking which it is the aim of this paper to emphasise. The first may be expressed thus: that while the pacifist is the true patriot, men are being imprisoned for refusal to train to be soldiers.

Before the signing of the Pact of Paris, the pacifist could be quite simply abused, imprisoned, or even shot. It was easy to argue that if a man would not defend his country, he was not entitled to the advantages of citizenship. This is not the place for a disquisition on the relative merits of obeying your government and your conscience. Suffice it to point out that now when fifty-seven governments have signified their agreement to the statement that settlement of disputes shall never be sought by other than pacific means, it is very difficult for the inexperienced to justify the imprisonment of men who refuse to be trained to take part in non-pacific measures. Yet it is estimated that at least one hundred young European men are imprisoned to-day for refusal to obey the call as conscripts. When we realise that some of these are condemned to the French penal settlements in French Guiana, whence return is practically impossible, it will be obvious that the service of peace is indeed an adventure and a dangerous one.

Surely this paradox is a fundamental one and shows us that while we are thinking—and earnestly thinking—peace, we are acting war. It shows us that we are seeking to impose the peace system, without eradicating the war system, an action only to be compared to trying to ride simultaneously two horses going in different directions, with equally dangerous possibilities. Psychologists tell us that when people collectively think one thing and do another their action is probably the result of some motive more primitive and unconscious than their thought, which is exactly what we find with our instinct to kill camouflaged by our pretence of world citizenship. We have to remember that a mere statement of what we desire does not effect it. We do not expect to be rich by stating that we wish so to be, we are, therefore, bound to be critical of those statesmen who, desiring peace, yet act so as to bring danger of war.

Let us follow the idea of these paradoxes more in detail. Perhaps the biggest fallacy of all is that of security by armaments. We

think we believe in a sense of security following the possession of armaments. Yet whichever country is the most heavily armed must at once cause alarm and anxiety to all the others, and instead of security, even the country which has achieved the greatest armaments must realise that its position can only rouse antipathy and ill-will, the most dangerous friction-producing emotions. It is curious, I think, that the opposite method, that of investing in goodwill by acts of generosity, has been so little practised. An instance is that of the Minorities, whose harsh treatment by the governments of some countries where they are to be found is such a problem at the present day. Why is no greater attempt made by good and just treatment to make them happy and endear them to their new fatherland?

To return to the question of armaments. It is clear that these are still used as a sign of prestige and an expression of the belief that Might is Right. If we are truthful with ourselves we realise that Governments still live in an anarchic age in which they are anxious to be able to insist on taking their own way if the worst come to the worst. "To keep the peace by being strong," of which we have so often heard, means really that the possessor of the force intends to do his own good pleasure, making it so obvious what would happen to anyone who objected that the chances of their attempting it become very slight. Dimly the nations are seeing that this is incompatible with a reign of law, and that instead the much harder task must be undertaken of being so right (instead of so strong) that there can be no fear in submitting any dispute to the cold light of judicial settlement. The fact, too, is just dawning that the sovereign power of a great many governments is incompatible with their living with each other in a world community, just as the "sovereign power" of individuals must be curtailed if they are to form a harmonious state community. In fact, anarchy is no more comfortable a system for nations than for men.

The idea of nationality, so strongly developed in the nineteenth century, must give place to a large entity, as formerly the tribe took the place of the family and the state of the tribe. Economically, we are already world citizens, though we ignore the fact, and though we pretend to desire to keep out foreign goods by tariff walls. Yet listen for a moment to this picture of the daily experiences of a typical French bourgeois, graphically described by M. Delaisi.*

On awakening, our mythical Frenchman washes with soap made from material brought from the Congo, and wipes on a towel of Louisiana cotton. He dresses in a shirt and collar of

* Condensed from *Les Contradictions du Monde Moderne*.

Russian linen, a vest of Australian or South African wool, and a tie of Japanese silk. His shoes are of leather from the Argentine, tanned with chemical products from Germany. In his dining-room, furnished with a Dutch sideboard of Hungarian wood, he uses utensils compounded of copper from Rio Tinto, pewter from Detroit, and silver from Australia, and eats bread from France, Roumania or Canada, according to season. His eggs are from Morocco, his frozen meat from the Argentine, preserved peas from California, jam made in England from French fruit and Cuban sugar, and his excellent coffee is from Brazil. So on throughout the day. Finally, he goes to sleep under a quilt of Norwegian eiderdown, dreaming that France is a great country, sufficient to itself, which can mock at all the rest of the universe!

So little do we really know ourselves, and so little are we ready to fly out of the imprisoning cages of nationalism into the co-operation of the United States, first of Europe, then of the World!

A most vital question lies before us with regard to our next stage in world organisation, which is disclosing a real cleavage in the ideas of those striving for peace. In short, it is the question whether the League is to be the conscience of the world or its War Office; is it to govern by law or by force? One group holds that it must be founded on military sanctions and that fear of overwhelming force will keep the "aggressor" in the paths of virtue. The other thinkers maintain that there is an inherent danger in the existence of that overwhelming force, that it cannot be kept for ever *in vacuo*, and will inevitably be used some day with the same appalling consequences as national force, and that fear is useless as the basis of human relationships. Human nature cannot continue indefinitely to prepare for something without ever practising it. Is an immense war, too, any more virtuous than a little one? In this age of science, when scientists take note of the most minute details, reckoning in millionths of inches, it is curious that it has taken people so long to see that evil on a grand scale is as evil as on a small. Murder of one man has long been held in abhorrence, yet only very slowly is it dawning on mankind that murder by thousands is just as wicked. When, too, will religious leaders emphasise that ethics are as binding on States as on persons, and that individuals in masses cannot do wrong more innocuously than singly? Now we have reached, as I have said, the stage when it is said freely that national wars should be abolished, yet the group which I may call the sanctionists hold that we should prepare for them on an international scale. They hold that armaments to be used by the League of Nations for the punishment of "an aggressor" will be righteous and necessary to keep order in an international sense. Now surely this is only perpetuating the fallacy that evil on a grand

scale becomes good. It is the old idea of bluff: "*Si vis pacem, para bellum.*" It is a strange idea to cure the sin of going to war with yet more war. In what sense would international force differ for the better from national? In the World War, had it been a "League War" could it have been any different? Admit Germany to have been the aggressor and consider the almost world-wide opposition to her to have been organised by the League, would the resulting clash have been any pleasanter?

A forcible illustration comes to hand. The R.A.F. exhibition of bombing at Hendon has been objected to for inculcating warlike ideas. Last year the programme explained that the bombing was to signify action against a foreign State which in a dispute with Britain had committed an act of aggression against this country without awaiting the report of the League of Nations, thus releasing British "sanctions" against it. This is seriously taken to render innocuous the bombing, and we find, therefore, that imitation of precisely the same activity is considered wicked one year because it is against a native village, and excellent the next year because it is carried out under League auspices.* So our new warfare is to be indistinguishable from the old after all. But "a rose by any name will smell as sweet" surely holds in the opposite sense. If we continue to plan our world on the reign of force we shall continue the war mind with the inevitable destruction—sooner or later—of our civilisation by the immensely developed powers of science. We must make up our minds that the real transition must be to the system of justice and law.

I think we shall see that this is far more possible than at first seems likely. The enormous force of public opinion is already with us, and it is clear, I think, that States fear being arraigned before it. We have, in fact, a world conscience being developed with tremendous possibilities for good. Might is *not* right, and it is extremely dangerous to build our hopes of maintaining right by the ordeal of battle, which in fact must be done if force underlies our international system. But the common sense of the jury and of the man in the street are very real, and with the growth of education in international affairs, public opinion may be more and more trusted to be impartial. Remember what happened in 1926, when the League Council refused the admission of Germany to the League. At once the Assembly representing what one may consider the views of the rank and file of the nations expressed their dissent and undid the unjust verdict. Is not that a very significant fact? Already, too, the judicial sense in the Hague Court is so strong that judges of the great Powers have given judgment against their own countries showing that they had risen above the old

* See *Headway*, August, 1929.

"my country right or wrong" idea and could impartially see where right lay.

Here it is perhaps well to remind ourselves of the essential difference between military and police action. In the former the force is used to carry out the desire of the nation: the soldier is, so to speak, both judge and executioner. The policeman uses no more force than is needful to bring the criminal to justice, and may himself be judged wrong if his actions are illegal. You cannot bring a whole nation to a judge against its will by an army, hence to my mind the impossibility of the analogy of police force with proposed League action. That for the present some international police work such as prevention of slave raiding in uncivilised areas may be necessary, is a perfectly different matter. But the actual futility of war to effect any purpose has surely been abundantly proved. The fallacy of its utility has perhaps been protected by the fact that the use of force often masks the original difficulties by superimposing many new ones. For instance, a country with internal difficulties feels inclined to unite its people by a call to arms against a foreign enemy and if war takes place the far greater supervening difficulties quite likely put in the shade the earlier ones! But this is no more sensible a proceeding than the well-known plan of burning your house to obtain roast pork!

We cannot depend both on force and law; that is an impossible "bi-metallism" and we have to choose between them. No doubt there is a risk in trusting ourselves to law—there is a risk in every human undertaking. But we may well remember that no human undertaking can be based on anything but trust: a promise to fight may be broken as easily as a promise not to fight, and the risks of trusting to law are as nothing to the risk in trusting to the war system. Further we may recall the wonderful success which has attended arbitrations in the past. Their history in the nineteenth century, was very remarkable, and no instance of their failure is, I believe, recorded. The fact is that, given the delay which is essential if arbitration be resorted to and which allows feelings to cool, the parties to it are only too thankful to avert war. Now that public opinion is roused as never before against the arbitrament of war surely it is the time so to order our world organisation that man the thinker takes command instead of man the fighter.

This brings us to yet another paradox in our present transition stage. We have renounced war, yet we continue to magnify its servants. No pacifist, I am sure, should wish any unfriendliness to soldiers as human beings, but they are the exponents of a system which it is desired to abandon. Yet still they receive honour and glory above that of other men and have the especial privilege of direct association with the Crown. They "decorate" every

national function—even the Armistice service must be accompanied by armed troops. It may be replied that such ornamental work is harmless, which is perfectly true. But there is in all of us, I suppose, a love of pomp and show, and especially in the young. What wonder, then, if boys in their impressionable years look with longing and envy on the magnificence of the smart regiments and determine one day to find themselves amongst them! Certainly let us have the show if it gives so much pleasure, even though it be an expensive luxury, but let it be turned over to inculcating life-saving and not death-dealing. The Boy Scouts are, we hope, a step in this direction, and the idea is capable of great extension. Even aggressive armies of constructive workers might make for international peace and could work in various ways. Could not the shipbuilders who are at this moment being displaced by the naval reductions be more usefully and perhaps no more expensively employed on engineering works throughout the Empire, such as Ireland has courageously entered upon in the harnessing of the Shannon? Further, in the League Commissions such as that to reorganise the medical health work in Greece, can we not see the germ of an international peace service in which the youth of the future will be proud to find their adventure and to give their work for the good of others? The voluntary service organised by the Fellowship of Reconciliation is another instance. This has recently carried out clearance of flood débris in Liechtenstein by volunteers from many countries. Already, too, the children of the world are being taught to use their imagination by helping those of other nations and winning their friendship. Thus under the Junior Red Cross, about £350 from 130,000 Polish children was sent to the victims of the Mississippi floods and a Japanese boy sent his \$3 of pocket money to Santa Barbara after the earthquake because the U.S.A. had sent help to Japan at the time of her similar tragedy. Further, in America, friendship symbols have been sent to various countries from her children, as, for instance, many thousands of dolls to Japan, which met with an enthusiastic response, and according to capable judges are deemed materially to have improved the relations between the countries.

Lack of money has deterred us in the past from many undertakings which would ultimately yield high percentage in increased wealth, health, or happiness. That may well be so when more than 14s. out of every £ of national money is devoted to wars, past or future. But the forward-looking nation will be that one which sees the anachronism of war, and quickly devotes its energies to peace development on an extensive scale. Such a nation will stop spending as England does to-day more on printing and stationery

for the Navy (£200,000) than for the whole of its work for peace under the League of Nations (£108,000).

What do we get from our £108,000 per annum? There are many critics who complain that the League is not all they want, but was ten years ever enough time to complete a great movement? And the League must surely be the greatest yet begun. Do we sufficiently remember, however, that the League has already given us (1) personal discussion of international affairs at regular intervals between the responsible Ministers, (2) an international civil service—500 men and women working together in the interests of the community of nations, (3) international reconstructive works, such as those for refugees, the financial rehabilitation of Austria (without which our loan to her would undoubtedly have been lost) and preventive health measures? These, in addition to the bond of the Covenant, may be reckoned as a rich harvest for ten years' work and offer immense hope for further development in the future.

Let us sum up the essence of the foregoing. A true system of international peace is no mere cessation of fighting. It is more like a change from one language to another—everything needs to be translated; and as there are fundamental qualities of mankind which have found their expression in the sphere of war, these need to have scope found for them in the new system of peace. Thus the pacifist to-day has a most important mental task. He must think out where the present system conflicts with the new, and so deeply embedded are many of our customs in the war atmosphere that we hardly notice the fact that they are connected with it. Having seen where adjustments need making, the pacifist must find the translation into the new language of action, and finally persuade the public of the necessary change. Peace must be a positive and not a negative thing. It is not enough to deny the necessity of war. We must show that a world society demands the best energies of the best brains to build up the greatest organisation for the good of all which the world has ever seen. To take part in such work is to realise the wonderful privilege of living in this marvellous moment of world history.

A. RUTH FRY.

THE SPLENDOUR OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

WE have in this country a peculiar way of grumbling when we are nearly satisfied and belittling those things of which we are most deeply proud. This does not weaken us in moments of crisis: our men growled about "Blighty," but they died for her. It does, however, cause other people, less fearful perhaps of vainglory, to misunderstand us when our deep loyalties flare out, and to accuse us of hypocrisy. It also causes us sometimes to misunderstand ourselves. And in the Church we have given way so much to grumbling and fault-finding that we have given a wrong impression to the world, and have even caused some of our own weaker brethren to lose sight of the splendour of the Church of England.

There can be no moral splendour without wisdom; and the deepest element in our Church's character is that which is not the most easily to be appreciated, since only the wise can understand wisdom. When England embraced the Reformation, she sprang in a generation from her old position as a gallant little country on the edge of Europe into that of a great nation, swinging forward as Spain swung backward, showing the world how a people could achieve self-government, in freedom from both religious and political despotism, and spreading her moral ideals, her law and her language, from one quarter of the world to another. But in accepting the Reformation the English Church refused to break with the past or to go in with the destroyers; her undoubted Protestantism was not negative but positive—a protesting for truth, as it has since remained; her Catholicism has also been positive, "condemning no other nations" and unchurching no other Christians.

She did not break with the past; and her wise conservatism retained what was best and most reasonable in the mediæval service-books, while her liberalism rejected as much as seemed tedious and untrue. Very learned in her divinity, she drank in also the tolerant and balanced spirit of a laity learned in all the sciences of the age; and she practised a willingness to abide by the results of sound learning which she has not lost to-day. She resisted the fanaticisms of the sixteenth century, as she resists those of the twentieth; and for that reason she has always had to defend herself against extremists and bigots on all sides; indeed she refused even to commit herself to the current Augustinianism which was the common orthodox theology of Catholic and Protestant alike almost until our own time; and thus her Articles of Religion not only avoided the doctrine of predestination to eternal death

THE SPLENDOUR OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. 207

but deliberately rejected that assertion of an atrocious hell which is found in every other confession of faith, from Trent to the Larger Catechism.

This instance may suffice of that wisdom which enables the Church of England to face the new knowledge of the twentieth century without fear and without prevarication. But it is often said that in putting herself on the side of culture and learning she has been aloof from the common people. The records of countless country parsons, and town priests also, cry out against this mis-statement; but, if in modern times a Church is to be abreast of knowledge, it is true that she must not take her tone from the traditions or superstitions of the ignorant, but must begin with the more difficult task of justifying the ways of God to the educated, if she is to have any leading place in the thought of mankind. Yet it was a devoted Churchman, John Wesley, who most deeply influenced the common people and who changed the heart of England in the eighteenth century; and if it be true to-day that the Church is stronger in the public schools than in the field of primary education, it is also true that she led the way in primary education, and is still helping to make the only basis for a religion that is at once national and credible by taking her part in spreading uncensored knowledge among all classes. We have been behind Scotland and the Presbyterian Church in popular education, but we have not been idle. Peasant superstitions may have appeared picturesque fifty years ago; but they are disappearing fast on the Continent of Europe, and religion too often with them. It is indeed in Britain only that a Labour Party is not irreligious—but in fact markedly Christian; and if much credit for this is due to Wesley's children, the Methodists, much also is due to those Churchmen who have, since the days of Wilberforce and Shaftesbury, and of Maurice and Kingsley, struggled so successfully for the moral ideals of Christian brotherhood.

The Church of England has still something to learn from the sturdy independence of the Free Churches; and the ideal of a Church of the English-speaking peoples will not be reached until increasing co-operation has led to a corporate unity. For this reason the duty of Anglicanism is to establish good relations with all Churches that are willing to be friendly; and such relations are possible wherever mutual proselytism is avoided, as it is, for instance, in the case of the Eastern Orthodox Churches. The Anglican Communion is doing much all over the world for reunion; and its tolerant character as a "bridge" between different forms of Christian tradition makes the work peculiarly valuable, as was shown at the great Lausanne Conference when Eastern Orthodox, Lutheran, and Free Church representatives from all

over the world drew up a common basis of agreement. The same leadership in a real catholicism was shown at the Jerusalem Conference last year, when the Christian communities (now running to millions) of India, China, and Persia formulated their plans for unity as autonomous national Churches. The principle indeed of self-governing Churches united by inter-communion is that of the Anglican as it is of the Eastern Churches: it was the method of the Early Church, and the examples in the political sphere of the British Empire and of the United States suggest that such free "federation" (to use a modern word) is the only way of unity in the modern civilised world.

But it seems clear also that the modern world demands that religion shall be expressed in a large way, rooted in a far-reaching tradition, as nations are rooted, and of impressive dignity; for the day of small separated religious communities has passed away, now that men are no longer grounded in one place or fixed in one class, and now that people are no longer so sure of any particular theory or system as to make it the excuse for an isolated religious separation. The modern world, so far as it is religious (and it is increasingly religious as well as increasingly undogmatic), is groping for something that shall express the religion of Christ without accretions, simply and nobly, allowing complete liberty of thought, free from sectional peculiarities and not tied by past ideas of the universe or by philosophies and theologies which are necessarily in great measure obsolete. Such a communion, in which truth and beauty can exist side by side, is the Church of England. Something analogous to it will have to be developed in the rest of the world if religion is to be a great power in the future. In this country we are fortunate: the same genius for fair play and breadth of outlook which has made our political and legal systems a model for the world has also given us a national Church in which freedom and order are well balanced (and for that very reason sometimes our liberty is abused), in which the common sense of the laity is powerfully equipped to prevent clerical aberrations, in which truth is respected and yet tradition is respected also. This we owe largely to the Establishment; and the liberty, wisdom, and common sense of Anglicanism, as well as its conspicuous dignity, would greatly suffer by disestablishment. In such loss of essential character all the daughter Churches of our communion would share; for they owe much, in all parts of the world, to the settled character of the ancient mother Church, around which their bishops will be gathering from all quarters of the globe this year. These Anglican Churches are already in many places forming the nucleus of a yet larger unity in freedom. It is, I think, certain that North America, for instance, is with

some rapidity developing a national American Church by the drawing together of the great reformed communions.

Perfect freedom then and reasonable order need to be combined, as they are with us, the grace of the past and the vitality of the present; conservatism and (in their literal sense) modernism and futurism; a coherent belief not tied by any form of words but resting securely on the faith that is behind the creeds; tolerance without confusion, and enthusiasm without extravagance.

To put it in two words, both truth and beauty are needed by the world to-day; and both these, we may say with pride but without assumption, the Church of England is peculiarly able to give. We have spoken of freedom, uncensored and unsuppressed, as a necessary condition of truth; let us note also the element of beauty. Briefly, the services of the English Church consist of the noblest product of our language, the English Bible, combined with a book which is of the same company and in no way falls behind it in the glory of great prose. It is our peculiar privilege that in all our services the deepest aspirations of man surge around us in the manliest and most musical language that even our resourceful tongue has ever produced, the English of Cranmer, Shakespeare, and Milton. And with all this we have a free, because an unofficial, hymnody, which by reason of that liberty is able to renew itself continually and to express for each age in great poetry and music the ideals that are real and present and vital. Those who go to church but seldom can hardly know to how great an extent they would find in the most active churches up and down the land hymns sung at every service which thrill by their beauty and sincerity and are worthy of the august company of the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer. And within the Prayer Book are directions for carrying out our services, which include the ornaments rubric, and provide a ceremonial rich, simple, restrained, eloquent, beautiful, and free from effeminacy and superstition. It is true that there have been abundant examples both of excess and defect: eccentricities and aberrations exist, for wisdom is not universal; the art of public worship, like other arts, is not so easy as to be child's play; the average man requires some guidance, and it is admitted that the bishops in the past have not given the guidance required or helped sufficiently to maintain the English standard. But the Church must not be held responsible for the mistakes of those who disobey her; and churches like Westminster Abbey, with a host of others in all parts of England, show how lovely our services are when the Prayer Book is faithfully carried out. That many, in decreasing numbers, fail to achieve such excellence only shows that the Prayer Book ideal is often above our own.

The art of public worship is of special importance to-day because there is no possibility of educated men agreeing on any one theology or philosophy during the generations that are immediately before us. We live, and our children will live, in an era of transition; and there is no chance whatever of getting the civilised world to unite in any formula which would satisfy the majority of devout and thoughtful people. This means that the bond of any real union of good men must be a fellowship, not a confession, and that its expression must be æsthetic and not scholastic. The greatest things in the world can be adequately suggested, as every artist knows, only in terms of art; and by music or poetry man can express in a true and lasting fashion spiritual realities which may be obscured or distorted by attempts at definition. This is true of the Gospels, as it is true of all other great writings: the teaching of Christ is as fresh and unsurpassed to-day because it is in terms of parable and poetry, and not of theological ratiocination. Thus it is that, if religion is to hold its own, to avoid the danger of becoming mere assertion and make-believe, and to grow freely with the new knowledge, it must express itself in terms of beauty—the least misleading, most intelligible and most enduring of all forms of human expression; and that the ages which are immediately before us will find no other rallying point for religion (apart from the private meditation of the soul and the social service of man), except in a glorious public worship which shall worthily express the faith and the idealism of those who think most deeply and live most Christianly in the world.

All this is possible within our National Church, and will be increasingly realised as we are strengthened by the drawing together of those other Churches of to-day which are already so much nearer to us, and which have so much to contribute to the ideal that we so unworthily represent. All the English-speaking Churches, with their sister-Churches of many languages, share a fundamental spirit—they are looking forward and not back, and are working for that perfect Church whose pattern is in heaven, since mankind has not yet come to be worthy of it, because they believe in that Kingdom of Heaven which is to come and yet is already within us.

For religion cannot in the end be merely a personal matter. It involves our fellow men, a social relationship, the welfare of the world; and true worship involves fellowship in the praise of God and in the reception of a corporate enlightenment and inspiration. And the only fellowship that can ultimately embrace the whole world and realise the dream (never yet in any century achieved) of a universal Church will be one in which all good men can join, whatever their intellectual position, who accept the ideal of Christ.

There is no bond so wide-embracing as that, and none so true; men differ to-day, as they must differ in any age of vast discovery, about almost every intellectual proposition, and those things which compel the agreement of educated minds are not theological but scientific; but good men agree about the great moral principles which the world has learnt from Christ and accept the philosophy of love which he revealed, nor do they hesitate, from East to West, and not least in so different a spiritual tradition as educated India, in acknowledging his supremacy.

I cannot shut that universal ideal from my mind; and yet I need the fellowship of my own people. I go to the great Church of England for what I want. Where else could I go? Others may find what they seek elsewhere, and the very principles of the great Anglican tolerance compel me to respect their choice and to be in sympathy with their communion: I can praise the glory of their churches; but for myself I could not find elsewhere all that I seek. For I need to be in the fellowship of that England, whose contribution to Christendom and to the world has been so strong and so precious. Nor can I see any hope of a world unity that does not begin, like charity, at home. I need a Church large, and with a great tradition, strong to preserve, yet ready to learn, free and beautiful, active in the service of man and reverencing the truth that is yet before us. And do we not all require of the fellowship which contains us that within it the sublime simplicity of Christ, untrammelled and untainted, shall be above all the traditions of men supreme and accessible?

PERCY DEARMER.

THE FOURTEENTH CENTENARY OF MONTECASSINO.

IN this year falls the fourteen-hundredth anniversary of the day on which Benedict of Nursia left Subiaco for Montecassino. The date is memorable as marking the beginning of the final form of western monasticism, important both for the rôle it played in the social structure of the Middle Ages and for all that it has contributed to our civilisation. For this reason Montecassino remains one of the most significant historical centres not only of the past but of the present.

Benedict had spent part of his youth in the retreat of Effide, then three years in the austere hermitage of the cave of Subiaco. Elected abbot of Vicovaro, a monastery of the region, he soon left it again after the monks, rebellious against his discipline, had tried to poison him. He returned to Subiaco and there gathered round him a large following of disciples, among whom the best known are Placidus and Maurus, who subsequently followed him to Montecassino and later founded the first Benedictine monasteries in Sicily and France. Here he laid the foundations of his monastic edifice, the first outlines of his Rule.

But Subiaco was not to be the last phase of his conception. It retained many old features of the monastic type of the time; the monks lived in separate dwellings, with a certain degree of independence, though under the direction of the abbot. The great Benedictine community had yet to come into being. The varied experience of nearly thirty years enabled him to realise in all its aspects that ideal of monastic society which had germinated in his own life, as a growing intuition of the need of the society of his time. Other than an intuition it could not be. He had left Rome very young and we have no record of his having ever returned to it or to any other large city. His contacts with the outer world were for religious ends and confined to humble country folk. Yet he understood profoundly the spirit of his times, the evils of Italy and the Church and the needs for which he must provide. With the intuition of a genius and a saint he founded the monastery of Montecassino with which is associated his admirable Rule, which survives the test of time as one of the few great books of the human race.

Not that at the time of Benedict there was any lack of monks or hermits; rather there were too many of them, not always well disciplined. But there were no great monasteries with a fame and tradition of their own, such as Lerins and Marseilles in Gaul. Pre-Benedictine monasticism was at best a languid imitation of an oriental model, transplanted as an exotic growth to the Occident.

FOURTEENTH CENTENARY OF MONTECASSINO. 213

Its textbook was the writings of Cassian on the fathers in the desert, and its prevailing tendency individual asceticism. This was foreign to both the psychology of the Latin peoples and the needs of the time.

The sixth century was one of great difficulty for Italy, dominated at the same time by the semi-barbarian Aryan Goths and the vexatious Byzantines with their interference in the internal affairs of the Church. The Imperial institutions were void of force and significance, though everything still recalled the grandeur of Imperial Rome. Italy never succeeded in becoming a political unity, standing on her own feet even within the framework of a larger Empire. She was trying to fend off Byzantines on the one hand and barbarian conquerors on the other. The latter, because of the survival of the Empire and on account of religious differences, never fused with the Latin population into a political unity, as did the Franks in Gaul, the Langobards for a short time in Upper Italy, and, little more than a century later, the Visigoths in Spain. The reign of Theodric the Great, which for a space gave Italy peace and tranquillity, was not based on a real fusion of peoples but on a juxtaposition of powers; for the Latins Theodric was the representative of the Empire, for the Goths an absolute monarch. Hence, when, on account of the anti-Aryan policy of the Emperor Justin, Theodric sought to break with Constantinople, he only succeeded in annoying his opponents and compromising his own realm.

The countryside, the prey of conquerors, was either deserted or badly tilled by serfs of the glebe. The population for the most part was crowded together in the towns, where life revolved around the cathedral, until, with the rise of a middle class, the new Italian commune came into being. But at Benedict's time no shadow of this new Italian life yet existed. In the general depression and dissolution of the social organism, nothing remained but the Church, whether in Rome or in the other cities, to act as mediator between Byzantines and barbarians, rich and poor, city and rural districts. This brought power and wealth to the clergy, clerical dignities were greatly sought after, the passions of the populace and the intrigues of the mighty were concentrated on determining the selection of the leaders of the Church, despite the fact that pure and religious-minded men were not lacking who opposed the system. Institutions showed clear signs of decadence and growing confusion; there was a dearth of outstanding personalities capable of gathering round them the few vital forces. Only Boethius emerges as a strong and generous spirit: but both he and Simmacus were survivals of ancient Rome, not the germs of a new future coming into being. And though Pope John of Rome was the good shepherd who gave his life for his sheep, he was not a man to dominate his times.

Such was the century in which appeared Benedict of Nursia. None at that time could foresee what an important work he was about to create, what an influence he was to exercise on the society of his time and of the future, what constructive elements he hid in the secret recesses of his spirit. Benedict forsook the world and never sought to return to it. He therefore never mixed himself up with political strife or ecclesiastical questions, burning as these were in the age of the Laurentian schism and the intrigues of Pope Vigilius. His interests were solely with monastic life and the spiritual love of the humble folk who crowded to the monastery. He sought to make the monks into a strong religious community, to destroy the remnants of pagan cults among the peasantry and reinvigorate the Christian life. All other secondary aims were foreign to his spirit. Yet, while wedded to his object of spiritual regeneration, he, as others of wide intuition, succeeded in creating a living organism in the midst of hidebound and decaying ones, a centre of discipline amid the decomposition of civic forces and the anarchy of the rural districts; it was as one immune from the ecclesiastical struggles rendered frequent by the political intrigues of Byzantium and the power and wealth of the clergy in the diocese.

The concrete embodiment of Benedict's potent ideal was Montecassino; the spirit which penetrated Italy and all Europe was that of his Rule. The reader of the little book, the *Regula Sancti Benedicti Abbatis*, receives an impression of humanity and equilibrium rare even in saints and geniuses. In the calm and gentle prologue he explains that, in instituting a school of divine service, he does not mean to set up something severe and burdensome. If it contains something of strictness, this is, according to a just reasoning, both for the bettering of wickedness and the preservation of charity. Therefore let not the disciples be afraid or forsake the way of salvation entered into by the strait gate. Such words are characteristic of the Benedictine spirit. The saint had undergone severities and the most absolute solitude in the cave of Subiaco, and did not want to form hermits on the oriental model. On the other hand, he opposed the monasticism then known as "Sarbaitic," by which small groups of three or four monks lived without a fixed rule and without subordination to an abbot, and were thus liable to rapid moral degeneration. Nor did he want wandering monks, a disturbance to discipline and too often a cause of scandal to the faithful. So he founded a close-knit community, with a well-thought-out rule, sufficiently large-hearted to be interpreted by the abbots with prudence and kindness. It was, according to the Benedictine idea, to be an independent organism, economically self-sufficing, uniting large numbers of monks in a common life. No

rounds of begging of alms in town and country, no rich patrons bestowing economic and moral protection, no ecclesiastical organisation in the hierarchical meaning of the word. The community must be capable of living by the ownership of the land around the monastery, by the toil of the monks and voluntary gifts. Manual toil in the fields and house, the keeping of farmyard stock, agriculture, and skilled crafts were to be the economic and moral bases of the monastery. No personal possessions, but everything in common, the features of the daily life, the choir, the table, the dormitory, the work. All were to have an equal share in the election of the abbot, in the management of the monastery, in the congregation general and the councils of the elders. The details of administration were to be in the hands not of the abbot, but of a monk called the Cellarer, deputed to this office under the supervision of the abbot and the whole community. The Rule prescribes daily manual labour of from seven to eight and a half hours, according to the season; sleep occupies an average of seven to eight hours with interruptions for vigils and prayer; adequate nourishment of the Mediterranean type was on a basis of bread, macaroni, and vegetables, and a small ration of wine was also allowed.

The Benedictine system contains no cenobitic or hermit asperities. These would have been unsuited to a community based on manual labour interspersed with reading and prayer. If in the course of time for certain categories of monks manual is replaced by intellectual toil, the same reasons also held good for attenuating fasts and vigils. St. Columbanus of Ireland founded monasteries based on an extremely strict and harsh rule, but the necessity soon became evident for a return to the Benedictine rule, which became the fundamental type not only of mediæval monasticism, but also of all later initiatives. The Charterhouse in their day, the Trappist monasteries of our times, even after they moderated their original rules, always remained exceptional institutions distinct from the Benedictine type.

On the spiritual training, which is the chief aim of the Rule, is imprinted the stamp of mildness and humanity. The monastery is, of course, based on obedience—it cannot be otherwise; but from the very first page of the Rule St. Benedict begins to speak of the duties of the abbot, describing him as he should be, namely a father, as is shown by the Gospel text: "They called him 'abba,' that is to say 'father.'" The chief virtue of the abbot must be discretion; that of his monks, obedience. But the superior is not above the law, he is subject to the Rule and must only command in the name of the Rule. While the Rule enjoins immediate and unqualified obedience on the subordinate, it does not deprive him of the possi-

bility of humbly calling attention if what he is ordered to do is too hard or beyond his strength.

Benedict's strongest censure is directed against evil talk and idleness. He well understood how to strike at this weak spot. In contrast to his usual mildness, his words ring harsh. "Let us ever condemn evil talk and idle words to an eternal seclusion and let not the disciple be permitted to open his lips with such language" (Chapter VI). And in Chapter XLVIII: "Idleness is the enemy of the soul and therefore at certain hours the brothers must busy themselves with manual labour and at others in sacred reading." His motto is "*Ora et Labora*," and to this end there crowded around him a host of men seeking respite from the storms of life, weary of the world, eager to acquire virtue and a healthful and useful discipline for soul and body. Not only those came to the monasteries who desired to become monks, but others, attracted by the holy life, by spiritual aspirations, and also by material needs of help and hospitality. The exercise of hospitality was in those days general, and recognised as a duty responding to an actual social want. The monastery attracted the humble and needy more than the landowner's castle or the bishop's court. Based on landed property, surrounded by field labourers, often serfs of the glebe, more humanely treated here than elsewhere, working side by side with the monks and able themselves to become monks and freemen, the monastery attracted the attention both of the neighbouring population and of the wayfarer as a refuge to which one might confidently turn. Chapter LIII of the Rule—"De Hospitibus Suscipiendis"—is of incomparable courtesy. It lays down: "Let there be read to the guest the Divine Law (*the Bible*) in order that he may thereby be edified and after this let all kindness be shown him." St. Benedict is so courteous that he almost makes it a duty for the prior to keep the guests good company even to the point of breaking the fasts unless on a day of obligatory fasting for all.

The Rule was also adapted to convents of women. St. Benedict's sister Scolastica was their first foundress and their rise was rapid all over Europe. No wonder that religious houses became active independent centres within the Church and in society in general. From the first the monastery took its place in the machinery of feudal society without forfeiting its peculiar character and independence. It fostered the development of agriculture, gave an impulse to the arts, became a centre of culture, in the worst moments of civil and religious strife it contributed great men schooled to self-discipline and noble self-sacrifice.

Of course such institutions could not escape periods of decadence and standstill. But their mutual independence always enabled one

or other of them, under able leadership or favourable conditions, to maintain the high level of achievement.

Successive ecclesiastical reforms and the regrouping of the divers Benedictine families introduced by the Church in the course of centuries into the primitive type have been caused by changed social conditions and by the modern tendency of ecclesiastical discipline to unification and centralisation, but the spirit of St. Benedict and his Rule have remained intact in Benedictine monasteries all over the world. Montecassino underwent its share of the vicissitudes of history, had its moments of distinction and decay, its periods of glory and light. Perched like a watchtower between Benevento, Naples, and Rome, it suffered Langobard assaults, Saracen incursions, vexations of all kinds from the innumerable armies who have swept along the valley of the Liri, the last of them being the army of Napoleon.

St. Gregory the Great in his Dialogues tells how one day the monk Theoprobos found St. Benedict weeping, not gentle tears of prayer and spiritual emotion, but sobs and tears of grief. Being of the intimate circle of the saint, he asked him the cause and received the reply: "The monastery which I have created and adorned for the brothers is to be given into the hands of the infidel. With difficulty I have obtained that the inhabitants shall be saved." Many others since Benedict have wept over the ruins of Montecassino and many others have rejoiced to see it rise again greater and more magnificent.

The present structure of the monastery and basilica dates back to the fifteenth century, but has suffered a series of restorations. The structural modifications and the paintings are in the Barocco style of the early sixteenth century. The modern Benedictine school of Beuron has achieved a triumph in the austere crypt where the bones of St. Benedict and St. Scolastica rest together and also in the bright and linear frescoes of the saint's rooms. The famous library of MSS. and old books is in the zealous care of the monks, a magnet for students. Emperors such as Charlemagne, Popes such as Gregory VII, humble country folk and men of the world, saints such as St. Francis of Assisi and Ignatius of Loyola, artists and men of letters like Boccaccio, in all ages have sought at Montecassino an hour of peace and uplifting and have venerated St. Benedict as the founder of western monasticism. After fourteen centuries, Benedictine families are to be found in all corners of the globe; every land has its own celebrated monastery, its own traditions of culture and sanctity. But they all look to Montecassino as the sacred spot where Benedict completed his work synthetised in the salutary motto "*Ora et Labora*."

L. STURZO.

THE FUTURE OF THE MESTIZO COUNTRIES OF AMERICA.

THERE was a time when nomadic Indians roamed through the plains of the Mississippi and La Plata, while the civilisation of the Toltecs and the Incas flourished in the highlands of Mexico and Peru. Progressive, democratic, and wealthy nations now occupy these plains, while feudalism and military rule wrestle with democracy on the Andean plateaus. Why have the rôles been inverted? Why the first-born degraded?

The blame for the undoubted backwardness of the countries from Mexico to Bolivia is commonly laid on climatic conditions. This reason, however, does not stand the test of serious consideration. Even most of the lowlands are no hotter than New Orleans, and the greater part of the population lives on the high plateaus of the Andes, where the climate is more agreeable than that of the United States. The tropical latitude prevents extreme cold, while the high altitude prevents excessive heat. The seasons differ only in humidity, and not in temperature. Spring conditions prevail throughout the year. These plateaus are, therefore, a perfect white man's country, unsurpassed in the matter of climate by any country in the world. If climatic conditions only are considered there is no plausible reason why Mexico, Guatemala, Colombia, or the countries farther south should not be as progressive, democratic, and rich as the United States or Argentina. In trying to find the fundamental reason for the difference which unquestionably exists, we are forced to accept the seemingly paradoxical conclusion that the *higher* culture which existed on the Andean plateaus before the coming of the white man, and certain humanitarian tendencies of the Spanish Crown, are together responsible for the less advanced stage of development of the plateau Republics to-day.

The nomadic Indian tribes in the plains of the La Plata and of the Mississippi were driven back by the European immigrants and practically exterminated. These plains and the surrounding hills became a white man's country. The high civilisation of the Incas from Ecuador to Chile, of the Mayas in Central America, of the Toltecs in Mexico, stood its ground; not culturally but racially. The Spanish conquerors despised the religion of these peoples and did not grasp their intellectual culture. They destroyed both. But they appreciated the technical skill of the Indians and their law-abiding docility, developed in their well-ordered empires. There were some cruelties committed against their chiefs, there was some reckless treatment of the populations for some years, but a reaction soon set in. The conquistadores, established as feudal masters in Indian lands, often abused their power to force the Indians to the hard labour in the mines to which they were not

FUTURE OF MESTIZO COUNTRIES OF AMERICA. 219

adapted, and nearly exterminated them thereby. But both the powerful Catholic Church and the Spanish Crown refused to permit these abuses to continue. It is well known that the Benedictine monk, De Las Casas, advocated successfully the introduction of the stronger Negro slaves in order to free the Indians from labour in the mines. It is less well known that the Spanish kings introduced labour legislation comparable to that which has been revived only in recent years in the most progressive countries. The Royal Order of 1563 prescribed rules against exploitation of the Indians and restricted forced labour mainly to productive service of a public character. The Code of the Indies (*Recopilación de Indias*) prescribed a minimum wage in accordance with the quality of the work and the cost of living. It also limited the working hours. The eight-hour day was established by Philip II at the end of the sixteenth century, for workers employed by the military administration. Compensation for accident was provided for. Employment of minors under eight years of age was prohibited (except for tending animals). Apprenticeship was regulated, and female work on estates prohibited. Industrial work by minors under eighteen years was forbidden by Charles II in 1682, more than a century before the Anglo-Saxon countries finally accomplished this indispensable reform. Credit for these measures is in part due to the Church. But an important determining factor was undoubtedly the comprehension of the fact that overwork with insufficient pay, i.e. insufficient means of living, would exterminate the Indians and deprive the governing class of their labour supply. The Indian policy of Spain on these plateaus was strictly the opposite of that pursued by the Anglo-Saxons elsewhere. The warlike nomadic Indian of North America—and of the southern parts of South America as well—was an enemy and a rival for the possession of the land. The quicker he was exterminated the more rejoicing there was among the conquerors. The civilised Indian of the plateaus was not a liability but an asset, not an enemy but a servant, not a rival but an instrument for the production of wealth.

The absence of the racial prejudice which characterises Anglo-Saxon nations was another important factor. The races intermingled, not only through illegal unions, but also through marriage. The children of mixed races were not excluded from the circles of the dominant race, as in the south of the United States, but formed a connecting link between the white aristocracy and the Indian labouring class. The development of all these countries is predominantly characterised by these *mestizos*, who form the bulk of the population in the cities; do the more skilled kinds of work even in the country; and are the soldiers in the army: it is they who are responsible for the success or failure of democratic institutions in these countries.

From a humanitarian standpoint, this development seems infinitely less objectionable than the cruel extermination of the natives which took place in the temperate zone of North and South America. But has it not retarded progress? Is it not responsible for the insufficient exploitation of natural resources, the slow growth of democratic institutions, the lack of education, and the comparatively small contributions of these countries to the culture of humanity? If that thesis is to be answered in the affirmative, then the particular case seems to point to a much vaster generalisation: *Racial factors must be admitted as decisive in the development of human progress.*

But a first counter-argument could point to the fact that the Indians themselves, particularly in the vast Inca realms, had attained by their own force a civilisation which, ethically at least, if not materially, was in many ways superior to that of the European Middle Ages. Whoever doubts the fact may read one of the several available translations of the Inca dramas, written in Inca times. They manifest remarkable refinement of spirit and feeling which truly reflects the social-minded conceptions of their communistic state. Their high racial aptitudes stand the test of the most critical examination.

All that was destroyed by the Spaniards through the superiority of their weapons; no proof of cultural Spanish superiority (over the Incas, at least) has been forthcoming. The Inca civilisation was not replaced by a superior civilisation, but destroyed and systematically eradicated by a stronger one. The hypothesis remains permissible that the backwardness of the Indian descendants to-day is in part due to the fact that they have been removed from their natural environment and were thereby prevented from creating again what they had created before. Be that so or not, the economic, political, and cultural backwardness of all these Andean countries, from Bolivia in the south to Mexico in the north, seemed obvious until very recent times. The agricultural resources remained unexploited; means of transportation were not developed to bring mining products to the coast; no great industries were created. Financial solvency remained at a low point. Illiteracy was great, semi-feudal conditions prevailed from the far south to the Rio Grande. Indian peons lived a wretched life on ill-managed *haciendas*. No strong middle class sprang up to develop true democracy. Feudalism, clothed in modern garb, coloured the political life, and in some cases dictators established themselves in power by force.

These were at least the outstanding characteristics of those vast areas. There were exceptions, of course. Historical contingencies had established predominantly white populations in some restricted areas, particularly in Costa Rica and some parts of Colombia. These racial differences were faithfully reflected by different educational and social conditions. In Guatemala, for instance (Indian

majority), the "school population" amounted to 3 per cent. of the total population; in Costa Rica (white majority) to 6 per cent. Note for comparison that the percentage in the United States is 14 per cent. and in "white" Argentina 11 per cent. Prosperous small farms prevail in the provinces of Colombia, where there is a large white population, but in most other parts of this and in the other republics *haciendas* with peonage conditions are still the rule. The author was struck by the orderly and modern aspect of market places in Costa Rica (white majority) compared with those in Guatemala (Indian majority and *mestizo* minority, very few whites). At some places in the high Andes Mountains white majorities also develop, or particularly active populations grow up by particular streams of immigration. The city of Medellin in Colombia, for instance, grew rich by exceptional industrial enterprise, which is generally attributed to an immigration of Spanish Jews some centuries ago. In Mexico again, "immigration" of capital and technical methods (more than of people) from "white" countries has changed conditions in most of the larger cities. Modern communications carry, of course, certain modern influences to all parts of these countries, and mediæval conditions cannot remain in their pure state. But in the main, feudalism (white aristocracy of high culture, with large numbers of low-paid, uneducated, physically decadent coloured peons) has prevailed in these countries.

There are, however, some clear signs of the beginning of a change. When the author, a few months ago, revisited Mexico, where he had been for the first time when that country was under the rule of Porfirio Diaz, he found another age of civilisation. The agrarian revolution has triumphed, although its results may yet be, to a certain extent, endangered by the vicissitudes of military revolt or counter-revolt. Many of the great *haciendas* have been broken up; the old communistic village communities, or *ejidos*, have been re-established by the revolutionary government, leading back, in a way, to pre-Spanish times. Other *haciendas* have been divided among small farmers, who are helped in the purchase of modern implements by the National Bank of Agricultural Credit.

A powerful trade-union movement has sprung up in the cities, counting 2,000,000 members, and exercising great influence on the federal government. Up to July, 1928, its leader, Morones, occupied a leading post in the cabinet, and was responsible for several radical labour laws. Some examples may illustrate their one-sided character, which has scarcely a parallel in the world, not even in Russia. The law of 1925, claiming to guarantee "liberty to work," protects the worker against abuses of the employers, but not the employer against abuses of the workers. Arbitration is obligatory, but the workers are not punished if they infringe the

law, while the employers are heavily penalised for the same act. If they close their shops without reasons considered legitimate by the authorities, they have to pay three months' wages to their workers. The new Labour Code, sponsored by President Portes Gil, provides a more equitable and very complete system of industrial arbitration. Employers and workers together, in a general convention, held in December, 1928, agreed on amendments to that Act, and developments seem to tend in the direction of organised industrial peace, although this goal has not yet been attained. Wages in the past have been very low, about 20 to 30 *centavos* (10 to 15 cents) per day for the rural workers. Through organisation on one hand, and minimum wage laws on the other, a betterment was attempted, but these new laws are not applied in a uniform way. The minimum-wage provisions of the federal constitution of 1917 are not enforced, and the Senate has so far refused to adopt the federal law, which was approved in 1925 by the lower chamber of Congress. Most of the State legislatures have promulgated local laws, but only a few of the States apply them. Last summer the author found complete application only in the State of San Luis Potosi, and there only in the city, where wages of unskilled workers were raised from an average of 1 *peso* (50 cents) to a minimum of 1 *peso* 66 (83 cents).

Healthy small farms have taken the place of large plantations in many districts of the Central Plateau. In other parts of the Republic, particularly in the lowlands, organised economic effort has disappeared. The author was rather surprised, at the Guatemala frontier, to find jungle conditions on the Mexican side and organised, flourishing plantations on the Guatemalan side of the border. Upon inquiry he found that these plantations flourished upon forced labour. A State law makes the Indians subject to taxes, which they can only pay by working on the plantations for a month or more each year. The managers of the plantations very frequently succeed, by making more or less fraudulent money advances to the Indians, in keeping them in permanent indebtedness and thereby retaining them on the spot. Exactly the same system of debt slavery had predominated throughout Mexico, and is now disappearing. With it disappeared in many instances production and wealth. In Guatemala, through forced labour and debt slavery, prosperity has survived. The Indian who prefers to live peacefully and primitively on the mountains is forced to descend to the unhealthy lowlands, where his family becomes sterile as a result of unsuitable living conditions, and gradually dies out. Then other victims are taken from their mountain homes to maintain the prosperity of the plantations. Economic prosperity, bought by human welfare, in Guatemala; lands going out of cultivation in radical Mexico: human values or economic values—which should be preferred?

Education in Guatemala remains at a low level; politics are unstable because democratic institutions lack the basis of a self-reliant middle class. In Mexico that middle class has not yet sprung up, but it seems to be gradually developing. The authorities are trying to spread popular education, and the "school population" is 7 per cent. of the whole population, more than double the proportion for Guatemala. When the common people rise to greater intellectual and political maturity, when the soldiers, children of the people, no more follow blindly, in feudal devotion, the orders of their officers, when even these officers revolt; then will military insurrections be rendered difficult, then will institutions be stronger than the sword of the military caste.

The religious struggle continues. Its issues remind one of recent strife in France under Combes' premiership. Responsibility seems divided. The revolutionary power endeavoured to undermine the political position of the Church, and asked for direct submission of the priests to the civil authorities, without the intermediary action of the Catholic hierarchy. The hierarchy forbade the priests to comply with the conditions set by the civil authorities for organised worship in the churches (registration). Thereupon the civil authorities prevented that organised worship, and to-day the churches can be used only by the individual worshippers. Mass is forbidden. This state of affairs can obviously not last for ever; it can be considered only as a revolutionary intermediate. Conditions of necessity will lead back to old authority or forward to a new authority. All this turmoil and unrest show, nevertheless, that great forces are at work, that the popular soul is agitated, that the passivity of the Indian and *mestizo* populations, which dates from the times when the Aztec Empire and its culture were destroyed and the Indians were reduced to the rôle of serfs, has disappeared. The revolutionary mobility which has followed that passivity may destroy economic wealth; may for a time even appear to lead backward; but it prepares for conditions similar to our own, where free initiative rules, education prevails, and workers obtain wages which enable them to lead a civilised life and to rise to political responsibility. Racial factors, after all, were not decisive in the social immobility of Mexico. Racial factors have not changed; yet passivity has given way to mobility.

Will these factors also awaken Central America and the plateau country of South America inhabited by the same *mestizo* race? Why should not similar basic factors lead to the same consequences, even at an interval of a number of years? There are some fundamental differences, however, between Mexico, Peru, and Bolivia on one hand, and Central America, Colombia, and Venezuela on the other. Centuries of Toltec-Aztec empire in Mexico, of Inca empire in Peru and Bolivia, have rendered the populations of these coun-

tries very docile and facilitated the development of peonage on large *haciendas*. Over-pressure has stimulated revolt; Mexico, since 1911, has been in the throes of social revolution; strikes are frequent in Peru, and the Indian uprising in Bolivia in 1927 foreshadows future unrest.

No such docile Indian population existed or exists in Central America, Colombia, and Venezuela. *Haciendas* with patriarchal peonage conditions do not prevail to the same extent as in the empires to the north and south. In Guatemala plantations labour is sometimes obtained by fraud, as in the regions near the Mexican border, and sometimes by modern methods and high wages, as in the case of the United Fruit Company on the Caribbean seaboard. There are many small farms owned by *mestizos* in parts of the plateau of Colombia and in the western part of Venezuela. Here there was less pressure than in Mexico and therefore a less violent reaction. There are indications that developments in these countries may take the way of *evolution* rather than of *revolution*. In Peru and Bolivia, however, exploitation of the docile Quechua Indians is still as bad as it was in the worst Mexican times; the social understructure for revolutionary outbreaks exists. But revolutions arise only when bitterness from exploitation is coupled with a certain degree of intellectual maturity, or at least agility. Neither has developed as yet in Bolivia. They are not yet general in Peru. But there seems to be only a difference in degree and time. Indications are that the Indians of the former Inca empire will follow the way shown by the former subjects of the Aztecs, and will rise against their feudal masters. Passivity will be followed by activity, disorders, economic disruption, and finally by modern democratic conditions.

The backwardness of the *mestizo* nations on the Andean plateaus, which followed the superior Indian culture under the emperors of Mexico and Peru and has lasted for four centuries, will remain only an episode. These countries may never achieve their old superiority over the plains; may never become equal to the new white men's countries of the United States and of Argentina. They may remain somewhat backward in economic initiative because their Indian stock is less given to the thirst for wealth. They may remain less progressive because their denser population and lower wage standards tend to repel immigration from Europe. But they seem destined, nevertheless, to advance in education, political maturity, intellectual culture, and to a lesser extent in economic progress. Modern democracy, after having been for a century a mere cloak covering feudal conditions, will become more and more a reality.

RUDOLF BRODA.

Antioch College, Ohio.

BIRDS' EYES.

The song of men divinely wise
Who look and see in starry skies
Not stars so much as robins' eyes.

Ralph Hodgson.

THERE is an old saying: "God made the eyes, man made the mouth." In a man the eye's expression reveals temperament—what he was intended to be; the mouth indicates character; by its lines we proclaim, perhaps unconsciously, what we have made ourselves. And the same holds good with birds: the eye is the window through which we can look into their embryonic brains; as for their beaks, they harden too early in their careers to be an index of individual character. But heredity has been at work, and has moulded this feature in accordance with racial characteristics. Hence the hooked upper mandible of hawk and shrike, and the stout, seed-cracking bill of the greenfinch.

Because of their shyness it is difficult to study birds' eyes. They do not often stay still and look you in the face. Young birds in the nest can, of course, be watched with ease. I shall never forget the yellowish goggle-eyes of some young bitterns cackling at me from their "basket" in the rushes. But adults we can usually observe only with field-glasses, or upon our bird-tables when they are tame enough to frequent them. And, in the field, variations of light and shade cause modifications of colour, so that eyes seem to differ from the plates in our books, which are, indeed, not always accurate. It is the pigment on the anterior surface of the iris which decides the colour, and this varies remarkably in different species. Albinos have red eyes because no pigment is present, and so the red blood-vessels shine through. In most of the smaller passerines the iris is black, or so dark a brown that it appears to be black. But, though alike in colour, their eyes vary much in expression, and that expression is an index of temperament; the eye of the chaffinch is alert and wary, mercurial; so is the bird: it is always bouncing on and off the bird table; the greenfinch's reflects his more phlegmatic disposition; he plumps himself down solidly amid the crumbs and hemp seeds and feeds unperturbed. When a pied-wagtail blows in like a shuttlecock, and with open beak attempts to oust him from his corner, he returns hiss for hiss and peck for peck, but does not stir an inch. This wagtail's eye is small for the size of the bird; there shines in it a peevish aggressiveness which is reflected in his table-manners. He wants the board to himself.

Tits, great and blue, have all their nerves on edge. Their black-diamond eyes glint with a saturnine wickedness which is amazing

in such diminutive frames. No wonder that they fight among themselves like tom-cats. In the blue tit this malevolence of aspect is increased by the dark line through the eye; the shrikes are rendered forbidding by the same feature; in the human countenance a dark, bushy eyebrow can be equally forbidding. The cold grey of jackdaws' and jays' eyes sets me shivering. It is true that the jackdaw's roguishness and the lovely colours of the jay's many-hued plumes for the moment moderate this repulsion. But so soon as my glance returns to the eye the feeling of antipathy wakes anew. The chilly blue-white of the green woodpecker's eye affects me much in the same way. The reason is difficult to discover. It may be that the revulsion is temperamental; there is a type of icy grey or very light blue eye which freezes and repels me whether in bird or in human being. And my feeling is, I know, shared by others. I have a letter from W. H. Hudson discussing the subject, in which he agrees with me in thinking that such feelings are traditional, probably the result of old racial hatreds. If any grey- or blue-eyed reader wishes to know exactly what type of eye it is to which I refer, my reply is, "Not yours, of course!" Fortunately one does not often meet it.

At one time I wondered whether a grey eye in a bird did not denote some evolutionary advance in the mentality of its species. Jackdaws and jays belong to the crow tribe, which stands high as regards intelligence. But ravens, which certainly equal and perhaps exceed jackdaws in cunning, have eyes which though dark brown look coal-black; so have carrion-crows and rooks, and their brain is at any rate on a level with the jay's, though perhaps not more keen than that of the jackdaw. And the young hoodie-crow has a greyish-blue iris, which turns to dark brown in the adult. If this change recapitulates the history of the species, then a grey eye is not a sign of progress; rather, the transition from grey to brown may mark an advance which in jackdaw and jay has been arrested. Eyes of gulls vary. Some are dark and pleasing: the kittiwake's, for instance, has sweet reasonableness in it, but then its habits and appearance are mild and dovelike. But the pale eyes of the herring and greater and lesser black-backed are to me repellent. All three feed on carrion, and prey upon the helpless young of animals and even of their own kind; in their cold, fishy eyes are greed, cruelty, and heartlessness.

Crepuscular birds, such as robin and nightingale, have large, dark eyes. The robin's, when he is alert and expectant, sparkle with a brilliance which must have been in the mind of the poet when he wrote the lines which preface this article. But when he is unalarmed and reflective, for instance after the absorption of a plump, round worm or a succulent sultana, his eyes are not star-

like; there is in them a limpid and reflective beauty, the clear, translucent brown of a pool in a moorland peat stream, on a day when clouds gentle but do not blot out the brightness of a summer noon. There is a sparkle, too, almost a twinkle, in the eyes of raven and crow; mischief and devilment are mingled.

Owls' eyes were supposed to disclose wisdom, though the epithet "owlish" hints that their seeming solemnity is a fraud; they are not wise but wiseacres. It is when anxious over eggs or young that they are most easily observed, and then it is their ferocity which imprints itself upon our memory. A long-eared owl, glaring down at me over the edge of an old wood-pigeon's nest, twenty feet up a half-dead spruce, with ear-tufts erect and her orange-tawny orbs blazing with fear and anger, was a sight both awe-inspiring and beautiful. The golden eyes of the short-eared owl glow with a devastating fury as she crouches over her eggs beneath a bramble-brake. A brown owl's eyes are deeper hued: there is black rage in them as she sways from side to side, snapping her beak, before swooping down at your head.

But it is the little owl whose eyes are, of all her tribe's, the most malevolent. "Lemon-yellow" is the epithet applied, presumably to their colour, but they recall also the wormwood distilled by the most acid of that fruit—the sour lemon which spoils the taste of the most carefully concocted brew of punch on New Year's Eve. There is in them a chilly yet quintessential rage which inspires the savage war-dance, performed upon a bough above the nesting hole when eggs or young are threatened. With owls, both eyes look forwards from the broad, facial disc. As this enables them to concentrate their gaze upon their prey, it must double their power of fascination. Braver beings than the timid mouse would quail beneath it.

In birds of prey the colour of the iris is often dark-brown, but in some cases the bare skin round the eye is yellow or orange, and this contrast in colour certainly heightens the arrogant fierceness of their expression. Surprise a peregrine falcon sitting on her eggs in an old raven's or buzzard's nest. The head shoots up above the edge of the eyrie; the black eye fixes you with a splendid anger and scorn; it glowers amid an eyot of sable angled into the white cheek. But it is the yellow margin encircling the eye which most enhances its ferocity. Light-coloured rims of horn spectacles can increase the impressiveness even of a weak human eye: but the peregrine's, fierce enough already, redoubles its piercingness by the contrast in colour. It is curious that in the cock blackbird, who wears yellow spectacles too, the effect is quite different. Here the pale circlet sets off the beautiful mildness of the eye, which resembles the lapwing's in its gentle brown. Mallards' eyes look black: they have a knowing twinkle of humour in them. Swans' eyes are much

the same, but they seem to wish you ill. The lambent topaz of the tufted duck's beams upon you rather surprisingly above its pied black and white feathers. The changes in pochards' eyes are kaleidoscopic: the sexes differ: their gamut of colours declines in semitones from bright red, through brown, to pale ochre. Eerie and curious sensations are produced by the white "eye" of the dipper (the white is not in the eye but in the eyelid, which he blinks at you amid the shadows) and the eye of the sitting night-jar which she slants backwards between half-closed eyelids if you approach her from behind.

A red eye in a bird always causes a momentary sensation of surprise; it is unusual among the commoner species which are constantly about us. But it has great beauty. Hudson, in his delightful chapter on the Dartford warbler, or furze-wren, writes of "the ruby red of the small gem-like eye." The divers have wine-red eyes. In the golden oriole the eye is a vermilion star amid a splash of living sunshine. The iris of the long-tailed tit is hazel, but some of the rose from its plumage has tinted its eyelids and so to me it is rosy-eyed, like the dawn. There is some controversy as to the colour of the eye of the hawfinch. The plates in some ornithological works show it as grey, and this is its hue after death. But, watching the live birds in spring, I have seen quite clearly that the iris is a very beautiful vinous red. It has been stated that this fades to grey when the bird is alarmed. Possibly there is a seasonal change. But I suspect that some artists paint the eye grey because they have worked from stuffed specimens and not from the living model. And there is the green-eyed cormorant: the young do not acquire this emerald jewel in their heads till they are a year old, but there is a hint of verdure in their grey eyes: these young birds are sometimes very tame: perched upon a balk of timber on the shore, they will meet your look with a stare which shows blank surprise rather than resentment.

The puffin in summer wears a curious three-cornered plate of bluish horn above its dark eye, which curves and tapers upwards like an eyebrow raised in waggish interrogation. The bird is already ludicrous enough, with its immense particoloured beak, like a false nose, but the raised eyebrow adds to its comic appearance: it becomes half-clown, half-parrot, and you expect it to break out into some ribald quip or piece of profane parrot language at any moment. Another motley-vestured fellow is the oyster-catcher: he, too, goes about in fancy dress; the red "nose" and eye are only part of his make-up.

Every field naturalist knows how sensitive all birds are to the presence of a hawk, or any unusual object, in the air above them. The small fry on my bird table are con-

tinually looking upwards, and are often scared off even when one of their own species descends on them from the roof. We have recently heard a good deal about the third eye in the top of the head of the plesiosaurus: apparently it was never a real eye, but only "a primitive organ faintly conscious of light." Some biologists are inclined to think that the pineal gland is the vestigial relic of the third eye. Professor Newton, in his *Dictionary of Birds*, says it is the remnant of a sense-organ, possibly visual, but quite degenerated in all birds. The unscientific field naturalist may perhaps be excused if, after watching the behaviour of birds threatened with danger from above, he indulges in the harmless fancy that some faint glimmering of its original use may still remain. But it is, of course, only a fancy. "The pineal body shows no trace of the optic function." Thus speaks the scientist.

E. W. HENDY.

JEHAN THE MINSTREL.

JEHAN the Minstrel had been born in a ditch, and this evening he thought he would probably die in one. It was a cold day in early spring, and fitfully sullen gleams of sunshine lit wanly from time to time the revellers at the Fair of Saint Yves. Whether the ungenial weather had chilled their hearts and thus tightened their purse-strings, Jehan knew not, but never, since as a tiny child he had "tumbled" for coppers on the dusty market-places, had his takings been so small. A shadow, the presence of which he had always recognised, crept nearer, and he realised more fully that the time must come when his voice pleased no more and his nut-cracker face no longer raised a laugh. He had gone through his whole repertory from the tales of chivalry to the low songs of the pot-house, but his voice had quavered perilously and broken on the high notes and had become thin and reedy on the low. A few youths had loitered to snigger at so odd a drollity singing of Tristram the Sad or of Iseult the Fair, then a comrade had drawn them off to where a girl in a poppy-red dress danced with a tinkle of tinsel ornaments. For the most part he had been left to sing to himself and to a homeless dog that had crept near to him for companionship.

Where others would have wept, Jehan the Minstrel had been wont to laugh. He was tolerant towards the world, as he wished the world to be tolerant towards him and his sins against society. His situation was anxious enough, but he seized on the laugh in it as a dog seizes on a bone. For once in his life he would be a spectator instead of an actor, and watch the fun of the fair. It was good to sit at ease on the clean white wood of some scaffolding, with your legs tucked under you, and all the cheaterly and frolic of the merry life beneath you—the tricks of the trade, the posturings and beckonings; he knew them all. Here stood Zoro the Magician with his nostrums—love-charms so potent that by means of them you could draw down the Moon herself to your side, the Philosopher's Stone, the Fountain of Youth, the Elixir of Life itself! Jehan the Minstrel cackled cynically, but quietly; he would not spoil the trade of a brother of the guild! Yonder, with an alluring air of secrecy (for was not magic forbidden both by man and the Church?), Anna the Sorceress read fortunes and prepared love-philtres. She charged less for these than did Zoro the Magician, and her custom was proportionately greater among the serving-lasses of the countryside. Hard by, a child of about ten, undersized and with a face as pale as chalk, "tumbled" in the dust. But above all Jehan's eye was caught by the poppy-coloured dancer. Her short curly hair floated round her head, blue-black like the

centre of a poppy; she wore green shoes and stockings, and she swayed like a wind-flower in the wind. Jehan had never seen any woman but one who could dance so winsomely. Nor had he ever seen in hall or bower, in the old days when he had sung in noble houses, any maiden daintier or more self-contained than this dancer at fairs. She trod the boards as if she disdained them, so swiftly did she rise into the air. She went through her posturings with the grave seriousness of one who has a task to perform, with none of the self-consciousness of one who is there to be stared at. The gravity of the professional covered the brazenness of the dancer.

The heart of Jehan the Minstrel went out to these people in a curious, homely benevolence, especially to the poppy-coloured dancer. They were his own people; they formed a world within a world, outcasts from the society of even the humblest, under the ban of the Church, with the fires of hell to light them to the grave. Yet he, Jehan, was most to be pitied, for he alone had earned scarce a copper through the long hours. The inevitable had happened; he had failed to please his audience. He could have begged or borrowed from these people of his trade, for the unkindness of others made them stick the closer to each other, but he knew he would never repay a loan, and to beg—from his own kind—he was ashamed. He had thieved in his day at fairs and in crowded places from the outsiders who had held him a thief, and to whom he gave the treatment they expected, but he would not rob the necessities of those who looked on him as an honest outcast among honest outcasts. He was not greatly depressed; a thousand chances might befall before nightfall, and he still had a boy's delight (despite his sixty odd years) in the many-coloured thing called life that enabled him to live in the minute. That poppy-coloured dancer, for instance—her grace and the brightness of her dress had warmed his heart. The stoicism of the highest and of the humblest joins hands. Jehan had once seen a great noble led to execution. He had played a losing game with fate to be the power behind a throne, and a feeling of fatality held him calm. The minstrel had played for a stake higher than coronets, for a crust of bread, and had lost—and knowing that the fate of his folk had overtaken him, he shrugged his shoulders, leapt to the ground with a surprising agility and went his way.

He betook him to the inn where he spent his last coin on ale. The innkeeper was an old friend of his, and bade him draw up his chair to the fire, reminding him of the toy rebec he had made some thirty years before for the innkeeper's sick child, Richard, now a middle-aged man, and himself the father of a family.

"Ay, thou wast a proper man in those days, tall and upright and fit for more than fiddling," said the innkeeper, while Richard's

youngest child came forward and laid her hand in that of the minstrel, "but if it were our lord the King, he could not lie by my fire to-night. Why, the beds will be full, the barns full, the stables full. This floor, on which thou would'st lie, will be as thick as a shoal of herring—and, to be plain, thou art a rogue, albeit a good rogue, and I will not have thee lie here to thieve and pick the pockets of honest men . . . no, nor yet will I have thee here to sing to my guests, for when the ale is in thee thou wilt grow loud and sing what is unseemly and Father Laurence will fine *me* in penance. Nor do I believe thou hast no money, Jehan, my friend. Go and earn some, if not; the fair is still high. As for me, I can give only what I earn, and times are hard and my son's wife is sick and must live on the best. Ask nothing of friends, and thou wilt keep thy friends longer than most. And take my advice, Jehan; thou wert once a proper man, with a fine, clear voice in thy throat, but now—go to the monks and get thyself a cowl. 'Tis the only way for thy kind to die in bed."

"There are worse things than to die in a ditch," said Jehan, as he got up and turned to go.

"If there be, I know them not," returned the host.

"To have a bed-death, with monks mumbling around and no sky above," said the minstrel, as he went into the dusk.

* * * *

But Jehan was not minded to relinquish shelter without a struggle. He coughed as he left the warmth of the inn and the chill air struck through him. Of late he had felt weaker at times than usual, and this evening, fasting, unacknowledged defeat and the coldness of the day made him feel ill. He formulated his plans quickly. If he could neither earn nor beg, there was but one way open to him—to steal from an honest man. . . . What about that stout, heavy, prosperous-looking fellow yonder? "He deserves to lose for going among the hungry with a face like that," said Jehan to himself, half chuckling, half relieved to have hit on someone to whom a trifling loss could mean nothing. Had he been taken to task for thieving, he would probably have said that that particular fellow had stood long enough listening to him and had walked off at the end without giving him anything; that he was a poor minstrel who sang to live, and that the churl had stolen the sound of his voice. But more probably he would scarcely have bothered to defend himself. The friends of the doomed noble had made one last futile attempt at the scaffold's foot to save their leader from fate; so he, Jehan the Minstrel, was casting one final throw of the dice against fate in a game the high stakes of which were bread and a roof.

He followed his victim, and when the man had removed his fat hand from the mouth of his purse and had given it to Anna the Fortune-teller, Jehan crept close to his side, and with a wink at the woman, earnest of his confidence in the honour among thieves, the deed was done.

* * * *

There was a little hostel some miles down the main road from Saint Yves, and as Jehan made his way towards it in the gathering dusk, his spirits rose within him. He thought longingly of a fire, a platter of meat and bread, a deep draught of ale, and then sleep, sleep in some warm corner till the birds woke him in the morning. He felt his voice coming back to him; life was a very excellent game—in which he had not lost his cunning—and that of the minstrel was best of all. He would die of dullness if he lived soberly and knew whence his next meal was to come. He still felt weak, but he knew that a good meal and a night's rest would revive him. He whistled to himself softly between his teeth, laughing at intervals at his own cleverness. The night was unusually cold for the time of year. The light was failing rapidly, but Jehan's eyes were keen, and suddenly, as he approached, a group of figures grew to distinctness. A woman was sitting in an attitude of weariness by the roadside. She was enveloped in a large dark cloak, and held a bundle at her breast—a child, thought Jehan indifferently. A figure neared the woman from another direction—apparently that of a priest. "Aha," said the minstrel, slipping silently behind a tree, "Father Laurence, doubtless, who would have put mine host to penance for housing me for a night! I have a bone to pick with him!" The woman stretched out a hand and touched the priest timidly. He started, then collected himself.

"Daughter, dost wish aught with me? What is thy name?" From his tone, he took his office seriously.

"They call me Mary, and my babe is at my breast. I have no money and they would not lodge us at the inn. An alms for the love of Heaven, that I may try for shelter further on." The woman's uplifted face looked small and pure in the moonlight.

The priest stood trembling and crossing himself. "'Mary,'" and "'her babe at her breast,'" he murmured. Then, "Lady," he began, in a tone of deepest reverence, "I am unworthy . . ." Then the woman's cloak fell apart and revealed the poppy-red dress of the dancer. The priest could bear no more. "Take off that livery of Hell," he said sternly. "Then come to Holy Church for alms." He strode off indignantly into the night. He was a tender-hearted man, and a brave priest. Ten years later, when the Black Death broke out, he lost his life remaining at his post in a plague-stricken village. But the revulsion of outraged piety was too much,

and his vanity, which thought to have seen a vision, was wounded. Besides, he had dealt with the woman according to her truest good. When the body is tended, the soul does not learn repentance.

"So," thought the minstrel behind the tree, "I have my vengeance ready to my hand. If I, Jehan the Vagabond, Jehan the Pickpocket, Jehan the son of Satan, do more, through the proceeds of knavery, to convert that girl there than Master Priest, why, Saint Peter may laugh if he has a sense of the wit of things, and I shall have my revenge on Sir Baldpate!" He considered a moment. A wave of weakness swept over him, and the night was bitterly cold. He knew what his decision meant. He knew the landlord of the hostel whither he was bound. He would give a night's lodging to none without payment. But the poppy-coloured dancer! It was worth while for the pleasure she had given him! He drew his cloak closer, so as to disguise as far as possible his minstrel dress, stepped out, and touched the woman on the shoulder. "My girl," he said, "thou'rt sad. I saw thee dance at the fair yonder, and thou hast a step, believe me, that can dance on the hearts of men."

"Sir," she answered, "the night is cold, and my babe is an-hungred, and they robbed me of my takings. I have no money to seek further shelter, and my feet are sore, but I must make shift to walk till morning."

"Thou hast a fair face. Whose child art thou? I was once a minstrel of some repute myself."

"My mother was known as Madelon the Enchantress."

"And thy father? Who was he?"

"How should I know?" she answered carelessly. "Thyself, it may be, if thou wast once a minstrel." She spoke with no shame, only with a weariness at being questioned. Was this then the end of his quest, pursued fitfully, forgetfully, yet with some real desire and purpose?

"And the father of this babe?"

"He is not here. He keeps true to me so far. He had a mind to have married me, but the priest whom we asked would not. He bade us give up our way of life ere we sought the Blessed Sacraments. We minstrels are under the ban of the Church."

"Thou speakest bitterly, yet would'st fain be friends with Holy Church," said Jehan. "Madelon had always a turn towards piety. Perchance it had been better for herself and others had it been otherwise."

"How should'st thou know?"

"I know many things. Thy name is Mary, and thy Babe is at thy breast, and they turned thee from the inn."

"Art a sorcerer, or did'st overhear?" asked the dancer, in some alarm.

"I am no sorcerer, and whom should I overhear? I was once a minstrel. So was Saint David, for that matter, and played on the harp, and thereby saved King Saul—and doubtless many another Saint, though Holy Church is not minded to remember it. But, behold, a miracle! Here is money to ease thee and thy babe." Jehan the Minstrel placed his all in her hand. He would not halve it: the mood of munificence was upon him, and he wrapped himself snugly in his new game as in a mantle.

The flush in the girl's face was his reward. "Thou art one of the Blessed Saints themselves! I was afeared for the child. If it may be, I will think more henceforth of holy things. But thou! if thou art indeed an immortal spirit (as I do think) all is well; if thou art still a living man, hast thou no need of this?"

"Have no fear," answered Jehan the Minstrel, as he disappeared in the gloom. "The Blessed Saints lodge well. They have the sky as roof."

* * * *

He turned into a side road and thence into a field where there was a dry ditch which he well knew. He had often, when he came to that district at fair-time, sunned himself there on a fine day, and it had struck him more than once that it might serve him just such a turn as he wished now. The night was very cold, and he felt worse than he had ever done in his life. He knew well enough what it meant, but he was not unhappy. He had done one good action, and had raised a laugh in Heaven against the Priest. Surely that was worth while. A week or a month or a year longer, what matter? The torments of Hell, if the Church did not teach amiss, awaited him, but lying there and surveying his life, he felt it had been worth while. When he was born, his mother said, he had laughed instead of crying. As a man he had trod the roads of the world, laughing. In his life there had been cold and rain and hunger, but there had also been love and rude kindness and wine and long summer days and long nights in the open with the sunrise over the hills. And song had been his, and fame of its own kind in the days when he had sung before great nobles, and the jollier chaplains of the households had clapped fat hands at his minstrelsy, and the sterner had left the chamber, lest they should be forced to reprove their lords and ladies for listening to the light loves of Launcelot and Guinevere, where Heaven itself was not too severe on the pastimes of the great. And Jehan thought that if all the gay things of earth went to Hell, there might be need there of his minstrelsy, and there would he meet many of his old friends who had led the merry life—his mother, and William the Harper,

and Aubrey the Lute-player, and Madelon. . . . How cold the night was growing! The grasses beside him were heavy with frost. There was a glimmering before his eyes. Father Laurence would doubtless preach of the frost as a judgment on the village for the wickedness of the Fair of Saint Yves. He stretched his hand out; it touched something warm. The homeless dog had evidently followed him; it snuggled up to him and laid its head on his breast. He put his arm across it. . . . A few tentative chirpings of birds arose through the darkness, then gradually the full chorus burst forth until the whole countryside was vocal with song. The sky reddened slowly. The songs of the birds sounded fainter, although strangely clearer than usual, thought Jehan, but it was better to feel the green earth beneath one than to have a bed-death in a cell with monks mumbling around . . . nor would he have changed his life . . . that girl was safe for the night anyhow, and he, for one last perfect witticism, had got himself mistaken for one of the Blessed Saints. The red haze in the east broadened and grew brighter. . . . Thus, with a laugh, Jehan the Minstrel met the Dawn.

K. M. CARROLL.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

DIPLOMACY BY CONFERENCE.

JANUARY, 1930, opened a prospect of diplomacy by conference such as reminded one of the exuberant days of Lloyd Georgian Europe; but the present prospect was fuller than anything we saw even in those days. The Five-Power London Conference was to be opened by the King on January 21st; the second Hague Conference met in the first week of the month; an unusually important meeting of the League of Nations Council immediately followed it.

The conference method of diplomacy has had its ups and downs in public favour since 1919. When the late Lord Curzon opened the Near Eastern conference at Lausanne (November 20th, 1922) he hoped, as he expressed it, that after the settlement then being sought was achieved, we should be done with diplomacy by conference. He was touching wood as he spoke, for his right hand was leaning on the heavy stick that supported him in those days of physical infirmity: but the hope was roundly belied. During that winter, diplomacy by conference was to redouble its vigour and its intensity.

Mr. MacDonald believes in oral conference. In 1924 he smoked pipes with M. Herriot in the grounds of Chequers, and organised the important "Dawes" reparation conference and the ill-fated Anglo-Russian conference, both held in London. In 1929, although he was no longer Foreign Secretary, he entertained General Dawes in Scotland, and then crossed the Atlantic to be entertained by Mr. Hoover. The naval conference in London was the direct result.

THE FIVE-POWER CONFERENCE.

The meeting in London of the five chief naval Powers of the world promised to be a landmark in the world's progress towards common sense. That progress is difficult. Wise men are thankful for small advances, and the wisest men take infinite trouble not to jeopardise even the smallest advance.

At the outset of the London conference there arose a subtle danger to success which threatened to put a strain on the temper and the quality of the wisest diplomatists. It has been a constant obstacle to progress in the general diplomacy of the last ten years that what may be called the Anglo-Saxon mentality on the one hand, and the continental, especially the French, mentality on the other, while sharing the same purpose, have differed deeply in method. Roundly expressed, the Anglo-Saxon puts his faith in the establishment of a good precedent, no matter how small an advance that precedent may embody. The continental by contrast demands a complete,

comprehensive machinery of security by sanction before he will risk taking any step at all.

The continental hypothesis in this matter is a little paradoxical; for juridical instruments tend in the European tradition to be regarded as scraps of paper when a crisis arises. Yet the continental mind reverts to the juridical instrument with more apparent confidence than to any other means of securing the peace. The Geneva Protocol symbolised the continental tendency; and was distrusted by British opinion as too committal an enterprise. The Kellogg Pact, lacking material substance, was welcomed by the Anglo-Saxon thinkers, but was merely tolerated by continental thinkers as little more than a pious aspiration.

That old divergence of mental approach to the problem of peace and security again took form in the preliminaries to the London naval conference. Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Hoover, as it was clear to see, were anxious that the five Powers should concentrate on an immediate agreement for the prevention of future expansion and future competition in naval building. They deliberately, as it were, shut their eyes to any longer view, on the principle that if you look after the pennies the pounds will look after themselves. France, however, in a long memorandum drawn up before the conference met, was at pains to explore the ultimate sanction that could be applied to any agreement on naval limitation; submitted, indeed, that the general problem of ultimate security be examined before the particular step in disarmament now contemplated be taken. Patience and sympathy were called for in meeting that conflict of tactical opinion.

This paper had to be written before the conference met. The dispositions of the various participants had however been made clear, and the course of the conference itself will be the more easily understood if the preliminaries are remembered. THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW of December carried the story of those preliminaries up to the middle of November. By that time, as the United States Ambassador stated at a banquet in London (November 16th), the British and the United States Governments had narrowed their differences to a matter of only 30,000 tons, a small matter in relation to the total 2,400,000 of tons involved in the problem. Mr. Hoover, meanwhile, had made a remarkably statesmanlike promise in his Armistice Day speech. Having said that the people of the United States did not want one gun or one soldier more than was needed for defence, and that the United States would *reduce* her naval strength to as low a level as the strongest naval Power, he remarked: "It only remains for the others to say how low they will go. It cannot be too low for us." An unqualified promise of such a kind from such a quarter was of good augury for the success

of the conference. By contrast, although it would be mischievous to labour the point, the Naval Committee of the French Senate on November 21st formally recorded its view that the Government's existing naval programme was inadequate for French needs, and urged that France should not abandon her "freedom" to build as many ships as she thought necessary for her purposes. A week later (November 28th) the French official report on the naval estimates for 1930 was published. The figures of the estimates themselves were some 20 per cent. below the corresponding figures for 1914; but the report submitted that France, although she had accepted the invitation to take part in the London conference, should stick to the principle that disarmament is a catholic process affecting all armaments, that the League of Nations and not the London conference is the final arbiter of any questions of disarmament, that France should reject any suggestion that submarines be totally abolished. On the face of it that document was less attractive than Mr. Hoover's Armistice Day speech; but difficulties are made to be overcome, and if there had been no difficulties, there need not have been any conference.

Mr. Hoover is a man of courage. In his Message to the Seventy-First Congress (December 3rd) he maintained his optimism about the forthcoming conference ("we hold high hopes," he said, "that success may attend this effort"), and went on in a practical way to apply the moral of such success to the future conduct of the United States. He frankly confessed that the growing amount spent on the United States army and navy was a source of concern to him. In 1914, he recalled, the United States spent the equivalent of £53,400,000 on her army and navy. She was now spending the equivalent of £140,000,000 a year, and still heavier programmes of building with a still heavier expenditure had been authorised for the future. He did not spare his audience. He firmly revealed to them (if they had not known it before) that the expenditure of the United States on armaments was greater than "those of the most highly militarised nations in the world."

A grim footnote to Mr. Hoover's admirable doctrine was written on December 8th by the Secretary of the Navy, who in his annual report, published on that day, postulated an increased number of officers for the navy and increased pay throughout the service. He stated that the work of modernising ten of the thirteen pre-Jutland battleships was nearly finished, and recalled that the naval plans already made demanded the completion before June, 1933, of five out of the fifteen 10,000-ton cruisers that had been authorised. Two of them, he added, were already being built; the building of the other three would be postponed till the London Conference had been held. He presumably implied that if the London Con-

ference failed to produce results, the three cruisers would be built forthwith.

Thus in effect was Mr. Hoover mocked by his own colleague : as most pioneers in most good causes are mocked. It would be a waste of anxiety to be depressed thereby, for such is the way of the world. The world in this case pursued its way so doggedly that ten days later a still more strikingly unenthusiastic message was sent out from Paris. Again there was no need for premature anxiety. On December 18th M. Tardieu addressed the Foreign Affairs and Naval Committees of the French Chamber. Instead of pointing out what the impending London Conference might succeed in achieving, he exercised himself in explaining what it would not be allowed to achieve : to wit, there must be no separate agreement about naval armaments apart from land armaments ; that any agreement reached in London must be provisional in the sense that the most it could do would be to form the basis of another conference, to be organised by the League of Nations, on the subject of armaments. Now the United States is not a member of the League of Nations ; and moreover, what conceivable objection could there be to a definite agreement among the five chief naval Powers of the world not to go on building more warships ? Could such an agreement possibly militate against the success of a League of Nations Disarmament Conference ? By what process of reasoning or of humanity could M. Tardieu desire that the naval Powers should refrain from reaching any such understanding ? The politicians of the world, it must be confessed, work for the most part on a low plane of intelligence and of service. They are called " Ministers," but they too often do not minister to anything except muddle and mischief among the nations. " If disaster comes," observed Mr. Stanley Baldwin in the British House of Commons (July 26th, 1929), " if bloodshed comes, as it often has in our history, the politicians always escape. The worst that can happen to the politician is loss of office ; and the men who give their blood are generally those whose hands have had nothing to do with the laying of the train that led to the explosion."

On the very day following M. Tardieu's timid reservations aforementioned, the French Chamber began discussing the 1930 estimates, which involved an expenditure equal to a million and a half sterling in excess of the 1929 expenditure. The pleasantest comment on that state of affairs is that it dots the i's of the need for a naval limitation conference. On December 20th the French Minister of Marine gave to the Chamber an outline of what he interpreted to be the Government's naval policy, as mobilised for use at the London Conference. It was a policy, according to that statement, consisting wholly of negatives and reservations. He repeated that

the London conference must be regarded as merely preparatory to the League Disarmament Conference ; that France would not agree to any arbitrary criterion for the measurement of naval strength ; and ended by submitting that so long as the League of Nations had not assured the general security, each nation had the " right " to assure its own security, and that so far as France and her colonial Empire were concerned, they would state their needs in terms of political expediency, not in arithmetic figures. One must assume that it is French fear of danger in general that makes French politicians distrust any movement which would reduce the number of her troops on land, her battleships on the sea, and her submarines beneath the sea.

On the same day (December 20th) the French Government transmitted to the British Government a written memorandum of its views on the subjects to be discussed at the conference. The memorandum was published in the Press on December 27th. There seems to be no escape from a minute study of its content. The memorandum was divided into two parts, one giving the motives of French policy, the second an exact statement of that policy. Among the passages about French motives were these : (1) " . . . the problem of naval disarmament must be considered, since the meeting in April and May last of the Preparatory Commission at Geneva, as holding up the work carried on by that Commission, which had the efficient co-operation of the American delegates. Furthermore, the last Assembly of the League of Nations declared that an agreement between the leading naval Powers was necessary in order to prepare a general understanding with regard to the methods to be used for the reduction of naval armaments. The conversations already proceeding at the time appeared to that Assembly as being likely to lead to the resumption and completion of the interrupted work of the Preparatory Commission and ultimately to the calling of a general conference. . . .

(2) " The British Government has stated that the Government of the United States and itself had based their conversations on the Pact of Paris. The French Government, which has already had an opportunity of expressing the satisfaction with which it welcomed this statement, took too large a share in the working out of that Pact for it to be necessary for it to lay emphasis on the importance it attaches to it. The Pact is based on the force of public opinion, which is great. But its rational application has not yet been organised ; it does not settle all the questions of peaceful procedure, of mutual assistance against an aggressor implied in the outlawry of war. It is undoubtedly a real step towards the preservation of peace, but it cannot be looked upon as sufficient in its present state to guarantee the security of nations. . . .

(3) "It was primarily on the Covenant of the League that the French Government, as well as the other Governments belonging to the League, undertook to base the limitation and reduction of their armaments, whereof naval armaments are but a part. Incomplete as are the measures adopted for carrying it into effect, the Covenant already provides the basis of a complete system of security, based upon the application of the methods of peaceful settlement and assistance to any State unlawfully attacked. Only in proportion to such assistance as they may be able to rely upon from without could the nations be in a position actually to reduce their armaments. Just as a general technical agreement upon armaments implies a previous political agreement, so does a complete naval agreement presuppose an understanding on the question of the freedom of the seas, defining the rights of belligerents and the rights of neutrals, and providing for the prospective co-operation of other fleets against that of an aggressor country."

Having expressed its "general observations" (of which the three mentioned above were the chief), the French Government proceeded to define in the most precise detail the policy it would pursue at the conference. There were those outside of France who regretted so precise a commitment in advance of the conference, for it would perhaps be difficult for France to modify a view it had thus unreservedly committed to writing and freely published. Part two of the memorandum proceeded "to define the principles whereby the French Government will be guided in the London negotiations."

The first principle was thus expressed: "It is upon Article 8 of the Covenant that the French Government, faithful to its pledged word, intends to base the reduction of its armaments. It is, indeed, upon this basis alone, a basis which does not imply the *a priori* application of mathematical ratios, and upon which the Preparatory Commission on Disarmament already based its work—that it would be possible, in its opinion, to work out an agreement acceptable to the Governments not represented in London."

"On the lines of Article 8 two opposite methods for the limitation of naval armaments were suggested in Geneva, the one by total tonnage, the other by classes of ships. The stronger navies inclined to the latter method, while the rest were all in favour of the former. Desirous of reconciling these conflicting views, the French delegation proposed as early as April 1927 a compromise which met with the approval of all the navies that will not be represented in London, and was sympathetically considered by several others."

"The United States, in particular, took the opportunity on two separate occasions of publicly stating that it was willing to accept

it as a basis for discussion. Under this arrangement the limitation of fleets by total tonnage was to be supplemented by measures of publicity concerning the distribution of that tonnage between the chief classes of ships and by rules for the transfer of tonnage from one class to another.

"Such a system, which has the further advantage of permitting minor adjustments, may adapt itself the better to the needs of the projected understanding between the United States and British Governments, in that it leaves any States that may desire it full liberty to bind themselves more closely as between themselves. In spite of its preference for the method of limitation by total tonnage, the French Government is willing to agree to this compromise, should it prove likely to lead to a general agreement."

The second principle was defined in these words: "The preparatory work in Geneva has revealed the close interdependence that exists in a country's defensive armaments between its land, sea, and air forces. The French Government has frequently had occasion to explain that this was a fundamental principle of its policy of national defence, and one the importance of which results in particular from the geographical position of France, a Power both continental and maritime, and the metropolis of a colonial empire spread out over the whole surface of the earth."

The third: "Subject to the preceding observations, the French delegation will have no difficulty in making known the importance of the tonnage corresponding with the national needs of France, taking into account her geographical position on three seas, the extent of a colonial empire with an area of 11,000,000 square kilometres, populated by 60,000,000 inhabitants, and a trade amounting to 32,000,000,000 francs."

There followed an interesting suggestion that a Mediterranean "Locarno" agreement be concluded, to include Spain as a party. That suggestion constituted the fourth principle, and was thus expressed: "Moreover, remembering the beneficial effects produced by the Pacific Treaty on the conclusion of the Washington naval agreements, the French Government considers that in a narrower field, but one in which most of the European fleets are concerned, some progress might be achieved. Its communications through the Mediterranean are of an importance for the British Empire which the French Government by no means disregards. They are equally vital for France. Might not an agreement of mutual guarantee and non-aggression be negotiated between the Mediterranean naval Powers, to which those not represented in London would be associated, and first and foremost a Power like Spain, on the importance of whose naval interests in the Mediterranean emphasis need hardly be laid? The French Government

asks this question, declaring itself in favour of the principle of such an agreement, because it is earnestly desirous of bringing about a reduction of naval armaments."

In a final paragraph, however, the French Government conceded that "none of the difficulties to which it has thought it necessary to draw attention appears to it to be insuperable."

Now both Mr. Hoover and Mr. MacDonald had been trying to avoid precisely such an extension of the conference agenda as that suggested by France. Moreover, the submission and publication by France of her detailed views about the impending conference made it impossible for the British Government to avoid an equally detailed and equally public answer to the controversial matter thus raised. Both documents inevitably assumed the quality of textbooks for the conference, and must needs be read, marked, and learned by all those who wish to follow the conference closely. It would have been better, according to the British view (with which view Mr. Hoover allowed it to be known that he agreed) that neither document had ever been written.

The British Note was published on January 13th. Its important passages were these: "In issuing their invitation to the London conference, His Majesty's Government considered that it would not conduce to the success of the conference if the various Governments were to entrench themselves, before the conference opened, in positions—based perhaps on misunderstandings—from which they could not recede: nor in the invitation did His Majesty's Government refer to obligations contracted under the Covenant, or to questions of national security and such considerations, because they are clearly inherent in all disarmament negotiations, and must be in the mind of every nation taking part in this conference.

"One of the great advantages of the frequent meetings at Geneva is that Governments have opportunities to understand each other's respective positions and problems, and His Majesty's Government felt that it was unnecessary to recite elementary obligations, internal and external, but rather to concentrate upon the supremely important problems which have to be faced. The considerations set out in such a friendly spirit in the French memorandum will, of course, be in the minds of all the delegates.

"It is true that there may not yet have been devised a complete machinery of sanctions to enforce the various peace agreements now in existence; but in the meantime much has been done, and His Majesty's Government place considerable trust in the fact that fifty-six countries have declared their intention to renounce war as an instrument of national policy and to resort only to pacific means for the settlement of international disputes.

"Unless a beginning in the reduction of naval armament is

held to be justified by the measure of security already achieved through the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Quadruple Treaty relating to the Pacific, the Treaties of Locarno, the signature of the Optional Clause of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice by thirty-three countries, and, finally, the Treaty for the Renunciation of War, public expectation will be disappointed, the tendency towards an expansion in arms which is only too evident already will develop, and the nations will be taught once more in practice to trust only to military preparations for their security. His Majesty's Government earnestly hope that the nations attending the London Conference may, by agreement on reduced naval strengths, register their confidence in the great advance made since the war in the provision of national security by political agreement.

"His Majesty's Government observe with interest the distinction drawn in the French Memorandum between the Pact of Paris and the Covenant of the League. They would suggest, however, that the two documents may also be regarded as complementary one of another.

"From this standpoint the Pact of Paris, by its renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, may be held by the States which are members of the League of Nations to have completed the structure of peace which the more restricted language of the Covenant had for the time left unfinished. His Majesty's Government accept fully and unreservedly all the obligations of the Covenant, which, however, must not be held to involve a delay in progressive steps for disarmament for which the Pact of Paris is a justification.

"His Majesty's Government note the suggestion of the French Government that it is doubtless due to the absence from the Kellogg Pact of any provisions for its methodical application that they have been deterred from contemplating any considerable reduction in their naval establishment. His Majesty's Government desire to remove the error upon which this observation rests.

"In response to the better prospects of peace and of an international agreement the British proposals, as a matter of fact, provide for a very considerable reduction in the strength which the British Empire has considered necessary in all categories of combatant vessels from capital ships to submarines.

"In Part II, Section 1, of their memorandum the French Government refer to the system of limitation of naval armaments by 'global tonnage.' His Majesty's Government have consistently expressed their preference for dealing with the problem of naval disarmament by a strict limitation of the types, tonnages, and guns of all categories of warships, since they feel confident that

any other method of limitation must tend to preserve those elements of competition and uncertainty which it will be one of the express objects of the conference to eliminate.

"The problem of naval armaments involves not only the amount of tonnage but the use to which it is put. Nevertheless, His Majesty's Government have studied with great care the 'transactional proposal' to which the French Government refer, and are ready to discuss the possibility of some arrangement based upon that proposal.

"The French Government emphasise in Part II, Section 2, of their memorandum that there is a close interdependence between the various defensive armaments of a country, and give the reasons why they regard this as a fundamental principle of their policy of national defence. His Majesty's Government agree that the problems of naval, land, and air disarmament cannot be completely dissociated one from another, but they do not take the view that no attempt should be made to deal with one unless all are being dealt with simultaneously. His Majesty's Government consider that the approach to disarmament can best be facilitated by attacking the problem in detail as is now proposed at the Naval Conference.

"In the end a complete disarmament agreement must cover the whole field of arms, and steady and continuous work will be required until that field has been covered. They therefore join the French Government in earnestly hoping that the conference will result in an agreement which will commend itself to all the Powers represented on the Preparatory Commission, and, by facilitating the task of that body, hasten the summoning of a general disarmament conference.

"His Majesty's Government have learnt with interest the views of the French Government regarding the desirability of a treaty of mutual guarantee and non-aggression between the Mediterranean Powers. They agree that the Four-Power Treaty relating to the Pacific which resulted from the Washington Conference exerted a happy influence upon the negotiation of the Washington Naval Treaty.

"His Majesty's Government would only point out at this stage that a treaty such as that suggested by the French Government appears to go considerably further than the Pacific Treaty above-mentioned, which provided only for the summoning of a conference for the settlement of controversies and for joint consultation in the face of aggressive action.

"Inasmuch as all the Mediterranean Powers are members of the League of Nations, it would appear that facilities already exist for joint consultation in the event of need. There is a great

measure of security in this, but His Majesty's Government would be glad to exchange views on the subject with all the Powers concerned."

The existing strength of the various fleets of the world was revealed in a British official paper (Cmd. 3464) published on January 10th. It makes depressing reading, but gives a fair idea of the magnitude of the problem in hand. I here summarise in tabular form the main figures affecting the five chief Powers:

I. BUILT.

	Battleships	Cruisers	Destroyers	Submarines	Other craft	Total
British Empire	16	59	134	53	115	377
U.S.A. ...	18	14	309	122	67	530
Japan ...	6	44	106	64	33	253
France ...	9	17	58	52	110	246
Italy ...	4	13	63	43	205	328

II. BUILDING.

British Empire	—	4*	18†	10‡	10	42
U.S.A. ...	—	18	—	5	1	24
Japan ...	—	5	13	7	2	27
France ...	—	5	6	47	28	86
Italy ...	—	10	8	14	7	39

III. PROJECTED.

British Empire	—	—	—	—	—	—
U.S.A. ...	—	5	12	—	1	18
Japan ...	—	1	—	—	—	1
France ...	—	—	—	—	—	—
Italy ...	—	—	—	—	—	—

The five chief naval Powers between them spend £500 a minute on their navies. The imagination reels if it tries to fathom what that means. In general it would probably be fair to surmise that the finance of war and of its implications is a matter too big for one's imagination to grasp; and that is probably one reason why the people of the world cannot contrive to put a stop to the whole mad thing. How many people realise what the Great War cost Great Britain alone, in money alone? Simple arithmetic tells one that it cost the equivalent of £3 for every minute that has elapsed in the whole period of time since the birth of Christ.

The business that faced the international delegates who had either come, or were on the point of coming, to London when this paper was written, was simply that of arresting an increase in future naval armaments. If that could be done, something would

* Two others are suspended; two more provided for have not been ordered.
 † Eight others not ordered.
 ‡ Six others not ordered.

be done that might lead to the second stage of the enterprise, namely to the reduction of naval armaments, to be followed perhaps by a reduction of land armaments. Cannot the world be delivered from armaments?

The personnel of the various delegations that concentrated in January for diplomacy by conference was in many ways remarkable. The Naval Assembly constituted one of the strongest international assemblies that ever met in London. Some of the men were concerned in all three conferences, and no doubt found the pace a little fast. M. Briand, who probably holds the world's record for what may be called diplomatic mileage, travelled from The Hague to Paris, from Paris to Geneva, back to Paris, and again to The Hague, and then to London, all within a fortnight.

A passing interest attaches to the physical stamina of the statesman who will be sixty-eight in March next, whose health has been damaged by the strain of the past ten years, and yet who can do what M. Briand does. He has been in office nearly continuously since the war and has attended nearly all the international conferences and weathered ten years of Paris politics to boot. What that may mean was illustrated by a certain six days in 1926, when M. Briand spent three of the nights in the train between Paris and Geneva, another whole night in the Chamber of Deputies, after which he resigned at breakfast-time and spent the following ten hours in forming a new Cabinet. In addition, he attended critical conferences, gave political luncheon parties, interviewed representatives of foreign Powers and gave statements to the Press. M. Briand was by far the most experienced of the diplomatists who were about to congregate in London; but his fellow delegates from other countries were recruited from the highest ranks, and thus illustrated the importance that was attached to this conference by the world's leading naval Powers.

The chief British delegates were Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Wedgwood Benn (Secretary for India), and Mr. A. V. Alexander (First Lord of the Admiralty). They were to be helped by four Foreign Office experts, headed by Sir Robert Vansittart, Permanent Under-Secretary of State; by nine experts from the Admiralty, headed by Admiral of the Fleet Charles Madden, First Sea Lord and Chief of Naval Staff; by two experts from the Dominions Office; and by a staff of eight private secretaries. Among the secretaries personally attached to the Prime Minister was his son, Mr. Malcolm MacDonald. Sir Maurice Hankey, who has been the official delegation secretary at every post-war conference, was to function again in the like capacity, and Sir Arthur Willert and Mr. G. F. Steward were to be the Press officers.

The United States delegation was led by Mr. Stimson himself,

the Secretary of State. He is a lawyer by profession and came to the conference with two peculiar qualifications. He is one of the few leading politicians who fought in the Great War, having served in France as a colonel of the 31st Field Artillery. Since the war his name is mainly associated with a successful pacific mission abroad, for in 1927 he was sent by President Coolidge as special commissioner to Nicaragua, where he persuaded President Diaz and the rebel leader Moncado to lay down their arms. He had six chief colleagues for the conference: Senator Reeds, of Pennsylvania; Senator Robinson, of Arkansas, General Dawes (who fills the vacancy caused by Senator Borah's refusal of the invitation), Mr. Charles Adams, Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Hugh Gibson, Ambassador to Belgium (who was the chief U.S. delegate at the 1927 conference), and Mr. Dwight Morrow, the financier whose tact and common sense have, since 1927, been exercised in calming passions in Mexico. The American delegation could not have been better chosen for the purpose. They had eight technical advisers, including four admirals.

The Japanese delegation was equally impressive. It was headed by Mr. Wakatsuki, former Prime Minister, and included Admiral Takarabe, Minister of Marine, and Mr. Matsudaira, Ambassador in London. The latter was Secretary-General to the Japanese delegation at the Washington Conference (1921-1922).

M. Tardieu led the French delegation, and had as chief colleagues M. Briand, M. Leygues, M. Pietri, and M. de Fleuriau. They were to be assisted by M. Massigli (who has attended all the post-war conferences as a Quai d'Orsay expert), and by M. Moysset.

The Italian delegation had the Finance Minister, Senator Mosconi, at its head, and two other chief delegates, Signori Pirelli and Suvich. They were to be helped by two "associates," Signori Brecchi and Buti.

THE "GAPS" OF THE COVENANT.

The meeting of the Council of the League of Nations which began at Geneva on January 13th raised an issue which was likely to be the subject of prolonged and interesting investigation. It affected the whole problem of peace and disarmament, and in its immediate bearing was nothing less than an attempt to combine the juridical value of the League Covenant with the psychological value of the Kellogg Pact so as to form the most effective instrument yet devised for the prevention of war.

On the face of the matter, all that the Council did was to appoint a committee of eleven persons to explore the famous "gaps" of the Covenant in the light of the Kellogg Pact and to draw up a

greater mistrust. The High Commissioner, the late Sir Gilbert Clayton (who died in Bagdad on September 11th last) therefore advised his Government at home, as Sir Henry Dobbs before him had advised, that the offending qualification to the 1927 treaty be dropped. The argument for dropping it was unanswerable. Granted British sincerity in the promise of Irak independence, what conceivable purpose was served by allowing an Irak mistrust of that sincerity to increase and multiply? The condition was all the more easily dispensable because it was evident that great progress had in fact been made by Irak towards security, sound public finance and efficient administration. By the summer of 1929 it was clear that Irak was fit for membership of the League of Nations, that the League would run no risk by admitting Irak to membership. The British Government therefore took the wise step of deciding to burn a worn-out boat. The High Commissioner last September was instructed to advise the Irak Government unconditionally that H.B.M. would support Irak's application for membership of the League in 1932.

The milk and honey at once began to flow in Irak. Suspicion was deflated, the nervous condition which had made impossible the formation of any Government in Bagdad, was now replaced by an atmosphere of confidence in which a strong Ministry, representing a coalition of the two chief political parties, promptly began to do things, and incidentally began to ask for British co-operation in the solution of the remaining problems that would have to be solved before 1932. Great Britain now became popular in the land.

The Secretary-General of the League of Nations has been requested to inform the members of the Council that the Anglo-Irak Treaty of 1927 will not now be proceeded with, and that in accordance with Article 3 (1) of the 1926 treaty H.M.G. will recommend Irak for admission to the League in 1932. When Irak has been admitted to the League a new Anglo-Irak Treaty will become necessary to regulate Anglo-Irak relations in the new circumstances. A draft treaty to that effect is already being prepared on the lines of the Anglo-Egyptian draft treaty.

January 15th, 1930.

GEORGE GLASGOW.

No. 341.

February, 1930.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS

	PAGE.
1. REVIEWS	253
THE LETTERS OF DISRAELI; CHRIST AND THE ANCIENT WORLD; WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE; EDUCATIONAL POLICY; THE KNIGHTS OF MALTA; INFANCY.	
2. SHORTER REVIEWS: "Thoughts on Indian Discontents"; "Forensic Fables"; "A Politician Plays Truant"; "The Garden of Fidelity"	268
3. NOTICES OF BOOKS: "The English Public School"; "James Ramsay MacDonald"	272

THE LETTERS OF DISRAELI.*

The Letters of Disraeli to Lady Bradford and Lady Chesterfield, edited by the Marquis of Zetland, are of greater biographical than historical significance; but as a revelation of personality they are unique. When his wife died in 1872 the childless statesman was stricken to the earth, and the septuagenarian only regained a measure of happiness by the cultivation of ardent friendships with two elderly ladies whom he had known as a young man and who were now grandmothers. This extraordinary relationship to the sisters was unveiled in Mr. Buckle's closing volumes; but, as the Editor points out in his interesting Introduction, the official biography hardly revealed the warmth of his affections. He wrote twice as often to Lady Bradford, who was younger than himself, as to Lady Chesterfield, who was older; but each of them received many hundreds of letters in the last eight years of his life. To Lady Chesterfield, who was a widow, and to whom his letters often begin with "Dear Darling," he offered marriage; but Lady Bradford stood closest to his heart. The friendship with the former flowed happily on like a river, while that with the latter passed through the crises and excitements commonly associated with being in love. For Lady Bradford was married; and though her husband was a good-natured sportsman, the unceasing stream of letters and visits must have been a little embarrassing. Disraeli

* Benn. 2 vols. 2 guineas.

loved the society of refined and intellectual women; but he was the least flirtatious of men, and his friendships were strictly honourable. "In the fierce storm of life one is grateful for the soothing sympathy of one gentle spirit." It adds to the piquancy of the situation that his outpourings of devotion were entrusted to black-edged writing-paper. The editor's selection from the 1,600 letters fills 600 pages; but the winnowing might have proceeded further with advantage, for there is endless repetition, and many letters contain nothing of interest. The reader would gladly sacrifice dozens of them for a few of the replies. Reading between the lines it seems that neither of the ladies loved him as he loved them, and that Lady Bradford often endeavoured to put water in his wine.

Though the political interest of these volumes is inferior to the personal, they fill in the details of a familiar picture. We have very frequent glimpses of "the Faery," who broke the tradition of the Court by allowing Disraeli to be seated in her presence, and made no attempt to conceal her delight at his visits. "I can only describe my reception," he wrote in 1874, the first year of his great Premiership, "by telling you that I really thought she was going to embrace me. She was wreathed in smiles, and as she talked, glided about the room like a bird." The impression left on the reader is that the affection was mainly on the side of the Queen; for though Disraeli gratefully recognises her kindness, there is not much sign of real attachment, and the never-ending bombardment of letters, telegrams, and invitations was sometimes rather irksome to an overworked septuagenarian. "The Faery writes every day and telegraphs every hour," he once complained. Next to the Queen among the figures on the crowded stage stands Gladstone, whose name is usually the signal for some phrases of angry dislike, such as "Tartuffe." Much more to his taste was Hartington, whom he could understand, and who in friendly fashion sent him presents of game. With Hartington it was a sham fight, with Gladstone a duel to the death. Among his colleagues we hear most of Salisbury and Derby, and from time to time we stumble across some rising star, such as Chamberlain or Lord George Hamilton. The second volume is much more interesting than the first, for the exciting events of the Premiership were crowded into its later years. The chapter on the Berlin Congress contains some vivid descriptions. However busy and however ill with asthma and gout, he always found time to write to one or other—or both—of the sisters, and it is impossible to feel that the devotion was a pose. His heart remained young, as he confessed; and we close these curious volumes with a kindlier feeling for the lonely old man who may have been a bit of an actor, but at any rate possessed an affectionate heart.

G. P. G.

CHRIST AND THE ANCIENT WORLD.*

Dr. Glover, in the introduction of this fascinating book, boldly adopts the view held by the earliest and the latest historians that history is purposeful and a thing of science. Polybius asked why Rome conquered the world, and found that it was not a matter of chance but of reasoned action. Professor Bury held that history is a science by which men interpret and explain facts. Indeed (though Dr. Glover does not go so far as this) it is in some ways as much a science as the physical sciences, since the higher criticism can cross-examine witnesses and weigh results with a delicacy in the search for truth even finer than mechanical tests. But the process is especially difficult, since it deals with Man and not with unpersonified energy. But if history is purposeful we can ask why it is that Christ conquered the ancient world to an extent that must amaze the historical onlooker.

Dr. Glover asks "Did the Christian faith, or does it yet, win the world because it was or is so like the other religions of the ancient and the modern world, or because it is so different from them?" It is clear that Christ was not the Person described in the Apocalyptic writings. "It was precisely the non-Apocalyptic features of Christ's thinking that appealed to the world." Nor was the Christian faith a mystery cult, and St. Paul, "one of the great figures in Greek literature," as Professor Gilbert Murray very truly calls him, lends no countenance to the idea, and the Christian apologists did not at all rely upon it. Miracles could not be the way of conquest, since "the educated world of the early Roman Empire had as solid a contempt for miracle as the rationalists of the opening days of the modern scientific movement." Nor did the allegoric method of apology appeal to Jews or Gentiles. No known form of faith was adopted by the early Church.

Yet Christianity did capture the ancient world. . . . Christianity triumphed because it squared best with the world's best intelligence, because essentially it liberated the human mind and gave it a chance to develop to the full range of God's conception for it. We can admit that; and we can add that the Christian learnt somehow to be quicker in recognising new facts than the ordinary Hellenist was, and that he found some signal factors in life that his neighbours and his ancestors had missed. That is my thesis in these pages, and it can be summed up very largely in a phrase of St. Paul's—where the spirit of the Lord, i.e. of Jesus, is, there is liberty. . . . I propose to maintain that Jesus came to the world as a liberating force, at once in virtue of the factors He was to teach men to recognise of the personality that He was.

* *The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World.* By T. R. Glover. Cambridge: at the University Press. 5s. net.

The question therefore deals with a larger field than the ancient world, that Christ was not only a liberating force, but was identical from that time forth with this history of liberty, the history which has consistently recorded in successive ages the destruction of physical, intellectual, and spiritual slavery. Slow as the normal forces of nature, at times swift as the cataclysms of nature, the liberty of Christ has worked consistently for a better and nobler world, a world not yet realised, but one that is slowly becoming the goal of man. That seems the actual process, though man must think that Christ was much more than this, that He was an individualist and saves the personality of the individual man for life, conscious, human but still eternal. The social view of a goal for humanity is not enough.

But it is a great issue. Rome, in the three centuries of peace that followed the birth of Christ, was the unconscious host of Christianity. In that period it was possible for the new faith to adopt at Alexandria the humanism of Greece, and, so armed, to conquer the intellectual side of the ancient world and to provide a new stimulus to a dying age. Christianity gave woman a new status and the slave a new hope. After Constantine adopted the Christian faith as an imperial faith the principle of freedom was operative, and in the late Western empire the bishops acted as judges and christianised barbarian life. But Christianity remained, Dr. Glover declares, immune from art and culture, for many ages indeed.

To this day the Christian Church in many quarters, Catholic and Protestant, accepts with little reflection as integral elements of Christian belief masses of stuff derived, not from Christ, or from Paul, but from the third-century Greek (and late Greek) methods of interpretation, Neo-Platonist theology, Stoic and other Greek categories, Roman Law (in far larger quantity than the orthodox dream), and even folklore and superstition of less exalted origin.

But on this point it is difficult to follow Dr. Glover. In fact, St. Paul was a fine Roman lawyer, and Roman law has indeed given great strength to the Church in the building of the system of Canon Law, a law which St. Paul would certainly be the first to accept. Again, the Greek philosophic influence, the Neo-Platonic influence, which dates back with Philo to the time of Christ and St. Paul, gave the Church power to conquer the Gentile intellectual world and, after all, folklore and superstition adopted from an earlier world had and has something wonderful in it in the very fact of the form of its adaptation and its power in the process of christianisation of the barbarian hordes. Indeed, Dr. Glover quotes Norden as saying that the Hellenising of St. Paul gave to

Greek literature new life, and "the diction of the Apostle rises to the height of Plato in the *Phædrus*." Dr. Glover adds, "will anyone maintain that, if Paul had remained a Pharisee, and refused the new experience, he would have written, or could have written, as he did? . . . He was conscious always of a new freedom every way, with which Christ has made him free, of a new happiness: and in these he rose." Early Christian writers, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, who "claimed Greek culture and literature for Christ," and Prudentius show that the ancient world gave as well as gained in the new and refreshing orientation of a tired world which before the time of Christ was reaching out for new help, as the ancient pages of Plato and the almost current pages of Virgil show. Paul showed the strugglers after the new liberty the way that they should go. It was a sad scene, the end of the Republic, the beginning of the Empire. It was a tired world, but there was a long era of peace before it, and

The Christian came with a message of the highest conceivable morality to men and women who had failed to satisfy even the abridged standards of a pagan city, to men and women of broken will, "hardened to stone" and "past feeling," as even the Stoics said. They expected a response; they preached repentance and reformation; and people did respond, they repented, and they lived new lives. Paul told his friends at Corinth very bluntly what wastrels, what detritus of society they had been, and he reminded them of the change, the total change, to real purity and manhood that had been wrought in them.

The Christian organisation of society made a new beginning possible. Even before the adoption of Christianity the bishops began to exercise judicial functions as arbitrators, and later they introduced a new administrative order. But social reform—the social reform that is not even yet in full working—was not enough. Did Christianity promise life eternal, not in any vague way, but in the fashion that Christ manifested life after the Resurrection? Dr. Glover says that in the ancient world "it would be hard to pronounce" whether the emphasis of Christianity was on the resurrection or on the death of Christ. Was it possible for the Greek world to believe in actual personal immortality? The case does not seem fully put forward by Dr. Glover. Certainly Socrates, as interpreted by Plato, does not deny the after life. It was not the business really of Aristotle to dogmatise on such a matter; Euripides deals with purely mundane issues and the sorrows of a limited life; while Virgil felt that "one world did not suffice." It seems that Dr. Glover goes too far when he says that "it was in death that the later paganism believed." Pure intellectualism in all but the greatest of these no doubt inclined in that direction, but the masses of the people did believe in a

future life, and in the changes that Christianity made in the lives of men they saw their elementary faith confirmed. It was and is not an intellectual question, though it is possible to admit that the evidence for the Resurrection confirmed and did not create the belief for the masses of the people in a future life.

If one may venture to criticise this admirable book, it is in the fact that intellectualism, the opinion of the few and not the greatest of intellects, is the evidence largely relied upon. But surely the spiritual religion of old Rome was in essence monotheistic, the religion of the people, obscured no doubt in many ways, but holding in common the Aryan creed which in the Rig-Veda contains magnificent faith in immortality. It was to the people that the new faith appealed, not to the sophists. Israel had the faith too, the faith in one God which at the time of Christ was a generalised and not a tribal faith. All things were working, in the first century of our era, towards a new beginning in which the one God the Aryans as well as the Hebrews believed in, the one God who promised immortality to man in the combination of Aryan and Hebrew belief, was revealing Himself as a man. Christianity exactly represented the needs of the masses of humanity when everything else seemed to have failed. And that is true to-day as it was in the ancient world. Intellectualism has come to a full stop. We admit that the phenomena of the universe are merely symbolic, and religion can alone pierce into the unknown with instinctive trust.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.*

This is a delightful book. It makes the reader proud of his spiritual ancestry, and such a heritage of literature, as here depicted, cannot fail to prove itself a compelling force for all time. Mr. John Bailey portrays Shakespeare, both as man and genius, as the true Englishman: an Elizabethan of Elizabethans, with all the characteristics of his countrymen. A man with an eye to business "which was to please," shrewd, a lover of the country, laying up means for his return to his native place, and family life, entering into the activities and pleasures of the town, earning his living at high pressure, looking right through the deeds of men, and storing them in that ever receptive brain for reproduction, holding up life's magical mirror that all may see and recognise themselves, and their actions. His country's record and advancement was ever in his mind

* *Shakespeare* by John Bailey. The English Heritage Series. Edited by Lord Lee of Fareham and J. C. Squire, with an Introduction by the Right Hon. Stanley Baldwin. Longmans. 3s. 6d. net.

and in his writings, he was a patriot though his politics, and his religion, were unlabelled. Live like a Christian, and pay your debts was his philosophy, or part of it, for he instinctively knew that it contained more "than this world dreams of," troubling himself not at all as to fame or the aftermath. Life was too full of the present to confound himself with the future. He left all that to take care of itself and we, his heritage, know the result.

Shakespeare's presentations of kings, nobles, and peasants are human characters, and especially English. It matters little to him where his scene is laid, that corner of a continent which is "for ever England" fills all his pages, and of his patriotism there is never a doubt. Mr. Bailey's sketch of the man Shakespeare—for it is little more than an impression or a sketch—introduces the reader to one whose selfhood is utterly unconscious, who gilds all he touches with genius and abounding humour, "from grave to gay, from lively to severe," from the quips of the jester, to the mountain-tops of poetry. He had a profound disregard of critics or counsellors, and even at times of the laws of metre—for he was a law unto himself, and had no time for blotting lines. He was loved of the Gods, for he never outlived his powers, and if dates are correct, *The Tempest* is the conclusion of the whole matter, and he died at the zenith of his genius, after his return to his native county, honoured and respected.

Mr. Stanley Baldwin contributes a characteristic Introduction to this English Heritage Series. He feels that these books are much needed, not only for our generation, but for our children, and he looks forward to the time, fifty years hence perhaps, when an up-to-date series will be published of *Our Heritage and what we made of it*. Mr. Baldwin congratulates the writers of these books, and equally the readers, who are so happily reminded of their vast inheritance. We take it much as we do our health, quite unconscious of its value, till some great catastrophe or loss makes us realise it: that is one *raison d'être* of great art exhibitions, whether of our own or other nations. They tend to make us aware of the great achievement of the past; and in that awareness we dream of that which we may attain. There should be no panic in progression; it is the stimulus of the past that helps in the production of the future whether it be in literature or any of the arts or sciences.

The author has devoted some pages and much thought and appreciation to the Poems and Sonnets which he so truly says are often taken as read like the minutes of a committee or report. Mr. Bailey points out that "the Shakespeare of books and theatres and London life never forgets the country." We note this through all the Poems and Plays, and the loveliest things in Lyrics and Sonnets

are drawn from nature animate and inanimate. Passing on to the Plays, the author divides them into "The Earlier" and "The Later" Plays, and he gives more than half the volume to their consideration. As to the critical problems of the entire authorship of the plays, whether altogether by Shakespeare or some other hand, it would be out of place, even if possible, to discuss it in this series, but he feels that the plain reader should know that such doubts and problems exist; could it be otherwise of an author who died three hundred years ago? "None of Shakespeare's works were published by himself except the two poems which we have already discussed," viz. *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*. Plays in Shakespeare's time were not treated as literature, and were casually printed—if printed at all—for the use of the actors: the printer had to rely on the notes on the copy provided for the theatre which had already undergone revisions. The miracle remains that so much of Shakespeare himself has come down to us notwithstanding the casual processes of their preservation.

A few years after Shakespeare's death John Heminge and Henry Condell, two actors of his company, published in book-form the plays "according to the true originall copies." It is an amusing title-page, and speaks of these "originalls" as having scarce "a blot in his papers," but this does not imply that they were printed direct from Shakespeare's manuscript, for there is ample evidence that this was not the case with many of the plays, and in most probability the words "originall copies" were printer's puff, for which Heminge and Condell must not be made responsible. Mr. Bailey dismisses the Bacon theory with a few words, preferring to take the view of Ben Jonson and the editors of the First Folio, who knew and had long known the London theatre, and who speak of Shakespeare's authorship with the intimacy of personal knowledge.

After all, "the play's the thing," and Mr. Bailey gives a most interesting summary of both the earlier and later plays, beginning with *Love's Labour Lost*—probably written in 1591—and ending with *The Tempest*, which was played at Court in 1613, and perhaps in 1611. Shakespeare never lived to be an old man. He died at the age of fifty-two, and he seems to have written little during these last years of his retirement at Stratford. There are many signs of last things and farewells in *The Tempest*. There is finality in its ending, "Be free and fare thou well," a touch of pathos in parting from his "tricksy spirit," and in the Epilogue (which some critics refuse to attribute to Shakespeare, but, as Mr. Bailey says, it bears a strong resemblance, and is not inferior to many undoubted lines of Shakespeare) his final farewell:

And my ending is despair,
Unless I be reliev'd by prayer,
Which pierces so that it assaults
Mercy itself and frees all faults.

This is the Mercy which Portia invokes as "an attribute to God Himself"—and frees all faults. These lines, and the "set me free," are a fitting conclusion to the life-work of one who was always in harness and always looking forward to fresh fields and pastures new. The criticism in this book of all the plays will appeal strongly to the unprejudiced English mind, when studying the great literary heritage of the greatest of all playwrights and probably of all poets.

S. DE M.

* * *

EDUCATIONAL POLICY.*

This able book should be widely read at a time when the principles of educational policy, the principles of State intervention in education, are being discussed with great vigour in England and elsewhere. The author is not an Englishman. Dr. Hans is an Alsatian by birth who was educated in Russia, and became Director of Education in Odessa during the Kerensky régime, and gained full knowledge of education and other matters in Eastern Europe. After the Soviet Revolution Dr. Hans came to England in order to pursue research in education, and was awarded, Professor Dover Wilson tells the reader, the Doctorate of Philosophy "for a weighty and fresh contribution to Russian educational history," and has since studied for five years at King's College, London.

Few scholars are by training and linguistic knowledge more competent than Dr. Hans to produce a work on comparative education, and the magnificent bibliography dealing with education in different countries is in itself a gift to future researchers. Professor Dover Wilson rightly declares that to have undertaken this work in English, in what is to Dr. Hans a foreign language, is from the linguistic point of view a *tour de force*. Professor Wilson says that here and there Dr. Hans "has not quite hit off our idiom." Perhaps this is a further ground for congratulation, since the majority of modern books on education by English writers are not models of English style, and the wise reader, after perusing them, goes back to Matthew Arnold to disinfect his mind. The case of Dr. Hans is somewhat like the case of Sir Paul

* *The Principles of Educational Policy*. By Nicholas A. Hans. With an Introduction by J. Dover Wilson. P. S. King & Sons Ltd., Great Smith Street, London. 6s. net.

Vinogradoff, who came, saw, and conquered fresh fields in the history of law, and in the process also conquered the English language.

Dr. Hans found that there was "no complete treatise on the principles of educational policy which endeavours to build up a system of education based on some acknowledged principle," and feels that the time has come when that polity throughout the world "ought to be in conformity with some definite conceptions and should cease to be a temporary compromise between opposite tendencies." He declares that "educationists can build their systems irrespective of historical or geographical conditions," but wisely asks whether the result is a possible result in view of what he calls "some illogical residue" due to "sentiments, prejudices, traditions, and struggles." The present writer is quite frank on this subject: Education must be based on national history and, therefore, must differ from one region to another. It is not a question of an "illogical residue," but of differing logical premises. But Dr. Hans, in peering into the dark deeps of national educational history, believes that he has found the common principles that govern ultimately the whole business of the relation of the State and Education, and he proposes to be a theoretical guide for practical politicians. Strangely enough, at the very moment an educational thinker of the first magnitude, Pope Pius XI, has had the same idea, and in his wonderful Encyclical on Education also sets up to be a guide to practical politicians. Yet Dr. Hans and His Holiness look at educational things from very different angles. Dr. Hans is less bold really than the Pope, since his book attempts to summarise the results of educational legislation in the leading countries and "evolve a system in conformity with a democratic State." Pope Pius XI, on the other hand, lays down some leading educational principles and shows how the State cannot be truly democratic unless these principles are followed. His method is really based on history, while Dr. Hans's method is based on the quite modern experience in the region of State interference of a group of States.

Yet it is certainly important that the actual practice of modern States should be considered. Take the question of maintenance grants for children after the age of fifteen. Dr. Hans says that Scotland has the almost ideal system, but he goes further and says, with a gesture of finality, that "all children irrespective of their abilities should remain at school till eighteen." That proposal will never be possible for the simple reason that all juveniles would not attend school unless the University is in sight. Regimentation may be possible in Prussia or Russia, but it is quite impossible in England. We are what we are because it is

impossible. Voluntary adolescent or adult education is quite another thing. On the subject of religion and the State Dr. Hans again dogmatizes. He declares with much finality that "the modern State is a cultural State and not a religious one." That is curiously untrue of England. We are a religious State, but by no means a cultural State. No Englishman, however bad his prose style, would dare to call England a cultural State. Despite Matthew Arnold's efforts we are really all Philistines, and pride ourselves on the fact (upon which we never talk) that we are a religious State, and we hate the very name of culture, since culture (so uncultured are we) seems to us to savour of insincerity. And that is true in most parts of the British Empire, and certainly in the United States. It is the realities, not the forms, of democracy that matter, and the realities in the English-speaking world are that every sincere politician does the best he can to forward the interests of the denomination to which he belongs. It is not at all improbable that a Labour Government in England will make grants for the rehabilitation of the voluntary school buildings. It simply is not true to say that "the State has no interest in the religious salvation of its citizens." Recent debates in the House of Commons and the House of Lords vividly illustrate the contrary proposition.

The chapter on the State and the Family is very interesting, since it shows the part, and the growing part, throughout Europe and the British Empire, that the family plays in education. This chapter should be compared with what the Papal Encyclical says on the same subject. Pope Pius XI says that the business of the State in education is to supplement the anterior rights of the family. That has always been the position in England, and the swallowing of the family by the State is here impossible. The Greek theorists held the other view, but Greek culture in that respect has fallen on barren ground throughout the world, and not least in Germany and Australia. The discussions on centralisation and decentralisation are interesting. That in England centralisation has gone far enough is the general view of the citizen. The chapter on the rights of national minorities is useful, and the statement that "the only sure way to avoid the possible struggle in future is to afford an equality of opportunity to all natives"—as in New Zealand—has much to be said for it, though mixed schools would not prove an unmixed blessing. The term "educational ladder," as used by Dr. Hans, is inconsistent with his theories. The broad highway of education is the proper metaphor. But the book as a whole, with its chapters on teachers, methods, curricula, universities, is very stimulating, and deserves close and discriminating study.

J. E. G. DE M.

THE KNIGHTS OF MALTA.*

From the Council of Clermont until long after the fall of Acre Europe was fascinated by the Crusades. They were an outlet for much of the energy and ardour which the Middle Ages produced. Blessed by the Church, the Crusader won his soul precisely by those means forbidden in the West. Properly directed, the crusading zeal acted as a tonic and brought out much that was best in the man of that age. Moreover, this zeal was not merely a passing inspiration, else it could not have produced the great orders of chivalry which, for centuries, remained a distinctive feature of mediæval life. But, like all institutions, a time comes when their purpose has been achieved or their *raison d'être* has ceased to be. They were founded to protect the European pilgrim on his journey to Jerusalem and to act as outposts against the Saracens who were thirsting to regain their earlier conquests in Palestine.

When the infidel had attained his end and driven the last Christian from Acre the Orders must needs stagnate and decay or else find new work which might justify their continued existence. The Teutonic Knights took the first course, and found new infidels to destroy in Prussia. But the Templars continued to exist, living in idleness and extravagance which merited their suppression by Philip IV of France. Their principal rivals, the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, found shelter in Rhodes and endeavoured from that island to police the Mediterranean in the interests of Christian Europe. In 1523, to the shame of Christendom, Rhodes fell, and seven years elapsed before the Order found a new resting-place in the island of Malta. The Emperor, Charles V, granted Malta to the Knights with the twofold object of gaining renown and obtaining protection for his possessions along the Mediterranean seaboard. The Order remained in Malta until the coming of Napoleon, who drove out the Knights and prepared for the acquisition of the island by England a few years later.

Miss E. W. Schermerhorn has written a vivid narrative of this period in her book, *Malta of the Knights*. If she had intended to write a history of the Order she would no doubt have given another title to her work. For it is not a history book for the shelves only of learned historians. It is addressed to a much larger public, and is in its essence a picturesque narrative of a particular period in the life of an institution. The person who should enjoy this book most is the traveller who has visited Malta itself. Miss Schermerhorn creates a permanent background of Malta, the place with its harbours, buildings, and environment.

* *Malta of the Knights*. By Miss E. W. Schermerhorn. Heinemann. 25s. net.

The story of the Knights is superimposed. The author has made the most of such treatment, and the result is interesting. The reader is taken through the different periods of life in the island and sees the change in the habits and customs of the Order, largely in accordance with European development. Malta of the Knights was not isolated from the mainland. The Order, with its rich Commanderies throughout Europe, held a grip upon the Continent, as its history shows. The Order was rich, as the Templars had been, but it was saved from destruction by its work against the Turks and Moors in the Mediterranean. It was a living force and could not be sacrificed to the greed of kings because, whatever its wealth, it was necessary to the safety of the Mediterranean. But it is not only on such questions that Miss Schermerhorn dwells. She is more concerned to tell us of the daily life of the Order, of its internal mechanism, and of its material glory. We are told of the making of a Knight, of the various grades, of the election of the Grand Master, and of a hundred other things which affected its intimate life.

The Order of St. John was essentially an international institution, and one of the problems in its governance was to prevent the outbreak of national jealousy and disorder in Malta. The Langues, into which the Order was divided, were national institutions in themselves, and often prevented the possibility of a united front against the Papacy. For the Order was a religious body and as such was controlled by the Pope. The latter often acted over the head of the Grand Master; Pope Urban VIII determined to have a permanent hold over the Order and appointed, during the reign of Grand Master de Paule in 1631, a papal Inquisitor who should control the Chapter General of the Order and reside permanently at Malta, where he might the more efficiently control the Knights. Henceforth papal influence grew, and the part it played remained a prominent feature in the history of the body.

The constitutional development under which the Order passed during its residence in Malta is one of great interest. For it is a reflection, to some extent, of a similar development in the Kingdoms of Europe. The Order of St. John was essentially a constitutional body which elected its own Grand Master and was ultimately governed through a Chapter General which was convened every few years. But in the course of time the Grand Master acquired a greater personal control over the Order and was able to postpone indefinitely the meeting of the supreme body. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were an age of autocracy, and Grand Master Pinto completed the work of his predecessors and placed the closed crown of royalty above his arms. His hold was complete. Refusing to convene a Chapter General, he cynically

remarked, "These gatherings almost always end by destroying the rights of those who have permitted them to meet." He probably had in mind the great Council of the Church at Constance which three centuries before had deposed and set up Popes. The Grand Masters followed the example of France and ruled alone, as far as the Pope allowed. Pinto, if he had lived, would have smiled when Louis XIV summoned the Estates in 1789. With the growth of autocracy, extravagance and magnificence increased. The Grand Master, almost a monarch, held a court which was only rivalled by those of France and Spain. Miss Schermerhorn has given an interesting account of this development. Referring to the retinue of the Grand Master de Paule (1623-1636), she declares that he had, among others, four valets, twelve pages, four chaplains, two physicians, and a confessor. "There were twelve grooms and eight *chasseurs*, and the guards of the palace and of the falcons. And there was the butler and the steward, with three cooks and five scullions; there was a coffee-maker, and a rat-catcher, and a keeper of the storeroom," and so the list continues. In an earlier chapter we are given an account of the traditional ceremony of admitting a new Knight. He must sit "meekly on the floor of the refectory while his brother Knights serve him with bread, water, and salt, in token of his marriage to Dame Poverty." Created to tend the sick in Palestine and to fight the Saracens, the Order of St. John fell from its original purpose and gradually became a privileged and wealthy society without adequate duties. The story of mediæval monasticism is very similar, and it was well that Napoleon captured Malta and opened the way for reform.

* * *

INFANCY.*

The infant has given many cases to the Court of Chancery since that Court originally represented the King's Conscience and always strove for the equitable solution of doubtful cases, and was thus singularly fitted to correct the harshness of the Common Law or the negligence of the father or guardians or the trustees of property. But, as Miss Bicknell says in her excellent and extensive treatise on the law and practice in relation to infants, the Chancery jurisdiction could not easily overcome certain fundamental facts in the patriarchal Common Law. The Common Law had no room for the wife. Perhaps the doctrine of the unity of husband and wife was the reason, but in fact the father had the right to the custody of his infant child, and in defiance of the

* *The Law and Practice in Relation to Infants.* By B. A. Bicknell. The Solicitors' Law Stationery Society Ltd.

wishes of the mother could delegate his powers to any person. The Court of Chancery could do something to control those powers. If he were a grossly unfit person (as the Court held the poet Shelley to be), if he abandoned his authority or if he proposed to remove his child from the Court after it had been made a ward of Court, Chancery could interfere. But, as Miss Bicknell points out, "immorality alone, harshness which did not amount to cruelty to the wife or children, were held not to be sufficient to deprive the father of his rights."

The position had become absolutely intolerable in the eighteenth century, and Talford's Act of 1839 (replaced by the Custody of Infants Act, 1873) gave the Court power to allow the mother access to her child, and, in certain circumstances, the custody. A new principle was adopted in 1886 by which the Court was guided by the wishes of neither father nor mother, but by what is considered "the welfare of the child," the equitable principle upon which the old Court of Chancery sought to act, but was often foiled by the strict patriarchal law. The Guardianship of Infants Act of 1886, however, further improved the position of the mother and could, in fact, give her in a proper case the custody of the children even when she had been guilty of matrimonial misconduct. But the father was still the sole guardian and could not be displaced unless for grave reason. The Guardianship of Infants Act, 1925, in fact, established equality between the father and mother to the extent that in most important issues the Common Law rights are overridden. The Act of 1886 also gave a very important power to the mother, a power to appoint by deed or will a guardian to act after her death and that of her husband. The Act of 1925 supersedes in this respect the Act of 1886, and the position now is that each parent may appoint a guardian, and if the surviving parent refuses to act with the guardian so appointed the question will be settled by the Court. In this way both parents are safeguarded in their desire to act in the best interests of their children. It has been a long struggle, and one that well illustrates the slow but ultimate equitable processes of English law.

But the story of infants by no means ceases with these questions of guardianship. The question of illegitimate children remains, and under the Adoption of Children Act, 1926, adoption of children was at last made a legal status under very strict conditions. It is worthy of notice that the parents of illegitimate children cannot be joint adopters unless they have intermarried. It is doubtful whether a mother can adopt her own illegitimate child. Another change in the law is the adoption of the late Roman Law principle of *Legitatio per subsequens matrimonium* by the Legitimacy Act of 1926. For centuries, from the Statute of Merton

in fact, the English people have fought against the principle, but it resulted in many hard cases, so many that it was impossible for the Legislature any longer to deny the form of law that is practically operative in most parts of the civilised world.

Miss Bicknell writes learnedly and well of Wards of Court—it is curious that the Court will respect the religious belief of the parents in the matter of education while the Board of Education declines to do so—the marriage of infants—a difficult theme—the property of infants and its control, nice questions of maintenance and advancement, the thorny question of private and public capacity of infants, their liability in contract and tort, and lastly the whole question of procedure in infancy cases. It is an admirable book, and the reading of it should not be limited to lawyers.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Thoughts on Indian Discontents,* by Mr. Edwyn Bevan, is a most useful little book to read by the way, as we follow first the Simon Commission and successively the Indian Central Committee's Report, the Indian Congress at Lahore, with Mr. Gandhi's strange return to violent politics to be carried out with non-violence, and then the moderate politics of the new Liberal organisation which met at Madras. Is Mr. Gandhi, perhaps, trying to drive his followers into practical and co-operative thinking and is, therefore, not so illogical as he seems? According to Mr. Bevan "there is no essential difference between immediately conceding to India Dominion Government" and "immediately withdrawing altogether." The pace is the point, and a large part of this book consists of suggestions for the necessarily slow but definite steps by which the new India may be built up into "a nation physically healthy and vigorous, well-furnished with the material means of life, at peace with itself, able to understand intelligently the world in which it lives, ready to give a reception for new creative work in art and letters." The larger steps are of course "(1) to have sound knowledge what arrangements, social and legal, connection the recent Royal Commission on Agriculture, which was initiated by an Indian, and on which Indians and English sat together in complete equality, is commended as an excellent example; "(2) the bringing about an effective body of public opinion in support of such arrangements," and "(3) to get the necessary legislative enactments passed." In chapters on "The Way Out of the Deadlock" and "The Essential Task," subjects are taken one by one, and the possibilities of private enterprise by Indians and of combined enterprise are briefly discussed in the fields of hygiene, economics and the production of wealth, taxation, police and the army, the antagonisms which divide the population, the problem of the Indian Princes' position in a united India, the opportunities for intellectual, artistic,

* George Allen & Unwin. 6s.

and religious production, and finally, at greater length, education. But after suggesting so much that Indians can do to prepare for the great day of self-government, a better way is shown in the co-operation all the way through of the English and the Indians. The question is discussed of the effect of any sudden withdrawal of the English. No doubt *swaraj* at once, even at the best, would mean a considerable decline in efficiency. Yet, for the sake of freedom, it might be felt to be worth while. But "to give up the hope of a better India would be grievous." "If by *swaraj* you mean, not a mere absence of foreign control, but a healthy, prosperous, united, well-educated as well as a free India, then, so far from an immediate withdrawal of British control being the quickest way to it, an immediate withdrawal of British control might postpone the attainment of it to a much more distant future, perhaps indefinitely." "Since the weakness of India is the cause of the foreign government, and not the foreign government the cause of the weakness of India." "By making India strong you do of necessity make it free."

Whilst Mr. Bevan's book is aimed at persuading the Indian leaders with sweet reasonableness to choose the higher patriotism of social service, it appears designed equally as a pacemaker for us in England who need quickening up. There is no question that our attitude has changed and is still developing. It is remarked that "very many people in England have now come to have sensibilities which would cause them acute mental distress if the Government of India became involved in a series of repressive measures, especially if any shooting on a large scale took place." The ideal of co-operation in working out problems between the Indians and the English, official and non-official, is put forward again and again. There is a suggestion in the chapter entitled "The Vision of What Might Be" that "what has mainly been deficient on the British side is friendliness. . . . Friendliness means something more than performing conscientiously professional services to other people. It means entering into their interests. Individual Englishmen in India have had this friendliness in full measure, but the British Government as a whole has not succeeded in making Indians feel that it is as keen as they are to build up a better India." This is a significant remark. What many Indians long for is equality. But the Indians have their reserves as well as the English. They are different reserves, and hence much misunderstanding, which only goodwill and deliberate effort can hope to overcome. There is a chapter on "The Problem of Religion" which is full of interest. In the present state of things the consideration as to which religion the Indians had better choose, or rather what sort of religion the thinkers and students must work out for themselves, seems rather remote from reality. And, indeed, Mr. Bevan's own position at the end of this chapter seems almost too detached. However, as far as "young India" is concerned—the student here and in India—the question may be considered an open one. "Young India no longer says that this world is so incurably unsatisfactory that the less interest taken in it the better; young India is ardently interested in making this world different." And so it has the task set before it of choosing a universal religion which shall offer a world-wide brotherhood, a religion of sacrifice and service. On a later page Mr. Bevan remarks that "the situation seems sometimes to call for the great personality, and the great per-

sonality does not come. . . . If the right man is there at the critical moment it is the gift of God." Meantime, Mr. Bevan takes no notice of the new stir among the women of India. Surely that should help!

E. M. B.

* * *

Every lawyer has read and enjoyed those two excellent books full of legal wit and satire, *Forensic Fables* and *Further Forensic Fables*, by "O," who is quite certainly a lawyer. A trilogy has been completed by a final edition of stories entitled *Final Forensic Fables*.* Everyone who reads the book must hope that the Preface may be regarded in the same spirit as the stories. "To make the same joke twice before the same audience is rash, to make it a third time is to court disaster. Therefore *Final Forensic Fables* are offered to the legal profession with some misgiving, and with a definite undertaking that this volume is the last of the series." We sincerely hope that Sir Henry "O" is only being too modest and not serious, for undoubtedly this third volume is a brilliant series of short satires; the chief effect it has on the reader is to make him yearn for more. Perhaps the most interesting feature of these legal levities is the tinge of reality which is present in every story. No sketch is too grotesque or artificial for the reader not to be able to see behind it a definite connection with some eccentric reality or legal absurdity. Though Sir Henry wisely refrains from asserting that any of his stories have any basis in fact, the reader may with justification think otherwise. "The Languid Leader and the Ducal Action" must rank as one of the best in this volume. It is a story brilliantly told of a very shrewd and very wideawake K.C. ("where are the snows of last year?") who posed as a "Languid Leader" and a "Dilettante." "Sometimes he Remarked that He only Practised at the Bar because it provided him with a Certain Amount of Pocket Money. Often he would Say that it was an Old Woman's Job." Shortly after his taking Silk a "Painful Dispute Arose between the Boggesdale Rural District Council and the Duke of Agincourt. The Rural District Council Asserted and the Duke Denied that there was a Right of Way over his Grace's Best Grouse Moor." The Duke obtained Mr. Topnot, K.C., who, however, caught influenza and returned his "Large and Well Marked Brief. . . . Consternation Reigned in the Ducal Camp." The Languid Leader was cautiously approached and agreed through his clerk to "Give the Matter his Close Attention." "On the Eve of the Day appointed for the trial, the Duke of Agincourt, the Family Solicitor, the Managing Clerk, and the Junior Counsel Attended at the Chambers of the Languid Leader for the Final Consultation. The Languid Leader had Studied the Brief with Care and knew the Case Inside Out. But he was not Going to Give the Show Away. He received the Party with Vague Cordiality and Thought it Well to Mistake the Duke of Agincourt for the Managing Clerk. He then Observed that he had only been Able to Glance at the Pleadings, and Opined that the Case was about a Cargo of Chinese Pickled Eggs. . . . After the Junior Counsel had Explained the Outstanding Points, the Languid Leader Yawned and Said he was Afraid he must be Going to the House." The Duke was speechless with rage and indignation, but the next day the Languid Leader

* Messrs. Butterworth & Co. Ltd. 3s. 6d. net.

made a brilliant cross-examination and won the case. Upon the Duke congratulating him the Languid Leader explained that "One Case was Much Like Another, and that it was Quite Easy to Pick a Thing Up as You Went Along." Then follows the inevitable motto which clinches the whole story. "Keep It Up." The reader will enjoy, as he must have in the previous volumes, the excellent little illustrations which accompany each story. As witty as the script, they give a finishing touch to the whole volume, which will be treasured, like its predecessors, by the legal profession. The proper advice to Sir Henry "O" is to "Keep It Up." *Læte dat qui quarto dat.*

* * *

In his delightful book *A Politician Plays Truant: Essays on English Literature** (which has its main origin in lectures to working men and women in London and in Lancashire) Mr. Charles Roden Buxton writes wisely and well on the Pageant of English Literature—a pageant indeed—on the comedies of Shakespeare, on Boswell's Johnson, on eighteenth-century poetry, on the company of modern poets, on the significance of poetry, of comedy, and the technique of literature. It is a book that will inevitably take people, young and old, rich and poor, to the books that matter. Many critics will reject his attitude towards the work of Shakespeare. He adopts, in fact, Ben Jonson's criticism as to blotted lines, and prefers "the high, severe, concentrated unity of a work like *Paradise Lost* or *Faust*." Mr. Buxton, in fact, adopts the highly cultured attitude towards Shakespeare which in the eighteenth century culminated in Bentley's amazing annotated edition of *Paradise Lost*. It is an interesting phase of opinion, but in the last resort takes Shakespeare out of the company of the greatest poets, a conclusion that the leading Continental critics (*pace* Voltaire) have never held. But it is strange to think that Mr. Buxton should seriously declare that Congreve's *Way of the World*, Goldsmith's *She Stoops to Conquer*, and Sheridan's *School for Scandal*, are "vastly superior, as comedies, to *The Taming of the Shrew* or *As You Like It*." Whatever criticism may be levelled at the hasty construction of Shakespeare's comedies, the essence of comedy, which is the essence of human nature, is there, and that cannot be said of any eighteenth-century play. The essay on Boswell's *Life of Johnson* is fascinating reading, though the curious result is reached of making the biographer greater than his subject; however, Mr. Buxton admits that when Johnson's influence was gone Boswell went to the dogs. The current view is that Johnson was a great man and that Boswell was a great biographer of a great man. But it would not be fair to criticise Mr. Buxton's book because some views in it are questionable. The charm of the book is undoubted, and it will take the reader to the sources from which honest criticism only can proceed, the works of the great English authors.

* * *

The Garden of Fidelity, being the autobiography of Flora Annie Steel, 1847-1929,† is a remarkable self-portrait of a personality that stamped itself on all who came in contact with her, Indians as well as Europeans. In her kindly domination of situations both humorous and tragic, and in her powers of administration both in the home and

* Christophers, 22 Berners Street, London. 5s. net.
† Macmillan. 12s. 6d. net.

abroad, the late Mrs. Steele unconsciously shows herself to be one of those really great Victorian women who were not afraid to rise above conventionality, and in their work did everlasting good for humanity. Perhaps the two chief impressions given by the book are first her amazing energy and incapability, both through circumstances and temperament, of living a normal Victorian woman's life; and secondly, her deep "interest in the lives of the Indian people." It is more than probable that only a small percentage of the huge public that delights in her novels knows that her knowledge of the India she wrote about was deeper than that of the average white woman who has had to live there. She spoke the vernacular with fluency, and her interest in the life of the people was no idle curiosity; so strong was it that she set out to help them, chiefly through trying to improve native education. That her work was successful and appreciated was well proved, when, returning to Kasur after twenty years' absence, the Bengali stationmaster on learning her name "made an elaborate bow. 'Madam,' he said, 'your name is provincial, and your good deeds remembered far and wide.'"

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Mr. Bernard Darwin's book on "The English Public School" (The English Heritage Series) will be of interest to many people besides educationists, for it is a subject which inspires much controversy (for an unknown reason) among certain people who have no real knowledge of such schools, and who too often do not desire to have it. Mr. Darwin has not set forth controversial opinions, he has, instead, written on what his title suggests, the English public schools as they were and as they are: a straightforward account which takes in many aspects of the subjects, the past, the public-school spirit and type, the monitorial system, the games, and the social life, the curriculum, and the Royal Commission. He gives sketches of certain great head masters, including Mr. Almond, of Loretto School, and Mr. Sanderson, of Oundle School, whose methods still inspire controversial opinions.

"James Ramsay MacDonald, Labour's Man of Destiny," by H. Hessel Tiltman,† is a sympathetic and well-informed record, enriched by excellent illustrations, of a very exceptional and honourable career. The early chapters, describing his humble origin, his passion for education, and his search for work, are the most arresting because the most novel. A well-deserved tribute is paid to his wife for her beauty of character, the softening influence on her husband, and her services as "the first hostess of the Labour Party." A large part of the volume consists of extracts from his speeches and writings, which it is convenient to possess in accessible form. The author's personal knowledge of his hero is not intimate, though he has obtained information for his work; but friends of the Prime Minister will recognise him in these pages, which bear testimony both to his high intellectual distinction and to his warmth of heart.

* Longmans. 3s. 6d.

† Jarrolds. 2s.

THE ULTIMATE POLITICS OF THE CONFERENCE.

THE difficulty with a Disarmament Conference is the difficulty with armament itself, viz. that we begin, and perhaps are compelled to begin, by assuming for the purposes of the Conference that two plus two do not equal four.

Outside the walls of the Conference room we are all agreed that armament strength is a relative thing: the nation which has two ships while its rival has one is strong; the nation which has two hundred while its rival has three hundred is weak. Yet inside the walls of the Conference room, because we are not allowed to raise political questions, or to inquire who the enemy is likely to be, we immediately begin to talk about "needs" as an absolute quantity. "Let each nation state its needs," says the Conference cheerfully, momentarily disregarding the fact that A's needs depend on B's and *vice versa*. ("An armed motor-boat on Lake Tanganyika during the war was in every sense a capital ship," and established command as effectively as a Hood or a Rodney could have done—because there was no larger armoured motor-boat to challenge it.)

In so far as the relativity of naval power is recognised at all, it gets recognition by the establishment of ratios, "Parity" in the case of Britain and America, the Washington ratios in the case of Japan, France, and Italy. But these ratios are, of course, themselves a pure convention and have hardly the faintest relation to political realities. In the event of war—and it is that contingency which the whole monstrous effort of armaments is designed to meet—it is not single nations that would confront each other, but alliances. Yet we get X solemnly arguing for days that he cannot "sacrifice" a destroyer or a battle cruiser because it would upset his ratio to Y, knowing that the units of power which would confront each other in a war would not be X *versus* Y at all, but X+W+M+B+C *versus* Y+A+F+G+N; which would render all the present elaborate calculations of ratios utterly meaningless. At a previous conference one cynical delegate, having made a concession against the grain, consoled himself in the reflection to the rival to whom he had made it: "After all, it does not really matter, because we can make alliances quicker than you can make battleships."

The same inconsequence characterises a dozen other assumptions upon which the Conference has started. Britain and America have agreed with deep and complete sincerity that nothing shall ever induce the two to go to war with one another. Never, under any consideration whatsoever, could the one navy be led to fight the other. It would seem to follow then that the one preoccupa-

tion with which neither need concern itself is whether the other navy is stronger or not. But that is not the conclusion at all. Having settled that, as the two fleets are never in any circumstances to confront one another, and that the building by one has no relation to the programme of the other, the conclusion which results is that a mathematically exact parity must be established between the two. Weeks and months are spent upon it, each watching the other narrowly, discussing, arguing, trying to find a "yardstick," entering into elaborate and incomprehensible calculations, experts, senators, admirals, Navy Leagues, Women's Clubs, journalists all taking a hand. To complete the Alice-in-Wonderland situation, everyone is perfectly aware that parity is ultimately an imaginary thing since you are dealing with factors of power which it is impossible to equate. A says: "Because you have so many more coaling stations, a bigger mercantile marine, and finer harbours, you must give us x more ships." But how can we ever know that the x will equal the better harbours, the larger mercantile marine, the coaling stations, the seafaring population, and the rest? How can you equate such a group of factors as, say, ease of blockade, danger of starvation, industrial resources, birthrate, to, say, an economically self-sufficient home territory, land armaments, aeroplanes, and money? Factors of strength in armaments include such things, an American once remarked, as "fogs, bogs, and hogs." How many fogs or bogs or hogs does it take to equal a battleship?

Such are the questions with which the Conference has, in fact, to deal. When the tentative suggestion was made on the British side to abolish the big ship altogether, a school of American thought immediately retorted: "Nothing doing. If battleships—that is, the big ships—are abolished, then the present auxiliary, the cruiser, becomes the capital ship and the armed merchantman the auxiliary; and as Britain has so many more than America, this would give Britain an enormous advantage and completely upset 'parity.'" And in some American quarters it has been seriously argued that parity must ultimately demand equality of merchant marine as well as of navies. Then presumably we should have to establish the relative needs in that matter of an island and a continent. The reader is reminded of this difficulty of measuring power because we are only at the beginning of the problem. This Conference after all is only one link in a long chain. Other links are the disarmament clauses of the Versailles Treaty, the Temporary Mixed Commission, the Washington Conference, the Preparatory Commission, the Three Power (Coolidge) Conference, the Anglo-French Compromise of 1928, the Anglo-American Conversations of 1929, just as the Conference itself will be the predecessor

of a general disarmament conference which will have to equate not merely all the forms of naval armaments, but all the forms of land armament.

In the face of problems of such enormous inherent difficulties and complexities, it is pertinent to ask why we start with assumptions which we know will not hold water—such assumptions as that the power of two states which could never fight must at all costs be exactly equal; that power is exactly measurable; that the needs of defence are absolute, not relative, and that a basis for them can be established without reference to the source of strength of the attack which the defence will have to meet? That prompts, of course, the still more fundamental question: Why cannot we accept the commitments of the Kellogg Pact at something near their face value, getting down immediately to radical and far-reaching reduction? We have actually in England at this moment a Government made up of men who during the larger part of their careers have stood for Pacifist principles. Why is their actual policy with reference to armaments so much less thoroughgoing than their past declarations? The usual answer, which implies that all Governments in this matter are necessarily guilty of hypocrisy and cynicism, is inadequate. It is certainly not a realist view, if by realism we mean taking due cognisance of all the facts, pleasant and unpleasant alike. The men who signed the Kellogg Pact are not bloodthirsty hypocrites; the motives which prompt their hesitations in disarmament are not indicative of deep-laid plans of aggression. The explanation is rather to be found in certain characteristics of public opinion common to most countries, and to the fact that statesmen, being dependent upon votes, have to take this public opinion into account.

Since it is the basic factor in determining the ultimate result of this and future disarmament conferences, it is worth while to note some outstanding characteristics which explain the hesitations and stultifications. In any estimate of public opinion it has to be borne in mind, however, that public moods are often incalculable. One speaks of "American opinion" or "British opinion" as though each were a unit, and relatively stable and unvarying. But there is no such thing, of course, as a national opinion, only many opinions; and those opinions flow and ebb: now warlike, now pacifist. There is a good deal to be said for the view that at this moment a referendum in Britain would result in a large majority for a policy of, say, "abolish the battleship," a policy far more thoroughgoing than that which the Government has announced. It is impossible, of course, to be positive about such a thing. Appearances may be deceptive. Some very astute politicians at this moment believe that a policy of downright Protection

would "sweep the country." Others, equally astute, laugh the idea to scorn. Yet, in this matter of armament, each Government must be guided by a guess as to the lengths which it can go with due regard to "electoral security."

Take the case of America. If, in truth, Britain and America alike sincerely believe that war between them is out of the question, why need Americans be so tenacious of the principle of parity? When the Anglo-American negotiations began last summer, the editor of one of the largest and most popular daily newspapers in America said to the present writer:

The ultimate appeal in this matter will be to "boob opinion" in the United States—to Mr. Babbitt and the drug-store keeper in Main Street. They will feel, not necessarily that they have to prepare to fight John Bull, but that our ships and our navy should be just as big as his, by gum! Believe me, they will accept nothing less, Mr. Babbitt and the drug-store keeper. They will consider these negotiations a great success and will be satisfied if, as the result of them, we are able to splash across the front page, not "parity," because Mr. Babbitt is not sure that he knows the meaning of the word, but—*equality* of the American with the British navy. Gopher Prairie will then be happy and we shall understand each other. And Senator Sorghum knows exactly what the drug-store keeper feels, and will play up to this desire for equality. And why not? Aren't we as big as John Bull? That's how we feel about it.

One's first "reaction" to such a statement is to reflect: "Surely a great country will not complicate a world situation and take the vast risks of misunderstanding involved for the sake of a piece of school-boy boastfulness?" But Mr. Babbitt does not see the relation between his impulse to have a navy as big as Bull's and the complication of the world situation. His reflection on the American Navy is wedged in between a guess as to the outcome of the next ball game and the expression of a personal view on prohibition. Yet he is a unit of public opinion, neither much better nor much worse than that which governs the policy of other countries. Multiplied forty or fifty million times his talk produces a force which makes the American politician feel that Parity is the policy to stand for, especially when he remembers in this connection that America has stood intermittently in the past for the "freedom of the seas," the right as a neutral, that is, to trade with belligerents in wartime. The average congressman and senator is not likely to have weighed the implications of the Kellogg Pact, the fact that war, save for defence, being outlawed, one of the belligerents at least would be a criminal, and that to assert the right to trade with him as of yore when war was legal would be to assert the right to furnish the criminal with the means of going on with crime. In fact, the ink was hardly dry on

the Kellogg Pact before senators were proposing to "codify" this old right of neutral trade as though the Pact, which professed to make illegal what heretofore had been legal, had changed nothing at all.

On our side we rationalise our general feeling that we must still maintain a large measure of our sea power, subject to equality with America, in some such way as this: Notwithstanding the League, and even though the next war should be a public war, in which a blockade of our enemy would be mainly established by a refusal of other powers to let cargoes for him leave their ports, the naval job of the business would fall mainly upon our shoulders. And the whole League device might, after all, break down. Then where should we be? The admiralty authorities do not fail to tell the civil powers where we should be: and the telling of it loses none of its force by reason of the fact that there is a half-slumbering public ready to awake to the old calls about sea power and our dependence thereon, a public which knows nothing really of the League and how it is supposed to have altered the situation. And there is a further consideration. "It does not matter to us," we say, "how many ships America has. We shall never have to fight her. But her increase will cause certain other powers to increase; and that increase might affect us." "However strong the American Navy," says *The Times*, "it would not be regarded here as a possible menace. Its strength is a matter to be determined solely by the people and the Government of the United States. What this country has to consider is, not the size of the American fleet, but the effect of American construction on the programmes of other Powers and the strength of the fleet we should require for security in face of these programmes."

We come to France. France's concerns are, firstly, those which she has outlined in the Memorandum with which she accompanied her acceptance of the invitation to attend the Conference. The Memorandum means, if one translates pretty freely from the diplomatic jargon, that she does not believe we and other States take our commitments under the "sanctions" clauses of the League Covenant and of Locarno seriously. Her journalists point out that no sooner do we enter into commitments for co-operative defence than we begin to water down their effect. The French Government repeats what it has stated at every disarmament conference in which it has participated since the Armistice: so long as a nation has nothing but its own strength to look to as its means of defence it will maintain its armaments; to the degree to which it can look to the assistance of other States to protect it from aggression it can reduce its armaments; but only to such degree. Do we stand by the principle of the Covenant, which implies assistance to the

State victim of aggression, or by the principle of the Pact which trusts to the general undertaking not to go to war? To the degree to which the Covenant commitments are clear and binding, France can reduce her armaments; to the degree that those commitments are vague and uncertain, she must retain her armaments. It is a logic which appeals strongly to a nation which twice within the lifetime of living men has known invasion and for centuries has thought in militarist terms. We may criticise the point of view and urge all sorts of countervailing considerations; but we cannot charge it with hypocrisy or lack of frankness, nor indeed in some of its implied accusations of being altogether unfounded. It would not be true to say in the least that we do not take our commitments seriously, but we are puzzled as to what these commitments are, or ought to be. We oscillate between the two methods, at one time believing that safety consists in watering down the sanction clauses; at other times taking measures to stiffen them, as in such supplementary provisions as the Locarno treaties. It is not merely true that we hesitate between the war mind and the peace mind, but we hesitate between two types of peace mind.

So much for the nature of that public opinion which, in the case of the three major Powers, accounts mainly for the reluctance of the Governments to take a stand for direct and immediate action towards thoroughgoing disarmament. There remain Italy and Japan. If one could say of the three chief Powers that their performances are less than their pacifist declarations of the past had led us to hope, the policy of Italy at the Conference has been better than past bellicose utterances might have led us to expect. Mussolini's public utterances have sometimes been as warlike as the Kaiser's were reputed to be (but were not usually, in fact) and have caused us to look upon Italy as a turbulent, land-hungry, nationalistic State embodying some new adaptation of the pre-war Prussian Nietzscheanism. Yet she has not been a stumbling block at the Conference. It is true that she has seen in reduction and restriction of armaments a possibility of establishing parity with France which would improve her relative position in Europe from the point of view of power. But whatever the motive, the fact is that she has been far less of an obstacle to any general movement towards disarmament than has France.

Japan entered the Conference with a demand for an alteration of the Washington ratio. She wanted 70 per cent. of the cruiser tonnage required by Great Britain and the United States and 70,000 tons of submarines. The Japanese motive pretty clearly has reference to her policy on the Asiatic mainland. With the situation alike in China and Russia extremely fluid, and almost anything being possible in the immediate future, it is under-

standable that Japan should desire to be sufficiently powerful to assert her interest in any final settlement. But it can hardly be said that Japan, stubborn as she is in presentation of her claims, represents a major obstacle in the realisation of disarmament hopes. Her problem is rather a local than a general one, and public opinion plays a smaller rôle in determining her policy than is the case with the Western States.

The object of the above survey has been to find some answer to the question: If everybody is in favour of disarmament and sincerely intends never to attack or go to war save in defence, why is disarmament delayed and why does every State, while proclaiming its desire to get rid of all armaments, insist upon retaining so much armament of its own? And why does it do so with so much approval from its public opinion? The answer is, of course, fear. But fear of what? For danger from even an aggressively minded State would not be greater, but less by virtue of proportionate reduction all round. Intelligent fear would prompt an attitude like that taken before the Conference by President Hoover: "We will go as low as you like. It only remains for you to say how low that shall be." But the general tendency has been for each to cling to arms, and that tendency indicates a public opinion which might be described as a general confusion of mind. The world is just emerging from a period in which anarchy—each his own judge of his own rights—was the principle of international relationship. We have not yet, so far as public opinion is concerned, any real agreement as to the substitute for that principle. We are not at all clear as to how far the international community should commit itself to the common defence of constituent members, as a substitute for each being dependent on his own strength, which means competition.

An eminent London journalist, who pins his faith not to any general undertaking for common defence, but to the pledge of the Kellogg Pact not to make war, puts the question: "What nations are going to break their sacred oaths and make war?" The answer is, of course, that no nation is ever going to break its oath and make war. Nations are merely going to defend themselves. About the next war we know nothing save this one thing, that all its participants will be passionately convinced that they are fighting for their rights defensively. That is not said ironically. We have not learned the first lesson in the understanding of war until we have grasped the truth that when two rival belligerents declare themselves to be fighting defensively, they *both* honestly believe it. The belief that both can honestly regard themselves to be fighting defensively can be made possible, not merely because the issues on any one dispute are often complex, but because there is

no general agreement yet as to what a nation's rights are. Each must in large measure judge for himself. Indeed, so complete is the fundamental anarchy of thought about international relationship that some of the most civilised states still assert the right to be their own judge of their own rights. In such moral chaos it is often impossible to say when an action is defensive and when it is not.

Yet we have at least this to start with, a declared readiness on the part of America, Britain, Germany, and Italy, to go as low as anyone else will go, Japan refraining from reasons which are not immediately pressing so far as the West is concerned. There remains France as the outstanding obstacle. Her position has been stated. She says: Give us positive guarantees of security and we will disarm. These guarantees cannot be given. The consciousness of the international community has not yet sufficiently developed. Conceivably it may never develop along the lines of a common obligation to defend each unit, the lines followed wherever an organised society of individual persons exists. Above and beyond all the technical problems of the abolition of the battleship and the submarine, or the restriction of the uses of the submarine, or other instrument of war, remains the problem of French obstinacy. Some of us always foresaw that this would be the ultimate problem in the disarmament of Europe. The wartime legend that the only really militarist people in the world were the Prussianised Germans was only possible by reason of wartime myopia. The roots of militarism go far deeper, of course, in a France whose military literature stretches from Joan of Arc, passing by Napoleon to the Great War.

The problem is not insoluble, and in tackling it we may yet learn the power of a moral isolation, of an isolation which indeed is inevitably more than moral in that it must involve ultimately a military isolation as well. And to this much of internationalism France herself can hardly be blind. Her own unaided strength, however great she might have made it, would not have protected her in the Great War. She owes her salvation to the fact of international co-operation. No policy which involves cutting herself off from the possibility of that can be a policy of security. And this surely will be brought home to her as the sense of isolation grows.

NORMAN ANGELL.

PRESIDENT MASARYK.

IN an age of unrest and uncertainty where there are but few really great figures in any field, Providence has vouchsafed to one nation of Central Europe a man who is in the truest sense of the term the "Father of his Country," and has allowed him to reach the ripe age of eighty, not merely in full possession of all his faculties, but in a position of authority such as still enables him to shape and influence the destinies of his people. There is no parallel in history for the achievements of an elderly professor of philosophy who in four years of voluntary exile created a new political and military machine, and, after winning the recognition of the world, made good the claim of a State long since vanished from the map of Europe to be ripe once more for independence.

But if there is no exact parallel, it cannot be too strongly emphasised that Masaryk is altogether true to type and personifies to a remarkable degree a very ancient national tradition. At the height of her mediæval power Bohemia produced two very great rulers in Charles IV and George Podiebrad: but the two men who above all fired the imagination of the Czech people, even of many who strongly condemn their religious outlook, are John Hus and John Amos Comenius—one the pioneer of Church reform and religious liberty, the other the interpreter of those pedagogic principles upon which all modern education, too often unconsciously, rests. The idealism of "the People of the Chalice" sounded a new note in the sordid history of fifteenth-century Europe. And thus by an inevitable logic it was from Hus and Comenius that the spiritual succession passed to the small band of scholars who early last century inaugurated the Czech national renaissance after an eclipse of two centuries. The philologist Dobrovský and the grammarian Jungman made their long-neglected language an instrument fit for poets such as Kollár to use: Šafárik for the first time seriously investigated Slavonic origins and provided the solid scientific basis upon which Panslav theories of kinship could rest: while Palacký not merely disinterred the past glories of Bohemia from the dust in which Jesuit and German had smothered them and became the founder of a new school of historians, but stood forth as the political leader of the Czech nation from the forties to the seventies, while it was as yet content to demand a federal solution of the Austrian problem.

In the forty years that followed upon Palacký's death in 1876, the Czechs were absorbed in the detailed work of training a new intellectual class and a new bureaucracy: and at the supreme crisis of 1914 the logic of events again provided the nation with leaders true to type. The triumvirate which steered the Czechoslovak cause to victory consisted of Masaryk the philosopher and social

reformer, Beneš, in 1914 a young and untried lecturer in economics, and Štefánik, the young astronomer and explorer who made his name in the French flying corps. It was an ideal combination—the energy and endurance of youth with the ripe experience and extraordinary toughness of the older man: and two out of the three have remained to guide the policy of the new Republic through eleven critical and formative years and to give a continuity and stability such as few States can rival.

The career of Thomas Masaryk falls into three clearly marked but uneven periods of apprenticeship, of testing, and of unquestioned leadership. He was born as the son of poor parents on one of the Habsburg estates, in Moravia, where the population was mainly Slovak and enjoyed a racial and linguistic freedom which contrasted markedly with the plight of their kinsmen only a few miles across the Hungarian border. His interest in the Slovak question was thus a personal one from his earliest years, and indeed he stands as a living symbol of that unity of Czech and Slovak which he was one day to make a reality.

He was from the first drawn to an academic career, and, after some years of probation in Germany and at Vienna, he was in 1882 appointed to a chair at the new Czech University of Prague. Here he taught for 32 years, and his influence upon the younger generation can hardly be exaggerated. It is interesting to note that in philosophy he drew his main inspiration from Locke, Hume, and the Scottish school, and in the political field from John Stuart Mill. But in every subject, abstract and concrete alike, he threw his net very wide. He naturally did not ignore the great Germans, nor again the French positivists: his Slav sentiments led him to study the very divergent schools of Russian political thought, while his American marriage opened up to him a new world of practical political experience. But from first to last his studies had a strong moral basis. Starting from the precepts of discipline, equality, self-sacrifice, and patriotism inculcated by the founders of the Sokol movement, he held out a Spartan ideal to the youth of his country. He himself set a deliberate example by never touching alcohol or tobacco. In a country where the feud between clerical and anti-clerical aroused such keen antagonism as in the old Austria, and where the young man generally had to choose between the slavish acceptance of worn-out formulas and the intolerant rejection alike of dogma and belief, Masaryk was never afraid to proclaim the fundamental importance of ethical and religious principles. It may be that the atmosphere in which he breathed and thrived was too rarefied for the lungs of lesser mortals: but only the most fanatical critic will attempt to deny his constant insistence upon religion as a practical guide to daily life (witness a speech delivered in the Austrian Parliament in 1908—

one of the most unusual ever known there) and upon the life of Christ as the supreme expression of practical religion. This attitude is especially marked in what is in some ways the most striking of all his books, an analysis of suicide as a social phenomenon of our time. The divorce between ethical and religious standards and the rebound from formalism to excess and unbalanced views of life are shown to yield their inevitable fruits. The all too emotional and uncontrolled mentality of the Slav doubtless seemed to him to impart an added danger to a problem which confronted all Europe.

It is possible to detect a logical connection between this problem and certain tendencies of Russian political thought which came to exercise a growing attraction for Masaryk, especially since the Revolution of 1905 increased the probability of an attempt to put them into actual practice. His great book on *Russia and Europe*, published in 1913, was for many in the West the first opening of a door from behind which only a few distant murmurings had hitherto reached them. In it was traced the conflict of the Slavophiles with "the rotten West," the claims of "the Third Rome," and of theoretical anarchy and terrorist negation, the acid workings of Marxism upon a certain type of Slav mind. The rival creeds of Bolshevik and Menshevik are clearly expounded, and the reader becomes familiar with the name of Lenin at a time when he was still unknown save to a few revolutionary groups. Small wonder that some of the statesmen of Imperial Germany should have kept the book at their elbow, for constant reference during the war. The great upheaval of 1914 prevented its author from adding a third volume upon Dostoyevsky, whom he regarded as providing the key to the riddle of Russian psychology, alike in its idealism and in its deformity. But the work as it stands reveals Masaryk as one of the most penetrating of critics, perpetually attracted by the mystic charm which Russia exercises not only upon the Slav but upon the lover of human nature, but keenly aware of the feet of clay which might so easily bring the Russian colossus to its fall and to which some of the ablest Czech leaders have to this day remained strangely blind.

We have begun by stressing the academic side of Masaryk's work, because it is the firm foundation upon which all his political activities rested, and serves to explain the remarkable influence as a moral and social teacher which he gradually came to exercise upon the younger generation not only among the Czechs and Slovaks but also among all four branches of the Southern Slavs, and to a somewhat lesser degree in Russia and Poland.

Meanwhile fate was steadily forcing him in the direction of politics. He was repelled by the chaotic state of parties in the Austrian Parliament—among the Czechs no less than among the

Germans—by their insincerity and above all by their divorce from reality. Eventually he founded yet another group of his own, and though it never won more than three seats in Parliament, it had its own very ably conducted daily and monthly organs (*Čas* and *Naše Doba*) and enjoyed wide support among the Czech intellectuals.

Three incidents may be quoted as characteristic of Masaryk in his pre-war period, of his dislike of shams and exaggerations, whether in public or in private life. The first was the campaign which he waged, in the teeth of much obloquy, against the so-called "Kralové Dvůr" MSS. These poems, which national pride had accepted as the proof of an exceptionally early literary development, were now shown to be a skilful but thorough-paced forgery. At the time many keen nationalists condemned Masaryk's attitude as unpatriotic, but he boldly upheld the thesis that no national cause can flourish by falsehood and trickery.

A second instance was Masaryk's defence of the unfortunate Jew Leopold Hilsner against the monstrous charge of Ritual Murder. This time he earned abuse not merely from his own countrymen, but from clerical circles all over the Dual Monarchy: but he did not flinch, and contributed materially towards making such crude theories once and for all untenable anywhere west of the old Russian frontier, thereby earning the gratitude of the Jewish community all over the world.

The third instance belongs to the field of international politics. In 1909 Masaryk protested in Parliament against the gross scandals of the Croatian Treason Trial, which had originally been staged in order to justify before European opinion the projected offensive against Serbia. This affair had its sequel in the famous Friedjung libel action in Vienna, when the documents supplied to the Austrian historian by his own Foreign Office were exposed as impudent forgeries. The sensation was complete when Masaryk produced overwhelming evidence to show that the documents had actually been forged with the help of the Austro-Hungarian Legation in Belgrade, and accused Aehrenthal to his face of acting as an *agent provocateur*. None who lived through this *cause célèbre* will ever forget Masaryk's courageous defiance of the whole official world or the courage with which he declared himself ready to put his hand in the fire for the much-maligned Croat deputy Frano Supilo. But his warnings remained without effect: and there is no more characteristic incident in the whole history of Austria-Hungary's downfall than Masaryk's eleventh-hour attempt to mediate between Vienna and Belgrade and the superficial Count Berchtold's refusal to take a mere Czech professor seriously.

The outbreak of war brought Masaryk to the supreme crisis of

his life, in which his realist principles were to be put to the test. It is once more characteristic of the man that he made no hasty decision, avoided all pronouncements and set himself to a thorough and intensive study of the forces engaged and of every factor that might affect the fate of his own people. A full diagnosis could not be reached within the jurisdiction of the Austrian censor, and therefore before the close of 1914 he paid three visits abroad and pursued his inquiries in Holland, Germany, Italy, and Switzerland. It was only when a warning reached him that he had become suspect and would be arrested if he re-entered Austria, that he finally accepted the rôle of a political exile and openly linked his fortunes with the Entente: indeed it had been his intention to return home once more and gain a further breathing space in which the "Maffia," or secret Czech revolutionary committee, could be perfected for all emergencies. For while the Press in many countries still talked of an early victory, Masaryk had in his own way reached Lord Kitchener's conclusion that the war was bound to last at least three years. His knowledge of Russian conditions prevented him from believing in the famous "steamroller," and convinced him that the final victory must come from the west and even from overseas. Indeed what he learned of Russia's initial mistakes in Galicia and the proselytising zeal of Bobrinsky and others made him somewhat nervous as to what would happen if the Tsarist troops occupied Bohemia. Yet in the early stages of the war he was still inclined to regard Russian support as the first postulate of an independent Bohemia, and that is why his earlier programme carefully refrained from raising the question of a republican form of government. Nothing illustrates his "realism" more strikingly than his thorough change of strategy as Russia slowly disintegrated—till at last he won the recognition of the Western Powers and of America for a Czechoslovak Republic, not merely not dependent upon Russia, but through her legionaries at open war with the new Russian regime, and separated from her at home by large tracts of Polish and Roumanian territory, instead of obtaining a common frontier in eastern Galicia, as had originally seemed probable.

When once he had taken his stand, nothing could daunt him—neither the death of his son, the harsh treatment of his wife and daughter, nor the sentence of a traitor's death passed upon him in absence. With great difficulty he maintained his secret contact with the Maffia in Prague, while taking care that the committees formed in Paris, London, and America were thoroughly representative of all Czechs and Slovaks in exile. He was certainly fortunate in finding two ideal lieutenants in Beneš and Štefánik, who laboured in the more fruitful soil of France, while he himself devoted two years to combating the basic ignorance of south-east

Europe, and especially of Austria-Hungary, that still prevailed in England. The confidential memorandum which I drew up after a two days' secret meeting with him at Rotterdam in October 1914 reproduces his first general view of the objects at which the Allies ought consciously to aim, and is an amazingly accurate forecast of what was actually achieved in 1918-19, such as no other statesman has to his credit. His own more detailed memorandum, which I printed for him in March 1915 and distributed to a very strictly limited list of persons, seems to have fallen into the hands of the Central Powers: for it was published soon after the war in Herr K. F. Nowak's *Chaos*. A third memorandum, entitled *At the Eleventh Hour*, which the late Dr. Burrows and I circulated rather more widely in January 1916, covered the whole field of Allied enterprise, boldly contrasted "Germany's outspoken and well-prepared plan" with the fatal lack of clear thinking or co-operation among the Allies, and insisted on the vital need of a common political and strategic plan. In his inaugural lecture at the School of Slavonic Studies, at King's College, in the preceding October, he had already stated "the problem of small nations in the European crisis": in the memorandum he now addressed a grave warning to the statesmen of the Entente, which events were amply to justify.

In all this period Masaryk combined with a passion for "facing the facts" an infinite capacity for detail: he had his own Press bureau which kept him informed of opinion in all the leading countries: he found time for many modern novels, used deliberately as the key to British or American psychology, and constant visits to the cinema told him what appealed to "the man in the street." Above all, he and his lieutenants always took care to be at the point where vital political decisions might be expected.

The advent of the Lloyd George Cabinet relieved him of his worst political anxieties in England, and the first Russian Revolution and the entry of America opened new fields for his activity. In May 1917 he went to Russia, and his good relations with the Provisional Government made it possible for him to organise those Czechoslovak Legions which did more than anything else to convince the Western Allies that his political programme had a solid basis in the hard facts of nationality. After the Bolshevik Revolution he withdrew across Siberia, and I possess a letter of his from Vladivostok in March 1918 which shows how accurately he had gauged the relative prospects of Red and White. The following summer saw him in Washington, in time to exercise a decisive influence upon Wilson and Lansing in their attitude towards Austria-Hungary. American recognition of Masaryk, Beneš, and Stéfánik as an Allied Government and her espousal of the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav cause in her Peace Notes to Count Burián in October 1918 were the final blows to the fabric of Habsburg rule:

and when Masaryk reached London in November he was already President-Elect of an Independent Republic, which had carried out a bloodless revolution, and whose army was on its way back from its wonderful Siberian Anabasis on allied ships. He was now sixty-eight, and his physical endurance and fitness had been no less striking than his political insight.

Since then eleven years have passed, and Masaryk still presides over the destinies of Czechoslovakia, thanks to the special constitutional provision which exempts him from the veto upon a third term of office. Amid all the vicissitudes of party government he has managed to retain Beneš as his Foreign Minister, thus ensuring a remarkable continuity of foreign policy. Naturally enough, he had very considerable influence upon the drafting of the new constitution, which may be said to represent a compromise between French and American precedents. The powers and status of the President are probably more ample than Parliament would have conceded to any other than "the Father of his Country"; and it is impossible to foresee whether subsequent holders of that office will be able to intervene as actively or will share the fate of President Millerand.

Unquestionably President Masaryk deserves a large share of the credit for the rapid consolidation and normal development of the new State, though he would be the first to deny that he was indispensable. He has never lost an opportunity of urging it onwards upon democratic lines (he has indeed often been accused of showing undue favour to the Left), and has constantly set his face against Chauvinism or repression. While in almost all the reconstructed States of Europe communism has been rigorously proscribed, Czechoslovakia found herself strong enough to tolerate a Communist party with over forty deputies in Parliament—counting upon the radical social legislation of the post-war period to immunise the vast majority in town and country alike against the promises of subversive elements. The course of the last two general elections has amply confirmed the wisdom of such tactics. Foremost among the causes of appeasement has been agrarian reform, which, though here and there open to considerable criticism, has destroyed the most crying inequalities of the old regime, created 600,000 new holdings, checked emigration, and helped to maintain or even raise the general standard of living.

Much of the President's effort has been directed towards depoliticising the administration and promoting efficiency and economy. He has always favoured co-operation with the Germans, which for the first six years was rendered difficult by national antipathies and negations: he welcomed the triumph of "Activism" in 1926 all the more because it involved the abandonment of exaggerated centralism in favour of a moderate scheme of provincial devolution. This in its turn produced a *detente* in Slovakia, led to the co-opera-

tion of the Slovak Clerical opposition, and marked the first step towards full autonomy for "Carpathian Ruthenia." Acceptance of office by the Germans was an important stage towards the pacification of the national minorities, who enjoy a guaranteed position under a treaty signed with the Allies on the same day as the Treaty of St. Germain. Certain just grievances still await redress, but the first essential step has been taken, and it may be hoped that the Magyars of Slovakia will also abandon their attitude of uncompromising negation. The Hague Reparations settlement, by ending many of the long uncertainties between Hungary and her neighbours, should create a more favourable atmosphere.

Not the least of President Masaryk's activities has been a constant and persistent effort to strengthen and stimulate public opinion by a whole series of speeches and addresses. It is to the younger generation that his appeal is most urgent, and nothing could be more charming than his address to the school-children of Prague in which he weighs the possibility that he may be addressing a future President who in his turn may have to address their children "forty years on" from the same place. "A life without sacrifice is no fine life." "Live in friendly relations with all citizens, without distinction of calling, language, or religion. We are all equal, we must all be equally free." On another occasion he undertakes the defence of democracy against the plea that it is played out, and insists that both it and the parliamentary system are capable of the necessary evolution, but only on the basis of the widest possible education. Or again, he declares that "to leave the Church is not a positive solution of the religious problem." To the Sokols he is never tired of stressing the aspiration of their founder Tyrs towards "a symphony or harmony of the whole man." Phrases such as these, selected almost at random, may to strange ears seem a little in the nature of platitudes: to those who know the controversial background of the old Austria and Hungary they are challenges and affirmations. It should be added that Masaryk and Beneš have set an example of democratic frankness in publishing their war memoirs, and the body of their writings will form a rich legacy of mature and constructive political teaching for future generations in Central Europe.

Informed British opinion has watched with the detachment of distance but with a growing admiration and confidence the rise of a truly enlightened and pacific Slav democracy in the very heart of Europe. On the memorable Ides of March they will do homage to Czechoslovakia in her greatest son and thank her, under Providence, for entrusting her destinies in these years of stress to one of the most constructive and international minds whom this century has known.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE.

THE last Assembly of the League of Nations was confronted, both directly and indirectly, with two propositions of the greatest importance for the future of the world. One, put forward by the British Delegation, sought to establish a tariff truce between all the nations; the other, put forward by M. Briand, aimed at the foundation of the United States of Europe. These two propositions do not conflict, rather do they march together to some extent: to arrive at the United States of Europe there must first be some stop put to the race for customs barriers. But they derive from two movements of differing orders of ideas: the first purely economic, the second inspired by considerations which are mainly political.

THE ECONOMIC WORK OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

In order to understand the bearing of these questions it is first necessary to analyse the economic achievements of the League of Nations. Whilst the founders of the League, President Wilson, Lord Cecil, and General Smuts, had for their first object the making of peace by arbitration and disarmament, the peoples of the European continent, ruined by the war, accepted the idea chiefly in the hope that the League of Nations would help them to repair their losses. The first personnel of the Secretariate of the League, recruited in the course of the summer of 1919 from among the former officials of the inter-allied organisations in London, on the other hand brought to their task habits of mind which bore principally on economic problems. Finally, the absence of the United States weakened the League of Nations as a political organ, so that it seemed necessary to plan its immediate tasks in the economic sphere in order to keep it alive. It was at this point that the Eight Hours Conference met at Washington, the Financial Conference at Brussels, and the Conference on Communications and Transit at Barcelona. But, in the spring of 1921, the League of Nations was abruptly checked in its economic efforts by a complete change round in the world situation. Instead of a labour crisis and a shortage of raw materials, an unemployment crisis suddenly arose, for which the League of Nations was quite unprepared. Further, certain political problems had to be dealt with, the Åland Islands, Vilna, Corfu, Mosul, etc. It was only in 1926, with the final settlement of the political problems arising from the war and the entry of Germany into the League, that the League was able to address itself once more to economic problems.

In the spring of 1927 the great International Economic Con-

VOL. CXXXVII

ference met. The French Government, the first instigator of the conference, expected from it an industrial organisation of Europe by a system of cartels which should facilitate the collaboration of the different countries and eliminate competition in certain spheres. These hopes were disappointed and the conference, adopting proposals submitted by the British delegates, recommended to all the governments a policy of reduced tariffs. Obviously such a policy would meet the wishes of people in England who have no desire to increase Protection, but who recognise that an effective reduction of unemployment is not possible as long as England alone is left to practise a relatively Free Trade. The English economic situation requires a certain levelling of tariff dues; the problem is to discover whether this levelling shall be up, that is to say, by the adoption of Protection in England, or down, that is to say, by the return of the other countries to a more liberal policy. This last method was the one recommended by the Economic Conference. Unfortunately, in practice, these counsels have had very little result. There is a multiplicity of reasons for this failure. The people who in most countries would be interested in a reduction of the cost of living appear to have exerted nothing like the pressure on their governments that has been made by the industrial groups interested in the maintenance of protection. Secondly, whilst statesmen may perceive the necessity of a reversal of the economic policy in practice up to now, the experts who have to be called upon to carry out their decisions are still, in the mass, dominated by the ideas of the past.

But all this reasoning is of secondary importance compared with the opposition which emerges between industrial and agricultural States. The agricultural countries cannot reduce their tariffs on manufactured goods unless they obtain corresponding advantages in return for their own products. The industrial countries of Western Europe, on the other hand, do not believe in the possibility of opening their frontiers to agricultural products without bringing ruin on their peasant classes, and thus producing a profound change in their political and social equilibrium. For this reason, in spite of good will constantly reaffirmed, for months the studies and negotiations resulting from the Economic Conference of 1927 have not made a single advance. Out of this partial failure and out of the economic crisis which continues and is in certain countries on the increase the alternative arises: Tariff truce or United States of Europe.

THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEA OF THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE.

It is useless to discuss here the psychological origin and the positive tenor of M. Briand's ideas. It would be easy to discover

in that statesman's career and in the ambition which he has revealed in the later part of his life to have his name associated with the final reconciliation of the nations, sufficient reason for the rather sudden and perhaps premature initiative which he took at Geneva in September. But it is of more interest to consider the idea for its own sake and not in connection with the man who introduced it.

To begin with the philosophical origin of the United States of Europe. Many sociologists consider that the creation of the League of Nations has resulted in a complete stage in the evolution of the world being skipped. They consider that between the groups of governments and the Universe there should have been an intermediate category: the continent. This purely theoretic idea has no corresponding reality, but it has figured in the writings of numerous advocates and by its simplicity has caught the imaginations of eminent thinkers. On the other hand, as a practical proposition, the example of the Pan-American Union has suggested the idea that it would be a good thing to develop an analogous union in Europe and thus to establish the League of Nations on a more solid basis.

From the political point of view the idea of the United States of Europe arose first in Central Europe. The destruction of Austria-Hungary left the succession countries faced with such serious political and economic problems that certain observers considered that there could be no other solution than the reconstruction of a union of States, different from the old Austria-Hungary, but able to play a part in certain directions. So that the founder of the Pan-European union, Count Coudenhove Kalergi, who is an Austrian, found common ground with M. Benes, the distinguished Foreign Minister of Czecho-Slovakia, always anxious to bind up the interests of his country with those of Europe in general. M. Briand for his part saw, both before and after Locarno, the difficulties in the way of a rapprochement limited to France and Germany. France cannot abandon Poland and her other allies of the East, so that a really sincere Franco-German rapprochement which shall be deeply rooted and fertile is only possible in the frame-work of a more general entente in which all the peoples of Europe shall participate.

Lastly, the United States of Europe has also economic origins. Although the strain of readjustment after the war is now well on the way to appeasement, it cannot be said to be resolved. The growing industrialisation of the non-European States, the prodigious economic development of the United States of America, have closed the foreign markets to our industries, and have at the same time entered into competition in Europe itself. All the leagues in history owe their origin to outside pressure. Such is

the rôle played against us to-day by American competition.

Before going farther we must briefly call in review this line of reasoning, for the value of the idea of a United States of Europe and its future prospects depends largely on the reliability of the arguments which have given rise to it. The idea that in founding the League of Nations the world has skipped a normal and necessary stage of its development seems to me purely theoretic. It is only true if continents are really organic units. They are nothing of the kind. Continents are a geographical conception. Political institutions are not based on geography, but on economic facts. It is trade which determines the growth of political institutions. Trade is now world-wide, and it is clear that there are far closer relations between certain countries of Europe and America than between the various European countries. The same may be said of America. No serious American considers himself more in touch morally or materially with Bolivia or Paraguay than with the continent of Europe.

To the man of insight the history of Pan-Americanism is a demonstration of this. It is indeed curious that Europe should discover the Pan-American Union and seek to imitate it at the very moment when that union is on the high road to failure on the very ground from which it sprang. In former days it served to protect the Latin-American States from the imperialism, real or imaginary, of the great European powers. Now that imperialism belongs to a vanished past and that the power of the United States of America has become a serious menace to the weaker States of the same continent, the Pan-American Union has lost political importance and the States composing it are to-day seeking protection in the League of Nations. The example of Pan-Americanism, so far from encouraging us to found continental unions, is more likely to turn us away from them.

We might understand the political idea at the base of the United States of Europe if it could be shown that either at the heart of the League of Nations or outside it the non-European States were an obstacle to European rapprochement. But this is not so, and no single case can be brought forward in which the non-European States have been opposed to the peaceful evolution of our continent or have made it more difficult. The obstacles to European peace are in us and not without, and it is an illusion to imagine that we could arrive more easily at an understanding if we were alone and *tête-à-tête*. On the contrary, the nations of the other continents which have no stake in our quarrels can exert a pacific influence on them. It is a matter for regret that they have not so far done more of this, and possibly they have not realised all the opportunities which our position has offered. But in any case, they cannot be accused of

having embarrassed or thwarted us. The same holds good in the economic sphere. The return to a healthier economic policy does not strike across obstacles proceeding from extra-European States, but across the divergence of interests of the European States themselves. As we have seen, it is the opposition between industrial and agricultural countries which invalidates the efforts of the Economic Conference and not outside difficulties. So that statesmen who aim at a profound modification of the structure of the League of Nations appear to be the victims of an optical illusion. They fail to recognise the nature of the difficulties they are up against, which would be no less after the United States of Europe had been founded than they are to-day.

WHAT IS THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE?

In speaking of the United States of Europe, moreover, a vague expression is used, of which no one has as yet defined the meaning. On thinking it over, one may easily find several definitions of the idea, but not one has so far faced the footlights of political discussion. The United States of Europe may be a simple political or economic entente. In this case it would not differ essentially from what has been attempted hitherto in the bosom of the League of Nations, and is capable of further efforts. That would not seem to be M. Briand's idea, for he would then have aroused hopes in the minds of the nations which he proposed only very partially to fulfil. It might be imagined, in the second place, that the United States of Europe might take the form of a European *Zollverein*. But that is a hope which in the present economic conditions of the continent seems hardly permissible. In any case it would necessarily require the creation of a central power charged with the fixing of a common tariff against outside countries and with the division of the revenues received amongst the States-members of the Union. That would be to create a super-State, the idea of which is resolutely opposed by the European nations. Lastly, the further stage would be federation pure and simple, i.e. exactly analogous to the United States of America, but I do not believe that any political dreamer can think of such a thing for a moment. In these various conceptions there are not only differences of degree, there are also and specially differences in kind. Everything depends on what one expects from the setting up of the United States of Europe.

WHAT IS EXPECTED OF THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE?

Naturally, the various initiators of the United States of Europe are looking for different benefits from it. M. Briand's idea, as I have said, is mostly political. He sees in it a means of increasing

the security of his country, an anxiety which is never even now absent from the mind of a French statesman. He sees in it the necessary complement to the Locarno agreements which, however effectual on the Rhine frontiers, have left the East European problems in suspense. Now it is obvious that if a conflict arose between Germany and Poland France would be automatically drawn into it, and every pacific effort thought out by M. Briand would be reduced to nothing in a moment. So that the idea that haunts the Foreign Minister of France is above all an alliance, but that sufficiently general to have no point directed against anyone. At the bottom this is the very object of the League of Nations, but confined to the continent of Europe so as to give it a firmer base in the common interests of nations geographically associated.

The German Foreign Minister, M. Stresemann, before his death, had for the United States of Europe, which he heartily supported, more of an economic conception. What he had in view was not so much the security of Germany, who is endangered by nobody to-day, as her restoration, and he saw in the United States of Europe a means of international collaboration and the elimination of the dangers of competition which may at times prove an obstacle to the development of the weakest countries.

Finally, M. Benes, whose personal interest in this matter should not be under-estimated, entertains a synthetic idea of the United States of Europe. He sees clearly, with M. Stresemann, the necessity for providing an economic basis for the new union. Czecho-Slovakia is moreover dependent on Germany for her communications with the sea; on the other hand, M. Benes would not wish to link his country too closely with any one great power, for he perceives that every alliance menaces the independence of the weakest of the parties to it. His interest, therefore, is to sink his economic relations with Germany in a much greater whole, and to sink his alliance with France in a wider alliance. For him the United States of Europe must be both economic and political. It is the only conception which conforms with the laws of history, but it is clear that in extending the problem it is not any more easy to solve.

The political conception is evidently based on the idea that the universality of the League of Nations is an obstacle to the closer union of the European nations. One readily concedes the strangeness of the sight of the Persian delegate presiding over a Council which in most cases is dealing with problems of this continent, or the delegate from Japan intervening in the question of Vilna, or again some South American reporting on the problems concerned with Hungary. But, as we have already found by experience, this singularity which strikes the eye does not produce bad political

consequences. The extra-European nations have never been an obstacle to the solution of our problems. They have sometimes played a useful part. In any case they look upon the League of Nations as a necessary and effectual protection of their independence, and a link which unites them to the Old World. In weakening the League of Nations, which would be a fatal result of the founding of the United States of Europe, all the countries of Latin America would be handed over to the dominating influence of the United States of America and would break off the last links which unite us to them. Is that really desirable?

The economic idea is similarly based on the notion that the universality of the League of Nations is an obstacle to the restoration of Europe. Except in certain definite cases where it is possible that such and such a product of the Argentine may be in direct competition with a European product, it practically never happens that a solution unanimously desired by Europe in the economic sphere is made impossible by the opposition of other countries or merely by their presence.

DANGERS OF THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE.

As against the hypothetical advantages offered by the United States of Europe, must be placed the risks involved. To begin with America, it has often been said that American opinion, so far from being disturbed by the creation of a United States of Europe, was favourable to it and welcomed it at times with enthusiasm. That is true. It is perfectly logical for the American partisans of a policy of isolation for their own country to see in a formula of this nature a means of further separating American interests from European interests and thus indirectly helping their own policy. Everything that weakens the League of Nations may please them, but that is not the quarter from which M. Briand can hope to secure effective support for his policy of international rapprochement.

On the other hand it is understandable that American exporters long for the disappearance of the excessive division into compartments of the European States which present insurmountable technical obstacles to their commerce. But the hopes of such Americans cannot have any parallel fulfilment with the hopes of the promoters of the United States of Europe, who seek means of fresh defence against American competition. Which party is wrong? There must be one of two things: Either the United States of Europe is to be a tariff union, which will be obliged to erect barriers against American products—we should then have a new race for customs duties, and the United States of America, we may be sure, would not be slow to consider such a policy unfriendly if

not hostile—or it will be a simple economic entente and then it cannot attain the decisive result hoped for. Certainly, we also desire to see the European nations draw closer to one another but we must not expect from the rapprochement what it cannot produce: effective protection against American competition. Besides, is Europe prepared to do without the United States? Is it really to her interest to defend herself from penetration, the political effect of which is exaggerated? Is it not rather to strengthen co-operation which may in the long run be favourable to peace and the prosperity of the nations?

The United States of Europe presents a different but no less serious problem to the British Empire. What place will that Empire fill? Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, whose audacity has no limits, purely and simply excluded England from Europe. That is a radical proposal which conforms neither to geography nor to economic and political realities. England also, as we have seen, is interested in lowering European tariff walls. But she cannot join in an agreement which would bind her to a preferential policy to the detriment of her dominions. There are two alternatives: either the European union will not be closed, it will remain open to all the States who wish to join and then it will be no other than a new adaptation of the League of Nations, or it will be closed and England will not be in it. The English nation will then be not encouraged towards free trade but driven to protection against the countries which are its natural clients. It is the very opposite of the evolution desirable for England and for the world.

In the case of Russia it is to be feared that the United States of Europe, whether we wished it or not, would look fatally like an alliance and a coalition. It could not essentially modify the economic relations between the European continent and the Union of Soviets, since the latter has already in a way brought Europe into one single front against her by her monopoly of foreign trade. But there would be serious inconveniences at this moment if this actual front were given the character of a political anti-Russian organisation.

The United States of Europe raises a no less serious problem in view of the League of Nations. Its promoters have not been sparing in their assurances of sympathy. M. Briand was determined to make his proposal at Geneva, and rejected with quite unfeigned indignation the suggestion of holding a meeting of the European nations in Paris. But it is difficult to see how the purely material link due to the fact that the meetings were at Geneva could strengthen the League of Nations. There was something rather singular even in calling together during the Assembly some of the nations who belong to it, to the exclusion of others.

It is possible that some juridical accommodation might be arrived at between the League of Nations and the United States of Europe. The legal advisers of the European governments might be able to solve the formal problem, and this would enable statesmen to say that they are not acting against the League of Nations for which they entertain the greatest respect. But what matters to the world is, not the verbal arrangement but the facts. Now, there is no doubt that in setting up a union of European States, a blow would be aimed at the League of Nations from which it would be difficult to recover. Experience has taught us that most of the business which comes before the League of Nations concerns European nations. All this business would be taken from it, or at least would only come before it as a last resort when it had failed of settlement before, that is to say, in most cases when it had become insoluble. The League of Nations Council would not meet so often; it would lose its authority and its *esprit de corps*; it is at the heart of the European union that statesmen meet. When there was a desire to invite the representatives of the extra-European nations, the latter would no doubt scarcely be interested in an institution the object of which would in most cases be non-political. In fact, the first result of the United States of Europe would be to hand over without counter-balancing factors the States of Latin America to the United States of America, and Asia to the Soviets. Is that what is desired?

To hope that the League of Nations could be kept alive with the rhythm of to-day after three-quarters of its province had been taken from it is pure illusion. The League of Nations would continue perhaps to exist in title, but its rôle would be reduced to nothing and we should reach a continental organisation of the world which, far from eliminating conflict, would be likely to favour it and render it much more serious.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

Must we draw from this perhaps rather pessimistic but by no means unreal forecast, the conclusion that all is for the best in the best of all worlds and that nothing can be done to draw the European countries together? That is not at all my opinion. For it must be conceded that, even if one has no joy of it, the European idea is beginning to shape itself in the consciousness of the intellectual *élite* if not among the people, and they must be taken into account. The great art of politics is to make use of the spiritual. Here is a spiritual idea to be used and it would be very wrong to check it. Neither the League of Nations nor the cause of peace would gain by so doing.

But what is important to demonstrate is that the mechanism of

the League of Nations suffices perfectly to allow of the drawing together of the European countries to the extent of their own desire and as their interests require. There is no need to demolish an institution, the foundation of which has cost our generation so much bloodshed, in order to secure a result which can be achieved as well and even better within its framework. What is wanted in politics? Security and disarmament. The League of Nations has already done a considerable piece of work in this direction. The Kellogg Pact, which is not purely European, has come to complete it. It may be said without exaggeration that the security of the nations is assured in the eyes of all who believe in the force of law. As for those who believe only in force of violence, they will be no more satisfied by inter-European arrangements for which the sanction, again, will be purely moral.

If disarmament has not made parallel progress with security, it is precisely because the nations have not yet become convinced of the force of law and the efficacy of international engagement. But there is also another reason of which it is worth while to say a few words here. The Geneva Protocol or, in default of the act itself, its principles, were not acceptable to Great Britain and in consequence have not been put into force by the other signatories, precisely for the reason that the United States had no participation in them. When the time came to seek for security in inter-European arrangements the United States would no more participate in them than before, and the obstacle which prevented the enforcement of the Geneva Protocol would reappear again in full strength. The solution of the problem of disarmament must be sought not in the isolation of Europe, but in a growing rapprochement between continents. This is what the MacDonald government is doing at this moment. This is the result which may be hoped for from a combination of the Kellogg Pact and the Naval Conference, and it is a policy which in principle is exactly the reverse of the one which has been called the United States of Europe.

It is possible that on certain points special arrangements may become necessary to meet the conditions of life in certain countries. In what direction does the Pact of the League of Nations raise difficulties? I do not, in principle, greatly favour such agreements, which easily run the risk of looking like alliances, but in all cases where they are necessary they are possible and the proof is that they exist in various parts of the world. The United States of Europe would, therefore, politically be either useless, or superfluous, or even mischievous. In the economic sphere nothing prevents the nations—and they have done it several times—from negotiating agreements which do not involve all of them, under the auspices of the League of Nations. A convention is open to

the signature of all the States, but those alone whose interest it is to join it, sign. In these conditions the universality of the League of Nations is safeguarded, but in a practical way, and the special interests of certain States are safeguarded also.

Thus it is perfectly possible to plan a tariff agreement which only certain European States would adhere to whose conditions are alike. It is even likely that in this case not all the European States would be able to take part in such an arrangement, for some have interests very similar to those of extra-European States. It is easy to record, in fact, that the dividing line is not between Europe and the rest of the world. It is between the industrial countries of which the most powerful is North America, and the agricultural countries which may be found dispersed in Europe, in America, in Asia. That is why the system of the convention open to the signature of all and signed only by those interested in the act is in effect much more supple than a purely European agreement.

The suggestion of the creation of an international organisation limited to Europe is of such importance, and involves such diverse consequences, that it is not possible to attempt to sound its depths in a few pages. But I hope I have shown that it is not worth while for a result, of which the least that can be said is that it is problematic, to shake to its foundations the machinery for universal peace which we have taken so much trouble to set up.

WILLIAM MARTIN,
Foreign Editor of the *Journal de Genève*.

DEMOCRACY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE.*

I

THERE is much that is reminiscent of the *Republic* in Dr. Lindsay's *Essentials of Democracy*. Perhaps it could hardly be otherwise: he has kept house with Plato for a good part of his life. He is a Platonist in politics; not in his conclusions (for unlike Plato he believes in democracy), but rather in the method he follows. Reason goes exploring through his pages, as she does through the pages of the *Republic*, seeking her quarry *ἡ ἀνὸς λόγος φέρη*. And just as Socrates seeks to understand "polity" and its "righteousness" by comparing the large letters of the State with the small letters of the individual, so Dr. Lindsay follows a "procedure of trying to understand political democracy by the study of non-political democratic societies."

The "non-political democratic societies" which he studies are the Free Churches. He is thus a Presbyterian in politics as well as a Platonist. ("Presbyterian" is perhaps not the right word: lecturing in a Quaker College, Dr. Lindsay has naturally drawn on the experience and the spiritual riches of the Quaker meeting-house, as well as on the records of the earlier Puritans.) He starts from the *Clarke Papers*, and from the debates on government in the New Model Army which they record. Here were men, imbued to their very core with the spirit of free churchmanship, struggling, as in the sight of God, to translate that spirit into political ideas and institutions. What is to be learned from their struggle? Well, one lesson is to be found in a saying of Colonel Rainboro (and it is a saying which recurs in the pages of the *Essentials*): "Really I think the poorest he that is in England has a life to live as the richest he." But profound as is that lesson, there is another to be learned which is deeper still; and that is to be found in the argument of Oliver Cromwell. It is not an argument packed into a pithy saying: Cromwell, in his wrestlings with thought, could never get the wisdom he found into a nut-shell. But briefly it is this—that just as, by frank and open discussion among men wishing to learn the will of God, you attain a "sense of the meeting" which you follow, so, by the same sort of discussion among men wishing to learn the general will of the community, you collect a similar "sense of the country" which you similarly follow.

One who, like the present writer, has been seeking to learn and

* A. D. Lindsay. *The Essentials of Democracy*. (William J. Cooper Foundation Lectures at Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania.) Oxford University Press. 1929.

J. A. Hobson. *Wealth and Life: A Study in Values*. Macmillan & Co. 1929.

Nello Rosselli. *Mazzini e Bakounine*. Turin. 1927.

to teach a similar lesson—that discussion is the salt of life, and that a nation which has learned the way of discussion has found its soul and achieved self-government—can have no quarrel with Dr. Lindsay on his main thesis. "Agreed," one may answer to his contention that the democratic State is not a "will-State," based upon and governed by any plurality or even unanimity of wills, but a "common-life State," based upon and governed by a process of discussion which discovers the essential purposes of the common life, or, in other words, the "general will" of the community. "Agreed again," one may say at once to his adoption of the fine Quaker idea of the "sense of the meeting," the sense which comes from communion of minds and communication of ideas, when men think themselves together into the acceptance of an emergent truth which is better than any voting on the basis of a majority of wills. Where divergence comes, and it becomes less easy to say "Agreed," is when we turn from the thesis to its application; from the principle of discussion to the method of discussion, the area of discussion, the focus at which the rays of discussion are all to converge and meet. To some there appears to be, in this matter of politics, the single focus of the nation, organised by its own action into the single and unique legal association called the State, of which we are all members and citizens, and in terms of which, on the one common basis of our citizenship, we conduct political discussion. The State, on this view, is the one common and comprehensive organ of national community; and it is in terms of the State, as citizens of the State, that we must find the "sense" of the community. Dr. Lindsay, on the other hand, though he is in no way blind to the existence of national community, and though he recognises clearly enough "how continually there is a conflict between group interests and the community as a whole," none the less seems to let his thought run in what may be called, for brevity and not for obloquy, a syndicalist direction.

He has a multiplicity of foci. Sometimes the foci are arranged hierarchically, as in the Presbyterian model (which may also be called the Soviet model), where "we find the process of representation at its best," and where "the congregation is represented at the Presbyteries as Presbyteries are represented at Synod and General Assembly." Sometimes, less hierarchically, but not without some allowance for the harmonisation and co-ordination to be achieved by "the political machinery" (but is it only machinery?), Dr. Lindsay points to "the vast deal of public discussion and political education focused by universities, by churches, and by all kinds of cultural associations"; and he marvels "how much is already done by non-political associations like churches and univer-

sities to create a disinterested and real public opinion." One may ask how far churches and universities, if they act according to their own true and intrinsic nature, can "focus political education." One may ask again (and this is the vital question), whether the State does not call us out of our groups (in whose life we are justly enough immersed, *so far as their purposes go*) to contribute any rays that are in us to the common and comprehensive focus of its general common life. In this connection the history of Massachusetts in the seventeenth century is significant. As long as the men of Boston let their thoughts converge on the focus of the Church, they made their State an oppressive theocracy. (The story is written in Dr. Truslow Adams's *Founding of New England*.) When they began to think as citizens, in terms of a common civic life, they found again their old English liberty, and they made it a greater liberty. The churches have their lessons, as Dr. Lindsay abundantly shows. They have also their warnings.

We each bring our particular experience of life, and our particular interests in life, to our interpretation of the State. It would be impertinent to analyse the experience or the interests which the author of these *Essentials* has brought to their writing. But perhaps it is not unjust to say that they have led him, in one way, to minimise the State, and, in another way, to maximise its importance. So far as the State is "political machinery," it appears in the pages of the *Essentials* as a poor thing—"still largely a scene of conflicts for power and of irrational enthusiasms." So far as it is a "common life," it appears as a large thing—"concerned not only with satisfying individual demand, but with moral issues, with upholding a certain standard and manner of life." To the writer of these pages, with his own particular bias, the State appears as at once something more and less than it appears to Dr. Lindsay. It is more in the sense that its political machinery has more value. One who has lectured for many years on English Constitutional History cannot but acquire a deep sense of the value of a "law-State" which has guaranteed men's rights with singular success, and of a "free State" which has developed, again with singular success, the working of a representative assembly and a system of responsible government. It is easy to smile at the pæan on the English constitution with which Blackstone concludes his *Commentaries*; and yet, after all, what a scheme of ordered law and organised liberty it is, and how it lets each of us build up his own life in its shelter! So the State is more to the writer than it is to Dr. Lindsay; and yet again it is less. For it is not concerned with moral issues, but only with the one issue of providing that legal framework of life within which all moral issues must be freely settled by individuals for themselves. Perhaps

the divergence between the author and his reviewer is only verbal; for Dr. Lindsay himself writes that "compulsory morality is a contradiction in terms." But there are times when words are important, and in days when uninstructed goodwill is apt to cry to the State, "you must make men sober," it is important to say that the State has no direct moral function. Its business is simply to guarantee rights of persons; and the persons who are guaranteed these rights must make their life for themselves. The rights of persons (persons acting individually, persons acting collectively) are a vast enough problem for any State; and they will remain a vast enough problem for many generations to come. What, for example, are the rights of the persons who work together in a mine or a factory, in respect of conditions of labour, in respect of the methods of fixing and the rates of wages, and in other respects as well? It is a question still to be settled. But it is best settled, as all questions in the State are best settled, under the head of "rights of persons." For persons are the ultimate; and the common life itself is simply an instrument of persons.

II

Is this the proper frame of mind in which to approach Mr. Hobson's *Wealth and Life*? Let us postpone our answer, and begin with an expression of frank admiration for his achievement. It is now thirty-five years since Mr. Hobson published the *Evolution of Modern Capitalism*; nor was that his first work. For the allotted span of man, and beyond, he has wrestled, *non sine pulvere nec sine corona*, with the problems of social, political, and economic life. At the age of seventy-one he has published a treatise as it were *de Concordantia Catholica*: he has tried a bout with the most formidable of problems—that of reconciling economic with human values, of adjusting the values which we readily express in terms of money to the values which we try to express in terms of quality of life. This or that thing (we may say), or again this or that service, is worth this or that amount when it is appraised by the coarse thumb and finger of the market. But what is it really worth? How much does it count if we seek to appraise it as a contribution to the total life of a human society? How, again, if there be a discrepancy (as there often is), can we adjust the monetary to the vital value? And finally, what are the limits to the possibility of such adjustment?

This, as we have said, is a formidable problem; and the wrestling is bound to be arduous. Mr. Hobson's is in many ways a difficult book, partly for reasons of style and partly for reasons of substance. Dr. Lindsay, following his master Plato, wrestles in the *palæstra*

with the simple nude problem: he has only five footnotes, giving the source of as many quotations: he cites, and he controverts, no "authorities." It is a matter of pure lucid dialectic. Mr. Hobson anxiously confronts all views: he collects, and seeks to co-ordinate, a large variety of authorities; he wrestles, by the way, with Professor Pigou, and he is already fatigued when he comes to grips with his own main problem. The anxiety of this conscientiousness is the enemy of lucidity. The author of *Wealth and Life* has eagerly frequented the oracles of many philosophies—evolution, holism, emergence; but the oracles have confused his own utterance. He seems like a Samson struggling with a pillar which multiplies itself, and cannot be pulled down because it is always reappearing in a new form. Or again he is a David who has gone out against Goliath, not with a sling and five smooth stones out of the brook, but with a library. Sometimes, too, the very words puzzle the reader. We read of "sympathy and synesis," and we ask, "What is synesis?" Or again, we find "needs and equatics"; and we say, "But what is equatics?"

But it would be levity, and worse, if we did not hasten from these outer matters of arrangement and style to the solid core of Mr. Hobson's book. It is informed by serious and constructive goodwill: it is packed with arduous thought. But there is one difficulty of substance which confronts the student of its philosophy. That difficulty may be expressed in the single word "organic," a word which recurs throughout *Wealth and Life*. The author is concerned, as we have seen, with the problem of valuation not merely in the partial terms of money, but also in what may be called the total terms of human life—a human life, we must add, which is a life lived in society. Concerned with that problem, and seeking to speak in total terms, he is led to use the word "organic" to express his central idea. But the word occurs and recurs in various senses. Now it is organic as opposed to inorganic in nature: now it is organic as opposed to discrete or particular in individual human life: now it is organic as opposed to discrete or particular in general social life. Much depends on the exact sense of this word; but it becomes Protean, and it twists in the reader's hands.

What is it, after all, in terms of which final values must be graded, and "greater" and "less" be predicated? If the answer is "Life," we may ask, "Life in what sense—the biological sense (which sometimes seems meant), or some other and higher sense (which generally seems what is intended)?" If, again, the answer is that the valuable is the "organic," we ask, "What is the whole to which the organic is instrumental—the total human personality,"

* "We shall perhaps do better to seek our standard in the conception of man as a psycho-physical organism" (p. 16).

or some total social personality,* if there be such?" Mr. Hobson wrestles hard with his problem of the One and the Many, Unity and Difference, Society and the Individual. It appears, we may say, in two forms. In one form the question is a question of *prima philosophia*: it is the question whether the whole, in terms of which and by their contribution to which we must measure the value of things and actions, is a group-person with a group-life, or the individual person and the individual life. In the main Mr. Hobson seems to lean to the former view: he appears to incline to the doctrine of the "social determination" of values, both in the higher sense that final values *should be* determined in terms of the common life of society, and in the lower sense that economic values *are* determined by social forces. Yet the issue is never quite clear; and the measurement of human value is left uncertain because the canon of measurement fluctuates. In another form the question of the One and the Many is a question of the classification of sciences. If economic values have to be adjusted to the larger values, what is to be the relation of economic science to the larger science (or shall we say "method"?) of social philosophy? In answering this question Mr. Hobson deserts the word "organic" for the word "federal." By the use of that word he inclines to the Many. But there are, he remarks, degrees of federation. In the older conception "the unity of the social sciences was a loose federation of substantially autonomous bodies, with social philosophy as a sort of brooding over-thought." In the new conception for which he stands "we approach a system which is nearer to a federal State than to a federation of States." But will economic science consent to be federalised? And is social philosophy sufficiently strong for its federal task of co-ordination?

We may disagree with, or be puzzled by, Mr. Hobson's essays in general philosophy. But there is acute analysis and accumulated wisdom of life in his treatment of particular and actual problems. When in his third book, on the ethics of economic life, he analyses the conditions under which wealth is produced and distributed, and the processes of economic valuation by which it is measured, he has much to say which it is good for every reader to mark and learn and inwardly digest. His fourth book, on organic reforms of the economic system, is more than half of the entire volume; and it contains the constructive proposals which he makes for the adjustment of the economic system to what is desirable (as opposed to what is desired) in the life of society. The adjustment is in no sense Procrustean; and the writer seeks honestly to square the

* "I object to the assumption that this welfare can always be carved up into the separate welfares of individual persons. There is a genuinely collective enjoyment of 'joys that are in widest commonalty spread'" (p. 36).

requirements of theory with the exigencies of practical life. If he believes that the communist ideal is an ethically sound ideal, he recognises that a reasonable socialism must face the conditions which it finds; if he believes that each should receive from society according to his needs, he also admits that society may have to offer far more than that amount in order to elicit contributions which are necessary to its welfare, but will not, or may not, be forthcoming on lower terms. Again, while he recognises abundantly the problem of the distribution of income, he recognises no less generously the problem of the distribution of leisure. Life, he feels, is an art; and men must be free to live it with the grace that befits an art. Ideally it is the end of economics to get rid of itself; to reduce to a minimum the heavy and the weary weight of economic processes; to liberate energy to play upon "those 'unbought graces of life,' those free creative activities, in which production and consumption are fused in costless satisfactions." These are the last words of the book. They are noble words. It is as if the veteran economist, at the end of all his labours, consumed himself upon the pyre, in confident hope of the new Phoenix which should arise from his ashes. We may deprecate the immolation; we can only applaud the devotion.

III

Side by side, with these two English works the writer has had occasion of late to read a work, by a young Italian scholar, on the struggle between Mazzini and the Russian Bakunin during the twelve years of the Labour movement in Italy between 1860 and 1872. It is a work of steady research and judicial temper, marked by no "tendency" except a passion for historical truth. Unlike the *Essentials* of Dr. Lindsay and the *Wealth and Life* of Mr. Hobson, Nello Rosselli's *Mazzini e Bakounine* is simply a piece of historical inquiry. And yet it lives—because Mazzini lives still as a prophet, and Bakunin lives still as an embodied fact in the social system of contemporary Russia. The illustrator who has designed the cover of the book conveys the lesson in an allegorical picture. A spider, adorned on his back with the hammer and sickle which are the arms of the Russian Republic, is spinning what appears to be a cobweb of oblivion over a volume which bears as its title the motto of Mazzini—"God and the People." It is a service to Italy, which counts among its "titles manifold" to the world's esteem the noble teaching of Mazzini, that the last epoch of his life should be commemorated by Signor Rosselli. Englishmen, as well as Italians, may venerate the memory of Mazzini. He had connections, and friends, and influence, not only in the ranks of English Liberalism, but also in the ranks of the English working-class movement; and

Marx himself, in 1866, could lament "the old Mazzinianism of Odger, Howell, and Cremer." Not only so, but his whole teaching has its deep appeal to our English way of thinking. If Dr. Lindsay in our day expounds the "essentials of democracy" in close connection with the life of the Christian Churches, Mazzini, in his own way, had achieved, and he proclaimed, a similar faith. If Mr. Hobson can seek to adjust economics to the common life of society, that was also Mazzini's constant search; and though his synthesis was perhaps too facile, and his dream of a collective humanity reconciling labour with capital as well as nation with nation was too visionary, the synthesis and the dream have still their power. Behind them was a religious faith—a faith which can still make men's hearts grow within them; and Mazzini, knowing and acknowledging that there were mountains in the way, yet trusted to faith to remove them. *La nuova fede* (so Signor Rosselli expresses his hopes), *che scenderà inevitabilmente a illuminare tutti i cuori, renderà attuabile e semplice quel che appare impossibile o arduo*. Knowing and feeling the need of faith, Mazzini fought hard against the enemy, which he called *materialismo*; and the story of his fight with Bakunin (the atheist and would-be economic realist) is the story of the fight of faith with materialism. Bakunin could laugh at him "as the last great priest of that religious metaphysical and political idealism, *che se ne va*"; but Mazzini survives the laughter. Signor Rosselli well says, in a fine passage, that you comprehend and love Mazzini: you study and admire Marx. But you only comprehend and love if you have the same ultimate faith: *chi non sa vibrare con lui, chi non s'abbandona a lui, non lo comprende*.

Signor Rosselli's book has glow and movement as well as scholarship and a quiet judicial temper. In his preface he promises another volume, carrying the thread of the story, which he has here dropped in 1872, down to the beginning of the twentieth century. It is sincerely and earnestly to be hoped, in the name and the cause of scholarship and sound learning, that he may enjoy the opportunity to complete his researches. There is nothing biased in his work. He does not, it is true, agree with the communism of Marx and Bakunin; but his criticism is fair criticism. He is a scholar of whom the masters who have taught him may well be proud; for he knows how to seek and to state the truth, and to state it dispassionately and clearly.

ERNEST BARKER.

THE CARTWRIGHT INTERVIEW OF AUGUST, 1911.

EVERYWHERE the air was charged with electricity. The quarrel between France and Germany over Morocco, which in 1905 had assumed such grave aspects but calmed down later on the change of ministers in France until the Conference of Algiers caused the flame to burst forth afresh, was once more raging fiercely in the summer of 1911. Kiderlen-Wächter had sent the cruiser *Panther* to Agadir, and had thereby roused public opinion not only in France but also in England. A threatening speech by Mr. Lloyd George, addressed to Germany from the Mansion House, seemed to pour oil on the flames. At that time, as was my annual custom, I was staying at Marienbad, which was still a rendezvous for diplomats of the Western Powers and English politicians, a tradition inherited from the days of Edward VII. The British Ambassador at the Court of Vienna, Sir Fairfax Cartwright, had always been near the King, and remained true to his old habit of visiting the spa even after the death of his Majesty. Crozier, the French Ambassador in Vienna, could always be seen in Cartwright's company. They seemed joined together like the Siamese twins; or rather the twins were Crozier, an elderly bachelor, and the Cartwright couple. As a publicist, moving with, and disquieted by, the trend of events, I held it to be my duty to utilise my acquaintance with the French as well as the British Ambassador to learn the opinions of their Governments regarding Germany. I believed myself to have a nose for the political forces of the time and I smelt something like powder. Lloyd George's speech showed that the British statesman wished to warn Germany not to go too far in charging France with infringing the Act of Algiers or in demanding, in compensation for the expedition to Fez, perhaps the whole French Congo. On August 20th, I had visited Crozier and there met his school friend, the Roumanian Minister in Vienna, Alexander Lahovary, who some years previously at an intimate dinner had introduced me, also at Marienbad, to a third school friend of this set, Joseph Reinach.

During this hot season, when in a political sense as well flames seemed to shoot out of the ground, it was impossible not to speak of Morocco. And so we discussed the Moroccan conflict. After a long conversation in the presence of Lahovary, in which the lively Roumanian joined, I left Crozier who was staying at the Grünes Kreuz next to the Hotel Weimar, and immediately made some notes, as I was convinced of the importance of letting the world know the views of the French Government regarding the pending Franco-German negotiations about Morocco and the eventual com-

pensations to Germany. In the evening I telephoned my notes to the *Neue Freie Presse* in Vienna, insisting with the greatest emphasis that neither the name of the French diplomat nor the place where the conversation had occurred was to be divulged on any condition. Thus, at the outset, all traces that might lead to the source of a very important communication were to be obliterated. The *Neue Freie Presse* published in a leading article the conversation with Crozier in the following form:

GERMANY AND FRANCE IN A SERIOUS MOOD.

PAUSE IN THE NEGOTIATIONS.

(From an accurately informed diplomatic personage.)

On a journey, August 21st, 1911.

One of our correspondents has just received the following communication from a diplomatic French source:

"It is no use being too pessimistic about the delay in the negotiations. Accurate information has to be obtained just because so many details and technical questions have to be dealt with. It cannot be expected that the Berlin Ambassador Cambon should be so accurately informed on all details. If it were a matter of big things the negotiations would proceed more easily and quickly. Negotiations involving millions or milliards are frequently more quickly settled than those in which it is a question of defining small economic advantages. If the interests of both parties can be co-ordinated, the Treaty of 1909 between Germany and France will have to be supplemented on some points. Endeavours will be made, I may say, to fix the percentage of the shares of France and Germany in certain undertakings. But Germany is negotiating and must negotiate on the ground of the certainty that France has in no way violated the Treaty of Algiers. If France had really violated it, other States besides Germany would have objected. Quite a dozen have signed the Treaty of Algiers and not one dreams of asserting that France has violated it. As no violation of the Treaty by France has occurred, the present negotiations are intended to remove subsequent difficulties, difficulties due to the fact that at first many details relating to the economic advantages of Germany were not foreseen.

"The negotiations will probably only be terminated after some weeks. I believe one should not be too pessimistic, but I admit it would not be well to look at things too favourably. The situation must to-day be regarded with some seriousness in view of the fact that French sensibilities have already been hurt. The mind of the French people has been seriously stirred. A feeling prevails in Paris that the German statesmen have committed serious psychological errors dating back for years and that these have latterly been repeated. Delcassé in his day was not really defeated by Germany, but it was a satisfaction for Germany, and Paris abstained from crying from the house-tops that he had fallen on internal grounds. Berlin ought to have been satisfied with this. But they bragged and still brag.

There is also a feeling in Paris that Germany is trying at all costs to drive a wedge between France and England and between France and Russia, but no endeavour to drive England and Russia from France's side will ever succeed. Even in the Persian affair Germany seems to have a finger in the pie. London is exceedingly sensitive about everything connected with Africa. The route Cape-Cairo is a *via sacra* for England. Woe to those who meddle with it! Thus England is directly concerned with Germany's ambitions in Morocco, and calls out if France is touched. Therefore Germany must be very careful in regard to England when she touches on African questions. There is a feeling in Paris that the Ambassador there, von Schoen, cannot act with the same authority with which Cambon acts in Berlin. He has presented some things to the French Government too optimistically and too lightly, and they have been disavowed by the Berlin Government. He seems at times stalemated while Cambon puts the whole authority of his Government into the scale. This inferior rôle played by Schoen makes the negotiations more difficult. In any case both Governments have good will and both are aware of the seriousness of the situation."

This article caused some sensation, but not a painful one. It was possible even to assume a fighting attitude in regard to the views expressed in it, but in Germany no one thought of raising a hue and cry. I had not told Crozier that I was going to publish his communications. It was only on thinking over his remarks that it occurred to me to send them in a not too sensational form to the newspaper as information worthy of consideration. This is an everyday occurrence between statesmen or diplomats and journalists. It is not what in journalistic jargon is called an "interview." The main thing is that unless special permission has been obtained publication should take place with the greatest precaution. The following morning I was crossing the Kirchenplatz when I met the British Ambassador. I greeted him, or, if one prefers to call it so, I waylaid him. I immediately broached the Morocco conflict between Germany and France which, as might be seen from Lloyd George's speech, had become also in England such a burning topic that the danger of war seemed to ascend from the chasm. I accompanied Sir Fairfax a little way. Sometimes we stood still for a moment. Coals of fire seemed to be heaping on my head as he talked. I maintain that my nose was right when I sniffed the threat of war if Germany remained obdurate.

He was about to return to Vienna and so I said good-bye. On repeating his words to myself they grew into a picture of threatening danger if Germany persisted in her Moroccan madness. All manner of considerations passed through my head. For a moment I thought of sending a confidential communication to the German Secretary of State, Kiderlen-Wächter. Then it seemed to me

better to sound the alarm, to inform the German people of the impending danger. I went to my quarters and made notes, from which the reek of a burning torch seemed to arise. I said to myself that I would consider in the open air what I should do with the news of this terrifying knowledge of the situation. For the afternoon a walk had been planned with Dr. Richard Fleischer, Editor of the *Deutsche Revue*, and his charming wife Lucy, née Cockeril, who were spending the summer at their villa. I read my notes to him, saying that I intended to pass them on to the *Neue Freie Presse*, while keeping their source a strict secret. He warned me not to do so as they might arouse a storm. In the evening I was still considering whether to take his advice or to follow the voice within me which admonished me to raise the alarm and to give the German people notice of the approaching danger. I reflected that no useful purpose would be served if I told only the German statesmen of the terrifying certainty of joint action between England and France if war should break out. They, the unfortunate heirs of the unhappy Holstein, might under-estimate the danger of a one-sided view. This was a case where the German people itself should be roused in order that it might obstruct its statesmen in a needless exaggeration of a dangerous policy of prestige. With this in my mind I arranged in the evening a telephonic conversation with the Editor of the *Neue Freie Presse* in Vienna who represented the Chief Editor, Moriz Benedikt. A so-called representative! The autocrat who managed the paper by telephone from the Semmering, several hours distance from Vienna, where he spent the summer three thousand feet above the sea, was a god of the kind spoken of in the Old Testament, one who would suffer no other gods beside himself. Thus the alleged representative of the Chief Editor was merely a weak factotum. He received my emphatic demand for the strictest discretion as to the source of the information; but he did not carry out my definite request for a journalistic form similar to the conversation with Crozier with that energy with which I had confided it to him over the telephone.

The following day Cartwright's remarks appeared as follows:

PROBABILITIES AND POSSIBILITIES OF THE QUESTION OF PEACE.

BY AN ENGLISH DIPLOMAT IN AN IMPORTANT POSITION.

Editorial Note.

August 24th.

The following remarks will arouse attention by the vigour of judgment and expression, which has already been toned down in some passages. The assertions here made are not the views of the Editor, nor are they in accord with justice and reason, but they show an attitude to German policy and Ger-

man statesmen which seems to arise from a certain embitterment. The publication is, however, necessary because it would be wrong to keep from the public opinions expressed by so important an English personage. They are of particularly grave importance because they come from a source in close touch with practical politics and able to gauge the probabilities and possibilities of the Morocco question. As the communications of the English diplomat end peaceably, the publication can but strengthen the impression that Germany and France will ultimately come to an understanding, and that the bones of a Pomeranian Grenadier are not to be sacrificed even for the sake of Morocco.

"I believe that the result of the whole negotiations can be epitomised in Horace's formula: *Parturiunt montes nascetur ridiculus mus*. Mountains labour and a ridiculous little mouse is born! Germany is not likely to get large concessions. If France were to agree to an eventual territorial cession in Africa and if the French Government were to put it to the Chamber, the latter would refuse such a demand. For this reason I foresee that the German Government will return from these negotiations with only a miserable result. If Germany should not be satisfied with that and should try to squeeze great concessions out of France, it will mean a conflict. Thus the German Government has the choice between the discontent of the Pan-Germans and a conflict with France, and I believe the lesser evil would be the just rejection of those desires which endanger peace. You ask me what position England occupies in regard to this controversy between Germany and France. England is completely on the side of France. I believe I may say: Neither France nor England desires the conflict and both hope that it will be avoided. But England, too, must decidedly regret, not to say condemn, Germany's attitude. Let us look at the matter coolly and impartially. Both England and Germany are Signatory Powers of the Treaty of Algeciras. France has not violated it. Rather she had to help the Sultan to restore order in Fez. France was justified in doing this, not only on the basis of the Treaty of Algeciras, but particularly on the grounds of the Agreement with Germany of 1909. No Power has criticised this. Neither did Germany protest against it. France did not act contrary to the German-French Treaty of 1909. France in no way violated or intended to violate the concession of the open door. Then, without any motive, Germany sent the *Panther* to Agadir. A blow on the part of Germany against the agreement with France of 1909! I am still hoping that German reason will triumph. But there is every cause to ask Germany for moderation, not France, who has in no way exceeded the laws of moderation. I say quite frankly: a feeling is prevalent that Germany is defiant. But this everlasting challenging begins to be serious. Anyone knowing Germany will see in the despatch of the *Panther* to Agadir and in Germany's whole Foreign Policy, in so far as it subscribes to such provocations, not the German people but only a certain clique which acts with equal lack of consideration in other parts of Europe. What was true of France in 1870 is true of Ger-

many to-day in a certain sense. Then the Tuileries made the policy, and the Legislature was the creature of the Tuileries. The Tuileries were the originators of the mad war against Germany. In Germany, too, policy is made to-day from above, not by the people. The German Government does not, like the English, represent the public opinion of the country. The action of Agadir was obviously inspired by the *entourage* of the Kaiser. If Germany had a Government which truly expressed public opinion, it would not continue the unfortunate policy in Morocco. I need hardly say how much England desires peace and good understanding with Germany. Has not Asquith expressed this repeatedly? Did we not since the fall of Bülow wish to believe in a serious improvement of our relations with Germany? And then a blow is struck by German diplomacy behind which stands not the German people but an oligarchy which, while preventing a wise policy, deprives the real statesmen of their independence. It is a misfortune for the world that a great many German diplomats in prominent positions do not seem to inform their Government of the real temper of the people of the country to which they are accredited. I take the liberty of pointing out that the German Government is not well informed about the temper in England. In order to improve it a change must be made, at once, in the *personnel*. Behind the Morocco policy lies already many a dangerous phase. I recall the affair of Casablanca. If Germany had not given in then, a conflict might have taken place. At present we have arrived at a similar stage. If Germany does not moderate herself, there will be a conflict in which England will be on the side of France. It is a mistake on the part of Germany to have brought forward the Morocco question at so serious a moment as the present. Is the Turkish question not serious enough? There is no knowing from day to day what may happen in Turkey. Do you think it will be convenient for Austria-Hungary to see her close ally playing with the Morocco fire? What interest has Morocco for Austria-Hungary? Turkey means much more to Austria-Hungary, and the less Morocco is talked of, the better the statesmen in Vienna will like it. Or do you think that Italy will rejoice at Germany's broaching of the Moroccan problem? Turkey means much more to Italy too. Do you believe that Italy desires a situation in which it is forced to decide against the Triple Entente within the Triple Alliance? Supposing a break-down occurs in Turkey, do you think Italy will ever get into the ardently coveted possession of Tripoli if England and France are not benevolently inclined? Let us hope then that in the course of September the little mouse will be happily born with which these many months the mountains have been in labour."

While I was in Karlsbad the local correspondent of the *Neue Freie Presse* told me that the paper had informed him by telephone from Vienna that the article on the conversation with the English diplomat had caused a storm of anger against him throughout Germany, and no one doubted here that Sir Fairfax Cart-

wright was its originator. I immediately telephoned to the Editor in Vienna that whatever happened Cartwright's name was not to be mentioned and every clue should be removed. The honour of the paper and my honour, the honour of the author of the article, but above all consideration for the Ambassador demanded this, seeing that out of a desire to create a sensation the corner of the secret veil had already been lifted. Meanwhile I learned that the Berlin *Neue Gesellschaftliche Correspondenz* had made inquiries of Sir Fairfax and had been informed: "I decline all responsibility for anonymous newspaper articles, the origin of which is attributed to me by badly informed people." After a gala dinner in the Hotel Pupp which I had been obliged to attend, I returned, greatly excited, to Marienbad where I was besieged by wires and telephone conversations from Vienna. I decided to return to Vienna during the night. Weary from sleeplessness I wrote the following letter to Sir Fairfax:

Vienna, August 30th, 1911.

Your Excellency,

On my return here this morning from my holiday I am most desirous of asking your pardon if the recent publication in the *Neue Freie Presse* has caused you great unpleasantness. But believe me I have suffered and still suffer infinitely more on this account. For my personal exoneration permit me to say that I personally bear only part of the blame. I had expressly and emphatically requested that the personage and position of the diplomat should not be in any way indicated, and that the communication should be dated from abroad in order to eliminate every trace. The title "from a diplomat in an important position" was not more painful to anyone than myself, and it alarmed me when I saw it written down by an indiscreet hand. Without any authentic evidence, people who wished to be unpleasant to you immediately guessed your name. I then read your explanation in the Berlin *Gesellschaftliche Correspondenz* and found it wise, evasive, and correct. I personally agreed but little with the comments which the *Neue Freie Presse* added. I was away in Karlsbad when that happened.

It would be a satisfaction to me if you would allow me personally to give you further explanations. I cannot refrain from making the sad confession that your Excellency proceeded far more correctly than I, who, from a distance, did not employ sufficient care in the face of elements inclined to distort and exaggerate the sensation, though it might be in relation to a man "in an important position." If I can do anything to relieve your embarrassment, I shall be very glad to do so. Of course I am perfectly discreet in the present matter to all the world so as to justify your standpoint as expressed by the Berlin *Gesellschaftliche Correspondenz*.

I am, Your Excellency, Yours sincerely,

S. Münz.

THE CARTWRIGHT INTERVIEW, AUGUST, 1911. 315

I received the following reply:

Vienna, August 31st, 1911.

To Dr. Münz.

Sir Fairfax Cartwright has asked me to inform you that he has received your letter of the 30th instant, and that in the present circumstances it is impossible for his Excellency to grant your wish and to receive you.

Yours faithfully,

L. Buchmann, Private Secretary.

This did not prevent me from considering it my duty to come to the assistance of the Ambassador who had been embarrassed by the paper whose correspondent I was, and immediately afterwards by the *Vossische Zeitung*. I now wrote a letter to the *Vossische Zeitung* which, without betraying my secret and without prevaricating, was meant to refute by diplomatic embellishment some untrue details and exaggerated aspersions against the Ambassador.

It is superfluous to say that the details of the incident which Wolff Metternich reported to Berlin in Grey's name were absolutely untrue. I had not asked the Ambassador for an interview, so that he was not in a position to refuse it. It is true that he had not actually inspired the article, but untrue that he had not made the remarks in question. It is also untrue that I put into the Ambassador's mouth the communications of several diplomats. It is furthermore untrue that in apologising to him I withdrew anything. It is equally untrue that the article in question was submitted in Berlin before publication in the *Neue Freie Presse*. The real facts of the matter were perfectly well known in Berlin, though I withstood all blandishments of the German Embassy in Vienna to reveal the secret. The German Chargé d'Affaires, Count Oberndorf, tried to sound me through the Bavarian Secretary of the Legation, Count Luxburg. But I always replied with diplomatic reserve. Of course, following the indiscretions of the *Neue Freie Presse* and the *Vossische Zeitung* my secret was now an open one, a *secreto di Pulcinello*. But I retained my correct attitude, even in face of all the subterfuges and white lies of the Ambassador which I understood and excused. Numerous reporters of great newspapers visited me and promised me golden mountains and the moon on earth if I would explain the case to them as it had happened. The Editor of the *Neues Wiener Journal* asked me repeatedly in the course of years—before the war, during the war, and after the war—to relate in his widely-read paper the most sensational case—as he called it—in modern journalistic history. I was silent and wished to remain silent, even in view of the publication of the Berlin Foreign Office* blaming me somewhat for the communications of the British Minister, Sir Edward Grey, to the German Ambassador.

* Volume XXIX of the work *Die grosse Politik der europäischen Cabinete*.

in London. I thought it my duty to remain silent in order not to excite Sir Fairfax Cartwright, who was seriously ill, and whose dilemma and white lies I had, at the time, understood and excused. Now that he has been dead some time, I open my mouth for the first time and unburden myself of the secret.

To-day I may also relate that after the event in Marienbad Count Aehrenthal made strenuous endeavours to get another Ambassador, as Sir Fairfax had made himself disliked, and Germany's nearest ally could not be expected to suffer at the Austrian Court a diplomat who was hated in Berlin. The Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in London was importuned to get Cartwright recalled, but Count Mensdorff did not see fit to raise such a clamour at the Foreign Office as his Minister expected him to do, and thus two years went by before Sir Fairfax was relieved by Sir Maurice Bunsen.

It is hardly credible how little my modest services were appreciated in Germany and the small amount of political understanding that existed in that paper-crackling world through which all the pulses of active reality were meant to rush. These people did not conceive that I had done nothing but raise the alarm, as my meteorological knowledge enabled me clearly to see the approaching storm. If the newspapers and the Foreign Office in Germany had then more clearly recognised the danger, no one could have been painfully surprised during the eventful summer of 1914 to see England go to war on the side of France. How could German statesmen, when they declared war on France, doubt for a moment that it would also mean war with England, and, in view of England's friendship with Italy, for the time being Italy's neutrality towards the Central Powers? Such a threatening danger was plainly discernible in my conversation with Sir Fairfax published in 1911. But the Wilhelmstrasse was blind and deaf.

SIGMUND MÜNZ.

GLADSTONE AS A CHRISTIAN STATESMAN.

SINCE the war a large output of books, known as "England literature," has been published in Germany with the object of expounding, as a rule critically, political, social, and other aspects of English national life. Of course, this work of investigation is not meant as a compliment to us as a people, even where we may seem to come out of the ordeal with credit; rather its purpose is to point out to others whatever lessons may be drawn by our national successes and failures, the merits and defects of our character. This method of cultivating the international mind and outlook is laudable, and we might do well to imitate it more freely than we do, provided that it be not carried beyond due limits, since, after all, the best way of renewing and perfecting a nation's life is to build upon the foundations, and as far as possible with the materials, provided by its own soundest and most approved traditions.

One of the latest and most noteworthy books of the "England literature" order is an elaborate study of Gladstone as a Christian statesman.* Working upon his task for a long time in this country, the author, Herr Rudolf Craemer, has produced a work which bears traces of vast reading and research, and it will be interesting to see what his countrymen will make of the character he so ably portrays—a character so unlike any to be found in their own political portrait gallery. The points of approach for such a study as this are various, yet all roads converge. Hardly has any public career been truer to itself, more of a piece, in all the finer elements of character than that of Gladstone; even some apparent inconsistencies, rightly viewed, can be shown to prove its essential unity and constancy. His religious convictions, which counted for so much in his private life, profoundly affected his public actions and policies. Brought up under Evangelical influences, he gradually went over to the extreme Anglo-Catholic position. The transition was completed before he went down from Oxford, but he has left it on record that the Tractarian movement had "little to do with it." As a young man he was precociously, almost unhealthily, religious, and the too early and facile formation of final opinions on questions of the deepest moment led to a dogmatism which in turn bred in him an ecclesiasticism of a somewhat narrow, hard, and obstinate kind. Nevertheless, by the irony of fate throughout his later career this pillar of High Church polity and doctrine was taboo to the Church party, and had to rely for political

* *Gladstone als Christlicher Staatsmann.* By Rudolf Craemer. Deutsche Verlagsanstalt Stuttgart.

support in the main upon English Nonconformists of all persuasions, Scottish Presbyterians, and, when it suited them, Irish Roman Catholics.

Not seldom the ecclesiastical zealot is but little religious, and spiritual not at all. Gladstone's essentially emotional religion was absorbing and of overmastering force. It dominated the entire range of his life: nothing was too small to evade its oversight, nothing too large to be independent of its authority and sanction. So real was his piety, so implicit his faith, that he was convinced that in every step of his public as of his private life he was divinely led, and that in all his struggles in the cause of down-trodden mankind he acted as God's chosen leader. It was a tremendous claim, but making it he was as a fighter clad in impenetrable armour of proof.

In 1832, at the age of twenty-three, he entered Parliament and active political life as a Tory member for the Duke of Newcastle's nomination borough of Newark. This comfortable but intemperate constituency he represented for fifteen years, until he seemed to be passing under Peel's influence, when the irate Duke—the same who asked, "Cannot I do what I like with my own?"—ejected him, and Oxford University now took him in. In the meantime he opposed or supported with voice and vote a host of measures which he spent much of his later life in either advancing or undoing. He condemned the Reform Act of 1832 outright on the usual Tory grounds of danger to State, Church, and the established social order. He claimed privileges and even national taxation for the Church of England alone amongst Churches, since it was established by law. Although Ireland was a Roman Catholic country he defended the ascendancy of the English Church there, since, as he put it, "We regard the Protestant faith as good for us, and what is good for us is also good for Ireland." Although a defender of Roman Catholic emancipation, he opposed the abolition of the civil and political disabilities of Nonconformists, Jews, and atheists. For all these and other mistakes of judgment he was subsequently to make handsome atonement. He was at times painfully conscious of want of light and of clear purpose, even doubting whether he had found his right sphere of work. He wrote in 1844, "The general objects of political life are not my objects. The real renovation of the country does not depend upon law and government." As late as 1850 he was still wavering, "my opinions going one way, my lingering sympathies another." All he could then say with certainty was that he was more drawn to the Liberal side of the Conservative party than to the Conservative side of the Liberal. What he did was "simply to think on and on as to what was right and fair in the circumstances."

For all that time the spirit of this young Tory, who was not to grow up, was reproaching him with increasing urgency: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Slowly but surely, however, step by step, here a little and there a little, he advances towards the inevitable goal. His budgets have a free trade tendency; he repeals the taxes on knowledge; there are mysterious talks with Cobden and Bright; he withdraws from the Carlton Club. So it was that when full illumination came to him it was not by sudden vision; he simply walked into the light.

The year 1865 proved the great climacteric of Gladstone's political career. It was then that he truly found himself and definitely passed out of the Valley of Decision. From that year may be dated the Gladstone of fame and history. Up to this time he had continued to represent Oxford, though with growing distrust on the university side and with growing discomfort on his own. He wrote in 1860, "I am entirely sick and weary of the terms on which I hold my seat." More and more he suffered from the repression of a vivid and generous nature which had come to full maturity, and longed for free expression; he chafed against the frustration of aims and ideals to which his surroundings were unsympathetic and ever would be. Still conscious that parting would be a sweet sorrow, he hinted plainly in 1861 that it might soon become both prudent and necessary. The year before the election of 1865 he had made public confession of the political faith by which and for which he was to stand for the rest of his life. "I call upon the adversary to show cause," he said, "and I venture to say that every man who is not presumably incapacitated by some consideration of personal unfitness or of political danger is morally entitled to come within the pale of the constitution." When in July of the following year he again tempted the academic electorate, it was as an avowed Liberal, and he was dropped to the bottom of the poll. The rupture was inevitable, though it was probably hastened by the recent passing of an Act which introduced the voting paper system of university election, enabling the country parsons of a thousand Sleepy Hollows and the promiscuous crowd of non-resident A.M.'s generally to swamp the votes of the more active members of the university.

Galling as the result was for Gladstone on the sentimental side, it was not for him a defeat but a release. It was not so much that Oxford had parted from him—for Oxford never parts from anything—as that he fell away from her, like ripened fruit from a tree. His loyal friend Bishop Wilberforce, wrathful without need, wrote to him at the time, "You were too great for them." The Liberals of South Lancashire promptly offered him a safe seat, and upon his

first platform there, in Manchester, he introduced himself to the electorate as "unmuzzled."

For another generation, henceforth free to give rein to the ardour and faith of a generous nature, he was in the very forefront of political life, and the time was rich in legislation inspired by his warm sympathies with the people, his intense love of justice, and his conviction that "human excellence cannot grow up in a nation without liberty." Foremost among the measures associated with his name are Reform Acts, the Ballot Act, the Education Act of 1870, establishing the School Board system, the Irish Church Disestablishment Act, the Irish Land Acts, the Parish Councils Act, as well as the abolition of many social inequalities and civil disqualifications, such as church rates, purchase in the army, university tests, and restrictions upon admission to the Civil Service. For other important reforms, like the disestablishment of the Welsh Church and the cession of Home Rule to Ireland, he paved the way. Survey the entire wide range of his statesmanship and always he will be seen as removing injustices, levelling up the standard of popular citizenship, fighting for right causes and against wrong ones, and vindicating to his countrymen and the world the compelling precepts and obligations of morality.

Although he never filled the office of Foreign Secretary his fine humanitarian spirit and his passion for justice were shown conspicuously by his endeavours in the domain of foreign affairs, and here he was able to give for a time added value to his country's moral influence and new lustre to its fame. For him justice was an essential part of righteousness, but he knew that in no department of public life is the will to be just at once so necessary yet so rare as in foreign relations, owing to the powerful "pull" of national interests, and the proneness of nations to worship blindly a spurious patriotism and to advance in its name egoistic and often immoral claims. He wrote once:

"There can be no difficulty in any country, least of all this, in finding Foreign Ministers able and willing to assert the fair and reasonable claims of their countrymen with courage and with firmness. The difficulty is quite of another kind; it is to find the Foreign Minister, first, who will himself view those claims in the dry light both of reason and of prudence; secondly, and a far harder task, who will have the courage to hazard, and if need be to sacrifice, himself in keeping the mind of his countrymen down to such claims as are strictly fair and reasonable."

Because Gladstone himself possessed this lofty spirit and moral courage in so pre-eminent a degree, no phase of his career is more pregnant in significance for the present time than his attitude to international politics. His governing thought was the interdepen-

lence of the nations, his great ambition was to serve the cause of peace and goodwill. He was profoundly concerned for his country's clean reputation in the eyes of the world. He had no sympathy with the fetish of "prestige" which played so large a part in the outburst of "spirited foreign policy" and flashy imperialism which directly led to Disraeli's fall. He sought for Great Britain an ascendancy amongst the nations, but it was to be based not on sheer material or military or political power but on moral worth and influence. In the manifesto which precluded the historical Midlothian campaign of 1880 he said:

"There is, indeed, an ascendancy in European councils to which Great Britain might reasonably aspire, by steadily sustaining the character of a Power no less just than strong; attached to liberty and law, jealous of peace, and therefore opposed to intrigue and aggrandisement, from whatever quarters they may come; jealous of honour, and therefore averse to the clandestine engagements of our two latest years. To attain a moral ascendancy such as this is indeed a noble object for any Minister or any empire."

In his attitude to the question of foreign intervention he was a Canningite rather than a Cobdenite. He held that interference in other nations' affairs was to be justified only by the clear and urgent interests of "the cause of truth, of justice, of order, and of good government." "I value our insular position," he said in 1878, "but I dread the day when we shall be reduced to a moral insularity."

Nothing more surely moved him to indignation and wrathful protest than acts which seemed to lend colour to the suspicion that the influence of Great Britain, the home of liberty and constitutionalism, was on the side of oppression and tyranny. In the first phase of his career that characteristic was shown notably in his protests against British action in the Don Pacifico episode, in the Chinese opium war, and the "Arrow" affair, in which China was again the victim. It was the imperious call of justice and humanity, with the conviction that spotless reputation is the most precious part of a nation's life, and that his country's fair fame was at stake, that drove him into the Bulgarian atrocity crusade, convinced him that in that convulsive enterprise he was acting as "God's instrument" and hence performing "a holy duty," and that bore him through the triumphant Midlothian campaign. So strongly was he opposed to aggression and violent annexations of territory under any pretext that, although at the beginning of the Franco-German war of 1870 he had sided against France and her Emperor as its culpable authors, directly it was proposed to annex Alsace and Lorraine he wanted his Cabinet to mobilise neutral opinion in a declaration of protest. The idea of subjugating little

nations was hateful to him. Let the immediate consequences be judged as they may, one of the most courageous moral acts of his career was his decision in 1881 to restore the independence of the Transvaal. Those who still harp upon the unavenged humiliation of Majuba Hill may be reminded that Mr. Chamberlain approved the course then taken, and that ten years later after visiting South Africa Lord Randolph Churchill, who had been one of Mr. Gladstone's most vigorous critics, admitted "without reluctance" that the decision come to was the best in the circumstances.

To the last his noble humanitarian ardours continued unabated, and his gallant spirit was ready to undertake new exploits in the service of mankind even when, under the burden of years, the flesh had become weak. When the world again stood aghast before the Armenian horrors of 1896 only age kept him out of a new crusade. He was then eighty-seven and withdrawn from public life, yet the old fighting spirit flared up, and recalling the events of twenty years before he said to one of his sons, "Had I the years of 1876 upon me, gladly would I start another campaign, even as long as that."

It is natural to speculate upon the place which a man of Gladstone's magnificent moral stature would have occupied in our life to-day and in the events which, we hope and believe, are carrying the world forward to the happier future for which he laboured so earnestly yet did not live to see. That the world war would have occurred, or have been possible, if Gladstone had still lived is unthinkable. That we should have had the peace machinery of Geneva, in perhaps a better form, is a justifiable assumption. As long ago as 1870 he conceived of a European organisation of States corresponding broadly to the League of Nations, to which, with his ecclesiastical bent of mind, he would have given the name Oecumenical Council of the Nations. Read the Covenant of the League in the light of his speeches and actions, and it will be seen that there are few aims and ideals acknowledged or implied in that document which he did not anticipate more or less clearly, while the realisation of some of them was the main purpose of his practical labours in foreign affairs. He contended for the equality of all states and nations in international law, irrespective of size, wealth, or power, a principle not indeed formally affirmed in the Covenant, yet none the less implicit in many of its articles, and one by the faithful application of which the League will stand or fall. He might have penned article ten denouncing aggression, though he would not have simultaneously violated the stipulation in peace treaties.

Again, he was an earnest protagonist of the disarmament movement, and early in 1870 wanted a conference on the question. He

was also an ardent advocate of the adjustment of international disputes by arbitration, and it was during his Premiership that the *Alabama* claims, which had been a source of friction between the United States and this country for nearly a decade, were settled by that rational method. The Americans had claimed compensation of nine million pounds, and Lord John Russell, who as Foreign Secretary had been to blame for allowing the *Alabama's* illegal exploits, and admitted it, had told Gladstone that he would "rather pay down twenty millions"—of course, of the nation's money, not his own—than allow a foreign Government to arbitrate on the question whether an English Secretary of State had been diligent or negligent in his duties. Gladstone brushed aside this plea for anarchy in international relations, and the case went to arbitration, with the result that the claim was scaled down to three and a quarter millions. Although he regarded the award as "harsh in its extent and unjust in its basis," yet he added, "We regard the fine imposed on this country as dust in the balance compared with the moral value of the example set by these two great nations of England and America."

Living at a time when war was still assumed to be a justifiable "instrument of national policy," and the idea of a Kellogg Pact would have been ridiculed as the whimsy of cranks, Gladstone's mind had not begun to run on the formal proscription of war. Nevertheless, it was his conviction that it "could not be detested too much," that "most wars have been errors," and that "there is no war except one, the war for liberty, that does not contain in it deplorable elements of corruption as well as misery."

It is pleasing to notice that the German biographer pays special homage to Gladstone's healthy influence in relation to foreign affairs, conceding that he "again asserted a spiritual principle in the life of nations." The judgment is so just that it is with something of a shock that one finds the writer immediately afterwards comparing—not contrasting—Gladstone with, of all men, Bismarck. The comparison must suggest to most minds, at least among Gladstone's countrymen, a confusion of values. Let the matter be tested. Bismarck was a statesman of marvellous ability and resource, and the world regards his record in the domain of foreign policy as one of dazzling triumphs. On the other hand, while in domestic affairs Gladstone could point to a long list of achievements of great and lasting benefit for the millions of the people, much of his effort in foreign affairs was expended on what, in his day, appeared to be "lost causes and impossible loyalties." But how far does such a comparison of apparent success and apparent failure carry us? Herr Craemer admits that with Bismarck politics and statesmanship "left little room for, if they did not

expel, personal religion," while with Gladstone there was never a shadow of divorce between the two, and therein lies a fundamental difference between these great men. While in the domain of high politics Bismarck's test of a decision, an act, a policy, was not "Is it right?" but "Will it be to the advantage of my country?" with Gladstone the claims of conscience, of right and justice came first and were supreme. There is profound significance, which even he who runs may read, in the fact that of the three contemporary statesmen who dominated the European stage in the heyday of their careers, Bismarck, Disraeli, and Gladstone, the first two were thoroughly at home with each other, while to both of them Gladstone was spiritually alien, as they were to him.

Can Gladstone's career be appraised at all in terms of success and failure? Yes, but we must first define the terms. It is doubtful whether there is one of his domestic reforms which the men who opposed them most vehemently would to-day wish to undo; but this assumption would not alone carry us far. Popularity or unpopularity, the acclaim or opprobrium of classes or masses, legislative majorities or minorities, the approval or censure of posterity—these things have only relative value; they do not belong to the ultimate sanctions of life; they are not the determinate placets and non-placets which end discussion and close the record. Shall one man's life be judged a success simply because he has won through to the ends which he set himself, independently of what these ends were or how they were attained? Shall that other man be accounted a failure because he wore out his spirit in the attempt to know and realise the highest that was in him for his own good and that of his fellows?

You cannot weigh clod and soul with the same balance, apply to them the same measure of worth. If human life means moral life, what have material standards to do with it? It is the invisible values of life—in conduct, the values of motive and aspiration—that matter, and matter supremely, and it is by such values only that Gladstone's career can be judged. For him success meant doing right, seeking right ends by right means; he knew that only the good lasts and lasts for ever, and that the evil "is null, is nought, is silence implying sound." But the very assertion of a righteous principle, because the vindication of good against evil, is a moral success, whatever the immediate effects or the world's judgment of them.

No statesmen weighed more scrupulously the question of right or wrong in relation to acts of public policy, and all that he said in praise of Lord Aberdeen in that regard might be justly applied to himself. One of his private secretaries told the story of how, on the morning following an important Ministerial statement, he

found the chief pacing to and fro in his room, asseverating, "I know I was right! I know I was right!" Whether Gladstone was right or not matters little now; the point of the story is that he wanted to be right and to feel sure of it. Granted that he loved office and power, yet it was only because they enabled him to use his transcendent gifts and aptitudes on the grand scale and in the widest possible sphere, by serving the State through religion and morality, and serving religion and morality through the members and institutions of the State. The man who laboured thus, "as ever in his great Taskmaster's eye," will rank for time far beyond our ken as a statesman in the fullest, purest, and loftiest significance of that much abused word.

Lord Acton said that he "kept the soul alive in England." Herr Craemer says to the same purpose that "his conception of life upheld in a century of hustling, indifference, and greed, the transcendent standards of Christian morality." To the last, however, he was conscious that his nation was still far from what he wished it to be. In his early years, as his letters and diaries show, he had visions and dreamed dreams of a new and better England. Throughout a long career crowded with activities many and various he never ceased to think of his country as destined to take the same high place in the political life of nations which he believed to be reserved for the Church of England in relation to the religious life of Christendom. Just as the latter was to be a purified and reconciling influence when she had herself been purged and had found peace, so the former was to become a true *regnum Christi* and an ensample of the righteousness which exalts nations. As he grew older he came to detect, what we have since seen more clearly, a tendency for the moral standards of public life to be lowered. It must have been with keen regret that he made the confession in 1896, "Nowhere does the ideal enter so little as into politics; nowhere does human conduct fall so far below the highest ethical standard. I did not always think this, but I am convinced of it now." Yet he never became a pessimist or despaired, for as Morley somewhere puts it, "he did not rail at the world, he strove to help it." What he himself thought of life may be most fittingly said in his own words: "Be inspired with the belief that life is a great and noble calling; not a mean and grovelling thing that we are to shuffle through as we can, but an elevated and lofty destiny." One likes to think of sympathetic "contacts" between men so unlike in many ways as Gladstone and Lord Salisbury. Of Salisbury when at the Constantinople Conference of 1876 the older man said, "He has a conscience"; while of the "happy warrior" who passed away on a spring day of 1898 his

successor in the Premiership said, "He was a great Christian statesman," and both spoke truly.

Our German biographer speaks of the Hawarden Library as Gladstone's "own monument." But the monument to which his nation looks, and never looks without reverence and a consciousness of uplifting, is his life of high thinking and high endeavour. That is a monument which will prove more enduring than brass and long defy the flight of years. It is well for all of us that we should be sent back from time to time to the great and the greatly good men and women of our race, lest age should stale or familiarity dull the memory of our indebtedness to them. Hence in writing with so much sympathy a book intended for his own people, Herr Craemer has done a valuable service to Gladstone's countrymen. Those to whom this service is known will not fail to appreciate it, while those who read the book itself will be conscious of a deeper obligation.

WILLIAM HARBUTT DAWSON.

THE PROBLEM OF PERSONALITY.*

EVERYTHING turns upon Personality for human experience and, therefore, for Philosophy. Yet there is, at present, an influential and widespread tendency on the part of philosophers to belittle or pass it by,—to make use of its characteristics—Purposiveness, rationality, and valuation—while striking at the roots, Divine and human, of which these activities are branches.

Everything turns upon Personality, for the Whole to be explained and estimated consists in the experience of conscious subjects, either immediate or extended by reflection and reasoning. Its data are presented by feeling and conation, by thought and volition. Subsequent examination of this primary material presents the problems and prescribes the tasks alike of the Sciences and of Philosophy. The world to be explained is the complex result of apprehension, valuation and intuitive systematisation by human personalities. Without personal activity no world exists either to be perceived, utilised, or enjoyed. So dominant, indeed, is Personality that early man personifies everything, and that for him the sense of his own personality and belief in super-human personalities are born and grow up together. It is as personality becomes developed and in proportion as it is developed that the concerns of Science and Philosophy emerge.

Only subsequently, and at a more advanced stage, do difficulties arise from reflection. Man, as conscious personality, discovers himself to be a middle term between what may roughly be called the super-personal and the infra-personal. On the one hand, what appears to be the material world is treated as impersonal. For the purpose of physical Science men, as personal, become spectators, regard personality as an intruder, and, by and by, may come to regard it as an ineffective illusion. On this assumption, the attempt to achieve systematic unification of Reality as a Whole culminates in the endeavour to explain away Personality in terms of the material. On the other hand, the contemplation of the super-personal may lead to a similar elimination. Personality in Man differentiates itself as individual alike from other personalities and from the material world, conceived as a Non-Ego which confronts it. Such limitation and exclusion seem inapplicable to the super-personal, whether treated as an Absolute *versus* the

* *Process and Reality*. The Gifford Lectures. By Professor Whitehead, Cambridge University Press. 18s. net.
The Idea of Value. By Professor Laird. Cambridge University Press. 18s. net.
Matter, Life, and Value. By C. E. M. Joad. Oxford University Press. 18s. net.
Personality and Reality. By Dr. J. E. Turner. George Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d. net.

Relative, the One over against the Many, or as the All which includes and, in transcending, absorbs the particulars. Being, as the all-comprehending Whole, appears to be incompatible with emergent, partial and inter-related Becoming. Hence arises the tendency to secure systematic unification for Thought by treating human Personality as an unreal and transitory phase, and Divine Personality as an imaginative and erroneous projection of the unreal to the All, which, by its very definition, contradicts it.

In addition, human imagination, whether religious or poetical, invests the Super-personal with a subjectivity which is often so compact of specifically human, temporal, and sometimes even spatial qualities as are fundamentally inapplicable to it, and then makes matters worse by giving dogmatic formulation to these naïve assumptions. Such imaginative conceptions break down in subsequent experience alike in view of the actual processes and happenings of the world, in the scientific pursuit of continuity, and in philosophical endeavours to interpret the Universe as a consistent Whole. Moreover, there is a religious reaction against them, for Religion demands, for its full satisfaction, not only resemblance, but compensating contrast, in the Divine object of its worship.

Furthermore, the new dominance of the conception of Evolution and Process tends to such recognition, and indeed hard riding, of universal Activity as leads to disparagement of the static, and so to the dismissal of Personality, whether Divine or human, because it is presumed to be merely static.

Finally, even the new appreciation of Values may lead to the same result. For the gradual revelation and the appreciation of the Supreme Values are inextricably bound up with the evolution of the world as it completes itself in Consciousness. Hence they may be treated alternatively as either merely humanly subjective, or as cosmically existent without any need to lay stress upon Personality as actively creative of them.

As the result of all these influences, religious feeling may seek relief by dismissing the Personality of God in order to escape human limitations, with their inapplicability, on intellectual and moral grounds, both to God and to the Universe. It may content, or even delight, itself, with sub-intellectual communion with the Whole, as in process of impersonal Evolution towards a problematic and unenvisageable goal, the very absence of definition giving satisfaction to the emotions. Values may be treated descriptively and pragmatically without any Philosophy of Reality, or any emphasis on Personality as creative of them. The Philosophy of Process may seem to bring together Being and Becoming, Ideals and concrete Actuality, in an energetic and purposive Cosmos, by the abstract and symbolic utilisation of conceptions drawn from

conscious Personality, while dispossessing the very idea of Personality as static in nature or as transient in function. With the disparagement of Personality as energetic, dominant, and constitutive of Reality, the Universe may even fall apart, for thought, into the fundamental discontinuity of Pluralistic Realism, which antagonises unification by reducing Personality to the passive receptivity of manifold and unrelated forms and causes of experience.

Of these various philosophical tendencies certain recently published books furnish striking examples. First in importance must be placed Professor Whitehead's Gifford Lectures entitled *Process and Reality* (Cambridge University Press). That these Lectures are profound goes without saying. That they are based upon a sound and broad account of the task and provisional character of Philosophy is not surprising when the characteristic temper of their distinguished Author is borne in mind. Being the work of one who has achieved eminence, not only as a philosopher, but, first of all, as a Professor of Applied Mathematics, the volume exhibits elaborate complexity of detail and an abstruseness of expression, which create formidable difficulties for the ordinary, even if well-educated, reader. Yet the abstract discussion is brightened, again and again, by pregnant observations and pithy criticisms. Professor Whitehead treats his subject with an amazing combination of breadth of range and thoroughness of detail. The individuality of his thought is marked throughout by sympathetic comprehension and receptivity. In offering his own solution of the problem which he has set for himself, he makes ceaseless endeavours to find room in his system for what is most distinctive and lasting in all the great philosophies, ancient and modern, Plato, Locke, and Hume counting as the most important for his thought.

Professor Whitehead's general subject is "the philosophy of organism." His "train of thought" is Platonic (p. 54). This involves that he reiterates, with Plato, the emphasis on eternal and universal ideas or Forms, to the neglect of Personality (the term is not to be found in the Index), and that, in the light of Evolution, he substitutes a doctrine of the "Ingress" of Forms into phenomena for the Platonic alternative of participation in or imitation of the Ideas by the phenomenal world.

Throughout the whole of his reasoning Professor Whitehead effects a mathematically scientific abstraction from human subjectivity, both by reducing its significance and by universalising what is left. "The philosophy of organism abolishes the detached mind" (p. 77). It repudiates the assumption "that the basic elements of experience are to be described in terms of one, or all,

of the three ingredients, consciousness, thought, sense-perception" (p. 49). For it, "consciousness presupposes experience, and not experience consciousness" (p. 72). "The 'perpetual perishing' of individual absoluteness is thus foredoomed. But the 'perishing' of absoluteness is the attainment of 'objective immortality'" (p. 83), this immortality, apparently, being realised in, and only in, the process of the world. "The doctrine of an aboriginal, eminently real, transcendent creator, at whose fiat the world came into being, and whose imposed will it obeys, is the fallacy which has imported tragedy into the histories of Christianity and Mahometanism" (p. 484).

The Philosophy of Organism, in Professor Whitehead's view, exhibits the Becoming of God in and through the world, and equally the Becoming of the world in and through the Becoming of God. "It is as true to say that God is permanent and the world fluent, as that the world is permanent and that God is fluent" (p. 492). Indeed, each term of every fundamental antithesis is interchangeable between God and the world, the contrast between them being that "for God the conceptual is prior to the physical, for the World the physical poles are prior to the conceptual poles" (p. 492). The process of Creativity represents the interaction between God and the World. "God is completed by the individual, fluent satisfactions of finite fact" (p. 492), so that "the consequent nature of God" is "God as really actual, completing the deficiency of his merely conceptual actuality" (p. 494). The conclusion, therefore, is indeed, as Professor Whitehead declares, typically Platonic, save that the doctrine of "Ingress" is introduced into the earlier phase of Platonism, while for the latter conception of the Demiurge is substituted that of God, in Himself, spanning the chasm between Being and Becoming by means of the evolutionary process that gives to Him "consequent" actuality through the realisation of the Eternal Forms. Thus God is both primordial and consequent (p. 488). In describing the passage of the primordial into the consequent, Professor Whitehead speaks of God's "tender care that nothing be lost" and of His "patience" as "tenderly saving the turmoil of the intermediate world by the completion of His own Nature" (p. 490). Yet this is "but an image," that is to say a formula, or symbol, touched with human emotion.

Yet, if the position be as Professor Whitehead states it, namely, that the epochal process of the Universe is the passing of Eternal Forms (which can only be interpreted in terms of Reason), by an evolution into actuality (which can only be interpreted as purposive), and if emotional qualities can be conceived (though but as an image) as present throughout this process, would not the

explanation be strengthened and enriched by treating God as "eminently real," as living Personality, if only Professor Whitehead could rid himself of the prejudice that personality is merely static, and find the key to the process in the Love, that is in the Self-giving of God? In short "the brief Galilean Vision," as Professor Whitehead calls it (p. 484), has greater significance for Philosophy, as well as for Religion, than he accords to it. Then instead of what may be termed energetic and not static Spinozism, the great saying "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" will explain "Process and Reality," Being and Becoming, in a way that will include all and more than all the positive principles of Professor Whitehead's construction.

At this point it will be well to make a brief reference to Professor Laird's book on *The Idea of Value* (Cambridge University Press), a closely analytical and minutely thorough account of Value, including Valuation as *Bonum Utile* (Economic), *Bonum Jucundum* (Emotionally appreciative), and *Bonum Honestum* (Timological or spiritual). The result of Professor Laird's exhaustive examination is ambiguous. His conclusion is "that 'Value' is an ambiguous term, which includes both elective or appreciative prizings and timological insight" (p. 322). In other words neither subjective satisfaction nor objective reality can be got rid of by a treatment which does justice to all the factors involved in Valuation. This seems to show that the Idea of Value is a philosophical as well as a psychological problem, and that it cannot be treated satisfactorily except as conditioned by the place of Personality, as *valuing*, in the Universe, which presents objects as *valuable*, and sets up, both objectively and subjectively, standards of Value as ends to be pursued.

From this point of view Mr. C. E. M. Joad's book entitled *Matter, Life, and Value* (Oxford University Press) demands attention. If Professor Whitehead's Philosophy of Organism is a philosophy of continuity, Mr. Joad's is a philosophy of radical discontinuity,—pluralist, vitalist, and Bergsonian. Matter, Life and Values are three separate realms of Reality, and their separateness is upheld by treating consciousness, or life as Mr. Joad generally calls it, as being simply awareness of what is not itself, this awareness being of Sensory, Conceptual, or Valuable objects. This awareness growing in elevation, amplitude and intimacy reveals *what is there as it is*. Life is purposive, and its end is contemplation of "subsistent objects," awareness of which is conceptual, and of Values, particularly of the Beautiful and the Good; the former being mediated by the poet and still more by the musician, the latter by the mystic and the prophet. The birth of

individuals is their temporary detachment from "the stream of Life," to which they are restored at death, with henceforth the active, yet impersonal, function of enriching succeeding generations by the acquired awareness of the past. The existence of God is possible, but problematical, and Mr. Joad's interpretation of the Universe appears to be complete without Him, even if reduced to "the principle of the actualisation of possibility," which is Mr. Joad's summary of Professor Whitehead's position (p. 392).

The success of this whole account of the Universe depends upon that of the attempt to reduce the function, it can hardly be termed the activity, of mind to mere awareness. In order to maintain this reduction Mr. Joad is put to desperate shifts. Passing by the difficulty of explaining perception without the constitutive activity of mind, it must suffice to note that even for Mr. Joad knowledge involves "imagination, memory, belief, and judgment" (p. 102). Each of these severally and still more the whole of them collectively represents an intense activity of distinctive personality, an intense activity which seeks not merely awareness of objects, but enlargement and satisfaction of Personality by means of this awareness. Even the "subsistent entities" are primarily, if not ultimately, the product of personal activity. This is at least equally the case with the appreciation and pursuit of Values. And why treat personality, as we know it, as being a temporary "cutting off" from the "main stream of Life" (p. 156)? Still more, the daring suggestion that the reabsorbed individuals have a subsequent function to discharge in securing and enlarging the gains of progress is an illegitimate extension to an impersonal "stream of Life" of what is only known to us as due to the energetic exercise of individual personality and of active personalities in fellowship with one another. Mr. Joad professes to be "under the sway both of Parmenides and of Heraclitus" (p. 32), in the sense that he cannot reject the arguments of either of them. Yet how can they be reconciled save by an adequate doctrine of the activity of Personality, differentiating and yet unifying, supplying a spiritual bridge between Being and Becoming, the One and the Many, and doing this as the source, sustainer, and director of the creative and evolutionary process, which Mr. Joad terms "the Stream of Life"?

This conclusion is reached by Dr. J. E. Turner in a striking book entitled *Personality and Reality* published some time ago (George Allen and Unwin), in which he claims to give "a Proof of the real existence of a Supreme Self in the Universe" from the point of view of Realism. Self-hood in man, Dr. Turner shows, is an organised complexity, possessing definite structure, dynamic nature, and definiteness of function. It knows both itself

and its environing Universe. Yet this knowledge is never merely receptive, but is the foundation of volitional activity. Self-hood is unique among other systems by its specific content. It is, however, not isolated, for every real has the inherent capacity to unite with other reals, so as to constitute a system which is found ultimately to extend to the Whole of Reality, as a total system that acts in and through every one of its elemental parts (p. 49). The growth of Self-hood is towards developed personality, towards dominance and control, permanence, and, therefore, personal immortality.

Moreover, developed personality is purposive and achieves its purposes by means of mechanism, which as it advances in complexity and perfectness *conceals*, instead of revealing the origina-tive mind which controls it (p. 129). Now the Universe is a vast mechanism, yet more than a mechanism, for it *evolves*, instead of remaining fixed or running down. The inference, therefore, that is drawn by Dr. Turner is that the Universe involves the presence and activity of a Supreme Self, Who is best described as its Creator, and that His concealment is the consequence of the perfection of His work. That Beauty is concurrent with Utility gives additional support to this conclusion. All such reasoning is analogical and, however suggestive, must needs be inadequate. Dr. Turner's argument, while effective against materialism, cannot do full justice to the immanence of God. His analogy might, perhaps, be strengthened, if side by side with it were put that of the human mind and body, for Personality is active throughout the vital and mechanical activity of the body, using and controlling it, while yet the body has a subordinate autonomy of its own, is built up of quasi-independent though correlated elements, and may react, in whole or in part, alike against the dominance of the Personality that animates it and against its own internal harmony as an organised system. Yet the argument claims, by its intrinsic force and its lucidity, to be placed, side by side, with those of Professor Whitehead and Mr. Joad, as a corrective of the impersonalism of the former and as an interpretation of Realism, which is preferable to that of the latter.

One feature is common to all these thinkers. All of them, in various ways, require to use for their interpretations of the Universe conceptions of ordered process, of immanent purposiveness, of emergent evolution towards a goal—however imperfect its definition and uncertain its achievement—which are drawn directly from the characteristic experience and activities of human personalities. Why not carry this parallelism a stage farther, with Dr. Turner, and substitute for the negation of Professor Whitehead and the uncertainty of Mr. Joad the attribution of a Supreme Personality to the Universe, as its explanation, and in doing so, lay the

emphasis on human personality that its activities demand? The abstract conception of the Absolute is no more an obstacle for Professor Whitehead and Mr. Joad than it is for Dr. Turner. For the former God and the world are eternally correlative in an essentially dipolar Universe, and for the latter Matter, Life and Value have equal and irreducible reality. Indeed emphasis either on the reality of Process or on the eternal nature of Value is fundamentally incompatible with any conception of the Absolute as unifying the Whole by denying reality to its particulars or resolving them into itself.

The Universe exhibits a permanent concurrence of unity and diversity. Its emergent evolution has culminated terrestrially in the appearance of Man and in the secular development of Mankind. Both Man and Mankind come to their own by at once differentiating themselves from and, on this basis, unifying themselves with, the material world. For this purpose they apprehend and pursue certain standards of Value, which are appreciated, upheld, and graded in quality and therefore in rightful order of predominance, in order to continued being and still more to increasing well-being. And since Man emerges from the Universe and is organic with it, what becomes vitally important for him is grounded in it, so that the Supreme Values are the result of a concurrent interactivity between Man and the Universe, which causes all attempts to treat Values as either purely subjective or as purely objective to break down. Thus at every stage and for every purpose differentiation in unity and unity in differentiation are essentially involved in human experience and progress. Hence, if the conceptions of ordered process, immanent purposiveness, and emergent evolution towards a goal be accepted as indispensable to World-explanation, due regard must be paid both to the nature of the End, as it stands revealed in its partial realisation, and to the means by which it is being achieved, the principles on which it is based. It seems, therefore, to follow that ordered process and wisdom, immanent purposiveness and volition, emergent evolution and preferential guidance must be brought together and Supreme Personality be treated as the explanation of the Process, and of its reflection in the Personality of Man. A primary difficulty is, however, raised to the acceptance of this conclusion. In the case of Man, the distinctions between the Ego and the Non-Ego, and between each individual and others, are given and imposed. All human experience is conditioned by them. Exclusion and limitation are involved in it, and neither of these, at least in the form known to man, can be ascribed to God. Hence, even if He exist, must not His Personality be denied? Must not, indeed, the very exclusiveness and limitation of human individuality be treated as signs of its insignificance and impermanence? Furthermore, is not the very concept of Per-

sonality static, as Professor Whitehead deems it, whereas both the Universe and the Man demand for their explanation ceaseless and energetic activity, and this as ever transcending itself by passing over into an Otherness which is the negation of Personality in God, and its dissolution in Man?

Only the briefest answer can be given here to these objections, the force of which has been increased by a good deal of popular Religion and Theology. May not the *created* differentiation between Man and his world be a limited and relative reflection of a *creative* differentiation between God and the world, set up by Him not by any physical necessity but in the eternal exercise of His Personal perfection, so that, by positing a Universe in limited Otherness to Himself, He may manifest Himself in wisdom, thus giving expression to His Nature as Love? Personality is not static but intensely energetic in its nature, though the very concept of energetic activity demands the accompanying concept of the static in such correlated contrast as is suggested by the combination of permanence and change, of rest and activity, in the consciousness of men. Moreover, Personality fulfils itself by passing beyond itself in thought and feeling, in desire and volition, yet does so that it may achieve, not only enrichment, but also permanence, and this not in isolation but in fellowship. The Apostolic Benediction attributes all these qualities to God by conceiving Him, not as static, but as ceaselessly active in Grace, Love, and Fellowship, which pass beyond Himself to the Otherness of men, in order to bring them into unity with Himself. Thus the Personality of God is exhibited, not as abstract, static and exclusive, but as displaying a creative, redemptive and embracing activity, of which human personality is the creaturely and imperfect outcome and representation. It is in this sense that the Scriptural expression "the Glory of God," so often misrepresented, is to be understood.

This conclusion is, however, questioned and even challenged because an adverse judgment is passed upon the goodness of the world. Its catastrophes, inequalities, and sufferings furnish the grounds of this indictment, which, if formulated by intellect, owes its strength mainly to the reforming will and its poignancy to imagination and sympathetic emotion. Obviously this subject cannot be adequately discussed within the limits of this article. Yet the following considerations in regard to it should be borne in mind. To begin with, it is the Universe as all must admit, its Author as Theists contend, that furnishes men not only with the faculty and standards of criticism, with "divine discontent," but also with the material of outstanding beauty, magnificence and goodness in the light of which that which conflicts with them, or falls short of them, is judged. Moreover, both that which is approved and that which is condemned arise from the "concrecence," to use Professor

Whitehead's expression, between creative and creaturely activity which conditions the evolution of the world.

Furthermore, there is serious difficulty and grave danger of error in applying standards, which are supplied to Man as indispensable to his being and better being, in an abstract and extended way to a universal and incomplete process which men can only view from a particular and narrowly limited point of time and place. Professor Whitehead roundly declares that the attempt of Leibnitz to demonstrate that "this is the best of all possible worlds" is "audacious fudge" (p. 64). This criticism is essentially sound, because the attempt is based upon the twofold assumption that Man can so separate himself from the actual world as to become an external spectator and critic of it and of all possible alternatives, and also that he himself would remain unchanged although some other world were substituted for the present as conditioning his existence. Yet Professor Whitehead's criticism is equally sound as against any attempt to show that this is the worst of all possible worlds, and, indeed, against any intermediate position. In all such judgments men are in danger of ignoring, or denying, the value of the positive in their desire for the comparative and the superlative, of judging a process as static instead of apprehending its potentialities as directed towards a goal, and of condemning things as inherently bad when treated as ends, which may well be instrumentally good as means to an end, or stages on the way. The acceptance of Values, above all of the Supreme Values of the True, the Beautiful and the Good, as standards to be upheld and ends to be pursued carries with it the acceptance not only of process, but of process as meaningful, and also of the conclusion that its meaning is that the world is a "Vale of Soul-making" in the light of which its conditions must be estimated. In this light, above all, its social relations, its disciplinary and redemptive activities, the equipment of faith and hope and love which it furnishes, supply a corrective to pessimism, whether sentimental or ethical, as well as a condemnation of hedonism, which gives a misreading of the world that is destructive to the well-being of men.

The recognition of Supreme Spiritual Values as ends to be pursued carries with it the dismissal of all that is merely static in our conceptions alike of Man, of the world, and of God in His relations with both. It carries with it still further the recognition of supreme purposiveness with spiritual ends in view. The process of the world as men know it, reaches its highest stage and is continued by means of Values and Valuation. Neither the Values themselves, nor the activities of Valuation, can be satisfactorily explained as purely subjective or as purely objective. They are the "concrecence" of subject and object. Hence these Values are neither humanly created nor cosmically immanent.

They are given, revealed and unfolded to Man in his communion with, and equally in his distinction from, his world as it actually exists. Their existence, their persistence, their dominance can only be explained by treating the world and man as dependent on a Supreme Valuer, an eternal Home, and Spring, of Supreme Values, and therefore, as personal, when His Personality is truly seen as not only static but energetic, as self-giving and not merely self-contained, as passing beyond Itself into all things that It may include all things in Itself. That is to say that "God is Love." Clearly Christianity, as Professor Whitehead points out, "does not emphasise the ruling Caesar, or the ruthless moralist, or the unmoved mover" (p. 485) in its Idea of God. Each of these severally and all in combination are inadequate to represent "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." His Fatherhood transcends and transforms them all, and when fully apprehended gathers together in living harmony, permanence and process—the Origin, the Way, the Goal—in the unity of an eternal perfection, which is revealed in creative, redemptive, and satisfying Self-giving. Men, in moods of weariness and disillusion, are prone to ask, "Is it all worth while?"—this ceaseless activity and travail, this costliness and risk? In such moods they are prone to think in terms of drawbacks, of exhausting efforts, and of apparent failures here or there. Yet in the light of the Supreme Values and of the process towards their realisation the Vision of Faith passes beyond the confusion and perplexities of the moment, to contemplate with wonder, awe, and worship the splendour that is revealed in this but partially fulfilled world as it prophesies and proceeds towards its appointed end. Its ordered vastness, its sublime beauty, the glory and the holiness of the heroism and saintliness, which it fosters equally by its provocation and its nurture, dispel the disappointment of suspense by bringing the insight that nothing exists in vain and the peace that comes of the assurance that the Truth, the Beauty, and the Goodness which are revealed and achieved in Time have their Source, their Home, their End, in the eternal life and fellowship of God. To quote the Poet Laureate's noble *Testament of Beauty*:

And God so loveth the world . . .
and in the fellowship of the friendship of Christ
God is seen as the very self-essence of love,
Creator and mover of all as active Lover of all,
Self-express'd in not-self, without which no self were
In thought whereof is neither beginning nor end
nor space nor time; nor any fault nor gap therein
'twixt self and not-self, mind and body, mother and child
'twixt lover and loved, God and man, but *One Eternal*
in the love and Beauty and in the self-hood of Love.

J. SCOTT LIDGETT.

THE ROMAN QUESTION, LEO XIII, AND SIGNOR MUSSOLINI.

WHEN I was a boy I remember an interesting toy which was in everybody's hands and was called "the Roman Question." Two steel wires were so linked that it was impossible to disentangle them by force, and this could be achieved only by patiently and deftly manipulating them in a certain very delicate manner. This plaything was the exact counterpart of the complicated political, religious, and military "Roman Question" which has weighed for eighty years on the diplomacy, conscience, and statecraft of Europe, and looked insoluble. This question can be put in a nutshell: Shall the Pope of Rome be the Spiritual Head only of the Roman Catholic Church of the whole world, its *Pontifex Maximus*, as were the Roman Cæsars for the people of Rome, or shall he also be at the same time the independent political sovereign of a temporal State? Why was this question so long and difficult to decide? And why, having arisen as far back as 1849 under the reign of Pope Pius IX, and having passed through so long a period of chronic hopelessness under Leo XIII, was the Roman question solved—or at least removed to a higher plane—only in 1929 on the advent in Italy of the Fascist revolution and of the dictatorship of Signor Mussolini?

For many centuries the Pope, to whose spiritual power Emperors and Kings have bowed, was also the undisputed temporal Sovereign of the "States of the Church" stretching in a broad band across Italy from sea to sea. In those days Italy was the customary battlefield for French and German conquerors, in whose wars and political plans, as in other international questions, the Pope's influence, money, and troops often took an active part. The father of Peter the Great sent an envoy from Moscow to Rome in 1672 proposing to the Pope to join a European League against the Turks, who had then invaded Russia and her ally Poland. Strangely enough this Russian envoy was a Scotsman, Paul Menzies of Pitfodels, a devout Roman Catholic and "one of ye majors of ye Emperor of Russia his forces," whose curious story I looked up in the archives of Rome, Moscow, Vienna, and Aberdeen. The Popes themselves originated and supported an active and ultimately victorious Christian coalition against the encroaching Mohammedans. And the whole of Italy was at that time parcelled out between the Pope and the Dukes of Savoy, Bourbon and Habsburg, Princes and rulers, and had become, as Metternich said, merely a "geographical expression." Then in the last century began and ripened in Italy the *Risorgimento*, a revolutionary wave directed against all these sovereignties except the national Savoy dynasty which fostered the movement, and also

against the Pope. It aimed at unifying Italy and making Rome her capital. Pius IX was driven from Rome by these foes, and a Republic was proclaimed there. French troops were sent to protect the Pope, who returned to Rome after they had stormed and occupied the city in 1849, embarrassing by their presence both the Pope and France, and exasperating Italian nationalists. No way to bring about evacuation could be found, and thus began the first period of the "Roman Question." It continued for eighteen years, till the terrible onslaught of Germany obliged France to summon all her soldiers home, and Rome was at last evacuated in the summer of 1870. But on September 20th of that year the troops of the King of Italy stormed and occupied Rome, which was defended only by a handful of Pontifical troops, and the "Roman Question," instead of being ended by the retreat of the French, entered a new and still more lengthy and painful phase.

Rome was soon proclaimed the capital of the Italian kingdom and the King took up his residence in the former Pontifical Palace of the Quirinal, the Pope remaining in the Vatican. The Pope's belongings, such as buildings, pictures, plate, etc., were declared the property of the Italian State, and a situation arose which would have been absolutely intolerable in any other country. How could two inimical and rival Sovereigns, who were officially at war with each other, continue to live in the same city, the King being, besides, excommunicated by the Pope, and the latter having become *de facto* a prisoner of the King?

The Royal Government attempted at once to find a unilateral way out of this deadlock, and published in August 1871 the "Law of Guarantees." This law permitted the Pope to reside in the Vatican with his staff of clerics, servants, and armed guards, and to make use of the Lateran Palace and his villa of Castel Gandolfo. He could also receive ambassadors, delegate nuncios, and send his correspondence *gratis* through the Royal Italian post. A moderate annuity was guaranteed for him from the Italian Treasury. This offer was rejected by Pius IX and by all his successors, because they were convinced that the Pope, on being bereft of temporal power, would lose the liberty of thought, speech, and action without which his spiritual authority as Head of the Church could not be maintained nor universally trusted. Leo XIII, when Archbishop of Perugia, expressed this belief in a learned, lengthy, and eloquent pastoral letter of 1860. It does one good to re-read this epistle now in the light of the recent Lateran agreements, and to see how these able arguments in defence of the Pope's temporal power have been ultimately found convincing by Signor Mussolini.

I must say here that the temporal power of the Popes has never been questioned by the Tsars. The letter from Nicholas II to

Leo XIII accrediting me in 1897 as Minister-Resident at this court began with the words "Sovereign Pope" (Derjavni Papa); for, in the eyes of the Imperial Government, the *de facto* occupation of Rome by French or Italian troops in no way altered the *de jure* international situation. So I handed my letter to the Pope as to an independent temporal Sovereign, and transmitted in a similar manner to Leo XIII an invitation to send delegates to the First and Second Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907. No Papal delegate appeared, but this happened only because the Italian Government had declared it would otherwise refuse to take part. Russia had even fought for the Sovereign Pope, to defend him in 1799 against the revolutionary attacks of the French, whom Souvoroff drove out of Northern Italy, while Russian troops from the squadrons of Admiral Ouchakoff, disembarking in Naples, occupied and pacified Pontifical Rome. I have before me the printed Proclamation, couched in very good Italian, and addressed on October 13th, 1799, to the Romans in the name of Emperor Paul I by the Commander of the Russian garrison, telling them of the expulsion of their enemies, the French, and ordering them to pursue in peace their avocations. Souvoroff's statue in St. Petersburg represents him as defending with his shield an altar on which lie several royal crowns and the Pope's tiara.

When I arrived in Rome as a Russian diplomatic representative the Roman Question had become a chronic and hopeless evil. Leo XIII was in the twentieth year of his reign, and in the eighty-seventh of his life. The first time I saw him was at the audience Leo XIII granted me in the Vatican, to receive the Emperor's letter. A very old man, strikingly thin, with prominent features, was seated on a throne-like white and gold armchair with an icon painted in its tall back. He wore the white pontifical skull-cap, the long white cassock with many small buttons in front, the white slippers with a cross embroidered on them, and the simple gold pectoral cross of a priest on a long golden chain. On one of his fingers was the usual bishop's amethyst ring. When approaching the Pope I always kissed that ring as that of a bishop. Leo XIII spoke indifferent French, although he had been nuncio in Brussels, a time he found pleasure in recalling. While speaking, he gesticulated much, in Italian fashion. His most remarkable feature was his eyes. Small, black, and brilliant, they were continually moving, and looked like those of a young man. A Russian Minister was welcome, since one of the successes of his long reign was the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and the Imperial Government. These relations had been broken off under Pius IX in 1863 in connection with the part Roman Catholic priests had played in the Polish insurrection of that year. But my school-fellow and friend, Isvolsky, later our

Minister of Foreign Affairs, succeeded after eight years of patient and able negotiations in concluding an agreement which satisfied the religious needs of twenty-three millions of Russian subjects of the Roman Catholic faith, principally Poles, while the political interests of the Imperial Government were assured, because no sincere Roman Catholic had ever joined the Socialist and Atheist revolutionaries who were gnawing at the entrails of the Russian Empire since the unsatisfactory liberation of the serfs in 1861 by Emperor Alexander II. The Pope also always admonished the Poles of Russia to remain the faithful subjects of the Tsar.

Leo XIII was, as they say in Rome, "a political Pope." At the death of Pius IX in 1878 the Papacy was in such a sorry plight that it was an open question whether a conclave to elect his successor would be allowed to meet in Rome, or whether both the conclave and the seat of the Papacy should be transferred abroad, Malta being mentioned as a likely place. By the end of Leo XIII's reign all this was changed, and although the Roman Question remained unsolved, the Pope's relations with France were firmly established, those with Russia renewed, and the *Kultur-Kampf* with Bismarck's Germany had ended in a victory for the Holy See, while Roman Catholicism had achieved marked successes in Northern and Latin America.

In his great task Leo XIII was much aided by his wonderful and unique personal charm. I could not help experiencing it when listening to his animated, deeply interesting, and varied discourses. In the heat of one of them Leo XIII seemed, I remember, to find his pectoral cross in the way, so, when making his customary gestures with hands and arms, he tucked the cross away between the nearest buttons of his cassock. When my wife and mother-in-law, who belong to the Greek Orthodox Church, were received by the Pope, they both, after a few minutes' conversation, fell for life under his charm. The same happened to Grand Duchess Anastasia Mihailovna, wife of the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, when I accompanied Her Imperial Highness to an audience. And when her father, the aged Grand Duke Michael Nicolaevitch, wished to see the Pope, he had a long and very pleasant conversation at which I was officially present. When the Grand Duke was leaving, the Pope said to him, quite unexpectedly: "I regret not having seen your aide-de-camp, Mr. Échappard," who was to have accompanied His Imperial Highness. The Grand Duke proffered, of course, excuses for this young man on account of ill-health, but was much impressed that the Pope at his great age should have remembered, after such a prolonged audience, the absence of an aide-de-camp and even his name, which was, besides, a difficult foreign one!

In Rome one could buy at any good bookseller's a volume of

poems by Leo XIII. These were in Latin, in the form of odes. They treated of religious subjects, and the style has been found by impartial critics equal to that of Horace. When receiving pupils of Roman Catholic academies Leo XIII usually addressed them in perfectly fluent Latin. Of the three years I spent at the Pope's Court one was a "jubilee" year, accompanied by the customary magnificent ecclesiastical displays and Pontifical ceremonies. At these, as on other State occasions, the Pope is carried in the *sedia gestatoria* or throne-litter by his uniformed servitors, shoulder-high, wearing his tiara adorned by the three crowns, and his gorgeous Pontifical mantle. Leo XIII disliked being thus carried because looking down from that height at the thousands of kneeling people made him giddy. I noticed how he gripped with his left hand the arm of his chair, while giving his benediction with his right. At a beautiful ceremony of beatification, when an admirable nun, Rita di Cassia, who had died two centuries ago, was proclaimed a saint, 75,000 specially invited people, including our diplomatic corps in full dress, were assembled in St. Peter's, though neither the excommunicated King of Italy nor his "White" Court and diplomats were admitted; and there was still a broad open space in front of the Pope, the Cardinals and the Pontifical Court. All this sumptuous splendour surrounded a man who considered himself "a prisoner in the Vatican." But was he a prisoner?

The real truth of the matter was as follows. The Vatican demesne is surrounded by a mediæval wall. Inside its entrance-gate stands a Papal sentry wearing the red and yellow uniform designed by Michael Angelo, while the outside of the gate is guarded by a sentinel belonging to the King's troops. If the Pope were to go out of the gate, this Italian soldier would present arms, and the Pope would have either to accept his salute and recognise thereby the legitimacy of the King's occupation of Rome, or ignore the salutation and risk being arrested. Not one of Pius IX's successors was willing to do either, and preferred remaining inside the Vatican walls till they died. Even in summer, when the heat in Rome becomes stifling and all who are able to do so leave the city till October, the only alleviation Leo XIII could seek was to retire to a small summer-house in the shady gardens on the Vatican hill. But having caught there a slight attack of fever when he was ninety, he gave up even this change of residence on the advice of his old, excellent, and trustworthy Italian doctor. He took a daily drive through the Vatican gardens. A carriage-road had been so artfully laid out there that the Pope had the illusion of driving quite far and through a varying landscape. Leo XIII liked also to walk in his garden and to see his pet birds and small animals, which my wife and I have also

admired. He was very frugal, and dined usually off the wing of a chicken and a glass of claret. The Pope and his Cardinals were poor. The Pontifical treasury could hardly pay its way, even in such matters as maintaining the personnel needed for keeping in safety and order the priceless treasures of art and history which fill the Vatican Palace, museums, library, and archives. The Cardinals I visited in their homes never lit a stove even in mid-winter, and only put on an extra robe or cloak. None of them held any receptions. And all of them gave the "Black" Society, while we were there, only one reception. But that was wonderful. The Lateran Palace was illuminated for the occasion by thousands of candles, and a festive crowd could admire at leisure the splendid though scantily furnished halls. In this palace were signed in 1929 the Treaty and Concordat between the King and the Pope.

I have mentioned the King's "White" Court. That of the Pope was called "Black," and comprised the oldest and the best Roman families who had remained faithful to their Sovereign, and gone into mourning and closed the great gates of their palaces since 1870. Under Leo XIII the division between the "White" and "Black" social groups was as unpleasant and as scrupulously observed as that between the King and Pope. The foreign diplomats had also to be most careful. Those accredited to the Pope could not visit or see openly those accredited to the King. So, although the Russian Ambassador to the latter was my former chief in Constantinople, Nelidoff, and a great and old friend, it would have been fatal for me had I been seen at his Embassy with persons of the King's Court, or if he, at my Legation, had met a Cardinal. One of the staunchest and highest "Black" Romans was Prince Lancellotti. His palace gate was, of course, closed, and to visit the Princess one had to drive through a side-entrance. In one of the angles of his reception-room stands the original antique marble *discobolus* of the celebrated Greek sculptor Menas, and it is certainly a privilege to be admitted to admire it. This privilege was asked for by the Emperor William II when on one of his visits to the King of Italy. But it was politely refused by Prince Lancellotti, because the Emperor was the guest, in Papal Rome, of an excommunicated usurper.

On the other hand, the Emperor Francis Joseph never paid the King of Italy a return visit, though they had signed the Triple Alliance, because he preferred offending the King to offending the Pope. This offence, however, rankled in the memory of the King, and may have helped the latter to side in the Great War with the Allies against Austria. Politically Roman Catholics had formed in Germany the powerful "Centre" Party which helped Leo XIII to victory over Bismarck in the long and bitter *Kultur-Kampf*. But in Italy Leo XIII allowed Roman Catholics to take

many delicate questions of competition in prestige and authority to arise between the Vatican and the Quirinal. And there is little doubt that the winning side will be mostly that of the Pope. Both he and the Fascist leader are, however, true Italian patriots, and may be trusted to find, as they have done now, such a *combinazione* as will serve the interests of their cause and that of renaissance Italy. In solving any kind of Roman puzzle the Papacy has an immense advantage over any of its adversaries, as it can afford to wait. One of the magnificent Vatican frescoes of Raphael reminds us of a time when Attila, King of the Huns, came, 1,500 years ago, to the gates of Rome, and left the city unharmed, it being protected by an old man mounted on a white mule. Where is Attila to-day? Yet the direct successors of that Pope are still in the Vatican. Napoleon called his son the King of Rome. Where are they both? But the Pope is still on his throne. Bismarck started against Leo XIII a cultural campaign which is now forgotten. What has become of Bismarck and of the New German Empire he founded? And we see a successor of Leo XIII win back for the Popes a universal recognition of their temporal power. From this point of view Signor Mussolini and his six years of Fascist dictatorship are for the Vatican but interesting incidents which may be usefully exploited and are not much feared. Signor Mussolini told his Parliament that he had "buried" the Pope's temporal power, which would henceforth never extend beyond the limited area of the Vatican City. That is probably so, but every gardener knows that if you bury a tree by its roots it is most likely to grow and prosper, if given the necessary time. And that "time" for the Pontifical theocracy is no consideration may be seen from one more reminiscence I shall mention. I was once waiting with some other foreign representatives, including the French Ambassador, old M. Nizard, in the reception-room of Cardinal Rampolla, the Pope's Secretary of State. After some delay an aged Cardinal came out, excusing himself for having made us wait. Nizard, being his friend, asked him about the canonisation of Joan of Arc, which was then being impatiently awaited in France. "We are advancing this question," said the Cardinal, "as expeditiously as possible, and certainly it will be decided in about fifteen years." The speaker was perfectly aware that by that time neither he nor most of the men there present would be alive. Yet he was as absolutely sure that what he said would happen as if it would take place in a few days. For the Holy See fifteen years—or eighty, as in the case of the Roman question—are as nothing. The Pope can wait. Let time, friends, and foes pass, the Church is patient, being eternal—*patiens quia aeterna*.

N. V. TCHARYKOV.

HISTORY AS A TRAINING FOR CITIZENSHIP.*

IT is an axiom that democracy makes a larger demand on the individual citizen than any other form of government. In terms of political machinery it means cutting up power into little bits, counting heads instead of breaking them, the rule of the common man. In terms of social ethics it means government by discussion, the sharing of responsibility, the methods of compromise and accommodation. We are members of a society dedicated to the bracing principle of self-determination, in which each one of us is at once a subject and a sovereign; and it is the dream of our hearts to share in training the citizens of the future for their duties and destiny. To the writer and teacher of history in a democratic community such as ours falls a task which can be performed by no one else, a service of vital significance and utility to which we can never devote too much study and reflection.

In putting forward such a resonant claim for history as a factor in the making of citizens, I must be allowed to define it in my own way; for our estimate of its value must obviously depend on our conception of its nature. History as I learned it at school over forty years ago was barren of intellectual stimulus and civic inspiration, for it was presented as a string of more or less unrelated occurrences. To-day, thanks to the devoted labours of a generation of writers and teachers, we realise that it is the record and interpretation of the life of humanity; that it is concerned with man's ideas and ideals no less than with his physical needs, with the pilgrimage of the spirit no less than the strength of his hands. "*Historicus sum: nihil humani alienum puto.*" And to-day we proceed from the whole to the part, not from the part to the whole. Now that we know the story of mankind in all its length and breadth, it is easier to visualise and understand; for the vast structure is held together by the simple conception of growth from savagery to civilisation, and every chapter falls into its place as a stage and stepping-stone in the Great Adventure. To-day is not only the child of yesterday, but the heir of all the ages.

Assuming, therefore, that history is broadly conceived and intelligently taught, let us discuss its function in the training of our citizens. Its first task assuredly is to enable us to understand the world into which we are born and the stage on which we are called to play our part. Our birthplace gives a direction and a definition to our thought from which few of us ever escape. Though our blood, our language, and our religion for the most part have come to us from abroad, the scene on which we open our eyes wears

* An Address delivered at University College, January 6th, 1930.

a very different aspect if we view it from the meridian of Greenwich, from the Latin South, Eastern Europe, or the New World; and the differences multiply if we travel beyond the frontiers of Christianity and the home of white-skinned man. But this inevitable limitation has its advantages; for it simplifies the task of the teacher, and enables the budding citizen to adapt his lungs to the atmosphere he is fated to breathe. Moreover, with the aid of knowledge and imagination we can eliminate the cruder forms of local bias, and do justice to other varieties of human experience. The first and greatest lesson that the citizen has to learn is that the human family is greater than any of its constituent parts; that civilisation is a co-operative achievement, a common heritage and a joint responsibility; that every national unit is connected with the larger life of mankind by a thousand channels and contacts visible and invisible. Only if the growing mind is flooded with the conception of the unity of civilisation, the essential oneness of the human race, which came in with Christianity and the jurists of Imperial Rome, can it see the world of the twentieth century in proper perspective and understand the practical tasks which it presents.

Next in importance among history's services in the training of the citizen is the interpretation of the narrower stage on which he is born. Geography is the mother of history, and the young Englishman must be taught to understand that our island position is the key to our national development. Command of the narrow seas has been the condition of our survival and the basis of our colonial expansion. The watchword of Halifax, "Look to your moat," has been the guiding principle of our foreign policy for centuries, and must so remain till security is provided by other means in a renovated world. The unbroken rampart of our wooden walls has enabled us to erect the stately edifice of our liberties at leisure, undisturbed by the alarms inseparable from an open frontier, and unfettered by the concentration of power, natural in a community perpetually fighting for its life. The effective training of the British citizen has begun when he realises that the greatness of his country rests on the related principles of sea power and self-determination. The differences between British and Continental mentality are unintelligible till we recognise that security allowed us to outgrow autocracy, to exalt the civilian above the soldier, to develop the independence of law, and to foster the emergence of the common man. There is no more precious element in our national heritage than the sturdy individualism which bids defiance alike to subjection and to standardisation.

As the young citizen learns the framework, the tradition, and the tendencies of the community in which his lot is cast, the instinct of service and mutual aid comes into play. The visualisation of a

great inheritance suggests the continuity of our national life and awakens a sentiment of personal responsibility. "Thou hast inherited Sparta: adorn her." The teaching of civics is a very recent addition to the curriculum, and opinions naturally differ as to how it should be taught. But there is general agreement that it must be founded on history, and that our institutions and the principles they embody can only be understood in their historical evolution. "Why should history be studied?" asked Seeley in his Inaugural Lecture at Cambridge sixty years ago. "Because it is the school of statesmanship," he replied. "Our University is and must be a great seminary of politicians. Without at least a little knowledge of history, no man can take a rational interest in politics, and no man can form a rational judgment about them without a good deal." What Seeley said of politics is broadly true of civics; for the citizen should strive not only to master the elements of our community life, but also to form an independent valuation of their activities and influence.

The citizen of to-day has only begun his education when he has assimilated the institutions and the traditions of his country; for he is no less concerned with its relation to other countries and to the larger problems which affect whole empires, continents, and hemispheres. Men of my generation are old enough to remember the time when the Colonies aroused but scanty interest, and when the dependencies, apart from India, claimed but little of our attention. In half a century the white portion of our overseas Empire has grown into a Commonwealth of free nations, held together by sentiment alone; and our dark-skinned fellow-subjects, who are governed from Whitehall, are slowly climbing the steps of the ladder of self-determination under our sympathetic guidance. This extension of the theory and practice of free institutions throughout the vast expanse of our Empire is one of the main features of recent world history, and illustrates anew our devotion to the principle of ordered liberty by which we have grown and thriven at home.

Though our brothers overseas, speaking our tongue and sharing our traditions, make a special appeal, the Englishman can never turn his back on Europe or ignore the manifold contacts of politics, economics, and culture. In no direction can history more usefully prepare the citizen for his duties than by explaining to him in broad outline the development and characteristics of the chief nations of the Continent. We must tell him, for instance, how France has striven for what she calls her natural frontiers; how Germany and Italy achieved the national unity of which they had dreamed so long; how Russia instinctively reached out towards warm water; how the peoples of the Middle Danube were held together for centuries by the Hapsburg dynasty; how the Turks, who had flowed

into South-eastern Europe like a tidal wave in the days of their strength, were gradually pushed back by the Balkan races as they caught the morning rays of nationalism and secured the aid of one or more of the Great Powers; how certain nations, such as Sweden, Holland, and Spain, exhausted by superhuman efforts, have fallen behind in the race. And beyond the frontiers of Europe we have nowadays to fit into our mental panorama the United States, the South American Republics, and the immemorial civilisations of the Far East. As the stage thus widens the needs of the intelligent citizen proportionately increase, and the key to the labyrinth is supplied by history alone. Countries, institutions, religions can no more be understood from a flashlight photograph than the complex personality of the individual; for living bodies, like living beings, are only real and intelligible in the light of their past. If it be argued that I am asking too much of the citizen of to-morrow, I reply that a complacent provincialism is fatal to perspective and has become hopelessly out of date in an increasingly unified world. For the history of every country is the story of contact and exchange, of giving and getting, all through the centuries. We toss the ball to one another across seas and frontiers, and it is thus that we advance.

During the last ten years a new opportunity and a new obligation have come to the writer and teacher of history. The citizen of the post-war world must be trained to understand and to fulfil the duties imposed upon his country and himself by the creation of the League of Nations. It is childish to accuse or suspect of propaganda those of us who endeavour to relate the new institution to the main stream of European history; to compare and contrast it with previous efforts at international organisation in the Middle Ages and the nineteenth century; to explain how the rapidly growing interdependence of mankind facilitates and necessitates a more ambitious and sustained endeavour to secure the preservation of peace and carry on the international business of the world. If we have written history in the right way there is no need to alter a comma because the League of Nations came into being in 1920. If, however, we dwelt too exclusively in our national tabernacles or overstressed the element of material struggle, it is well that the coming of the League should have called attention to the deeper unity of civilisation and to the efforts of statesmen and thinkers of the past to build up an international order. To me, at any rate, the League is the logical and natural consummation of the whole process of human development. For the instinct of association is as old and as enduring as the instinct of strife. Patriotism is not enough, either in scholarship or in citizenship. A factor of incalculable significance has come into our lives, and it is our plain duty

to show not only what it is and what it does, but why and how it came into existence. Civilisation is organisation, and the League is the latest and most hopeful of human experiments. The Middle Ages invented the noble conception of the *Respublica Christiana*—the interdependence of different communities paying homage to the same fundamental principles of conduct and belief. We cannot restore that ideal, and we would not if we could. The world has enlarged its boundaries since the sixteenth century, and a common religious faith can no longer serve as a cement. But we must revive the kernel of the mediæval conception, and found it on the basis of our common humanity.

I have hitherto spoken of the contribution of history to the training for citizenship in terms of intellectual illumination; but it has also a definite task to perform on the ethical plane. The awakening mind approaches the past through the medium of the imagination, not through the critical judgment or the moral sense. Every child is a partisan. His natural leaning is to the victor, the bold warrior or statesman who sweeps obstacles from his path. But the child, under skilful guidance, is soon willing to look beyond mere success. It is one of the most precious of the services of the teacher to break the spell of the "great man" by explaining that he must be judged not only by the bulk of his achievements but by the cause which he served. There should be no difficulty in indicating the difference between Napoleon, whose insane ambition deluged Europe with blood, and Washington, who, after saving his country in the field and serving it in the council-chamber, contentedly retired to the position of a private citizen. The teacher's task is rather to suggest tests than to impose judgments. He will have laid a solid foundation of character if he can set the childish mind on its guard against the glamour of material triumph and convince it that real greatness does not work for itself alone. Other types must be introduced to his attention, and he will learn from King Alfred and Joan of Arc, St. Francis and Abraham Lincoln, Wilberforce and Shaftesbury, Livingstone and Nansen that there is no spiritual radiation without disinterested service. The youthful idealism kindled by such pillars of light may well develop into habits of thought and rules of life. The kernel of history is the growth of civilisation. The conception of our civilisation as implying certain standards of order, liberty, justice, morality, culture, and material well-being takes shape in the mind of the young citizen and helps him to find meaning and purpose in the pageantry of events; and the conviction that it has been built up, like a coral reef, by the efforts of myriads of men and women may well inspire a determination to take his place among the architects and engineers of a better world.

Listen to the deep organ notes of my honoured friend and teacher, Acton, a man not less eminent as a moralist than as an historian. "The great achievement of history is to develop and perfect and arm conscience." "I exhort you never to debase the moral currency, but to try others by the final maxim that governs your own lives, and to suffer no man and no cause to escape the undying penalty which history has the power to inflict on wrong." "If we lower our standard in history, we cannot uphold it in Church and State." "In judging men and things, ethics go before dogma, politics, and nationality." "The inflexible integrity of the moral code is to me the secret of the authority, the dignity, and the utility of history."

If this doctrine seems to some of us to overlook the fact that moral ideas, like every other expression of the human spirit, are subject to evolution, we may at any rate find in the study and teaching of history a source of priceless moral stimulus and discipline. It is the healer of past quarrels, the enemy of rancorous hates. Without history there can be no perspective and without perspective there can be no insight. At its best it is a judge, wiser than any one man, without passion or fear, swayed neither by religion nor race, party nor class, a corrector of injustice, an avenger of innocence. It encourages its votaries to ask for evidence, to allow for bias, to seek and to tell the truth and nothing but the truth. By bidding us apply not less exacting standards to the conduct of our own country than to that of other lands it disciplines and purifies our patriotism. The study of different epochs, races, nations, religions, institutions, and customs leads us to wide-hearted appreciation of the higher values; to respectful toleration of variety; to a conception of civilisation as orchestral, the fruit of effort working along many lines. In the study of history, in a word, we find precisely the synthesis of intellectual enlightenment and moral stimulus which citizenship requires and demands.

G. P. GOOCH.

CHESTERFIELD AND JOHNSON.

AMONG the many victims of what Lord Morley called defective and traditional criticism Lord Chesterfield is perhaps the most distinguished. Few, at any rate, have had to contend for the verdict of posterity against more damning epithets, coined not by the moralist in the pulpit, but by fellow-craftsmen in the world of literature. The reason is not far to seek. No man can be dubbed immoral in English literature without some damage to his immortal fame. Some of his critics have made broad their phylacteries: others, figuratively, consigned him to that circle of Dante's *Inferno* where raged the unhappy spirits who had "lost the good of the intellect." "Let us not speak of them: but look and pass."

Chesterfield was, in fact, placed outside the pale by those who deemed themselves moral and right-thinking men: no small class of the community at any time. From Horace Walpole and Dr. Johnson, down through the malevolent pages of Lord Hervey to Dickens and Macaulay, he was disparaged, abused, condemned. Considered judgments can always be revised; popular and offensive epithets cling tenaciously to their victims. From the days of "doubting" Thomas men's reputations have been made or unmade by a word or phrase; and better men than Chesterfield have had to wait for vindication against the slings and arrows of outrageous critics. But to be called by Horace Walpole a "corrupter of youth who left a system of education to poison them from the nursery," to be accused by Boswell of "glossy duplicity" (the phrase is sibilant and effective), to be accused of falsehood and dubbed an impostor, and, worst of all for his good name, to be crushed under the aphoristic contempt of Johnson in his memorable and oft-quoted phrase, would be a sufficient burden for any man's fame.

A recent writer on Johnson has once again clouded and distorted criticism by stigmatising Chesterfield as "a crude bounder": while another has described the Letters as an "atonement," a partial misunderstanding both of the man and his purpose. Pages have been, and no doubt will be, written on the moral precepts in Chesterfield's *Letters to His Son*. But the substance of the controversy is surely now defined and settled. As a whole his moral teaching has been, and still is, seriously misrepresented: but its gravest defects were those of the class and society to which he belonged. Unfortunately there are fashions even in morals, and Chesterfield was a man of fashion. Horace Walpole (always lavish in vituperation) called him "an ape of the French." Unfair though it is, the gibe contains a germ of truth. Chesterfield was

in no sense a normal or typical Englishman of the eighteenth century or, indeed, of any other. Those who seek for the normal Englishman of his age will find him rather in a Robert Walpole or a Samuel Johnson, in the pages of Fielding, or on the canvas of Hogarth. When Chesterfield wrote "a Frenchman who unites with virtue, learning, and good sense, the manners and politeness of his country, attains the perfection of human nature," he clearly wrote something offensive to the robust nationalism of the Englishman of his day.

From the time that he learnt French as a child from his Norman maid till his death-bed, when with his last dying words he offered Dayrolles a chair, he is French rather than English in the quality and texture of his mind, in his outlook on men and affairs, in his half-cynical, half-philosophical observation of mankind and its foibles. At the early age of twenty he wrote from Paris, with evident satisfaction, that he was often taken for a Frenchman. His persistent harping on the "graces," on the pleasing manners of the French, even his definitions of vice and immorality, are all tokens of the same French outlook and habit of mind. Like La Rochefoucauld he thought that grace is to the body what good sense is to the mind. This French bias explains to some extent the ill-will which he incurred from some of his contemporaries and from Johnson in particular. If the Italianate Englishman was "the devil incarnate," the Frenchified Englishman was at least suspect to some of his fellow-countrymen. How suspect, and even ridiculous, can be seen in Foote's *The Englishman in Paris* and *The Englishman Returned from Paris*. He easily became the dancing-master with the morals of a courtesan in the eyes of Johnson. Probably Johnson's unforgettable phrase in the pages of Boswell, and his quarrel with Chesterfield, have done more damage to the fame and reputation of the latter than more solid criticism from other quarters. Once the sage had spoken there was none so bold as to plead his cause against the charges of hypocrisy and insincerity for many years to come. Of all the charges levelled against the *Letters* and the writer, that of insincerity has least foundation. We may remember the Psalms of David and Uriah the Hittite. To picture Chesterfield as a solemn humbug or a hoary sinner doing penance for a disordered life is grotesque.

But there was a further reason for Chesterfield's unpopularity. He was a scathing censor of English manners and society. He condemned what he called "the indecent behaviour and the illiberal views" of his countrymen abroad. He urged his son to observe the civility of the French, "whose politeness seems as easy and natural as any other part of their conversation: whereas the English are often awkward in their civilities." He remarked that

French conversation with all its faults was much less futile and frivolous than ours with its dissertations upon the weather and upon whist; that the *beaux esprits* of Paris were commonly well-bred, while ours were not. He noted that English women in the eighteenth century were not nearly as well cultivated as the French. He observed (perhaps with Johnson in his mind!) that French people of learning were "not bears as most of ours are: they are gentlemen." He criticised English ignorance of foreign politics and European countries, and deplored the futile practice of sending young Englishmen abroad for tours of dissipation and pleasure.

"The studied smooth complying habits of the Continent," as Boswell called them, were to Chesterfield "Titian tints and Guido graces." And—climax of anti-patriotism!—he even preferred French to English hunting; the latter, in his view, being "only for bumpkins and boobies." In tastes and in manners he was, in fact, more of a *grand seigneur* of the *Ancien Régime* than a typical Whig nobleman of early eighteenth-century England. Even Johnson admitted that his manners were "exquisitely elegant."

For us, it is easier to forgive Chesterfield if we recall the background of English manners in the time of the first two Georges. Hanoverian society at its best was scarcely a school of refinement. It was no Hôtel de Rambouillet. The coarseness of the time was reflected in the rude jests and boisterous pleasures of Robert Walpole and the class to which he belonged, in the drunkenness and buffoonery of the smaller landed gentry. Chesterfield had abundant reason for teaching by his example and precept "a general propriety of conduct in the common intercourse of life." In the sense, therefore, that the admirer of Voltaire and the friend of Montesquieu was a reformer of manners he struck against the insular tradition and the national self-consciousness.

Nothing is more significant of the French quality of Chesterfield's mind than the fact that a French critic was the first to vindicate his fame and to define his peculiar literary values. If Johnson felled him to the ground, Sainte-Beuve raised him again and assigned to him his due place in English literature. Sainte-Beuve (in phrases so often quoted) gave him the highest praise: called him the La Rochefoucauld of England, noted his amazing sagacity and foresight in predicting the downfall of Church and State in France, and described the *Letters* as a rich book where every page yields some happy observation. But above all, he praised his understanding of the French people and gave him the highest eulogy which a Frenchman can bestow, viz. that he was *un esprit français*. Sainte-Beuve, too, has delicately summed-up the moral issue between Chesterfield and Johnson "... *c'est à*

ces endroits surtout que la pudeur du grave Johnson s'est voilée, la nôtre se contente d'y sourire." Though if Sainte-Beuve had read his Boswell more carefully he would have found that even the serious-minded Johnson loved a frolic and sometimes kept quaint company: he was not averse to playing hide-and-seek with Puritanism on occasions, to borrow a happy phrase from Mr. Birrell.

By readers of Boswell, Chesterfield is remembered mainly as the anvil on which Johnson laid his hammer with such energy and effect. In literature as in politics nothing invites human interest more than the clash of personalities. Ardent Johnsonians still quote the *Letter to Lord Chesterfield* as a striking proof of their hero's quality, and the more pugnacious of his protagonists regard it as the "knock-out" blow of literature. Natural impulse compels our sympathies for the man of the people who had lived on fourpence-halfpenny a day, had tramped the streets for lack of a night's lodging, and used to blow out his breath like a whale, rather than for the aristocrat who gambled away thousands at Bath, enjoyed the purple and fine linen of life, and was dainty in his habits. Yet Johnsonians should remember that it is permissible to praise a letter without approving the writer's action in writing it. They might even apply to Johnson his own wise comment on Goldsmith on another occasion: "He has done it very well, but it is a foolish thing well done." In truth Johnson was no more qualified to judge Chesterfield than either Gladstone or Disraeli to judge the other, than Gibbon to mete out justice to the Christian religion. On this occasion, at any rate, Johnson squeezed in "the hateful rind of resentment" as he called it.

Bear and panther are at all times ill-mated stable-companions, and when the bear has a sore head trouble is inevitable. However, the difference was more fundamental than Boswell or his followers have allowed or perceived. There was something more than a rebellion against "Patronage" on the part of Johnson, more even than a difference of social habit and outlook, or a collision between rugged honesty and smooth diplomacy, to explain the outburst of Johnson. True, no two personalities could well be more antipathetic than those of Johnson and Chesterfield. Clearly the ethics of Chesterfield were not the ethics of Johnson. Ethical codes of different classes seldom agree. Moreover, the former drew his inspiration in large measure from ancient Greece and Rome and, more directly, from eighteenth-century France: while Johnson's moral code was based on his faith in Scriptural Christianity and a profound belief in revelation. But there is little doubt that a mutual psychological antipathy was aggravated on Johnson's side by the French bias of Chesterfield's mind.

Here it is pertinent to remember that for nearly twelve years

of Chesterfield's adult life, and for some eighteen years of Johnson's, we were at war with France. If Johnson in his own day was the Dictator of Literature (a position which Chesterfield readily conceded to him) he was equally the John Bull of letters, with all his prejudices, roughness, hatred of foreigners and dislike for things he did not understand. A clash between Johnson and Chesterfield was, in effect, a clash between the English and the French mind—fundamental and historic. Moreover, Johnson was, on the whole, intellectually and morally unsympathetic to French literature. He approved Boileau, preferred La Rochefoucauld to La Bruyère, but he considered Rousseau "a very bad man" ("I should like to have him work in the plantation") and Voltaire no better. To him they were intellectually as thin as their light wines and, to make matters worse, did they not "eat frogs"? He was all for the beef and the ale against the wine and the omelette, for the tavern and the club against the salon and the court. His dislike for the French was, in fact, avowed and notorious. Good hater as he was, he placed them with Whigs, Dissenters, Scotchmen, and Americans, a useful topic for his more atrabilious comments on man as a social and political animal. "They have few sentiments, but they express them neatly, they have little meat, but they dress it well," was his comment. We know that he thought much may be made of a Scotchman if he be caught young, but he never suggested that anything could be made of a Frenchman young or old! His tour on the Continent in 1775 (two years after Chesterfield's death) did little to dispel his prejudices against the French: rather, as in the case of Hogarth, it strengthened his dislike. Though Boswell tells us he later spoke in praise of French literature, he crudely stigmatised their nation as "a gross, ill-bred, untaught people." With infinite satisfaction he crushed Boswell and the French by a single blow: "France is worse than Scotland in everything but climate. Nature has done more for the French, but they have done less for themselves than the Scotch have done." As a climax of perverseness he would talk nothing but Latin in France, though he talked French tolerably, understood it well and wrote it without difficulty. Evidently nothing was lacking in Johnson's prejudices to give pungency to his dislike for Chesterfield, with his French airs and graces.

Their tastes in books were also widely divergent. If Johnson often had the *Anatomy of Melancholy*, and the *Pilgrim's Progress* in his hand, and placed Cervantes on the pinnacle that he deserved, Chesterfield found more pleasure in the great writers of contemporary France. However, our real quarrel with Chesterfield is that he passed out of and not into the life of Johnson. We can forgive him for his failure to patronise the *Dictionary*, we may even

rejoice that Johnson struck a blow for literary independence and mutilated poetry in the process, but the estrangement may have robbed us of a harvest of good talk between the first wit of his age and the greatest English talker of all time. Perhaps Chesterfield would have discovered that much of Johnson's strength as a talker lay in his limitations. To Johnson a little knowledge was not a dangerous thing. His unrivalled power in conversation lay, not only in his stores of knowledge and his retentive memory, but in his ignorance. Ignorance is a formidable weapon when ruthlessly and savagely employed. Even in talk many a victory has been won by ruthlessness. No one knew better than Johnson the value of big battalions in conversation. He was in that respect the Napoleon among talkers. His enemy was crushed by a concentration of force where he least expected it and regardless of right or wrong.

A more grateful task is to note the points of contact between their minds. Both of them had "run about the world" in Johnson's happy phrase: and both had acquired the philosophy which results from experience and the study of mankind. To both of them the art of living was a matter of supreme interest and study. "Books without the knowledge of life are useless," said Johnson. "Knowledge of the world is only to be acquired by reading men and studying all the various editions of them" wrote Chesterfield. Both of them were devoid of cant, both were, at bottom, intellectually and morally honest, bravely facing the consequences of their own lives and opinions. They may even have agreed with Horace Walpole that this world is a comedy to those who think and a tragedy to those who feel. Neither of them suffered fools gladly: they differed only in method. The one swept them aside roughly, the other, to use his own words, always treated fools and coxcombs with great ceremony: though Johnson may well have agreed with Chesterfield in thinking that frivolous and futile people make at least three parts in four of mankind, and that the laughter of the fool is as the crackling of thorns under a pot. If the charge of cynicism can be made against Chesterfield, that of sophistry can with equal truth be levelled against Johnson. If there were two Chesterfields, there were, undoubtedly, two Johnsons. Horace Walpole said of Johnson that though he was good-natured at bottom he was very ill-natured at top. Of Chesterfield it may be said that if he was cynical at top he was a sound and honest thinker at bottom, and not lacking in good nature and kindness of heart.

Aristocratic though he was, Chesterfield's interest in life and mankind extended far beyond the narrow bounds of what Burke called "the pimping politics of the Court": he thought himself in company as much above him when he was with Addison and Pope

as if he had been with all the princes of Europe. But whereas Johnson's place in the hearts of his fellow-countrymen and in the Republic of letters is secure, and his contribution to English literature is beyond dispute, that of Chesterfield has been uncertain, and less than justice has been rendered him for his services to the English language. Although he was so French in taste and temperament, few writers have been imbued with a greater spirit of reverence for the mother tongue than Chesterfield. In purity of diction and in choice of words he stands with the elect. That he penned letters never intended for the scrutiny of the world as though he were writing for publication (for Chesterfield, like Pepys, is in a sense a literary accident) is proof of his rare and scrupulous craftsmanship in the art. He himself tells us that he observed the rule of never allowing any careless expression to escape him. In truth he was ever faithful to the Ciceronian standard of fastidious and ever-reverent usage of words and a loyal observer of Boileau's counsel to the poet, to polish and polish again until the glow of perfection appears. Not even Burke was more consistent in his search for the best rather than for the good: nor was Macaulay, with all his cornucopian variety, more fluent or purer in his diction.

After all, good style is the good manners of literature, and to Chesterfield good manners were the salt of life. If Johnson was more universal in his knowledge, Chesterfield was more catholic in taste and style. No sane preceptor of youth would place Johnsonian English before his pupils as a model to be observed, whereas a close study of Chesterfield's English might prove a useful prophylactic against the varied infections from journalism, broadcasting, and America, which threaten to poison our language in the present day. Johnson's greatest service was perhaps that he gave a fresh dignity to the craft of English literature, rather than any positive and permanent contribution to its treasure-house or to its style. There is pathos as well as dignity in the hope expressed by him that he had added something to the elegance of the construction of the English language and something to the harmony of its cadence. Unfortunately sonorousness and polysyllables do not always make for harmony, nor did his admiration for Addison reflect itself in the ease and grace which flowed from the pen of Chesterfield. If Boswell is partly right in saying that Johnson formed his style on the great writers of the seventeenth century—such as Hooker, Bacon, and some smaller fry (his latinity was an even surer foundation), there is little doubt as to the sources from which Chesterfield drew his inspiration and his sense of form. Like Gibbon, he talked and wrote French as easily as his own tongue. His English has all the peculiar dignity and precision of fine French writing. "Elegancy in one language will

reproduce itself in all," he wrote to his son, and he abundantly illustrated the truth of his own maxim. Moreover, his knowledge was not confined to the language and literature of the French: his acquaintance with their civil government, its structure, history, and working was probably not shared by a dozen Englishmen of his day.

Chesterfield rendered at least two services to his age and to English literature. He did something to improve the standard and general tone of English manners, while he did much to advance the standard of English prose. For this we can forgive him much, and there is much to forgive a man who prefers Racine and Corneille to Shakespeare or finds Dante unreadable and Milton a bore. If to the merits of a wit and a speaker we add that he was perhaps the best Lord-Lieutenant whom Ireland ever received at our hands, and that in political sagacity and foresight he was among the first statesmen of his time, we shall agree with Sainte-Beuve rather than with Horace Walpole. Even those who worship at the temple of the Great Cham of literature may spare occasional orisons at the smaller shrine of Chesterfield. Both, at any rate, obeyed Voltaire's precept, "*il faut cultiver son jardin*," and, each according to his gifts, did it well and to the honour and glory of English literature.

H. ARTHUR BAKER.

SINAI: A VISIT TO ST. KATHARINE'S MONASTERY.

OF the hundreds of visitors who come to Egypt every winter probably very few realise that but a short distance away, as the airman reckons, lies the peninsula of Sinai with the Gebel Musa or Mountain of Moses and the monastery of St. Katharine, famous to pilgrims and scholars for some thirteen hundred years. But fame alone cannot render travel any easier and the isolated position of the monastery, combined with the difficulty of approaching it, is sufficient to discourage visits except from those who are either stout of heart or else extremely fortunate. The writer must frankly admit to being of the second category, as the problem of transport was luckily solved by the kindness of friends in the Frontiers District Administration of the Egyptian Government. For it happened that a trip was being organised to test a special type of car for carrying distinguished personages on desert expeditions and thus an exceptional opportunity occurred for a small party of us to be taken to the monastery.

A word about the car itself may interest motorists. The chassis is a Morris Commercial six-wheeler with a 15.9 horse-power engine, and eight gears in two sets of fours. On to this a special saloon body was built, with four comfortable seats facing forward and six large windows, the glass being slightly tinted to counteract the glare. Electric lights and fan were also installed, which with grey window blinds made the interior both neat and comfortable. As the centre of gravity was too high for rough going, about a ton of lead was added to the chassis, making the total weight of the vehicle about three and a half tons. Spares, tyres, petrol, water, etc., not to mention our baggage, were carried on a six-wheeled tender, driven and manned by some of those excellent Sudanis whom the Frontiers Administration have turned into such efficient desert policemen.

We started about 8 a.m. one morning from El Shatt, which is on the east bank of the Canal opposite Suez, our course being southeasterly along a desert track between the Sinai hills on the left and the gulf of Suez on the right. Forty minutes took us to Ayûn Musa or the Springs of Moses, an oasis of date palms and gardens which was occupied by the Turks in the war; about midday we stopped for lunch at Wadi Gharandel, the traditional Elim of the Exodus, where at a water-hole among some tamarisks were a few goats and a couple of women, the latter being completely veiled, as is the usual custom in Sinai. Later on a remarkable instance of Nature's camouflage was seen in a covey of seven sand grouse, very hard to detect except when on the wing: otherwise nothing event-

ful occurred until we turned to the sea-coast and, after a run of 123 kilos, arrived at Abu Zeneima. This is the port and headquarters of the Sinai Mining Company, who work the manganese deposits in the neighbouring hills: they kindly allowed us to use their comfortable rest-house and after tea we had a delicious bathe in the sea, though its scope was limited to inside the coral reef through respect for the prowling sharks.

Early to dine, to bed, and to rise is the recognised rule in the desert, and next morning we were on the move by 6.30 a.m. At first the only possible road for cars runs along the short railway track belonging to the mining company close to the sea; at intervals it passes through narrow cuttings in the hills, and woe-betide any car that meets a manganese freight train! Luckily traffic on that line is the reverse of congested. Leaving the railway and following the coast we saw a couple of gazelle: a little after 8 o'clock we turned east and entered the Sinai hills at the Wadi Sidri, where the serious part of our uphill journey began. From thenceforth there was no "road" in any civilised sense of the word: between the hills are deep ravines or *wadis* (dry water-courses), which are littered with stones and rocks of all sizes, varied by stretches of very heavy sand. The driver is always grappling with the arduous task of picking out places which are less bumpy than others, while the passengers enjoy the fun (*sic*) of trying to keep their seats in a sort of cup and ball game. However, the novelty and scenery supply a welcome antidote: the brownish sandstone changes to gorgeous pink granite and in the Wadi el Mukattib (Valley of Writings) the rocks are frequently covered with early inscriptions in Nabatean, Greek, Coptic, and Arabic, done by travellers and pilgrims, who have occasionally displayed their artistic yearnings by crude drawings of horses, camels, and even ships. In the Wadi Feirân we stopped to double the front wheels because of the heavy going, shortly after which appeared date palms and gardens, showing we had reached the Oasis of Feirân, which is some three miles long and has an inexhaustible supply of water. This is supposed to be the Paran of the Old Testament story and Eusebius identifies it with Rephidim, the scene of the battle between the Israelites and the Amalekites. In early Christian times it was called Pharan and became a town with an archbishopric, the remains of stone houses and two churches being visible on the precipitous cliffs. To-day a Greek monk lives there alone, a hospitable fellow and a keen gardener, who invited us to eat our lunch under his shady trees and gave us some of the largest and juiciest lemons I have ever seen.

The vegetation in this oasis is so dense that the car had literally to force its way through thick clumps of palm trees, the result

being fatal to one of our windows. Then came patches of heavy sand, necessitating recourse to the eighth gear to churn the wheels out, and here we first saw the range of Um Serbâl (6,760 feet) with its serrated granite peaks. In this wadi grows the *tarfa* or tamarisk shrub, on which lives a species of insect called coocids; from their bodies exudes a clear syrupy juice, which hardens like gum and is identified with the *manna* of the Bible. The Beduin collect it regularly and sell it to the pilgrims. In the Wadi el Sheikh a whitewashed dome marks the tomb of Nebi Saleh, an ancestor of the Towâra Beduin; later on the right opened the plain of Er Raha, the traditional camping ground of the Israelites, and then we passed Gebel Hârûn, where Aaron is supposed (?) to have erected the golden calf.

Then came the thrill. In an oval amphitheatre of granite mountains the dark silhouettes of huge cypresses suddenly appeared in the evening light: we were soon passing gardens and fruit trees and the next moment we gazed on the great towering walls of St. Katharine's monastery. The car pulled up at the outer gate after a stiff climb of 5,100 feet and 144 kilos of the roughest track imaginable, a very fine, if exhausting, feat of driving. We were received by the four senior monks and piloted in single file through the main entrance, which consists of a narrow passage so low that you have to stoop to enter. It is protected by two massive doors heavily reinforced with metal and a right-angled turn leads to a third solid door, an arrangement calculated to prevent any intruder from making a forcible entry. Our hosts conducted us to the guest-room and regaled us with coffee and a glass bowl of quince preserve, home made, which we devoured like schoolboys. Our credentials being guaranteed by our letter from their Archbishop in Cairo, conversation started in Arabic and one of the first questions they asked was about the health of King George. Our good news was a source of real joy to these kindly folk—we were their first visitors that year—and they pointed with pride to a large picture of His Majesty on the wall and said they had followed all the bulletins and prayed for him regularly during his illness. By devious passages and stairs they took us to the guests' quarters, which are on a level with the top of the wall: the furniture was European and good, palm-olive soap was provided, and after a welcome dinner we were soon asleep in most comfortable beds.

To give a complete account of the monastery and its history is impossible, owing partly to the shortness of our visit and partly to the limited range of this article. Controversy as to Biblical sites and events must also be avoided, but to those unacquainted with early Christian records the following brief summary may be of interest. The Sinai mountains, hallowed by sacred legend and

remote from the horrors of Roman persecution, became by the fourth century A.D. a retreat for numerous hermits and anchorites living under simple monastic rules. They dwelt scattered among the valleys and mountains near the Burning Bush and Gebel Musa, but they suffered terribly from the Ishmaelite Arabs and the Blemmyes, who plundered their cells and churches and on two occasions murdered every monk they caught. In despair they appealed for protection to the Emperor Justinian, who in A.D. 530 built them a strong fortress inside which they all congregated. He endowed them also with a hundred Roman and a hundred Egyptian slaves with their wives and families, their duties being to render service to the monks and protect them in time of trouble. Their descendants, though converted to Islam and reduced in numbers, are called the Jebeliya (Mountain Folk) and are still employed by the monks in domestic and other occupations. This fortress of Justinian is to-day called the monastery of St. Katharine. When the followers of the Prophet Mohammed overran Palestine and Egypt, the fate of the monastery became somewhat precarious. But to conciliate the Moslems a mosque was built inside the fortress: at first the visitor is astonished to see a minaret and a church tower side by side within a few yards of each other, but this shrewd act of diplomacy, enhanced, perhaps, by a daily dole of food to the Beduin, has produced a friendly entente between the Crescent and the Cross and saved the place from possible Moslem aggression.

Byzantine in origin, the monastery has always belonged to the Orthodox Greek Church and to-day the monks are all Greek, coming chiefly from Crete and Cyprus. It is an autocephalous episcopate and on the demise of the archbishop his successor is chosen from among themselves. After his election he visits Jerusalem to receive the benediction of the Greek Patriarch, but this is more or less a formality, as the latter is bound to ratify the choice of the monks. At the time of our visit the present archbishop, Porphyrios III, was living in Cairo. He alone can give permission to enter the monastery, a fact discovered all too late by a party of English travellers who once made the journey thither from Jerusalem and were refused admittance. In his absence the monastery is controlled by a committee of the four senior archimandrites, whose names (in April last) were as follows: Jacobus, the *oikonomos* or steward, who spoke the best Arabic; Joachim, the treasurer; Theodosius, who spoke a little English and French; and Theocritus, of whom we saw the least. None of us knew any Greek, so Arabic was the medium for our conversations. There were eighteen monks and a number of novices in residence, but they all appeared to be busy with different jobs and we hardly saw anyone except the "Committee," who were most kind and attentive

in showing us round. And a guide is most essential, for inside the fort is a heterogeneous mass of buildings, rooms, and chapels connected by a maze of stairs and passages, but the outstanding objects of importance are the Church, the Refectory, and the Library.

The Church of The Transfiguration is an early Byzantine basilica, on the lines of those at Ravenna, with solid granite columns, the capitals being adorned with Christian emblems and animals, but unfortunately painted green. The basilica effect is somewhat spoilt by a large modern screen or eikonostasis, which my friend Theodosius described as "*mauvais gout*"; wherein he is right, for it is rather garish and obstructs the view of the apse and its fine mosaic. The latter is a beautiful piece of sixth-seventh-century work, which we were assured had never been repaired: it depicts the Transfiguration of Christ, while above it Moses prays at the Burning Bush on one side and receives the Ten Commandments on the other. Below are medallion portraits said to be those of Justinian and Theodora. We explored singly in the morning, but in the afternoon the whole "Committee" turned out to show us the church treasures—or some of them. Memory does not allow a complete description of all the wonderful things we saw, but we were much impressed by some magnificent early reliquaries and crosses, two being studded all over with pearls, rubies, and precious stones. There was a crucifix worked in enamel and set in diamonds, suggesting a Greek artist, and also a pendant with diamonds hung on an exquisite gold chain from Russia. Ceremonial tiaras were produced, one silver gilt and encrusted with pearls and another with alternating bands of emeralds and rubies mounting to crosses at the top. Most fascinating, too, was a lovely chalice bearing the lilies of France: on its base we made out "Karolus" and "MCCCC," but not the remaining figures: was it a gift from Charles VII of France? The beautiful old vestments, stoles, Brusa velvets and embroideries made our ladies thrill with excitement, but the masculine pen cannot hope to do them justice.

In the choir is the marble tomb of St. Katharine, who gives her name to the monastery and occasionally (it would seem) to the church. She is said to have suffered martyrdom in A.D. 307 under the Emperor Maximin at Alexandria and her body was taken to Sinai for burial: the legends of her wheel and her mystic marriage with Christ are favourite subjects in Renaissance painting. Behind the east end of the church is the small apsidal chapel of the Burning Bush, before entering which you must remove your shoes. Blue Damascus tiles cover the walls and the site of the Bush itself is marked by a large silver covering of *repoussé* work with Biblical scenes in panels: above it three silver lamps are always kept burning. Outside this chapel in a carefully-guarded enclosure grows

what the monks declare to be a descendant of the Bush. Actually it is a cluster of plants resembling a bramble, but the curious thing is that no other plant of that nature is known to exist elsewhere in Sinai. Service is held in the church every morning from 3 a.m. to 6 a.m. To stand on our wooden balcony high up on the walls and watch the stars overhead and listen to the men's voices chanting in the church below was an impressive memory which one can never forget.

But in some ways the most attractive place was perhaps the Refectory. Imagine a long vaulted stone chamber: the wall at one end is covered with a fresco of the Last Judgment in reddish tones, the style being Greek, but the composition reminiscent of Orcagna at the Campo Santo, Pisa. Lower down on the same wall is a small apse with a fresco in warm madder of Abraham entertaining the Three Angels. The *chef d'œuvre* is the magnificent wooden dining-table, forty feet long, the chassis, or under part, being divided into seven sections, carved with heraldic, floral, and other designs in Renaissance style. Our *cicerone* was ignorant of its history, but it was surely a gift from some European princeling to the monastery. Even more interesting were the names and coats-of-arms which are carved and painted on the stone vaulting. The names are not easy to decipher, but they appeared to be written in mediæval Latin, German, French, and English. Most of the coats-of-arms are of early date, as is indicated by their simple charges, on a field argent, and they are undoubtedly those of pious knights who visited the monastery when doing the Long Pilgrimage to the Holy Land and Sinai.

We were next conducted to the Library, where Tischendorf in 1844 discovered the famous *Codex Sinaiticus*, the second oldest version of the Bible, afterwards bought by Alexander II and kept at Petersburg. To-day the greatest treasure is the Syriac Codex of the Gospels, dating from the fourth century, which is carefully preserved in a wooden box with a glass cover and never touched by the *profanum vulgus*. Syriac was the vernacular of Palestine in the time of Christ and this is the oldest Syriac version in existence. A beautiful piece of work was the *Evangelium Theodosianum*, consisting of passages from the New Testament written entirely in gold lettering on white vellum, the frontispiece containing most attractive miniatures of Our Lord, Mary, and the Evangelists. The monks attribute it to Theodosius (eighth century), but modern critics refuse to date it earlier than about 1000. Some fine Greek Bibles had Byzantine covers made of heavy silver gilt with sacred scenes worked in high relief: the back of one resembled bands of chain armour in silver, which seemed an ingenious and artistic arrangement to make a heavy book open easily. In lighter vein was the MS. of Cosmas Indicopleustes, an Alexandrian mer-

chant and traveller of the sixth century: the monastery copy—of the eleventh century—is enlivened with the quaintest illustrations, giving the most humorous conception of sacred and profane subjects. Judging by the many finger-marks it must correspond to what the publishing trade to-day calls a "best seller."

Space does not allow a description of the other literary treasures nor, for that matter, of our explorations, all too hurried, of the old walls, the smaller chapels, the wells, the bakehouse, and other fascinating spots. But two things cannot be omitted. One is the ubiquitous and motley collection of cats, and especially the big tabby that followed its master when he walked up the hillside to a quiet spot for evening meditation. The other is the artist monk, Pachonius, who invited us to *mastic* in his rooms and displayed a weird jumble of old eikons and modern rubbish and finally—with becoming modesty—his own contributions to religious art.

The ascent of Gebel Musa or the Mountain of Moses is incumbent on every able-bodied visitor to the monastery, whatever his "higher" criticism of the Bible story may be. We started about 7.45 a.m., the others on donkeys and the writer on a most reluctant camel, whose maximum cruising speed could rarely have exceeded a mile an hour. After a long crawl up a zigzag path we left our mounts and climbed for half an hour up some steep rocky steps, a breathless effort which revealed our lack of training. On the summit (7,500 feet) are a small church and a mosque side by side: the mosque is empty, but the church is simply furnished and is still used by the monks at certain festivals. You are immediately shown a grotto or hollow as the "clift in the rock," where "the Lord covered Moses with His hand as He passed by" (Exodus 33). For from a very early date tradition has identified Gebel Musa with the "Mount Sinai" where Moses received the Ten Commandments; and the camping ground of the Israelites is likewise placed in the plain of Er Raha, which lies below the mountain and which, with the adjoining valleys, contains in a normal year sufficient water and vegetation to support a considerable nomad population. The scenery is magnificent: all around are rugged granite ranges, the highest peak being Gebel Katharina (8,550 feet), whither picturesque legend says that the body of the saint was miraculously borne by angels. We ate our lunch in silence, which induced a small mountain rat to emerge from his retreat and nibble our cheese with the calmest sang-froid: he and a few stone-chats were the only visible signs of life. We made the entire descent on foot by the Pilgrimage Steps, a severe strain on the middle-aged knee, for the steps are as numerous as steep. But we paused, as surely everyone pauses, at the Plain of the Cypress, a charming hollow in the hills with a single gigantic cypress and a neatly-kept garden. The path is simply bristling with legendary sites conveniently grouped

together; you pass the Chapel of Elijah with the hollow where he hid himself; then comes the Chapel of Mary and, lower down, the spring where Moses watered the flocks of Jethro. Whatever value (if any) may be placed on such legends, it cannot be doubted that an expedition of this kind helps one to grasp the inherent probabilities of Old Testament narratives in the most realistic manner.

To the north side of the monastery lie the gardens, laid out in terrace fashion with quinces, vines, orange, and olive trees, interspersed with tall cypresses, the different shades of green making striking contrast to the pink granite of the hills. Here we visited the chapel of St. John, the crypt below which forms the burial place of the monks. Just inside the door one is surprised to see a crouching figure sitting on a chair in hermit's clothes and velvet cap: surprise turns to shock when one learns that it is St. Stephanos the porter and that he has been sitting there since the year 580! The bodies of the bishops are folded up and kept in boxes with their episcopal robes, but the bones and skulls of the monks are just piled up loosely in two large and repulsive heaps. The sun had set when we emerged from this grisly spot, so automatically we moved towards tea. Later on it transpired that the *apéritif* was not unknown to the "Committee" and we were invited to try some Greek brandy in the guest-room and exchange news with our genial hosts. There was something most attractive about these good fellows: their personal charm, the breadth between their blue eyes, and their spontaneous anxiety to please was one of the most delightful features of our visit.

But that, alas! was our farewell to them, for our two days were over, and the third morning saw us up at 4 a.m. and all packed and ready to start soon after 5 a.m. The monks were at service in church, but our friend Jacobus stole out for a moment to give us his valediction and a parting request to ask our Bishop in Cairo to pray for rain, as they had had none for over a year and wanted it badly. With much reluctance we turned our backs on the monastery, as the car began bumping and jolting us down the *wadis* leading to Abu Zeneima, which we reached for lunch at 1.15 p.m. We were off again by 2 p.m., as our pilot wanted to make Suez before dark: again we saw a covey of sand grouse and two gazelle—were they the same ones?—and eventually reached El Shatt by 7.30 p.m. On the whole double journey, extremely rough as it was, the special car had no punctures and no engine or other trouble, a tribute to the excellent work of William Morris & Co. A launch took us over to Port Tewfik and the Bel Air Hotel at Suez provided dinner and early bed. Next morning we drove across the desert from Suez to Cairo, but the levelled road and the other passing cars seemed a banal anti-climax after the romance and thrills of Sinai and the Mountain of Moses.

C. A. G. MACKINTOSH.

THE SICILIAN MARIONETTES.

HOW many times, when on plunging a knife into the juicy heart of a ripe melon and exposing to view the myriad flesh-coloured seeds which lie, string upon string, like necklaces of palest coral, have we wondered at nature's lavish profusion, and, gross utilitarians that we are, regretted the inevitable waste of so much material, saying: "What a pity we cannot find a use for all these seeds!" But a visit to a Sicilian marionette theatre shows us that this humble product has its uses and is in fact highly appreciated in certain circles of society. A crowded audience of men and boys throngs the narrow benches, restlessly waiting for the performance to begin. A piercing and monotonously reiterated cry resounds through the building: "*Si-men-za! Si-men-za! A-gua! A-gua!*" and a boy bearing a tray of small paper packets pushes his way between the seats, followed by a companion carrying a dull brass vessel with a long spout, similar to an Arab coffee pot, and a large tumbler. The packets contain dried melon seeds and the brass vessel contains water to allay the thirst they provoke; and both vendors quickly dispose of their wares. The Sicilian populace consume these seeds in large quantities, crunching them incessantly with their teeth, and no popular entertainment is complete without one or more vendors of *simenza*.

The Marionette Theatre or *Opira di Pupi* is the favourite amusement of the Sicilian populace, and for the student of ethnology it is one of the most interesting institutions of this wonderful island. In Sicily we find the puppet show at the summit of its evolution, we behold the lineal descendant of the very earliest form of dramatic art. Puppets with movable limbs worked by wires have been found in Egyptian and Etruscan tombs; they also existed in Babylon. Puppet shows were in high favour among the Greeks, and were beyond doubt introduced by them into Sicily, where they took such deep root as to be still flourishing at the present day and holding their own against the cinema and other modern entertainments. The Sicilians quickly became adepts in this art and travelled with their "troupes" to distant lands; the showman mentioned in Xenophon's *Symposium* was a Syracusan.

Primitive puppet shows continued to exist in the island through the centuries, and the French did not really introduce them in the thirteenth century as is often stated; what they did was merely to revive a languishing art by grafting on to it a new and entrancing form of drama: the representation by marionettes of the Tales of Chivalry and the Carolingian cycle, which since

VOL. CXXXVII

those days has never lost its hold on the imagination of the people and is still vigorous all over the island.

All the principal towns in Sicily possess at least one *Teatrino di pupi*, a primitive building whose door is hung round with highly-coloured posters describing what may be seen within. Here every evening the men and boys of the neighbourhood flock to witness the performance of a chapter in some stirring serial drama founded on the Tales of the Paladins. These serials last as long as two or three months and are written by the *Puparo* himself or by someone connected with the *Teatrino*. They are usually in pompous, old-world Italian, not always free from grammatical errors, but recalling the heroic language of Tasso and Ariosto, on which they are modelled. The leading characters in the drama are always the familiar figures of the Tales of Chivalry—Roland, Charlemagne, Rinaldo, etc.; but the playwright gives full rein to his imagination in inventing new incidents and even new descendants of the heroes, who grow up amid stirring adventures and so continue the story indefinitely.

Even more interesting than the libretto are the *pupi* themselves, small jointed wooden figures usually under three feet in height and weighing 13-14 lbs. The low proscenium opening gives the illusion of greater size. Their stolid painted faces take on an extraordinary animation in the play of the primitive foot-lights, and as their heads move in response to skilful manipulation. Their movements, stiff and jerky though they be, have a curious dignity of their own, which is often wanting in living players on a larger stage. How they strut and stamp about, their armour clanking at every step, and in the battles which are a great feature of these dramas, how realistically they fall and die!

It is a tradition of the Marionette Theatre that the Christian knights should wear a short, full skirt under their armour, while the Saracens are clad in trousers. The female warriors, of whom there are several in the cycle, are distinguished by the more ample curves of their figures and by strands of long hair appearing from under their helmets; Gano di Magonza, the traitor, hated by the Sicilian audience, is sometimes represented as a dwarf, "to make him ridiculous" as the *Puparo* explained to the present writer. There is in fact a great deal of curious symbolism in the whole performance, all having its origin in early traditions or legends. For the lover of these things the Marionette Theatre provides endless material for study.

As we travel from place to place in Sicily, visiting the *Opéra di Pupi* in each town, we note certain variations in the performance. In Catania, for instance, there is the small comic figure "Pep-pinino," who wears an apology for a modern dress and speaks in

dialect, and who acts as a kind of familiar to the great Orlando. In Palermo this comic touch is absent. Can it be because the Greek influence was strong on the east coast and the people there are to this day more versatile and humorous, while in Palermo the Norman-Saracen element prevailed, leaving a heritage of grave and dreamy romanticism? Endless are the speculations inspired by the Marionette Theatre regarding history and atavism.

The art of *Puparo* is generally hereditary, at least in the two principal schools, Palermo and Catania. In Palermo it is in the hands of the Greco family, and the other small theatres which spring up from time to time are usually managed by men who have learned their profession as assistants to Greco. The founder of this theatre, Don Gaetano Greco (b. 1813, d. 1874), was a small landowner who began making marionettes for his own amusement and in order to improve on those in general use, which were badly dressed and unnatural in their movements. Don Gaetano substituted iron rods for strings and covered the knights with metal armour, giving them helmets with movable visors and swords which could be sheathed. As time went on his passion for the puppets of his creation became so strong that he gave performances in the towns and villages amid general wonder and enthusiasm. So life-like were his puppets that popular legend declared them to be alive and stated that Don Gaetano himself, gazing in ecstasy at a Bradamante he had just completed, said: "Oh, if you could only speak." Whereupon the puppet moved its head, rolled its eyes, and uttered the one word "ma . . ."

His son, Don Achille, inherited the marionette passion and continued inventing and improving, his speciality being stage lighting and scenes of magic and illusion—all performed of course by marionettes. He is now an old man, but still takes part in the performances and works the puppets with consummate art. He has a fine voice and it is really moving to hear him declaim the tragic parts. The chief management of the theatre is now in the hands of his sons, Ermenegildo and Alessandro, who are not less talented than their father and grandfather, and who specialise in the duel scenes, where the knights manipulated by them use genuine swordplay and not the windmill action generally associated with marionette battles. They also give comic scenes in dialect with acrobats and ballet, and for the last three seasons have arranged special performances for tourists, to whom this interesting family extends a cordial welcome.

The Catania *Teatrino*, now owned by Sebastiano Zappalà, has also its traditions, not less interesting than those of Palermo. Its founders were Don Giovanni and Don Gregorio Grasso, father and grandfather of the famous actor, Giovanni Grasso, who

began his career as a *Puparo*. Another well-known actor, Angelo Musco, began life as a *Puparo* in Catania, a city which has given birth to many famous men in various branches of art. Zappalà, who is a simple, uncultured son of the people, creates the most marvellous marionettes ever seen. They measure over four feet and weigh from 56 to 90 lbs., so, naturally, the extreme delicacy of movement which distinguishes the Greco marionettes is wanting. But for life-like appearance and richness of costume, they would be hard to beat. Zappalà makes them entirely himself, even beating out the elaborately embossed ornaments on their armour. He has an able coadjutor in Don Raffaele Trombetta, an old *Puparo* with fifty years' experience, who sits in the wings and reads the libretto with dramatic changes of voice.

Wherever we go in Sicily: Palermo, Catania, Syracuse, Taormina, Trapani, even at Enna in the heart of the island, we may for a ridiculously small sum spend an enthralling evening watching the unfolding of the old, yet ever new, story of Orlando and the Paladins, the loves of Rinaldo and Marfisa, the grief of Charlemagne for the death of his knights, and feel that we are back in the age of chivalry "when knights were bold and ladies fair." What matters it that the heroes whose warlike achievements produce in us a responsive thrill, are represented by wooden puppets and that we now and again catch a glimpse of the wires of a gigantic human hand sweeping down like that of a deity from the cardboard sky? The drama is so absorbing, the acting so good and so breathlessly in earnest, that we are carried away by enthusiasm and admiration, and join in the frantic applause of the eager, dark-eyed boys who surround us, fidgeting in their excitement and ceaselessly chewing *simenza*.

ISABEL EMERSON.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE NAVAL CONFERENCE.

1. "Humanising" the Submarine.

NEW words, some unnecessary, some illuminating, were coined in the early days of the Naval Conference. We already knew from 1927 the grandeur of the word "global" meaning "total." The French now added "transactional" (French "transaction," compromise) which read misleadingly in English. The American word "parity," meaning equality, was not new, but was given a new form of exercise. Such linguistic extravagances were harmless, if not useful. Then M. Tardieu started the "humanisation" of the submarine, a conception which deserved the commendation of honest people. It was a posthumous product of the 1922 "Root Resolutions" about the "humane rules of existing law" in relation to submarines: but M. Tardieu's masterpiece, consisting as it did of a simple crystallisation of an existing idea, was immensely valuable because it contrived, unconsciously no doubt on its author's part, to crystallise also the nonsense of it. It would perhaps be unfair on M. Tardieu to suspect that the humour of the word entirely passed him by.

That word by itself gave us the measure of what the world suffers from its diplomatists. A submarine is a diabolical contrivance of which the only purpose is to approach a ship unseen and then to launch a torpedo at it. Nothing else. M. Tardieu was invited to abolish the submarine. He preferred instead to "humanise" it. A tiger's claw is the work of God (mysterious as that work may be) and has its uses. From the point of view, however, of a helpless human being who happened to find himself within striking distance, there would be something unpleasant about a tiger's claw. It could be "humanised" as effectively as a submarine. There would be as much sense in the Five Powers stipulating by international agreement that a tiger should use its claw in accordance with "the humane rules of existing law," as that a submarine should be used in the same sense. Who after the Great War of 1914-18 imagines that paper restrictions are quibble-proof in war time?

The notion of "humanising" a submarine is possibly no sillier than that of humanising a military tank: but no one has ever yet talked of humanising a tank.

The fact appears to be, and is recognised by every man, woman, and child who has given a moment's thought to the matter, that the humbug of imposing civilised or humanised laws or rules of conduct on war in any way is a dangerous form of mental self-

deception. On philosophic grounds there is something to be said for submarines, tanks, and poison gas, so long as war is retained as an instrument of human relationship. It is even arguable that the palliatives of war, the Red Cross organisation, the distinction between combatants and non-combatants, are an asset for war; whereas frank unmeasured brutality, being the true attribute of war, would conceivably contribute to unloosing the hold of war over the habits of men. By the time London can be wiped out on the pressure of a button in Paris, Berlin, or Moscow, war will have killed itself by its own efficiency; but so long as war can be localised, "humanised," toned down, and camouflaged; so long as the non-fighting civilians, including the politicians who organise it, can contemplate it from a safe distance, then war is likely, or more likely, to persist as a habit. If it were known absolutely that the moment the next war were declared, the entire surface of each belligerent country could be inundated with poison gas, and every ship on the sea, merchant ship, passenger ship, and warship alike could be sunk within an hour, there would be no more war. Even the inhabitants of this world at this time would see the absurdity of it, and would not do it.

M. Tardieu's "humanisation" of the submarine became a practical issue after the conference had been sitting for three weeks. The other issues had been defined and narrowed to negotiable dimensions. Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Stimson had demanded the total abolition of the submarine. M. Tardieu held out no hope that France would give up her submarine fleet, the second largest in the world. The French alternative had in it an element of irony. The 1922 treaty about submarines, signed at Washington on February 6th of that year, had been taken down from the shelf, and the French delegation was toying with it. The irony consisted in this, that although France in the persons of MM. Sarraut and Jusserand signed the 1922 treaty in common with the British Empire, the United States, Japan, and Italy, she was the only signatory who had never ratified it. It was France, therefore, who was responsible for that treaty becoming a dead letter: yet it was France who, rather than accept the further proposal for the abolition of the submarine, now reverted to it as a *pis-aller*. The British memorandum published on February 8th, 1930, hinted that as a second best solution the 1922 treaty might be revived, and we were given to expect that France might now be disposed to contemplate it, although French quarters did not as yet hold out any hope that France would accept it except with certain emendations.

The submarine treaty of 1922 resulted from a proposal made by Senator Elihu Root on behalf of the United States and incorporated

in what were known as the "Root Resolutions." Those resolutions were formulated as a separate treaty of seven articles appended to the Washington Treaty and signed by the Five Powers. The object was defined as "the protection of the lives of neutrals and non-combatants at sea in time of war," the two weapons on which restrictions were prescribed being poison gas and submarines.

The submarine was dealt with in the first four articles. The first article stipulated that merchant vessels must not be attacked unless they refused to be searched; must not be destroyed unless all persons on board had been removed to safety; must be allowed to proceed unmolested unless they could be captured under those conditions. Article three provided penalties for those who violated those "humane rules": "any person in the service of any Power who shall violate any of those rules, whether or not such person is under orders of a governmental superior, shall be deemed to have violated the laws of war and shall be liable to trial and punishment as if for an act of piracy, and may be brought to trial before the civil or military authorities of any Power within the jurisdiction of which he may be found." Article four stipulated that "the prohibition of the use of submarines as commerce destroyers shall be universally accepted as a part of the law of nations."

2. First Exchanges at the Conference.

The conference was opened in the Royal Gallery of the House of Lords on January 21st, when the King welcomed the delegates in a speech broadcast throughout the world. The air had been cleared for the occasion, and the King's voice, clear and strong, went round the world. Ten days before the conference opened (January 11th) a British White Paper (Cmd. 3464) was published in which were given the full numerical details about the fleets of the entire world. There was no lack of documentary material on which to base the work of the conference. Nor clearly was there any lack of expectant human interest to which the delegates could appeal. The personal statistics of the conference would surprise those who do not know from their experience what a "five-Power" conference may imply. There were 446 delegates at St. James's Palace. There were 270 press units from many parts of the world commissioned to report the daily events. The London Correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* on February 12th analysed the list of journalists. He found that 111 of them were British, 40 British Imperial, 109 American, 49 French, 22 Japanese, 11 Italian. The total number of journalists accredited by the participant nations therefore amounted to 342. There were, in addition, 28 journalists from Germany, 12 from Holland, 11

from Hungary, 8 from Sweden, 6 from Spain, 4 from Czechoslovakia, 3 each from Denmark, Greece, and Russia. Serbia, Egypt, China, and Bulgaria were also represented. The press of 34 nations reported the conference. The transmission of speeches by wireless, both on the morning of January 21st and on special occasions later, still further widened the field.

If words were worth their face value, and if there's a way where there's a will, the problem in hand was as good as solved in the Royal Gallery of the House of Lords. It is, at any rate, fair to cull a phrase from each of those opening speeches so that the chief delegates may be judged at the end of the conference in the light of what they professed at the beginning. After the King had struck the high note ("Since the Great War," he said, "all peoples have determined that human statecraft shall leave nothing undone to prevent a repetition of that grim and immense tragedy") Mr. MacDonald spoke on behalf of what is technically known as His Majesty's Government in Great Britain. He had been elected President of the Conference on the motion of Mr. Stimson. "The whole world," he said, "... expects that we shall deliberate and negotiate on the assumption that, having put our names to Pacts of Peace, we mean to respect our signatures ... in the naval programmes of the leading naval Powers there is a margin between real security needs and actual or projected strengths, and the world expects this conference to eliminate that margin."

Mr. Stimson said: "We are ready to stay here until the problems are solved. ... Our peoples demand of us a success; they recognise the disaster that a failure of this Conference would bring to their dearest hopes, and they are determined that we shall succeed."

M. Tardieu cast a slight shadow when he said: "The solution of such a problem cannot be found by any mathematical formula, because the stress of life shatters all formulæ," but before he sat down he professed that "France brings towards the success of the common objective the affirmation both of her goodwill and of her will to succeed."

Signor Grandi declared that "The Fascist Government is desirous of securing real and tangible results in the field of disarmament and security."

Mr. Reijiro Wakatsuki: "Japan is ready to effect not merely a limitation but an actual reduction in naval strengths, which she considers to be an appropriate and necessary programme of peace, as well as a measure for relieving the nations from onerous financial burdens."

Sir Atul Chatterjee (India), Professor Smiddy (Irish Free State),

Mr. T. M. Wilford (New Zealand), and Mr. Te-Water (South Africa) each contributed a pacific pledge.

Now the interesting thing to the plain man was this. The chief delegates had started with the profession of a desire to reach an agreement on naval limitation. Each of the countries they represented had signed two pledges, first the Covenant of the League of Nations ("The High Contracting parties in order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war ... agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations"), second, the "Kellogg" Pact ("The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples, that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another"). If the Five Powers had undertaken not to go to war; if they now declared that they wanted to limit naval armaments; why should they not on the morning of January 22nd have proceeded simply to draw up a treaty to that effect? One might as reasonably ask why a neurasthenic man, having nothing to worry about, should not simply stop worrying. After the opening speeches the conference descended from the heights, and involved itself in varying writhings of fear, suspicion, and competitive cleverness, which on any long view was not clever at all.

The sort of situation with which the conference at the outset was faced was clearly epitomised during the course of the conference by Mr. Snowden. He gave some figures of the cost of naval armaments to the world. He was broadcasting (February 9th) from the London station to the United States and Canada. He gave his figures in dollars, but I here repeat them in sterling. He began typically enough by reminding his hearers that although the United States spends on its armaments a smaller proportion of its income than other countries, it spends absolutely more than any other Power. He then gave these remarkable figures:

"Great Britain's armament expenditure last year was £115,000,000; in 1913 it was just under £80,000,000. The average annual expenditure of the United States on armaments, including ordinary pension charges, in the four years before the outbreak of the Great War was £92,000,000; ten years later it had risen to £175,800,000. Every one of the Great Powers of the world, except Germany, who has been compulsorily disarmed, is spending much more on armaments than it spent before the Great War. This is a sad commentary on the hopes that were entertained that an Allied victory would result in relieving the nations from the burdens of armaments. The nations of Europe are spending annually on armaments £520,000,000. The world expenditure on this purpose

is £900,000,000, of which 60 per cent. is expended by European countries, about 20 per cent. by the United States, and 20 per cent. by the rest of the world."

He passed next to a philosophic discourse on the text that preparation for war is not a means of averting war, but of precipitating it, that the effects of war are disastrous to all sides impartially; and quoted in support of his argument some of the figures of the cost of the last war to Great Britain. "Great Britain," he said, "spent some £10,000,000,000 on its part in that colossal tragedy. This is apart from the loss of the wealth-producing capacity of some millions of men drawn for four years from useful employment. The war has left Great Britain with a debt of over £7,000,000,000. We have to raise each year from taxation a sum of £350,000,000 for the service of this debt without making an appreciable impression on the amount of the debt. At the present rate of repayment of the debt it will take 140 years to liquidate it. Our taxpayers have to pay on our debt services £1,000,000 a day, £40,000 an hour, over £600 a minute. It takes the whole-time labour of 2,000,000 workers, year in, year out, to produce the means to pay the annual cost of our debt service. Add to this the £115,000,000 we annually spend on the fighting Services, and £56,000,000 we pay yearly for war pensions, and we get a total of £520,000,000 a year, £1,000 a minute, which the people of Great Britain have to provide for war expenses. We have to raise annually from taxes for national expenditure a sum of £606,400,000. Three-quarters of our taxes are spent on paying for past wars and preparing for future wars. Our people are the most heavily taxed in the world. The average amount of national and local taxation works out at about £100 a year per family. We have an income-tax of 4s. in the pound and a super income-tax running up to an additional 16s. in the pound. In addition, the duties on estates passing at death range as high as 40 per cent. The whole of the yield of these heavy taxes is only sufficient to provide two-thirds of the cost of providing for the annual war debt charges, war pensions, and the fighting Services."

The moral he drew ought to be printed in large type and taught in the schools as an offset to the mischievous historical text-books which so often are built on the framework of past wars. He said: "It passed the power of the most imaginative mind to conceive what prosperity and happiness could be added to the world if we could divert our efforts and resources, now so largely wasted in the barbarous and inhuman obsession of war, to the advancement of human welfare."

Great Britain, at any rate, has done something since the war in the reduction of her armaments. On the second day of the

conference (January 22nd) Mr. MacDonald, broadcasting to the United States, recalled that the personnel of the army had been reduced by 50,000 compared with 1914, and by 152,000 compared with 1921; in the navy, compared with 1914, capital ships had been reduced from 69 to 20, cruisers with eight-inch guns from 27 to 11, smaller cruisers from 81 to 43, and submarines from 74 to 53. At the end of the war the Air Force contained 3,300 first-line machines, while to-day the number was 772, and "the air fleets of the other great Powers far outnumber us."

It was on the following day that the conference started its detailed business. Sir Maurice Hankey was elected Secretary-General of the conference and a committee was set up, consisting of the whole conference, to do the practical work. It had the power to appoint sub-committees. Each chief delegate was invited to submit a precise statement of the minimum naval "needs" of his country, by which was meant the minimum regarded as necessary for "self-defence" and the protection of trade routes. The resultant statements were somewhat reserved. In the case of Great Britain, as Mr. MacDonald explained, a detailed estimate of needs had already been made public, and he therefore confined himself to a few generalities. The American, Canadian, and South African delegates decided not to submit any statement at that stage. Australia and New Zealand drew attention to their peculiar geographical position and the resultant need of naval protection. Signor Grandi's case was easy and simple. He confined himself to postulating an equality with "any other Continental European Power," having in mind, as his hearers knew, no other Power but France.

It was M. Tardieu who made the longest statement. It was full of figures, not of figures of what France demanded in ships, but of statistics on which might reasonably (he submitted) be based a French claim for a larger navy than before. Politicians are often a snare to good causes. M. Tardieu, once the scene had changed from the House of Lords to St. James's Palace, approached the problem of naval limitation as if it was a reparation conference, ships being the divisible spoils; in other words, he started by aiming, not at a minimum, but at a maximum number of ships. Humour in such circumstances is banished. M. Tardieu left his audience with an uneasy feeling that France, participating in a conference on naval reduction, was preparing a case, not for a smaller, but for a bigger navy; a feeling that was given some further justification later on. On January 23rd M. Tardieu rolled out yards of figures about the length of the French coast; the area, population, length of coast, length of communications, trade-turn-over of the French colonial empire; the military needs of France.

is £900,000,000, of which 60 per cent. is expended by European countries, about 20 per cent. by the United States, and 20 per cent. by the rest of the world."

He passed next to a philosophic discourse on the text that preparation for war is not a means of averting war, but of precipitating it, that the effects of war are disastrous to all sides impartially; and quoted in support of his argument some of the figures of the cost of the last war to Great Britain. "Great Britain," he said, "spent some £10,000,000,000 on its part in that colossal tragedy. This is apart from the loss of the wealth-producing capacity of some millions of men drawn for four years from useful employment. The war has left Great Britain with a debt of over £7,000,000,000. We have to raise each year from taxation a sum of £350,000,000 for the service of this debt without making an appreciable impression on the amount of the debt. At the present rate of repayment of the debt it will take 140 years to liquidate it. Our taxpayers have to pay on our debt services £1,000,000 a day, £40,000 an hour, over £600 a minute. It takes the whole-time labour of 2,000,000 workers, year in, year out, to produce the means to pay the annual cost of our debt service. Add to this the £115,000,000 we annually spend on the fighting Services, and £56,000,000 we pay yearly for war pensions, and we get a total of £520,000,000 a year, £1,000 a minute, which the people of Great Britain have to provide for war expenses. We have to raise annually from taxes for national expenditure a sum of £606,400,000. Three-quarters of our taxes are spent on paying for past wars and preparing for future wars. Our people are the most heavily taxed in the world. The average amount of national and local taxation works out at about £100 a year per family. We have an income-tax of 4s. in the pound and a super income-tax running up to an additional 16s. in the pound. In addition, the duties on estates passing at death range as high as 40 per cent. The whole of the yield of these heavy taxes is only sufficient to provide two-thirds of the cost of providing for the annual war debt charges, war pensions, and the fighting Services."

The moral he drew ought to be printed in large type and taught in the schools as an offset to the mischievous historical text-books which so often are built on the framework of past wars. He said: "It passed the power of the most imaginative mind to conceive what prosperity and happiness could be added to the world if we could divert our efforts and resources, now so largely wasted in the barbarous and inhuman obsession of war, to the advancement of human welfare."

Great Britain, at any rate, has done something since the war in the reduction of her armaments. On the second day of the

conference (January 22nd) Mr. MacDonald, broadcasting to the United States, recalled that the personnel of the army had been reduced by 50,000 compared with 1914, and by 152,000 compared with 1921; in the navy, compared with 1914, capital ships had been reduced from 69 to 20, cruisers with eight-inch guns from 27 to 11, smaller cruisers from 81 to 43, and submarines from 74 to 53. At the end of the war the Air Force contained 3,300 first-line machines, while to-day the number was 772, and "the air fleets of the other great Powers far outnumber us."

It was on the following day that the conference started its detailed business. Sir Maurice Hankey was elected Secretary-General of the conference and a committee was set up, consisting of the whole conference, to do the practical work. It had the power to appoint sub-committees. Each chief delegate was invited to submit a precise statement of the minimum naval "needs" of his country, by which was meant the minimum regarded as necessary for "self-defence" and the protection of trade routes. The resultant statements were somewhat reserved. In the case of Great Britain, as Mr. MacDonald explained, a detailed estimate of needs had already been made public, and he therefore confined himself to a few generalities. The American, Canadian, and South African delegates decided not to submit any statement at that stage. Australia and New Zealand drew attention to their peculiar geographical position and the resultant need of naval protection. Signor Grandi's case was easy and simple. He confined himself to postulating an equality with "any other Continental European Power," having in mind, as his hearers knew, no other Power but France.

It was M. Tardieu who made the longest statement. It was full of figures, not of figures of what France demanded in ships, but of statistics on which might reasonably (he submitted) be based a French claim for a larger navy than before. Politicians are often a snare to good causes. M. Tardieu, once the scene had changed from the House of Lords to St. James's Palace, approached the problem of naval limitation as if it was a reparation conference, ships being the divisible spoils; in other words, he started by aiming, not at a minimum, but at a maximum number of ships. Humour in such circumstances is banished. M. Tardieu left his audience with an uneasy feeling that France, participating in a conference on naval reduction, was preparing a case, not for a smaller, but for a bigger navy; a feeling that was given some further justification later on. On January 23rd M. Tardieu rolled out yards of figures about the length of the French coast; the area, population, length of coast, length of communications, trade-turn-over of the French colonial empire; the military needs of France.

He claimed that France must " (1) Be able at all times to depend on her navy to ensure her the possibility of transporting the necessary forces from or to any point of her Empire. (2) Be able, for the defence of the Mother Country, to use at any time her total resources."

That took place forty-eight hours after the opening speeches above quoted. *Sunt rerum lacrimæ.* There were not tears, but cheers, however that same evening when at a banquet given by the City of London M. Tardieu declared: "We have faith, that faith which, it is said, removes mountains, and which therefore (at least we hope so) will move naval armaments from the perilous waters of competition to the safe harbour of a loyal understanding." The speaker's oratory did not weigh much in the balance against his essay at the morning's conference.

The next few days were taken up by informal exchanges of views between the various delegations. On Monday, January 27th, a meeting of the chief delegates was held at 10 Downing Street for the purpose of "collecting, selecting, and arranging" the agenda of the conference. It was at that meeting that M. Tardieu successfully opposed a British opinion that limitation should be effected by categories of ships and not by global tonnage. The method of assessment by global tonnage had not appeared in the draft agenda prepared by Sir Maurice Hankey, but M. Tardieu secured its insertion. He likewise raised the notion, first ventilated in 1927, of providing for the transfer of tonnage, within limits, from one category to another, and succeeded in having that question also inserted in the agenda. It became known loosely in conference circles as the "transactional" method of limitation, purporting to be a compromise between the "global" and the "category" methods of assessment.

3. The "Method" of Limitation.

The uppermost controversy that exercised the conference in its first week was this question of the "method" of assessment. It was not a new question. It was first considered by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference sitting in Geneva in 1926. Sub-committee A of that Commission spent several months in an attempt to discover a single ideal criterion for measuring naval strength and thus to formulate a comparative measure for the limitation of naval strength. There emerged two rival hypotheses. One was that of limitation by categories; the other that of limitation by total tonnage. By the first method the maximum tonnage for each category of vessel would be fixed, and the total tonnage would thereby also be fixed. By the second method a total tonnage only would be prescribed, it being left to

each Power to distribute its tonnage as it might choose between the various categories. The issue between those who advocated the one method and those who advocated the other became a deadlock by the end of 1926. It was that deadlock that produced the so-called "transactional" or "compromise" proposal, submitted to the Preparatory Commission by M. Paul-Boncour on April 11th, 1927. The proposal simply was that a total tonnage should first be fixed for the navy of each country; that the total tonnage should then be divided among four categories (capital ships, aircraft-carriers, surface-vessels of less than 10,000 tons, and submarines); but that each of the contracting parties, while undertaking never to exceed the total tonnage imposed, should have the right to alter the distribution of that tonnage among the categories by transferring tonnage from one category to another, with the sole proviso that before laying down the portion of tonnage to be thus transferred, the transferring Power should give a year's notice to the other contracting Powers. That was the "compromise" in its first blush. It was hardly distinguishable from the method of global limitation, the only practical difference being the giving of a year's notice before a transfer. The new proposal was then improved by the addition of a provision "in principle" restricting the scope of transfer within certain limits to be expressed as a percentage of the category tonnage.

That proposed compromise did not save the 1927 Three-Power Conference from failure; for the conference broke precisely on the issue between a "category" limitation as advocated by Great Britain and a "global" limitation as at that time advocated by the United States; nor was the position improved by the 1928 Anglo-French re-hash of the British proposal submitted to the United States a year before. The United States in 1928, of course, again rejected it. Before the 1930 conference met the United States had changed her view about the global method.

When the third plenary session of the conference was held at St. James's Palace on January 30th, Mr. MacDonald stated that so far the delegations had been exchanging views "in order to remove misunderstandings, and in order to pave the way for compromises and agreements." The results, although apparently "very slow" in coming, had, he said, "nevertheless to those who understand the difficulties in front of us, been most gratifying up to now." The conference resolved, on the motion of Mr. Stimson, that the questions of method and procedure be referred to a committee composed of representatives to be appointed by the delegations. That proposed committee was promptly and aptly christened by the Americans as a "steering committee." The main interest of what was said at that session lay in the rival theses

expounded by M. Tardieu and by Mr. Alexander, First Lord of the British Admiralty. M. Tardieu referred to the so-called French transactional proposal. "The efforts," he said, "of the French Government since 1927 have aimed at rendering this system more supple and more adaptable to the particular needs of all countries."

Mr. Alexander interpreted the British preference for "category" classification. "The British proposals," he said, "for the limitation of naval armaments are based on the category system on which I think I can say that we find ourselves in complete agreement with the United States of America and with Japan. . . . The classification which we have adopted comprises the well-recognised divisions of a fleet—that is to say, capital ships, aircraft-carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. As regards cruisers, we desire that these should be considered under two types, those carrying a gun above six-inch calibre and below. An important aspect of our classification proposals is that within each category the maximum tonnage of the individual unit is strictly limited, and it is our desire that this tonnage should be at the lowest possible figure consistent with the proper execution of the duties which the unit is called upon to perform. . . . We do not object to the principle of transfer as such, but we must have most careful regard to what the results may be or any specific measure of transfer proposed, as such results might conceivably impair that confidence and stability which we should aim at. Nevertheless, we are fully prepared to consider some system embracing the transfer of tonnage, provided that this applies only to the less powerful types of ships. . . ."

Signor Grandi proved to be one of the consistently healthy influences at the conference. It is true that his case was simple, that in his desire for parity with France he was on equally firm ground whether he proposed a levelling of Italian strength upwards or downwards; but it was a comfort to hear a delegate who was not afraid on every opportunity to talk of reduction rather than limitation. In that respect he took his place beside the American, British, and Japanese delegates. The French was the only delegation that claimed a stabilisation of strength on a higher plane than that of the *status quo*. In emphasising the need, not only for limitation, but for reduction, Signor Grandi made the impressive point (which one would like to have made much oftener by responsible Italians) that Signor Mussolini's programme of work in Italy necessitated a long period of peace for its execution. Has Signor Mussolini ever said that? On the contrary, has he not often said something hardly consistent with it? The more honour to Signor Grandi.

M. Tardieu was a less inspiring influence. After the third plenary session he spent the week-end in Paris, and it was a little chilling for those in London who read the French Press to learn that he had had an enthusiastic reception on his return, not for a positive, but for a negative reason: namely that he had averted the "danger" of any naval reduction being achieved by the Conference. M. Tardieu himself on reaching Calais, on his way home, made a highly illuminating statement. "France (he said) is already entitled to derive satisfaction from the fact that the method proposed by her in 1927 for the limitation of naval armaments has been definitely adopted by all the Powers represented at the Conference. . . . This gives us the assurance that we shall no longer during the discussions suffer the unjust tyranny of mathematical formulæ which exerted itself eight years ago. . . . Given the ground on which the debate is thus placed, the effort made in London will be helpful to the ulterior work in Geneva. This is a fact upon the interest of which I need not enlarge."

He had, in fact, enlarged on it. France started the conference with the express *caveat*, recorded in the Memorandum of December 20th, that the London Conference should be competent, not to take binding decisions, but only to make recommendations to the League of Nations Disarmament Conference. There was perhaps some little irony to be extracted from the thought that France was using the League of Nations as a means of postponing disarmament. M. Tardieu had before, namely on December 18th, when he addressed the Foreign Affairs and Naval Committees of the French Chamber, stressed the reservation that Geneva and not London must reach the binding decision, if any. He knew that the United States was not a member of the League; and in any case it would be a fair question to ask why any effective agreement on disarmament, no matter how or where made, could not be reconciled with Geneva? The French sense of irony is a unilateral instrument.

The faith of the British Government in the outcome of the conference surprised and pained certain British commentators whose political allegiance was to another party than that which held office. The pain was accentuated by a statement made on January 29th by the First Lord of the Admiralty, who in answer to a question in the House of Commons announced that the two 10,000-ton cruisers, *Surrey* and *Northumberland*, which had been ordered under the 1928 programme had been scrapped, and that, in addition, the 1929 programme had been modified by the cancellation of two cruisers, one of which would have carried eight-inch guns, four destroyers, two sloops, and three submarines. The excitement caused thereby was not easy to understand. As a

gesture the cancellation might conceivably encourage the other delegations; and if the worst came to the worst, and the conference broke up without reaching any agreement, the cancellation itself could readily be cancelled.

The first week of February was taken up in a discussion of the Franch transactional plan. The plan itself had been modified since M. Paul-Boncour first launched it. The original four categories had been expanded into six by the splitting of the cruiser category into two, distinguished by eight-inch and by six-inch guns respectively, and by the addition of a sixth category of special vessels such as minesweepers. At the end of that week, the conference having sat for nearly three weeks, some public impatience began to manifest itself over the obscure and tiresome information that was given about obscure and complicated discussions. Mr. MacDonald thereupon allowed it to be known that he would like to see the work go faster, and the Conference, for the most part agreeing with his impatience, decided to hold a fourth plenary meeting on February 11th. It was further agreed that the question of submarines should then be tabled. A measure of the boredom that had begun to pervade the outskirts of the conference was conveyed by the fact that the old story of the American Correspondent was again put into currency. It is a remarkable thing that that same story is remembered, and is duly republished, at every international conference whenever a lull descends upon the proceedings: the story, namely, of the correspondent who, on being offered the facts of the situation by an eminent delegate, declines the offer on the ground that "my paper does not want facts; it wants noos."

History again repeated itself in the circumstances which preceded a certain sudden publication by Mr. Stimson of an American memorandum of his country's policy. A warped version of the memorandum had leaked out. In self-defence and prematurely Mr. Stimson decided to issue the correct text. It was issued from the Ritz Hotel on the evening of February 6th and caused considerable consternation at the Carlton Hotel the same evening, for it made an offer of immediate parity with Great Britain on a clearly practical basis. The reason for the consternation aforesaid was the fear that Anglo-American agreement should be further consolidated before the subject of submarines, all-important in French eyes, was submitted to the conference. It had been decided that the subject of submarines should be submitted to the plenary conference that had been arranged for February 11th.

Mr. Stimson's statement of February 6th was divided into two parts, the first dealing with the United States and Great Britain, the other with the United States and the other parties. Part one

started by suggesting "With Great Britain immediate parity in every class of ship in the navy. The gross tonnage of these two fleets is substantially 1,200,000 tons apiece. The negotiations between President Hoover and Prime Minister MacDonald last summer practically reduced the discussion of parity between them to the comparative insignificant difference in their respective cruiser-class tonnage of 24,000 tons. We propose to settle this difference as follows: under our suggestion the actual tonnage difference between the two cruiser fleets will be only 12,000 tons." The detailed suggestions for the various kinds of ship were formulated thus: "*Cruisers*.—Of the larger cruisers armed with eight-inch guns Great Britain will have 15 and the United States 18—an advantage to the latter of 30,000 tons. Of the smaller cruisers armed with six-inch guns Great Britain will have an advantage of 42,000 tons. But beyond this, in order to ensure exact equality of opportunity, the United States makes the suggestion that each country will have the option of duplicating exactly the cruiser fleet of the other. Thus, Great Britain would have the option, by reducing its number of small cruisers, to increase its large cruisers from 15 to 18 so as to give it a total tonnage of 327,000 tons which the United States now asks. On the other hand, the United States would have the option, by reducing its large cruisers from 18 to 15, to increase the number of its small cruisers so as to give it a total cruiser-tonnage of 339,000 tons, the exact amount of tonnage which the British now ask. *Battleships*.—In battleships we suggest by reduction in numbers on both sides to equalise our two fleets in 1931 instead of in 1942. At present the British battleship fleet contains two more vessels than ours. *Submarines*.—In destroyers and aircraft-carriers we suggest equality in tonnage, and in submarines the lowest tonnage possible. As is well known, we will gladly agree to a total abolition of submarines if it is possible to obtain the consent of all five Powers to such a proposition, and in any event we suggest that the operations of submarines be limited to the same rules of international law as surface craft in operation against merchant ships, so that they cannot attack without providing for the safety of the passengers and the crew."

The second part of the memorandum suggested to the Japanese "an over-all relation satisfactory to us, and, we hope, to them in conformity with our relations in the past. It is not based upon the same ratio in every class of ships." No proposals were made to the French or Italians.

The American statement, explaining as it did the details of a particular stage that had been reached in negotiation, was an unusual incident in the practice of diplomacy by conference; but it not only did no harm, but contrived to recapture public interest

in what was taking place. It was commonly assumed that the statement was due to the direct inspiration of Mr. Hoover, whose anxiety and sincerity were thereby again illumined. The drop on the part of the United States from 21 to 18 cruisers made agreement easier. It had the incidental effect of making M. Tardieu and the Carlton Hotel fight for time, for it was an unfortunate feature of that delegation's tactics that the "transactional" argument should be indefinitely prolonged if for no other purpose than to postpone the discussion of submarines.

Within twenty-four hours Mr. MacDonald responded with a statement of British views. It was not a new statement. It had been drafted soon after the beginning of the conference as a text upon which the British delegation based its policy and was now published in a friendly spirit of competitive frankness with the United States. The cheerful element in that competition was the growing convergence of British and American views. The main points of the British statement of February 7th were these: "It is proposed that the general agreement resulting from this Conference should run until 1936, and that in 1935 a further conference should be called. Agreement should be not only upon global tonnage but upon the size of individual ships in various categories and upon the tonnage used by each nation in each of these categories. The categories should be capital ships, aircraft-carriers, cruisers, destroyers and submarines. The Government is opposed to transfer in regard to capital ships, aircraft, and submarines. In regard to cruisers, it would permit transfer out of the eight-inch class into the six-inch class on a percentage which remains to be arranged.

"*Capital Ships.*—It is proposed that the number of capital ships for each signatory fixed by the Washington Treaty should be reached within eighteen months of the ratification of the Treaty resulting from this conference instead of by 1936; and that no replacement of existing ships should take place before the conference in 1935. The Government's experts favour a reduction in size from 35,000 tons to 25,000 tons, and of guns from sixteen-inch to twelve-inch. They also favour a lengthening of the age from twenty to twenty-six years. The Government would wish to see an agreement by which battleships will, in due time, disappear altogether. Under the heading of *aircraft-carriers* the following proposals are made: a reduction of the total aircraft tonnage for the British and United States navies from 135,000 tons under the Washington Treaty to (say) 100,000 tons, with an adjustment of that assigned to other nations in the Washington Treaty ratios. The maximum size of aircraft-carriers to be reduced to 25,000 tons, and their age to be twenty-six years instead

of twenty. Ships of 10,000 tons and under to be included in the total tonnage of this category if used as aircraft-carriers.

"*Cruisers and Submarines.*—The Government proposes that the tonnage limit of eight-inch gun cruisers should remain at 10,000 tons as provided for in the Washington Treaty, and that there should be a tonnage limit for smaller vessels at about 6,000 or 7,000 tons. Only a fixed proportion in the latter class should be built up to that limit, and the life of cruisers should be twenty years. In regard to destroyers it is proposed that the limit assigned should be for leaders 1,850 tons and for destroyers 1,500. The maximum size of guns for both classes of destroyers should be five-inch. The present British building programme of destroyers is for 200,000 tons ultimately, but this can be reduced if the submarine programmes of other Powers are reduced. The Government proposes the abolition of the submarine. Its experts feel that the argument that the submarine is an arm solely of defence was destroyed by the experience of the late war, and that in war conditions it is an arm of attack. If abolition cannot be agreed upon, the Government will put forward proposals limiting submarines rigidly to defence requirements. In any case, it will press for limitation of the submarine to the lowest possible limit, and it proposes to urge the revival of the agreement, signed at Washington in 1922, but not ratified by all the signatory Powers, which would regulate in the interests of humanity the use of submarines against merchant ships. In regard to auxiliary vessels not strictly entering into fleet strengths, the Government proposes that they should be specified, and that each Government should publish yearly lists of vessels of this class in commission as laid down."

It almost inevitably happens that when two parties at a conference tend to agree, the other parties tend to assume a defensive attitude based on a nervous assumption that the "agreement" may be directed against themselves. In this case the nervous party was France. Neither Italy nor Japan gave any evidence of anything except pleasure that a move was at last being made. M. Tardieu, however, according to a report given by M. Géraud in the *Écho de Paris*, took steps to acquaint Mr. MacDonald of his "astonishment" at being presented with the accomplished fact of an Anglo-American agreement about which he had no previous inkling; and it was suggested in Paris that the reason why the conference had been delayed during the past fortnight was now clear, namely that Mr. Stimson and Mr. MacDonald had been concocting their secret agreement.

When tempers are frayed, however, the Russian delegation (if any) can nearly always be depended on to supply the comic relief. When no Russian delegation happens to be present, the Moscow

Press can nearly always be relied on to fill the gap. In this case what could have been neater than the way in which *Izvestia* rose to the occasion? France had become jumpy about an alleged Anglo-American understanding; very well, the obvious antidote was to make America jumpy about an Anglo-French understanding. The writer of the *Izvestia* article began by referring to the "transactional" plan as an Anglo-French plan, and incidentally as a "victory for French militarism and pseudo-Socialism" (a hit at M. Paul-Boncour). The writer then made this delicious diagnosis: "This new London compromise is only the beginning of the beginning. England will only be reconciled to the serious growth of the French fleet if it can regard this fleet not as a possible enemy, but as a possible ally in any future clash. But America, with the greatest interest and suspicion, follows every manifestation of Anglo-French *rapprochement*. A thick cloud of intrigues and contradictions surrounds the conference's first steps."

Possibly as a result of M. Tardieu's anxiety, which had not been wholly allayed by the tonic from Moscow, Mr. MacDonald made a statement in the House of Commons on February 10th in the course of which he declared that: "I should like to make it clear that this memorandum, which indicates our policy, has not been drawn up in agreement with any other delegation."

GEORGE GLASGOW.

February 10th, 1930.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
I. REVIEWS	389
BISMARCK'S LATER POLICY; NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN EDUCATION; MR. POEL'S LETTERS; THE GREAT MATHEMATICIANS; JOHN WYCLIF; KENYA.	
2. SHORTER REVIEWS: "Continental Statesmen"; "The World Crisis of 1914-18"; "Letters of Sir Joshua Reynolds"; "G.K.C. as M.C."; "The De-thronement of the Khedive"; "English Wild Life"; "New Light on the Youth of Dante" ...	403
3. NOTICES OF BOOKS: "Memories of My Life"; "The Solitary Warrior: New Letters by Ruskin"; "Rudolf Steiner Enters My Life"; "The Admiral of the High Seas and other Stories"; "Talks and Lectures Broadcast January to April 1930" ...	407

BISMARCK'S LATER POLICY.*

The *Saburoff Memoirs*, translated and edited by J. Y. Simpson, are a contribution of first-rate importance to the study of Bismarck's later policy. Professor Simpson received a copy of a privately printed edition from the veteran Russian diplomatist in 1917, and published extracts in two articles in the *Nineteenth Century* during the following winter. The value of the *Memoirs* was immediately realised, and historians of all countries will be grateful for the appearance of the complete work and for the Biographical Introduction furnished by the editor. When the discontent aroused by Bismarck's handling of the Berlin Congress caused Alexander II to write a menacing letter to the Emperor William in the summer of 1879, Bismarck promptly concluded the treaty with Austria which lasted till the realm of the Hapsburgs disappeared in 1918. The *Saburoff Memoirs* describe the attempt to mend the wire between Berlin and St. Petersburg which resulted in the secret treaty of 1881, reviving in some measure the League of the Three Emperors which had existed in an undefined manner during the middle of the 'seventies. The reports of the Russian Ambassador at Berlin give a most vivid picture of Bismarck at the height of his incomparable powers. "I have always been the friend of Russia by conviction," he observed; "it is good to have as friend behind you a nation of one hundred millions." The Tsar quickly realised that he had gone too far in 1879, and the Emperor William,

* Cambridge University Press. 15s.

who detested the formation of the Dual Alliance, was delighted to renew intimate contact with his nephew. Austria under Haymerle was less willing; for Austria was a rival of Russia in the Near East, in which Germany had no direct interest. Gortchakoff and Bismarck heartily disliked one another; but the old statesman was losing grip, and his assistant Giers was obtaining control under the supervision of the Tsar. "Nobody wishes to be in a minority," remarked Bismarck in 1880. "All politics reduces itself to this formula: to try to be one of three, so long as the world is governed by the unstable equilibrium of five Great Powers." Italy did not count with Bismarck, and with the Three Emperors' League he was once again in the majority. In addition to supplying a documented narrative of the making of the Treaty, these chapters are of extraordinary interest for Bismarck's disquisitions on the art of diplomacy and the complexities of the European situation. Professor Simpson has done his work well, and it was well worth doing.

* * *

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN EDUCATION.*

The title of Lord Eustace Percy's very able book does not do justice to it. Education is not at the crossroads at all. If the metaphor of roads is allowable at all it would be true to say that education is at last on the high road of national life and is speeding on it with the pace of a hasty motor car. That is a useful metaphor since it indicates that there are hills to climb, that there are obstacles, political and social, which here and there limit the pace and make the machine crawl, that there is a goal not only for the few (as the very foolish and dangerous metaphor of the ladder of education indicates) but for all the citizens of the land. This is the moving picture, perhaps, that Lord Eustace Percy presents to the reader and he may read it in that sense.

Yet all metaphors of this sort are misleading. The truth is that education is a function of national life, and the business of statesmen is to make the function fully operative. The student of the history of education, not only in England but in all the countries of the West at any rate, sees governments, statesmen, and Churches, endeavouring, age after age, to the best of their ability, to promote the growth of the personality of the individual child and the individual citizen. It is not a question only of learning to read and write, of making a good craftsman, a good scholar, and a good Christian. National education is, and always has been, a question of developing something that differentiates man in an overwhelming degree from other forms of physical life, of develop-

* *Education at the Crossroads.* By Lord Eustace Percy, M.P. Evans Brothers, Russell Square, W.1. 5s. net.

ing the potential good gifts of personality to the highest degree in every man. It is hard to define personality—Professor Höfding, the Danish philosopher, once said to the present writer that it would take a lifetime—but this, at all events, is clear, that in each human personality there is something, an educable something, which has never existed before and will never exist again. Each person born into the world has something to give to the world in a brief space of years that has never been given before and will never be given again. Looked at in that light there is an awful responsibility in a system of national education. A little wholly helpless creature in the arms of its mother may have potentialities which will alter the destiny of the world, and the mother may be a dweller in a great or a little home, or in an agricultural labourer's unwholesome hut, or in the slums that still disgrace Great Britain. That is the problem: national education must be individualistic at the same time that it is integrating great schemes for the education of the masses of the people. The development of personality stands first of all.

Thus Lord Eustace Percy, with his full experience at the Board of Education, realises that it means not only care for mothers, but the education of girls in housecraft and mothercraft, the rapid multiplication of nursery schools of all types, very small classes for school-entrants as well as smaller classes everywhere. Individuality must be strengthened at every turn, and not least by teamwork, of which the home-team is the norm. That all goes without saying, though it involves much doing since it all is the root of the preventive medicine without which our school system can make no real strides.

Assume that these changes are being wrought, then, we come to the subject of Lord Eustace's essay. He does not deal in detail with these things. He thinks from the top, so to speak, in the belief that his fellow workers have already put enough scaffolding to enable him to plan the higher stories and the roof. He, indeed, begins with the universities. He says:

The whole point of the reform now in progress is to give to our educational system the continuity which it has lacked in the past. Every school is to regard itself as preparing its pupils for a higher stage of education; every institution of higher education is to regard itself as setting a standard for the schools below it; every pupil is to regard himself as pursuing a connected course of study which will, if he so desires, carry him from childhood to manhood. It is clear that such a reform throws an overwhelming responsibility on the institutions at the upper end of this connected course; that is to say, on the universities and the technical colleges. It is they who are to set standards for the schools, and everything will depend upon the manner in which they discharge this duty.

Now the technical colleges have no really organic connection with the schools, while the universities in their relationship with ordinary secondary schools "are dealing only with a comparatively small number of selected students." In fact, the elementary schools have no real link with the universities, since "preparation for the secondary school has necessarily played only a small part in their work." Lord Eustace Percy is clearly right when he says that it is "only when there is real continuity in curriculum and teaching, in the public and preparatory schools, that university influence has permeated the whole process of education." The Hadow scheme when it is at work will tend "to give to the standards set by the universities and technical colleges the same weight in the elementary schools as university students have had in the preparatory schools." That indeed is the goal to aim at, but Lord Eustace pertinently points out that the elementary school teacher is "exchanging the evils of purposelessness for the dangers of standardisation."

Now why should there be dangers of standardisation? The universities and the training colleges are, in effect, free agents so far as the imposition of standards goes, and the universities, with their vast experience, should know what is the difference between education at school and education within the walls of a university. They are wholly different things. The schoolboy is a boy, the undergraduate is a man. Have the universities set a university standard? Have they been in touch with a body of the same class, the technical college? The answer is that certainly they have not done so. They, by their recognition of the first school examination, and in some cases by their recognition of the second school examination, as university examinations taken by pupils who will not go "up" (a good working phrase) for some two years, have abnegated their duties and have encouraged premature specialisation of half-educated boys in university subjects.

The present writer asked a boy under sixteen years of age what he was doing at school. The reply was that he was a mathematical specialist. A few questions elicited the fact that he knew only the veriest elements of elementary mathematics. These examinations were instituted by the Board of Education to create lines of non-specialised progress, but the universities have practically abandoned the previous examination and responsions and examinations of that type and have adopted instead the first school examinations with a certain number of "credits" in certain subjects. The result is that a boy chooses his favourite "credit" subject two or three years before leaving school and, as Lord Eustace says, "the subjects which compose the first stage of a secondary school boy's education are also the subjects in which,

on the whole, an honours degree can most easily be obtained." The standard must go down for the average secondary school student under these circumstances. They have no tradition in reading; they live on textbooks and notes. Many university teachers frankly publish their lecture notes because their students have no idea of reading for themselves, have "no conception of the connection between general reading and special studies." Lord Eustace says quite frankly and with adequate brutality that "too many undergraduates to-day do not come to the university to read for a degree, but to be lectured into one." It is clear that a new university policy is necessary. It may be that the age of entrance will have to be lowered by a year. There is good seventeenth- and eighteenth-century precedent for that, but the universities, as a body, have to make up their minds on many other things. Lord Eustace has given them a good many things to think about in his "Plea for a University Policy." He declares that the universities should have a

Common foreign policy—a common frontier with the schools, undisturbed by boundary disputes and by the existence of a different set of passport regulations for every frontier station. And if their other frontier, that with the adult world, cannot in its nature be so clear and settled, marching as it must with a hundred different professions and occupations, there is one kind of emigrant across that frontier, and that the one most generally in demand, about whose training and qualifications for a passport they should surely have a clear and recognised idea, and that is the emigrant called an educated man.

All these troubles would disappear if the universities would get together and devise a policy. The world of education looks for a policy and standards from them. "At all points in our educational system it is, in fact, university initiative, initiative by the universities as a federal or confederate body, that is most needed to-day." In this matter the universities must take the initiative. It could not be very difficult for Oxford or Cambridge or both to call a conference and give the necessary lead and create a common entrance examination for all the universities.

The universities, however, are only one phase of higher education. To think that it stands alone is perhaps the greatest error of the pernicious doctrine of the educational ladder. There must be another goal, a goal that resolves itself into a higher unity of which the university forms indeed part, a goal for those who have neither the time nor even the specialised and crammed ability to go to a place that delays earning for some three years. If the new junior secondary schools which will be universal are to be part of a complete system of education the technical college with its part-time facilities will have to come into play as an organic

thing. In the Middle Ages when the corporation and the co-operative idea found its greatest strength the Gild found room for all who were willing to face its intensive training in culture as well as artifice. Lord Eustace Percy finds in the technical schools and colleges of a century ago living instances of these revived corporate ideals, and he believes that the idea which was at the back of some modern universities will come to our help in our present discontents. He thinks that the technical colleges of our time will provide, in the process of linking schools of technology, commerce, and art and many extra-mural subjects and the manifold but unco-ordinated fields of what is known as adult education, a full outlet for the new junior and secondary schools for which the local authorities are busily preparing local schemes. These colleges—Cambridgeshire knows something of them from the rural side—will have education in the truest sense always before them since, as Lord Eustace says, “the aim of all education is to teach men to think.” To think sanely and well about the processes which the hand and the machine undertake is in some ways the best of all education, since it combines the processes of the mind with the processes of actual production and is more likely to produce practical thinkers than a more bookish education. Such an education imbues men with reverence for the scheme of things that entrusts to man the working out of the marvels of art, technology, and economic life. Lord Eustace Percy’s Local College, with certain legislative modifications in regard to grants and areas and local control, would make a true centre of humanism if it makes itself a partner with the university and becomes also an object of attention in the curriculum of the secondary schools and brings into the sphere of university influence the junior secondary school. It is not a visionary idea or ideal at all. The Local College is a piece of humanised logic which recognises that all education is one. The head of the college is conceived of as a man of the same order of mind and character as the head of an Oxford or Cambridge college or as the head of a university. The idea is wholly practical, it should attract the attention of the rural districts especially, but it is clearly applicable through the whole land. Such a college has one difficulty, the teaching staff. But a great principal can be trusted to deal with this problem and gather round him men whose enthusiasm equals their technical and teaching ability. Lord Eustace only deals with the case of colleges and universities for men, but the same logical processes include the case of women students. This excellent essay deserves the close study of all educational authorities and experts of this country. It certainly will have such study in France, Germany, and the United States of America.

J. E. G. DE M.

MR. POEL’S LETTERS.*

These *Monthly Letters* are a very welcome addition to Shakespearean literature. They have been well edited and are most interesting. All students of Shakespeare are well aware of Mr. William Poel’s views as to the presentation, or, as the term is, *production*, of the plays for the theatre. These *Letters*, coming month by month from one who has made the study of Shakespeare his lifework, both as scholar and actor, should carry much weight. His dramatic and artistic sense and imaginative insight enable him fully to visualise Shakespeare’s period and his characters.

Mr. Poel strives to educate his pupils and his public in what he considers is the correct way of treating drama that was written and performed over three hundred years ago. Whether his method coincides with the taste and demand of to-day may be questioned. Unfortunately present-day art is more concerned with catering for the eye than the ear, and consequently the demand for scenery and gorgeous setting holds its own. It is only by the strongest personal appeal to the emotions that plays such as *Journey’s End* need no scenery to entrap the vision, or even poetry of language to charm the ear: its absolute truth holds its audience spellbound. It can hardly be called dramatic literature, it is simply life, and life that its audience can enter into as part of themselves. The connection existing between actors and audience is the link that matters either with or without scenery. But these are the very qualities of Shakespeare.

These *Letters* go back as far as 1912. Their chronological order is not adhered to, but they are grouped in relation to the subject in hand. The first in this volume is dated 1916, when the war was still in progress and men’s minds needed relaxation from the continuous and pressing anxiety of that time, and Mr. Poel turns his thoughts to tragedy in literature and its presentation by Salvini, “a great Tragedian,” one whom he rates as “the highest exponent of histrionic art in modern times.” Notwithstanding that thirty years have elapsed since Salvini appeared for the last time in London Mr. Poel still feels with George Lewis that no actor can compare with him, and that Salvini’s Hamlet is “the least disappointing and has the greatest excellences.”

Mr. Poel examines and criticises English and foreign acting to the detriment of the former, and instances the superiority of the National Theatre in Paris from the time of Molière until the secession of Sarah Bernhardt and the elder Coquelin, which event marked the decline of French histrionic art. The author of these

* *Monthly Letters*. By William Poel. Selected and arranged by A. M. T. T. Werner Laurie. 3s. 6d. net.

Letters, in his severity, makes the statement that "acting is no longer an art," at least while the playwright, or owner of the theatre, alone counts, and becomes rich. Surely this is a hard saying, for without good acting neither author nor owner would be successful; the poorest play is often redeemed by good acting. Mr. Poel urges actors to apply for legislation to prevent gambling in the theatrical profession. By all means safeguard the profession as far as possible, but after all it is the public that is being catered for. Educate it by good plays and good acting will follow. The loss to acting as an art is the debased state of public taste.

Mr. Poel in 1917 discusses the actor's art and especially that of gesture. Gesture must add meaning to the words spoken, and he says so seriously is dancing regarded in India that "no dancer ties the bells upon her ankles without first touching her forehead and eyes with the bells and repeating a brief prayer." Shakespeare in *Hamlet* instructs the players as to gesture: he knew its value, its moderating value, in connexion with speech—"suit the action to the word, the word to the action." Mr. Poel finds that children generally comply with this *dictum* more easily than grown-up people, especially Jewish children. This is not remarkable as the Jew has vision and his ancestry is foreign. The English rely on language more than gesture. In Elizabethan days—which Mr. Poel is ever eager to resuscitate—verse was chiefly the medium used in drama, and often of a quality which is regarded as literature to-day, "yet it was poetry built up purely on a human basis." The actor's art is to give to the poetry he is using the reality of conversation, and, as our author says, this can only be obtained by intonation and modulation of voice. He gives some good examples of the different meanings of a short sentence. Shakespeare, being an actor in addition to an author, knew the value of the keyword, and in the First Folio words of special import were printed with a capital for stage use, such as "I have that *Within* which passeth show."

In other letters Mr. Poel traces the growth of the theatre in Elizabethan times and relates how James Burbage not only built the first wooden play-house ("The Theatre," 1576) and later converted part of a monastery into a stone play-house ("The Blackfriars," 1596), but that he was also the creator of English dramatic art. The story of the Burbages, father and sons, is one long struggle, but their work survived owing to the genius of Shakespeare and his fellow actors, Hemminges, Condell, and Phillipps. "The Globe," of famous memory, was the outcome when "The Theatre" was removed to Bankside in 1598. Of course, this is all well known, but Mr. Poel writes it down in succinct and pleasant form which can be readily assimilated and digested. The author sketches

Shakespeare's life at Stratford as far as records permit, but he feels that "the mystery which surrounds the private life of Shakespeare will never be wholly cleared up." Little light is thrown upon it by the newly published records at Stratford-upon-Avon. Whether in the future other material may be discovered is a matter of doubt, and there for the present it must be left, but, despite this, that Shakespeare was first and foremost the greatest poet, and secondly the truest Englishman, there is not, and never can be, a question.

* * *

THE GREAT MATHEMATICIANS.*

This excellent series dealing with the great scientists should be useful to all those who desire to keep current scientific thought and its sources in mind. It indeed is necessary to keep those things in mind, since it is becoming impossible, in an age when science and thought are inextricably wedded, to understand the drift and purpose of the age without the history of the men who laid the basis of a new world. Professor Turnbull's account of the great mathematicians is of special interest, since mathematics lies at the root of all science and has, moreover, a peculiar poetry of its own, the music of the spheres, which in the highest regions of mathematical thought calls into coherent rhythm with itself philosophy and philosophic humanism.

Mathematics originated with the priestly caste in Egypt. Aristotle's statement to this effect has been confirmed by a papyrus of the eighteenth century before our era written by the Priest Ahmes, a collection of problems in geometry and arithmetic. In fact "the Egyptians were masters of practical geometry," and many perhaps must have known much of the theory. Commercial contact with Egypt in the seventh century before our era brought the Greek into touch with the problems of geometry, and Thales and Pythagoras and the Pythagorean Circle—a great religious cult—soon were busily building the theory of geometry. There are only five regular figures in solid geometry: three (including the cube) were known to the Egyptians and the Pythagoreans discovered the remaining two, the dodecahedron with its twelve pentagonal sides and "the beautiful figure of the icosahedron of twenty triangles surrounding its twelve vertices in circuits of five." Babylon, as well as Egypt, fed the Greek mind, and the discovery of irrational numbers was a piece of "essentially advanced mathematics."

* *The Great Mathematicians*. By H. W. Turnbull. With 19 Diagrams. Methuen. 3s. 6d. net.

After Marathon and Salamis a new group of mathematicians arose and devoted themselves to the duplication of the cube, the trisection of a given angle, and the squaring of the circle. "Such was their inherent stubbornness that not until the nineteenth century were satisfactory answers to these problems found." But the Greek attempt led to many other things, and among them the dealing with irrational numbers by the method of exhaustion. Mathematics was in a state of progress when political events altered the place of action from Athens to Alexandria in the persons of Euclid, Archimedes, and Apollonius, who laid the basis and more than the basis of advanced geometry, while the second Alexandrian school, in the third century of our era, invented the Ptolemaic system of astronomy with its wonderful system of epicycles based on a stationary earth. In fact, long before this Aristarchus, the friend of the mighty Archimedes, had argued that the sun was the true centre, thus anticipating the system of Copernicus. The second school of Alexandria also gave new life to algebra, to the theory of numbers, and to indeterminate equations. The Hellenic periods "virtually sketched the whole design that was to give incessant opportunities for the mathematicians and physicists of later centuries. In some parts of geometry and in the theory of the irrational the picture had been actually completed." Considerable work had been done also in India in these ancient times, and it looks as if it was absolutely independent, though there is much to be said for Greek contact. But the Indian mathematicians in the fourth century of our era produced work not known in Greece such as the decimal notation and substantial advance in algebra and trigonometry.

Why was a big gap of time left before the next great advance? Professor Turnbull says that after the death of Pappus "Greek mathematics and, indeed, European mathematics lay dormant for about a thousand years. The history of the science passed almost entirely to India and Arabia; and the most important event of this long period was the introduction of the Indian decimal notation into Europe," by Leonardo of Pisa. Apparently mathematics slept in the bosom of the Arabs. The Arabs in Spain had done something, and probably gave something to mediæval Europe and England. The names of Albertus Magnus, Grosseteste, and Roger Bacon cannot be dissociated from the history of science, but the true awakening was late in the days of Renaissance. Scipio Ferro (1465-1526), Niccolo Fontana (1500-57), Girolamo Cardan (1501-76) gave the lead and brought the algebraic theory of equations to its full scope; the German Copernicus revolutionised astronomy, the Frenchman Vieta made strides in the field of algebra, and John Napier, Baron of Merchiston (who died in 1617), at

last invented logarithms, while Kepler (his friend, who died in 1630) stated his famous laws of planetary motion.

The great names are comparatively few, though there were many humbler workers. The work of Descartes (who died in 1650) "gave geometry a universality hitherto unattained; and it consolidated a position which made the differential calculus the inevitable discovery of Newton and Leibniz. For Descartes founded *analytical geometry*, and by so doing provided mathematicians with occupation lasting over two hundred years." But Fermat, a French lawyer, also shared in the discovery, and Professor Turnbull declares that he was a "man of deeper mathematical insight than Descartes." To those two French names we must add Desargues and Blaise Pascal. Ireland gave Lord Brouncker, England Wallis, Scotland Gregory, and then we reach Newton whose corpuscular theory of light and Huyghens' wave theory of light seem to be resolved into a higher unity in the modern theories as to quanta and wave mechanics. The story is carried on by some account of the two Bernouillis, Euler, Maclaurin, and Lagrange, Gauss and Hamilton. There is, of course, no completion to the story, since mathematics and its relationship to physics is striding to new great goals that seem about to prove that things and their component parts are, after all, only symbols of immovable realities. But man in the struggle to ascertain the ultimate realities has also, even in his failure, if failure it be, ennobled the spirit and eased the lot of the human race.

* * *

JOHN WYCLIF.*

This book of extracts from the English writings of John Wyclif will answer a not inconsiderable purpose at the present time when a small but very determined section of the Anglican Church is seeking to lead the people of the country back to the very errors that Wyclif exposed. There is a considerable resemblance between the work of John Wesley and of John Wyclif despite a gap of nearly four centuries that divide them. Both of these great men found the recognised religion of England in an obsolescent condition. Both were members of what may be called the Established Church, the Episcopal Unreformed Church and the Episcopal Reformed Church respectively. Both were distinguished thinkers, both were sons of whom the University of Oxford were proud. Wyclif was Master of Balliol College, Wesley was a distinguished Grecian who became a Fellow of Lincoln College.

* *Wyclif: Select English Writings.* Edited by Herbert E. Winn. With a Preface by H. B. Workman. Oxford University Press. 4s. 6d. net.

Both were reformers within the Church and both, after innumerable labours, died in peace. Mr. H. E. Winn in summarising in his introduction the work of Wyclif declares that :

He was the last great Oxford Schoolman. He *instigated* the first *complete* translation of the Bible into English. He was one of the first writers of nervous and balanced English prose. Through his Latin writings he exerted a very great influence on Hus, and through Hus, a considerable influence on Luther and the Moravians. Lastly, to use the words of his authoritative biographer [Dr. Workman], he "should be regarded as a stern unbending forerunner and father of the Puritans, Covenanters, and Nonconformists of England and America."

In fact, however, his whole desire was a cleansing of the national Church. John Wyclif was probably born in the first quarter of the fourteenth century. When he went up to Oxford we do not know what College he joined, but it appears likely that it was Merton since there were men there of whom he was probably the friend, namely John Cornwaile, who was to become the master of the Grammar School at Pencricke, where he introduced for the first time, soon after the Black Death of 1349-50, the system of teaching lessons in the English language, Cornwaile's successor at the same school, Richard de Pencricke, and John de Trevesa. Cornwaile was teaching grammar at Merton in 1347, while Pencricke was at Merton in 1367. Before the latter date Wyclif had become, in 1360, Master of Balliol and he was awarded his doctorate in theology in 1372, only twelve years before his death in 1384.

It was in these twelve years that most of Wyclif's combatant work was done. He was not long at Balliol apparently, for he filled the college living of Fillingham from 1361 to 1368, and of Ludgershall from 1368 to 1372, but he was mostly at Oxford perfecting his scholastic training with the leave of the Bishop. From 1372 to 1374 his influence became so great that the Crown bestowed on him the rectory of Lutterworth, which he held till his death at the end of the year 1384. In these twelve years he acted for the Crown against the demands of the Papacy for the tribute that Innocent III had imposed upon King John. He went on the first mission at Bruges as a prominent member of the English Commission dealing with the same subject. He was a bold opponent, and perhaps too bold, for the situation was very delicate considering the French influence of Avignon—it was the days of the Captivity—before the Great Schism of the Church which began in 1378.

Wyclif became almost suddenly the centre of interest in the Church. In 1377 just before the Schism broke out Pope Gregory XI denounced him as a heretic and cited him to Rome, whither

the Pope had at last returned. Wyclif neglected the summons. The King and London were on his side. Oxford too was on his side and only formally condemned him. In March 1378 the English Bishops moved, but the Church was in the chaos of the Great Schism and the Crown was still on his side. Meantime Wyclif from Lutterworth organised his Poor Priests, a body of peripatetic priests who certainly laid the foundation of Lollardy, Lollardy good and bad. In 1379 Wyclif began to deal with the doctrine of Transubstantiation—a matter which a great Schoolman could put into any shape that he chose. In fact Wyclif dealt with the doctrine very sensibly and certainly in no heretical spirit. He declared that the Bread was bread, but also that it was the Body of Christ: "it is both together." His doctrine was not heretical at all save from the point of the Roman Church and it is the doctrine that Queen Elizabeth accepted.

Mr. Winn says that in 1379 Wyclif began to deny the orthodox belief as to Transubstantiation. He never really denied it but he dealt with it as a Schoolman versed in the subtleties of Aquinas might, quite reasonably, deal with it. But Oxford was doubtful, for in 1380 a Committee of twelve Oxford doctors, six of whom were friars, condemned Wyclif as an heretic. He replied in a polemical *Confessio* but left Oxford for Lutterworth and continued in his living till his death at the end of 1384.

Mr. Winn gives an interesting though brief account of the age in which Wyclif lived. He says that Wyclif "desired its reform from top to bottom." He would have given the endowments of the Church to the poor, and he would have the clergy replaced by voluntary pastors. In fact he kept his own living. Temporalities were worldly things and should be in the hands of secular lords, and all secular business should be carried out by laymen. He placed God's law above Pope's law and King's law. In other words he regarded the law of Nature as fundamental, a view held by most legal thinkers. Wyclif was not quite the type of reformer that Mr. Winn thinks, but he was a bitter opponent of the secular and political power of the Popes and was perhaps in this sense more than in any other sense a forerunner of the Reformation. He desired to cleanse society, but there is no evidence that he wished to overthrow the social order. He was a very strong man and his contemporaries were afraid to touch him, and he had reason on his side as well the actualities of a corrupt ecclesiastical world on the other side. The extracts will interest many readers: Wyclif's "Sayings," passages from the Bible in English, "the Poor Priest" passages, including their rule of life, various sermons, various papers on the relations of Church and State, some writings on the ecclesiastical position in his own

time, and various extracts dealing with social and other matters. The extracts perhaps are chosen with a purpose, the primary purpose of showing the man as a reformer, but they illustrate his clear prose and his strong nature.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

KENYA.*

There seems much ground for the view that Africa is the continent of the future; and yet comparatively few people take any real interest in its development, except to discuss with considerable ignorance native rights. Books, therefore, which depict undeveloped and uncivilised Africa in true perspective with a judicial view as to its commercial and humanistic possibilities have great value in educating the general British public. Such a volume is *Kenya from Chartered Company to Crown Colony*, by Mr. Charles W. Hobley. The author has had a distinguished career in the African Civil Service and thus can give a firsthand account of the development of British East Africa. In a foreword, the Right Hon. W. G. A. Ormsby-Gore, formerly Under-Secretary for the Colonies, sums up the great value of the book. "Mr. Hobley's book is a plain, unvarnished tale, the record of long experience, simply and directly told without ulterior motives of either criticism or justification." He preserves the scrupulous fairness of a British civil servant. Mr. Hobley started his career in East Africa in the days of the Chartered Company, so that his account covers a very important part in its history. He gives a particularly interesting story of the early settlers and of the conditions under which they lived. From the point of view of the native, Mr. Hobley has no doubt that British intervention was beneficial. "As far as one can judge, the inroads of the Masai would have increased until most of the agricultural tribes in this land were decimated." The "Pax Britannica" is of inestimable benefit to the African peoples. But they must preserve their own identity and not become merely echoes of Western ideas. It is an evil thing to try to displace tribal life violently. Customs and customary law can be, and have been, both in West and East Africa, humanised while leaving the tribal structure intact.

In a very interesting chapter on the personality and life of the African, Mr. Hobley points to what is, perhaps, the fundamental bar to his progress. "Natives generally seem to be devoid of the European sense of utilising wealth to improve their standard of living." British rule will be able to teach the African how to

* *Kenya from Chartered Company to Crown Colony*. By Charles W. Hobley, C.M.G. H. F. and G. Witherby. 16s. net.

make use of his natural resources and show the way to economic as well as humanistic progress. This is the justification of British intervention. During the last forty years in East Africa much has been done; but it is still only the beginning. The foundations are laid and we must see that the structure of African civilisation is built along the right lines. In a sentence, Mr. Hobley sums up what may be done: "providing that the native question is dealt with on liberal lines, and the willing co-operation of the black millions is assured, there is nothing to stop the continent from becoming the greatest producer of economic raw materials in the world." It may be hoped that this valuable book will bring to the British public a greater sense of responsibility for the future development of British Africa in both education and economic efficiency.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Mr. George Glasgow's latest work, *Continental Statesmen*,* is as readable and instructive as his previous studies of European diplomacy. His personal acquaintance with many of the men who have made the history of our time gives freshness and colour to his pages, and his steady judgment commands the increasing confidence of the reader. Unlike many specialists in foreign affairs, he has no special country which he takes under his protection, and no sectional cause to throw his pictures out of focus. He stands firmly for the new international order which the best men all over the world are endeavouring to build up, and his praise and blame are mainly assigned in proportion as they help or hinder the cause of peace. Thus he pays well-deserved tribute to Briand and Stresemann, the two men who have perhaps done most to restore Europe to sanity and peace. He is also generous to the statesmen who have guided the smaller countries through the difficult years of construction or reconstruction, above all Masaryk and Venezelos, both of whom are described from intimate knowledge. Mr. Glasgow is a Liberal in the broad sense in which England as a whole is Liberal—that is he believes in the worth of ordered liberty and the spiritual value of the individual citizen. He has no use for dictatorships, and he writes of Mussolini and the Fascist tyranny with the distaste which we expect from an Englishman. The Russian studies show that Mr. Glasgow finds the Bolsheviks as hard to understand as do the rest of us; but his pictures of Litvinoff, Rakovsky, and Krassin are entirely free from bitterness. He knows too much about politicians to feel great enthusiasm for the tribe; but he recognises merit where he sees it, and any European statesman may be proud to earn the approval of such an experienced observer.

* * *

Professor Elie Halévy's thoughtful little book *The World Crisis of 1914-18: An Interpretation*† contains the Rhodes Memorial Lectures delivered in 1929. "I shall not deal with individuals," he declares in his opening remarks. "I shall attempt to define the

* Geoffrey Bles. 10s. 6d.

† Oxford: at the Clarendon Press.

collective forces, the collective feelings and movements of public opinion which, in the early years of the twentieth century, made for strife. I say purposely strife, not war, because the world crisis of 1914-18 was not only a war—the war of 1914—but a revolution, the revolution of 1917.” At the close of the third and last lecture the author strikes the same note a little harder. “I have looked for the ‘causes’ or ‘responsibilities’ of the war, not in the acts of individual statesmen, but in collective anonymous forces, against which individual statesmen were powerless.” The moral is that, instead of attacking our rulers, we must transfer the responsibility for our ills to ourselves. “The wisdom or folly of our statesmen is merely the reflection of our own wisdom or folly. That is, of course, only true of countries which enjoy the privilege of self-government, and even then it is perhaps stated a little too broadly. But it is true enough that most of the acts of public men which history regrets or condemns were approved by the common man. “So long as we have not evolved a fanaticism of humanity strong enough to counter-balance or absorb the fanaticisms of nationality, let us not visit our sins upon our statesmen. Let us rather find reasons for excusing them if they occasionally feel compelled to submit to the pressure of our disinterested and fanatical emotions.”

* * *

Mr. Frederick Whiley Hilles, of Yale University, has recently published a little book entitled *Letters of Sir Joshua Reynolds*.^{*} Such a collection is not primarily concerned with Reynolds as a painter of portraits, but rather as a prominent member of that literary group of which Dr. Johnson was the head. “The increasing interest shown in Dr. Johnson by scholars and collectors alike, would seem to justify a collection of the letters of Reynolds, who, it must be remembered, was not only ‘father of English painting,’ but founder of the Literary Club and Johnson’s *dulce decus*.” Mr. Hilles further points out that the number of letters he wrote was surprisingly small. Sir Joshua disliked writing letters, considering it waste of time, and never claimed to be a stylist. Yet there is a great charm and frankness about those he wrote. “The conscious element is lacking and what is thus lost in correctness and elegance is gained in sincerity. His letters ring true.” This is more enjoyable to read than, for instance, the laboured prose of Walter Pater which is so ornamental and artificial that the subject-matter must needs take second place. Mr. Hilles has selected a number of letters which stretch over the greater part of the painter’s life. They are expressions of experience and opinions, of likes and dislikes. Writing from The Hague in August 1781 to Edmund Burke, Sir Joshua mentions art in Holland. “Dutch pictures are a representation of nature, just as it is seen in a camera-obscura. After having seen the best of each master, one has no violent desire of seeing any more.” This is an opinion which would not perhaps receive confirmation from all art critics to-day. In a letter to an artist, Charles Smith, Reynolds writes of the difficulty he had in discovering whether he was the artist of a certain painting. “I saw the other day, at Mr. Bromil’s, a picture of a child with a dog, which after a pretty close examination, I thought my own painting; but it was a copy, it seems, that you made many years ago.” There are other letters full of interest from many angles. The

^{*} Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d. net.

book should certainly be studied, especially when one considers the greatness of Reynolds and of the circle in which he spent so much of his life.

* * *

A book entirely composed of prefaces to other works must appear at first forbidding. But when it is realised that the author of such a work is Mr. G. K. Chesterton, there can be no doubt of its success. For the fact is that G.K.C. writes no ordinary introductions. In the Dedication of this volume of prefaces, ably edited by Mr. J. P. de Fonseka, G.K.C. says that the more the introducer “really appreciates the authors, the more will he wish to let the authors speak for themselves. . . . It may therefore be found that, in spite of occasional lapses into relevancy, these scraps of scribbling have something of the character of personal essays.” G.K.C. as M.C.^{*} is therefore a selection of short essays expressing Mr. Chesterton’s views on a variety of subjects. G.K.C. wanders from Jane Austen to detective stories, from Oliver Wendell Holmes to the Book of Job, from one extreme to another, and gives the reader a brilliant and fascinating reproduction of his thoughts. Of Johnson he says: “I mean a strenuous and sincere belief in convention, combined with a huge natural inaptitude for observing it. . . . He would have innocently explained that a delicacy towards females is what chiefly separates us from barbarians, with one foot on a lady’s skirt and another through her tambour-frame.” Mr. de Fonseka calls G.K.C. the Grand Master of Ceremonies. Doubtless he deserves that title; but when we read this little book let us forget that they are introductions to other works and absorb the more fully the abundance of thought and wit contained therein.

* * *

The Dethronement of the Khedive,[†] by A. H. Beaman, asks a question which requires an answer. Why was Abbas II deposed? We were told at the time that he had deserted his country and sided with the enemy. We now learn that as early as September 27th, 1914, the Khedive, then lying ill in Constantinople from bullet wounds caused by an attempted assassination, was informed by our Ambassador that the British Government did not wish him to remain on the Bosphorus, but were taking a villa for him at Naples, and expected him to move there as soon as his health allowed. When Abbas replied that he hoped to return to Egypt in a few weeks, Sir Lewis Mallet replied, “You will never go back to Egypt.” Thus, if this story is correct, he was deposed and exiled weeks before Turkey entered the war, without any reason being given or indeed existing. The official deposition and the proclamation of a Protectorate came later when the belligerence of Turkey supplied a plausible reason. Even then Abbas, so far as we know, never adhered to the enemy. The author, who died last summer, was one of the greatest authorities of his time on Egypt and the Near East, and if there is any official reply to his indictment it should be made without delay. Though this mysterious incident is the *raison d’être* of the book, there is also a good deal of interest on recent Egyptian politics. The Right Hon. J. M. Robertson, himself a specialist on Egypt, contributes an instructive Introduction.

^{*} Methuen. 7s. 6d. net.

[†] Allen & Unwin. 6s.

The editors, Viscount Lee of Fareham and Mr. J. C. Squire, are to be congratulated on publishing "The English Heritage Series." It is with regret, however, that one learns that they have chosen to write on *English Wild Life** Mr. Eric Parker, who has just published an exhaustive work on *Shooting by Moor, Field, and Shore*. Future generations will learn much of the author's personal preferences, but little of the true wild life of England, for the whole book bristles with reminiscences of game preserves, angling, and even deer-stalking. The chapter on "Mountain and Forest," for instance, is a dissertation on deer stalking, ancient and modern. To a lover of nature this chapter suggests mountain hares and foxes, badgers and pine martens, buzzards and merlins, not to mention the many magnificent birds that have become extinct as breeding species only during the last few years. This is the wild life the series should immortalise. Likewise in the chapter on "The Wood: (2) Without," one hopes to hear something of the animal and plant life which is normally so much more abundant on the outskirts of a wood than within. It is, therefore, disappointing to read the author's personal views on the various English crows. The first chapter, "Past and Passing," is excellent, giving a graphic account of the passing of such large mammals as the beaver, bear, and wolf during historic times. There is an interesting observation on young green woodpeckers playing hide-and-seek in September, though, as the author rightly suggests, this apparent play may be the beginning of courtship. The book is pleasantly written. Throughout the author shows a genuine though rather conventional love of nature. A book on *English Wild Life* cannot be written by a sportsman who finds that "shooting grouse over dogs is delightful work." Only a naturalist who has spent long years in intimate observation of wild life in England, with never a thought of killing, can hope to do justice to our wonderful heritage.

* * *

Miss Gertrude Leigh, in her volume entitled *New Light on the Youth of Dante: the Course of Dante's Life prior to 1290 traced in the "Inferno," Cantos III-XIII*,† seeks to unfold that part of the autobiography of Dante which extends over the first twenty-four years of his life. Miss Leigh says that this can be discerned "underlying Cantos III to XIII of the *Inferno*," and adds that her book "is the outcome of discoveries made during an examination into its allegorical purpose, pursued for over twenty years." Dante was born in 1265. In 1288 he joined the Guelfs. He married Gemma Donati and had four children born before 1301. He was elected prior of the Florentine Council in 1300, and two years later he was expelled from the city in consequence of his opposition to papal secular authority. He died in 1315 at Ravenna in exile. Miss Leigh is seeking to reconstruct the life of the poet in Florence until 1288. We are made to see through a glass darkly the environment of the new-born child, his progress under a Biblical and yet poetic education. At the age of eleven he meets or rather sees Beatrice, and his mind dwells on the lovers of history, but he soon dreads also, in the next year, the tyranny of ecclesiasticism, and in the five following years he sees safety from peril in monastic authority. Later, till the year 1286, he finds the theory of law obstructing the march of

* Longmans. 3s. 6d.

† Faber and Faber, Ltd., 24, Russell Square, W.C. 15s. net.

reason and perhaps especially in the penal code of the Church. We see emerge a spiritual leader in the Church and we are taken to the history of the reformers condemned by the Popes. The poet finds refuge behind the tomb of an excommunicated Pope. He thereupon attacks the Ghibellines in 1288 and his career becomes clear. This is a very bald summary of the reading into the *Inferno* of what may be called a mystic interpretation based upon the actual early life of the poet. It is difficult to criticise an effort that represents the labours of so many years, but it may be suggested that all great poets, whether it be Dante or Shakespeare or Milton, unconsciously do inscribe into their works the mystic shadow of their own lives. It could hardly be otherwise, and if Miss Leigh has caught that shadow in the case of Dante, she has given new aspects of the obscure life of one of the greatest of the poets.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Readers of Edward Westermarck's learned treatises will be glad to know something of their author in his lighter vein. "Memories of my Life" is an unpretentious but very readable record of the life of a great scholar who has found perfect happiness in his work. The book was written in Swedish; but it is only right that it should also appear in English dress, since England, next to his native and now emancipated Finland, is nearest to his heart. The works on Marriage, Moral Ideas, and Morocco are known throughout the academic world, and are important enough to justify an autobiography. For many readers the most attractive chapters are those which describe his years of travel and residence in Morocco, on which, despite the perils and physical hardships, he looks back with genuine delight. A keen sense of humour, a warm devotion to his friends, and an ardent love of nature are among the ingredients of an attractive personality.

* * *

"The Solitary Warrior: New Letters by Ruskin,"* edited by J. H. Whitehouse, will be welcomed by all lovers of the great teacher and artist. The frontispiece is an exquisite portrait painted by Samuel Laurance in 1864, and six water-colour or pencil studies by Ruskin himself—some of them very beautiful—also appear for the first time. Since the death of Sir Edward Cook no one has done so much to keep alive the name and fame of Ruskin as Mr. Whitehouse, whose interesting Introduction summarises and comments on the letters here published. Some of them are slight enough, but taken together they suggest a personality of rare nobility and depth. We hear much of his travels and friendships; but the most striking of the letters are those written in 1869, which reveal the social reformer. "The sight of the distress and horror round me in the world is too great for me. I cannot escape from this to the beauty of nature or to her peace." Of this anguish of soul was born the Guild of St. George. "Our object is only to show them how to live." That indeed was Ruskin's supreme service to his time—he reminded the complacent Victorians of the eternal values.

* Allen & Unwin. 16s.

† Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d.

"Rudolf Steiner Enters My Life,"* by Friedrich Rittelmeyer, gives a vivid picture of the personality and teaching of one of the most striking figures of twentieth-century Germany. Dr. Steiner lectured in England on several occasions after the war, and deeply impressed those who came in contact with him. His work survives him, and Anthroposophy has its branches in several countries. "By deepening and developing Goethe's ideas on science," writes the translator in an Introductory Note, "Rudolf Steiner was able to create an independent scientific system of occult knowledge to which he finally gave the name Anthroposophy." The author, a theologian and preacher of high repute, only came gradually under his influence, but the process of conversion was complete. Dr. Rittelmeyer writes with reverence and affection for the character as well as the intellect of his master and friend.

* * *

"The Admiral of the High Seas and other Stories,"† by Miss K. M. Carroll, makes a delightful book of four tales of varying scenes and themes. The first, "The Admiral of the High Seas," centres round a little Scotch boy in the year 1760, and is in itself a pathetic story of love and courage culminating in the death of the child, and yet at the same time it is not a sad story. The second tale, "The Seven Sins of Pontignac," is perhaps the best story of the collection; it consists of a long letter from the Curé of Pontignac to his Bishop, an old friend, explaining his action in putting certain stained-glass windows into his church, which have caused much interest and comment, since they were pictures of his parishioners. The story is a letter, and a long one, but the Curé's simple descriptions of his parishioners are both illuminating and delightful; and however much the reader wonders whether the Curé was justified in his methods, it is impossible to doubt that the idea was excellent and apparently had a beneficial effect. The remaining two are both quite different from their predecessors and themselves, one being of adventure and the other of mystery, yet both are excellent and make delightful reading.

* * *

The British Broadcasting Corporation has just issued its new programme, "Talks and Lectures Broadcast January to April 1930,"‡ which is full of interesting matter to meet the needs of all listeners. The subjects are so many and varied, not only for the whole period, but also for each day, that the listener has a constant choice before him, and cannot say that his tastes are never considered for broadcasting. History, domestic service, language teaching for beginners, literature (historical and critical), art, science in different aspects, music, and politics, taken by authorities on the individual subjects, all find their place in this fine spring programme.

* George Roberts, 24 Great Russell Street.

† Braithwaite & Miller, Ltd. Ordinary edition, 3s. 6d.

‡ Free on application to any Broadcasting Station. 1d. post free.

PROBLEMS AND PARTIES.

THE second Labour Government has already been in office for a longer period than the first Administration of that political colour, and it is possible to form some idea of the measure of success or otherwise it has obtained in various spheres of national policy; and to look into the future guided by the light of the events of the last ten months. First of all, casting one's gaze beyond the seas that encircle us, it is impossible not to feel that in the realm of foreign policy the Government have in most respects acted admirably and in very marked contrast to their predecessors. Mr. Baldwin's Cabinet left British prestige and influence abroad at a lower level than it had touched for a long time by a general attitude of timidity, obstruction, and reaction; but His Majesty's present advisers, with the support and hearty approval of the vast majority of the electorate, immediately reversed the engines, or, to put it perhaps more accurately, they accelerated the speed of progress from four to forty miles per hour, a perfectly safe course on a well-beaten and level track.

Nowhere was this change more remarkable and dramatic in its results than at the Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva last September, when Great Britain took her proper place as leader of mankind. The signature of the Optional Clause by a united Empire was a great act of statesmanship, and brought as a direct result the adhesion of, in all, fifteen states, including, in addition to ourselves, two great powers—France and Italy. I believe this to be one of the most important international events since the war, a big stride forward on the path of permanent peace, and I sincerely hope the Government will crown this work of constructive advance by signing at the next Assembly the General Act of Arbitration, Conciliation and Judicial Settlement. In every sphere of the League's work it is felt that a new and vigorous force is pulsating and driving fresh blood into veins almost in danger of becoming anæmic. The Government have shown wisdom in availing themselves of the services of Lord Cecil, thus greatly broadening the basis of support for work of a truly national character.

Equally outstanding has been the transformation scene in Anglo-American relations, and the Prime Minister deserves great credit for the very real personal contribution he made during his visit to the United States towards bringing about the greatly improved atmosphere now existing. It is too early to say to what extent the Five-Power Naval Conference is going to be successful, but its convocation with the careful work of preparation beforehand was a creative act of immense significance, and it will be the earnest

Liberals naturally pressed for the adoption of their well-known policy based on the report of the Samuel Commission, but the Government dare not incorporate this in the Bill for fear of offending their friends the owners. Finally, however, they gave way after the second reading, and accepted the four main points of Liberal criticism, including the vital element of compulsory amalgamations. The Coal Mines Bill, though much improved as a result of concessions to Liberal criticism, is still far from satisfactory, and is in no sense the bold constructive measure that a Liberal Government would have brought in. We can accept no responsibility for it; the best that can be said for the measure is that it does give the miners the reduced hours we hold they are entitled to, and does create the machinery for reforming and rationalising the industry, so that we may hope that in due course it will be placed in a position through greater efficiency to pay the miners better wages without any appreciable rise in the price of coal. As the destruction of the Bill would mean that the miners would continue to work eight hours per day, and as there would be an immediate demand from the owners for reduced wages, resulting probably in another national coal stoppage costing far more than anything likely to arise under this Bill, it seems better on the whole to acquiesce in its passage. There is, further, the point of the political as well as the industrial crisis that would necessarily arise in the middle of the Five-Power Naval Conference if the Bill were rejected. The levity with which the French Chamber upset two Governments at such a moment is hardly an example the Mother of Parliaments would wish to follow. Let it be said that after the initial blunder referred to above, the President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Graham, showed a reasonable and conciliatory spirit and endeared himself to the House by his uniform courtesy and unshakable good humour.

It is a disappointment to find how little interest is taken in the Labour ranks as a whole in the Liberal industrial policy of partnership so clearly expressed in the famous Yellow Book. The mind of the trade-union official is so accustomed to the eternal struggle against the employer as regards hours and wages that he cannot easily bring himself to see the wider vision of co-operation with the employer in constructive work for the benefit of every section of the industrial community. Thus the suggestion made by Sir Herbert Samuel on the subject of pit committees during the debates on the Coal Mines Bill aroused little interest or response. The Socialist conception of industry is narrow and limited in many respects, and Liberals should take every opportunity of pressing the larger and more generous modern outlook, inevitably the path

of future progress, through Joint Industrial Councils and Works Councils set up by law.

The Conservative party has all this time been very much under a cloud, and is probably as little anxious to return to power at the moment as is the country to see it there. The only front-bench speaker who can fill the House is Mr. Churchill, but his brilliant and exhilarating utterances are either so much in the vein of buffoonery as to be merely entertaining or are so provocative and indiscreet as to be embarrassing to his own party. There are a number of able obstructionists on the back benches who will, when their tide comes in, be able to do effective constructive work. The party as a whole attends very badly, and unless a three-line whip is issued for very special occasions, the Government can safely rely on a large majority over Conservatives and Liberals combined. The ugly menace of the United Empire Party, which for a spell caused genuine dismay, seems to have passed for the moment, but the very real differences both personal and political that still divide them cannot promise much hope of an early revival in the absence of any effective leadership. Conservative policy at the next election will clearly be full-blooded Protection with Food Taxation, however many attempts may be made to hide it behind referendum barricades or to camouflage it as Free Trade. That is an issue the Liberal party will fight as willingly, as vigorously, and as unitedly as on the many previous occasions when the banner of Freedom has carried it to victory.

What upon this crowded and uncertain stage is the Liberal party doing and what should its policy and tactics be? The leader, Mr. Lloyd George, continues to display in undiminished vigour those brilliant gifts of genius which place him as a Parliamentary performer in a class apart, and his interventions in debate on first-class occasions have been devastating. He has been most ably seconded by Sir Herbert Samuel, whose many contributions, short, clear, always to the point, have greatly impressed the House. One feels as if one were listening to a judge summing up. The Liberal party occupies indeed a position of commanding importance and responsibility. By reason of the fact that the Government is dependent on its support, or, at least, its abstention, it can and does influence considerably legislation passing through the House. It cannot blindly attack everything as the regular Opposition does; it supports the Government in all reasonable matters of procedure and in all measures that are liberal; those not coming under this category it uses its power to bend as closely as possible to its views and those incurably bad it reserves its right in the last resort to destroy.

As for the moment a Liberal Government is unfortunately not on

the horizon, it seems to be desirable to squeeze as much Liberalism as possible out of the present Administration and to do it by means of friendly and organised pressure. There should be co-operation and consultation before and not after measures are brought in, so that the maximum of possible agreement may be reached, the Liberal party maintaining all the time its complete independence.

I should like to see this Parliament continue for three or four years, carrying out those radical measures common to both parties and so accustom the British people to the normal functioning of the three-party system. I believe it is in the national interest that this should happen, but events up to date do not altogether make me feel that it is going to happen. A variety of circumstances may upset this particular applecart. Liberal policy will doubtless be guided by the desire to obtain a measure of electoral reform which will enable us to be represented in the House of Commons more nearly in accordance with the clearly expressed wishes of the voters.

There is one thing I think the electors would not forgive: if they felt when the day of reckoning came that the Government had not had a fair chance, that we had not played the game, that they had been unreasonably harassed and harried and tripped up, then I believe the country would simply regard us as a nuisance and decide to return a clear Labour majority, or look with the hope of despair to the protectionists, certainly reducing Liberal representation to a very little measure, in fact, re-establishing the two-party system. I do not, of course, think anything of the kind will happen, for I believe the party has every desire to give the Government a fair chance to make good, even now, with its deplorable unemployment results. Nothing has been more remarkable than the unity shown by Liberals in this Parliament as compared with the last. The number of times when we have not acted together is very small indeed, and every effort will be made to reduce even these to a minimum by a general determination to take every factor into consideration and to pass every opinion under review, though reserving, as one always must in a Liberal party, the right of private judgment in the last resort.

The Liberal parliamentary party has been described as a band of brothers, with, of course, one sister, and certainly the spirit animating the team is admirable. I believe that at the next election its numbers will be considerably increased if the electors, realising the failure of the Socialists on so much of the home-front, and the fatuity of the Tories, feel that we have shown patience and restraint under difficult and novel circumstances, combined with a vigorous devotion to our own principles and policy—in a word, shown that we deserve the confidence and support of the nation.

GEOFFREY MANDER.

ANCIENT AND MODERN IN CHINA AND JAPAN.

I AM writing this on my way home across Siberia, after having seen the Far East for the first time. Even now, I have had only a glimpse; for it is little more than three months since the P. & O. boat that brought me from Bombay touched at Singapore and Hong-Kong and Shanghai, and less than three months since I left her at Kobe. And what are three months, when there is all China and all Japan, ancient and modern, spread out before one's untrained eyes? Evidently the impressions that one brings away from a first reconnaissance of this kind are bound to be fragmentary and superficial. And yet their value for the observer himself is inestimable. I can measure the value of these impressions for me by comparing the picture of the Far East which I am bringing away with me now with the picture that I brought out with me so short a time ago. As I examine the two pictures, side by side, with my mind's eye, I realise how vastly they differ. If I did not know that they were mental representations of the same object, I should hardly have been able to guess it.

When one comes to think of it, the greater part of our mental panorama is composed of pictures of things that we have not yet seen, and perhaps never shall see, with our own eyes. The individual's capacity for direct observation is infinitesimal compared with the accumulated experience and knowledge of Mankind; and the sum of this knowledge is at the individual's disposal only at second-hand. Moreover, he is not in a position to leave this second-hand knowledge severely alone and live solely on what he has learnt for himself. In order to live at all, he must be working all the time upon provisional representations of the universe which he has put together from other people's reports. He must divine as best he can whether their reports are true, and must trust to his own intuition to sift and recompose this foreign matter in his own mind. Having had to live, during the last half-dozen years, by studying and attempting to record the current history of international relations all over the world, I have been compelled to paint for myself any number of these provisional pictures of whole regions and continents on which I have never set eyes: Latin America, Tropical Africa, Russia, the Far East. Of these images, my image of the Far East always seemed to me the least plausible; and for this reason I took the opportunity of attending the Institute of Pacific Relations Conference at Kyoto last autumn in order to confront my imagination with the reality of life in the Far East—so far as I could observe that in a passing visit.

The mental image of the Far East which I brought out with

me was something like this: A race of men with yellow skins, slanting almond-shaped eyes and flat noses; an architecture of curving eaves; a script of innumerable characters, each so complicated that it would be quite an effort to memorise a single one of them; a tradition of landscape-painting that travestied Nature in a charming but rather monotonous way. While my mind dwelt on those things, it saw the Far East as a civilisation one and indivisible. When it evoked a picture of the political map it divided this unity into two countries, China and Japan; but it differentiated these in a very rudimentary way. The main differentia was that Japan had providently embarked upon the process of "Westernisation" two generations ago and had reaped the fruits of her initiative, while China had waited until the eleventh hour and was now paying the penalty for her procrastination. It amuses me now to mark how crude that *a priori* picture was. To begin with the point of physiognomy: After a few weeks of first-hand observation in the Far East, my eye learnt to differentiate the Japanese and Chinese racial types from one another as sharply as—what shall I say?—the Iberian and Scandinavian in Europe. And very soon after that I ceased to see racial types altogether. I simply saw individual countenances, each expressing the personality underneath, as one sees countenances at home. I was no longer conscious that Mr. Z. or Miss Q. was a specimen of the "Yellow Race" (a label which is a gross misnomer, anyhow); I was no longer conscious of their being Japanese or Chinese; they had become just Mr. Z. and Miss Q., two human beings of flesh and blood and like passions with oneself. And so it happened with the rest of my provisional scaffolding. The dry sticks came to life. Aaron's rod began to bud in his hand.

To come back to the difference of national character between China and Japan: Is it all contained in the fact that the Japanese stole a march on the Chinese when they set foot on the Great West Road? No, of course not; the difference goes very much deeper than that—as you realise at once when you see a number of Chinese and Japanese taking part in a conference together. Watch that young Japanese who is addressing us. All the time that he is on his feet he is almost oppressively aware of the presence of all the other Japanese in the room—aware of his and their relative statuses in some exact and exacting hierarchy. He is thinking of what they are thinking about the way in which he is acquitting himself. Is he serving his country well in the sight of his seniors—and so in his own sight, which sees through their lenses? As I watched one after another of these able young Japanese reacting to this atmosphere, and revealing their reaction in an embarrassment and constraint which they could not conceal, I was reminded of what it

had felt like to be a "junior" in an English public school; how formidable it had been to have to live and move in the midst of so great a cloud of witnesses ("Sixth Book Inferiors" and "Tolly-keepers" and "Prefects"; thrones, dominions, principalities and powers). Yes, the social pressure under which a young English public schoolboy and a young Japanese adult "intellectual" live must be just about the same—that is, just about the highest that human nature can stand. They breathe as divers breathe at the greatest depth below the surface to which human beings are able to descend.

And now look at this young Chinese who rises, with an easy gesture, to reply to his Japanese confrère and contemporary. How jauntily he stands, how fluently his words flow, how much he is enjoying himself! What are his Chinese colleagues thinking? What does he care? Perhaps they are disgruntled because he is outshining them—that would be fun. Perhaps they are shocked because he is striking a more audaciously "modern" attitude than they would have ventured to take up—and that would be fun, too. Or perhaps they are just fuming because he is making such a hash of the Chinese "case" in this important issue of "extrality" or Manchurian railways or whatever the subject of discussion may be—but that would be the greatest fun of all. And won't China suffer from his incompetence? Well, China is always suffering from somebody's incompetence and always has suffered; but each time she muddles through in the end—leaving far behind in her wake these solemn and rather ridiculous nations which take thought for the morrow and try to cultivate a sense of responsibility in their young men. Eat, drink and be merry, for to-morrow we are out of a job!

It is the same with the women. In the Japanese group at the conference, there are a certain number of women who have had considerable experience of life and fairly distinguished careers: head mistresses, factory-inspectresses and the like. These sit in the back row, demurely, without uttering a word. Now and then some conscientious British or American chairman makes a determined effort to draw them out. He calls upon one of them by name to address the meeting on some point on which she is obviously an expert. Dutifully but uncomfortably, the lady stands up, blushes, falters out a few words (the delivery bad—the matter excellent), and then sits down again as soon as decency allows. Clearly, for Japanese women, the degree of social pressure is still so high as almost to inhibit them from taking part in public affairs.

Conversely, the Chinese women are even more *insouciantes* and more facile than the Chinese men. No need for "Anglo-Saxon" chairmen to be anxious about them! They do not wait to be

called upon; they adroitly catch the chairman's eye; and, as soon as they open their mouths, you realise that they are "past-mistresses" in the art of speaking. Indeed, they do it distinctly better than their brothers—with less bravado and more charm, with less flashiness and more solid argument. As you listen you feel that in China to-day the women are the superior sex in most of the things that matter: vitality, mental balance, character. Is this a regular phenomenon in countries that are in a bad way? I have noticed the same thing in the "South" of the United States, where the men seem never to have recovered from the shock of the Civil War. I should judge (at second-hand) that it has been the same in modern Russia. One need not buttress the theory by citing an individual genius like Joan of Arc. Is this some universal "law" of sociology which happens to be operating now in China? Or is the present position and outlook of the Chinese women something specifically Chinese, which can be traced back through earlier chapters of Chinese history?

I do not know the answer to this particular question about the position of the Chinese women; but, in general, I am sure that the difference between the Chinese and Japanese national characters, which I was able to observe at a conference held in 1929, does go back into the past, and very far back too. From my scanty knowledge of Far Eastern history, I should say that in China the movement of social change had always proceeded "from below upwards," while it had always proceeded "from above downwards" in Japan.

Let us test the proposition in the field of politics—one of the most superficial planes of social life, on which phenomena are relatively easy to observe. In China, the political system has been "despotism, tempered by revolution," as some witty and discerning foreign spectator remarked long before the outbreak of the present Chinese revolution in 1911. The dynasties rose from below by force of arms (the typical founder of a Chinese dynasty was a successful rebel); the civil servants who governed "All that is under Heaven" on the emperor's behalf made their way upwards by their peaceful prowess in competitive examinations (and in China this competition for entry into the public service was open to a wider range of social classes than it has ever been, so far, in any country of the West). In the present Chinese revolution, the war-lords with their quick-firing artillery and the foreign-educated students with their university degrees in "political science" are playing, under these exotic accoutrements, a traditional Chinese rôle in the traditional Chinese manner. What a contrast is presented by the political history of Japan—especially when one bears in mind that Japan started her political history by borrowing the Chinese system full-blown in the age of the T'ang. How did the Japanese deal with this foreign

importation? They put the Imperial Court in cold storage. (And is not the "Restoration" simply a more up-to-date form of cold storage than the old "Babylonish captivity" at Kyoto?) The effective reins of power in Japan have always been in the hands of a hereditary aristocracy which has imposed its policy upon the people. The policy of systematic "Westernisation," inaugurated in 1868, is simply the most recent and most striking illustration of the way in which Japanese politics traditionally work (even though the inaugurators of the "Meiji Era" may prove, in retrospect, to have set in motion forces that will break the Japanese tradition in the end). In substance, the political histories of both China and Japan are sermons on the test: "Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose."

If we now extend our inquiry from the superficial social plane of "politics" to the deeper plane of "*Weltanschauung*," we can perhaps express the same difference of national character in more general terms by observing that the Japanese are far more consciously concerned than the Chinese are to preserve the sense of continuity between the present and the past. In Japan, every historical monument is carefully preserved by the State, whatever the monument may be: an Imperial palace, a Shogun's castle, a Buddhist temple, a Shinto shrine. And all these well-tended monuments are made to earn their keep. Time and again, during the few weeks that I spent in Japan, I ran into "crocodiles" of Japanese school-girls and school-boys (uniformed and marshalled as though they had come straight from Brighton or Cheltenham) being shown these "sights" and having their significance intelligently explained to them by their mistresses and masters—and this not only in Kyoto and Nara (the Oxford and Winchester of Japan), but at fairly remote places out in the country. The emotional and intellectual effect of this thorough education in the continuity of Japanese history must be very strong. Is this policy of recent date? One might put forward the hypothesis that the "Elder Statesmen" of the Meiji Era introduced this cultured antiquarianism with the express design of balancing the revolutionary changes which they were introducing simultaneously in the material technique of life. The hypothesis sounds plausible, but is it correct? I am told that the immediate sequel to the overthrow of the Tokugawa Shogunate and the re-opening of the door to the West was a bout of vandalism against the Japanese past. Troops were quartered in places where priceless works of art were exposed to their tender mercies; and the pagoda in the deer-park at Nara only escaped by a miracle from being burnt down by a contractor for the sake of the copper in its bolts and nails! No, it looks as though the present solicitude in Japan for the preservation of historical monuments were rather a reversion, after a temporary lapse, to a traditional habit. For,

after all, if this habit had not been normally dominant throughout Japanese history, how is it that these monuments (mostly built of timber, which needs repairing or replacing all the time) have been preserved at all? How is it that one can still walk through the cloisters and the halls of a seventh-century monastery at Horyu-ju, and admire the austere simplicity of eighth-century statues in the museum at Nara? I am reckoning by the Christian Era, and this reminds me that the beginnings of civilisation in Japan and England—which one may equate with the conversions of the two countries to Buddhism and Christianity—were almost contemporary. Yet in England, where we build with brick and stone, what have we preserved from those early centuries in comparison with what has been preserved in Japan? These considerations suggest that the care for the monuments of the past is no new thing in Japanese history.

The difference strikes one painfully when one travels from Japan to China. The first historical monument that I saw in China was the palace at Mukden—a palace built on the Chinese pattern for the princes of the Manchus before they became the conquerors of China. Afterwards the place became the residence of the Manchu viceroys who governed the conquering race's homeland for their elder brothers who were reigning as emperors in Peking; and as long as the Manchu dynasty lasted, the palace at Mukden remained one of the official seats of their empire. It is thus an historic piece of architecture; and I was shocked to see the shrubs growing up between the flags of the courtyard and between the tiles of the roofs, and prising flags and tiles apart. The shock prepared me for what I was to see later on at Peking: in the Forbidden City, in the Hall of the Classics, at the Temple and Altar of Heaven. And when, at Peking, one's eye was caught by some ancient building or work of art that was being properly cared for, one found, as often as not, that the upkeep was being paid for by some vicariously public-spirited American benefactor. It would, of course, be misleading and unfair to suggest that nothing of the kind is being done by the Chinese themselves. It is true that they have taken a large part of the Forbidden City in hand on their own initiative and at their own expense. It is true, again, that the cost of keeping up so huge a monument as the Forbidden City must be immense (there can be no monument on this scale in Japan or anywhere in the world, I should imagine), and that the bare funds necessary for arresting decay must be exceedingly difficult to obtain in the present distracted condition of the country. Still, when all this is said, I was left with the impression that the Chinese (that is to say, the sophisticated Chinese—and it is only they who think about such matters at all) felt a certain *Schadenfreude* in watching their

national monuments go to rack and ruin and in pulling the tail of any sentimental foreigner who allowed it to become apparent that he was distressed at the spectacle.

How is this indifferent or even mischievous or malign attitude towards the monuments of the past to be explained? One might plausibly interpret the state of mind of the contemporary Chinese Western-educated "intellectual" as follows: "I believe in Western civilisation," one might imagine him saying to himself, "and I have been doing what I can to reshape the life of my country on Western lines. But the undertaking is proving more difficult than I had bargained for; and somehow I haven't had the luck of those detestable monkey-faced Japanese. I haven't made a good job of it as they have (curse them). I have failed, and failed again. It can't be my fault. The trouble must come from the size of the country or from those 'Unequal Treaties' which still hang round our necks, or from the Devil himself." (For I suspect that the Chinese "intellectual" is not without his superstitions.) "Anyhow," one can imagine him summing up, "I seem unable, for some reason, to build the New Jerusalem in my native land; but one thing I certainly can do: I can knock down the old Peking, and that I will. After that, if the foreigners still can't admire our callow present, at least they won't be able to get on my nerves any longer by going into raptures over our senile past." Perhaps this interpretation of what "Young China" is feeling about Ancient China to-day is partly correct—only partly, though, I believe; for I fancy that Ancient China, too, has always been indifferent or hostile to the monuments of some other China that was more ancient still. Here I am at a disadvantage, for I have not visited Loyang and Sian, which were the capitals of China under the Han and T'ang, or even Hangchow, which was the capital under the later Sung. I have only visited Nanking and Peking. But from observing the fate which is overtaking Peking now, and which overtook Nanking some time ago, I should infer that those older capitals have not much of their glory left to show. It looks as though vandalism—at least the negative vandalism of deliberate neglect—were part of the Chinese tradition, just as it was part of the Muslim tradition in Hindustan for each new dynasty to build a new Delhi and let the last Delhi go to pieces.

This Indian parallel, however, suggests another interpretation of the Chinese point of view. With Delhi, surely, it was a case of "Le Roi est mort; vive Le Roi." Each brick-and-mortar Delhi might return to dust, as dust must always do, but the ideal Delhi never died. In India, where the concept of transmigration is indigenous, this attitude towards historical monuments seems almost

a matter of course. May the Chinese point of view be interpreted in the same terms? In that case, the indifference or hostility towards the transitory incarnation may be the negative aspect of a positive reverence and affection for the eternal idea.

One might follow out this train of thought into concrete illustrations. For instance: the political constitution of the Chinese State (whatever that constitution may happen to be at any given epoch) must always be consecrated by being founded on the philosophy of a sage who has already departed this life and received his apotheosis. The individual incarnation or mummification of the sage need not always be the same; in one æon it may be Divus Confucius, in another Divus Sun Yat-sen. But, the philosophical sanction being always indispensable, the idea of the dead sage who imparts it can never die. Again, the administration of the country must always be in the hands of learned men. In one æon they may be students of the Confucian Classics, in another they may be students of "political science" as it is taught in the Universities of London and Chicago. No matter, so long as the student governs still. Or consider the element of religion which is always held in solution in the political consciousness of a community. In China, this element must be precipitated in a shrine with an annual cult. In one æon that shrine may be the Temple and Altar of Heaven, in another it may be the mausoleum of Dr. Sun Yat-sen. Or we may come back to the instance of historical monuments, from which we started. China must always have a capital, laid out on lines symbolic of her political structure; but this capital need not always stand on the self-same piece of Chinese soil. When you have laid out Peking you can let Hangchow decay; when you have laid out Nanking (for the second time, this) you can let Peking go the way of Hangchow. Well, the Kuomintang are engaged in laying out Nanking now. They have driven a great royal road right along the major axis of the ancient walled city, from the shore of the Yangtse to the foot of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's tomb. And as Nanking increases, Peking must decrease. That is no sacrilege; it is all in the day's work.

If this is really the Chinese point of view, one of those audacious young Chinese "intellectuals" might open a counter-attack on the Japanese. He might insinuate that all this attention which is given in Japan to preserving the material relics of the past is really a sign of weakness. Why do they cling so morbidly to these cast-off incarnations? The snake does not treasure the skin that he has sloughed. They cling to the letter because they fear, deep down in their hearts, that the spirit is departing from them. And at this point our young Chinese, if he happened to be educated by the Protestant missionaries or by the Y.M.C.A., would

probably be tempted to quote something from the New Testament about cleaning the outside of the cup and the platter, and about whitened sepulchres.

Is there really here a weak joint in the Japanese nation's armour? Is it true, after all, that the "Elder Statesmen" of the Meiji Era, when they launched Japan on her career of "Westernisation," set forces in motion which the Epigoni of this generation are finding themselves unable to control? The Industrial Revolution, for example, is conceivably a force whose nature it is to gather speed and increase in momentum *ad infinitum*, when once it has been released from Pandora's Box. We English, who opened the lid, have already been led a dance by this fiend whom we set at large so thoughtlessly a century and a half ago—a dance of which we cannot see the end. And what about the Japanese, who have been compelled to embrace the industrial system, not from choice but because the thing was already stalking abroad through the world? One Sunday, during our conference at Kyoto, my fellow-delegates and I went over to Osaka (the greatest city of Japan, which is now a country of great cities) as the guests of the city fathers, and in the course of the day we were taken up to the roof of an exceeding high building from which we appeared to be looking out over all the chimneystacks in the world. When one rubbed one's eyes and opened them again, one could fancy oneself surveying Manchester and Oldham. (The line of low mountains on the horizon would stand for the fells that divide Lancashire from the West Riding.) Our hosts told us that, within the range of our vision there and then, there was living an industrial population of between two and three millions; and the thought of those two or three million souls began to work in my mind. Where had they come from? In the brief span of one or two generations, they had sprung uncannily out of the earth, like those child-operatives who doubled the population of my own country at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. And these were only the vanguard of a great oncoming host; for Japan is now committed to industrialisation—and to more and more of it—as the only practicable solution of her population problem. Those surplus seven hundred thousand souls that now accrue to the Japanese nation every year cannot be disposed of by emigration. All the unfilled countries round the shores of the Pacific in which the climate is inviting to Japanese settlers are already in the hands of the English-speaking peoples; Manchuria is being colonised by the Chinese (who there have the advantage over the Japanese both in their lower standard of living and in their greater ability to bear the rigours of the climate); even the still half-empty island of Hokkaido, the northernmost member of the Japanese Archipelago, is too

inclement to attract the Japanese peasant from the congested south. The only resource left open to Japan is to provide for her expanding population within her own coasts by increasing her exports and thereby increasing her national purchasing-power. But what is she to export? Certainly, under these conditions, she cannot export foodstuffs. On the contrary, she will have to import a constantly greater amount of foodstuffs from abroad in exchange for the export of some other commodity; and that commodity can only be manufactures. Therefore the industrialisation of Japan is bound to go ahead full blast; and if, a few years hence, I revisit Osaka and ascend that high building again, I shall find myself looking out over a city, not of two or three million souls, but perhaps of five or ten. Am I not here in the presence of a force which will inevitably sweep the ancient Japanese national tradition away? The authorities may send the school-children of Osaka by the thousand to look at the monuments of Nara and Kyoto; but how, after all, can occasional excursions of this kind be expected to balance the effect of the industrial urban environment in which these children are being brought up and in which the majority of them are destined to spend the whole of their lives? Surely the environment must be moulding their minds after its own image, and then—what will happen to the traditional culture of Japan?

Full of curiosity on this matter, I communicated my thoughts next day to one of my Japanese colleagues at the conference—a man of letters of the younger generation who had recently gone into parliamentary politics in the Liberal interest. What, I asked him, was the microcosm that corresponded to the macrocosm which had been shown to me yesterday? What was the furniture of those two or three million people's minds? What did they do with their leisure, such as it was (for Japanese factory-hands work long hours)? In England, where the industrial environment was of longer standing, its cultural fruits seemed to be an addiction to betting news and football matches and cinemas. In Japan were the symptoms the same? "Well, no," he said "they are not—at least not yet—though you might naturally expect them to be so. No, the minds of those two or three million people in Osaka are still occupied with quite other things. If you want to know what really interests them, observe what the big daily papers publish as their *feuilletons*." (In Japan, 98 per cent. of the population is literate and the circulations of the leading newspapers run into millions.) "They publish re-hashes of our mediæval stories of chivalry and romance. Those noble lords and ladies of half a dozen centuries ago—Yoritomo and his like—are still the popular heroes and heroines in our great cities to-day. The cinema-stars and football-professionals are not in the running.

Why," he added, "I can give you first-hand evidence. It had distressed me to see this fine old literature served up to the people—hungry for it, as they were—in so shoddy a form; so last year I made a collection of stories from the mediæval repertory—reproducing them in the modern style, but in something better, I hope, than 'journalese.' My publisher was rather sniffy about the book, but it has turned out a 'best-seller.'"

I came away from this conversation vastly interested and considerably relieved in mind. In Japan, then, the spirit that the Industrial Revolution has evoked in England did not yet prevail. Was it possible that the Japanese might be successfully solving the problem of how to secure the material advantages of industrialism without suffering the spiritual impoverishment which the West has suffered from it? Well, perhaps Japan may be evolving a satisfactory industrial proletariat. But what about her intellectual proletariat? From what I have heard, Japan is now confronted with an unsolved and perhaps insoluble problem here. Owing to the efficiency of her modern educational system, she is producing university graduates—both women and men—in far greater numbers than she requires; and the result is unemployment, in this class, on an appalling scale. For example, I was told that jobs had been found for only 20 per cent. of the students who graduated from the university of Kyoto last year; and I was not given to understand that this was in any way an exceptional case. Apparently very few of these unemployed young "intellectuals" have private means. Most of them come from poor but ambitious families which have made considerable sacrifices in order to give their more promising children a university education. And the end of the story is that the *élite* of the younger generation find themselves in a worse position for making a start in life than if they had remained on the land or had entered the factory. There is food here for what the Japanese police call "dangerous thought"; and the police seem to have this bugbear rather badly on their nerves. It may have been accident that, during my short stay in Japan, there happened to be a grand "round-up" of suspects. But only a chronic anxiety could have begotten that form which has to be filled up nowadays by everybody who lands in a Japanese port—a form of declaration of every book and pamphlet that the traveller has in his baggage ("three volumes of Procopius; one volume of Ammianus Marcellinus; and the Qur'an"—they did not get much change out of me!). Of course, the fish that they are trying to net is Communist propaganda. But who ever heard of propaganda being successfully excluded, by this kind of precautionary measure, from any country where the soil is ripe to receive it? That declaration form is quite in the Hamidian manner; and it pulled me up short; for in general there could hardly be a greater contrast to

the half-witted tyranny of 'Abd-al-Hamid than the sagacious oligarchy by which Japan is governed.

So the young Japanese "intellectual" may harbour "dangerous thoughts" (at least, so his seniors fear) beneath that constrained and demure demeanour. And if such thoughts are really there, he is possibly a more dangerous creature than his Chinese contemporary, who unburdens his heart by trailing his coat all the time. In their different ways, however, I am afraid that both the Japanese and the Chinese student of to-day are unhappy souls and therefore awkward customers.

As I think of them, poor fellows, I cannot help also thinking of "Mr. Wu"—but I must explain who that gentleman is. In China (not in Japan), you will find that, in every public building—palace or Government office or place of worship—the four concave ridges which run down to the four corners of the curving roof support a row of terracotta figures which are always identical. In front, at the very tip of the ridge, there is a little man riding on a cock, and behind him, in single file, rising one behind another as the ridge curves upward, stand a squad of queer beasts. This fantastic procession is *de rigueur*—so much so that, in a Muslim village just outside Peking, I found it, all complete, on the four roof-ridges of the mosque, though in Islam graven images are anathema. What do the figures represent? They were explained to me in this way. The little man riding on the cock is "Mr. Wu"—a demon of an unusually mischievous temper, who used to scurry about the world, making himself a nuisance to Mankind. After long ages, when the nuisance had become intolerable, a sage contrived to corner "Mr. Wu" by inveigling him on to the tip of a roof-ridge and then promptly marshalling in his rear a squad of philanthropic monsters to cut off his retreat. Thus "Mr. Wu" was immobilised and banned. (Why couldn't he flutter down to the ground on his winged steed and start his pranks again? Well, for some reason he could not: he was checkmated.) Now, if you make your pilgrimage to the historical monuments of China nowadays and glance up at their roof-ridges, you will often notice that, while the guardian animals are still standing faithfully at their posts, their prisoner's place is empty: he has made a "get-away." How is "Mr. Wu" contriving to outwit the sage and recover his liberty after all these centuries? Sometimes, I fancy, he persuades the frost to split him off from the tile to which his cock's feet were riveted. Sometimes he puts it into the heart of an unprincipled priest or janitor to break him off and sell him to an unprincipled Western tourist. Anyhow, "Mr. Wu" is at large again. In China, at this moment, you can see his handiwork. I hope he is not planning to extend his operations to Japan.

ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE.

RUSSIA: THE FACT AND TECHNIQUE OF RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

APPEALS for prayer for Russia, and especially for the victims of religious persecution in that land, have appeared and found response during recent weeks. They have come from the heads of the Roman and Anglican communions, and from Free Churchmen. They are not confined to our own country; the American Churches are involved, and those of almost every country of continental Europe.

I

It has actually been suggested that in regard to the facts the Churches are deceived. If that be the case, the Baptist denomination was one of the earliest to be misled. Serious reports reached me during February of last year, in the course of a journey in Northern and Eastern Europe, not only through the Press, but from persons coming out of Russia. As far back as April 9th, 1929, I wrote to the *Manchester Guardian* a carefully worded statement regarding the intensified repression which had marked the three or four preceding months. In May the Executive Committee of the Baptist World Alliance was in session at Detroit. Grave statements from known and trustworthy sources were laid before its members. They gave themselves to prayer, and adopted and issued an appeal for continuous and world-wide intercession. I quote its terms:

The Executive Committee of the Baptist World Alliance, assembled at Detroit, U.S.A., on Friday, May 17, 1929, appeals to Baptists of every race and tongue, and to all other lovers of religious freedom in all parts of the world, to offer continuous and united prayer for their fellow-believers in Russia, and for all others who in that land in this twentieth century are denied religious liberty and exposed to disabilities and persecutions because of their loyalty to their conscience and their Lord.

It should, I think, count for something that the one Protestant denomination which is strong both in this country and in Russia, and therefore keenly interested and likely to be as well informed as present conditions allow, has been led, after closely following events for years, to issue such a document. Nor is its action open to the suspicion which has fallen upon some more recent pronouncements. When the Baptist appeal was issued, Mr. Baldwin was still in office. The British General Election was not mentioned at Detroit, nor did the question of diplomatic representation, or any other political issue, arise. The Baptist appeal is in line with the traditional witness of the denomination against persecution

and in favour of liberty for all men. It was adopted as a purely religious appeal, and as such it stands.

II

On what testimony does it rest? It is obviously impossible to name witnesses, but certain sources of information may be described. (1) To me the most important of these are persons who, during the year 1929 and the early weeks of the present year, have come out of Russia, and have given their testimony face to face or in writing. Several such witnesses have directly helped me since August 1929, the latest during the present month (March). (2) Next I place a series of specific statements by correspondents in Moscow from Walter Duranty of the *New York Times* early in February 1929 to the correspondent of the *London Observer* in February 1930. Those messages are subject to Russian censorship; and they do not exaggerate! (3) Visitors to Russia—responsible and representative men—have recorded the results of their inquiries and observations. Dr. Hutchinson of the *Christian Century* is one whose testimony appears in the *Christian World* of September 5th last, Dr. Orlo J. Price is another; the current issue of *Goodwill* reproduces an impressive article from him. (4) The changes in the constitution of the U.S.S.R. and its laws during 1929 furnish evidence of a character which leaves one astonished that their terms have not been more closely studied abroad.

Now it is true that "White" propaganda abounds. To cite an example which has a personal bearing: a report of a visit by myself to Russia during 1929 has been printed on the Continent, accompanied by an alleged "interview" in which I was made to bear witness to what I had seen in cities that I have never entered. Neither visit nor interviewer had any foundation of truth. As a matter of fact, before writing to the *Manchester Guardian*, I had applied through the Soviet embassy in Paris for leave to visit Russia and investigate the position, but this was refused. Many a statement which has reached me has found its way to the wastepaper basket as manifestly untrue, or hopelessly out of date, or originating from tainted sources. But the acknowledgment that many published statements are false does not imply that it is impossible to reach truth. Those who have kept in contact with Russian questions and learned to sift evidence know otherwise.

III

To sum up the position in a sentence: *There is in the U.S.S.R. a steady, continuous, and widening pressure directed to the extinction of religion in every form.* I have ventured to describe it as

the most far-reaching and well-organised attack on Christianity since the Diocletian persecution. The phrase has been criticised, and it has been urged that other persecutions have involved larger numbers of victims, more terrible examples of savagery, and so forth. The criticism misses the mark: my comparison had nothing to do with quantitative assessments of cruelty. I meant precisely what I said, that there is in progress a campaign against Christianity almost without historical precedent in its skill and its range. (Of course against other religions also.) It would be amazing if such a campaign had not in its earlier years accompaniments of horror. Cruelties abounded in Czarist Russia; they characterised "White" and "Red" alike during the revolutionary struggles and the civil wars. In carrying out the policy whose aim is the destruction of religion, cruel treatment of individuals is not pursued for its own sake, nor is it avoided if it promises to serve the end.

IV

The "dictatorship of the proletariat," i.e. the monopoly of power by the Communist party, explains the repressive policy. The Communist party admits to membership no adherent of any form of religion. It is frankly, resolutely, and unanimously atheistic. The only divisions within its ranks concern the methods by which religion is to be fought. Shall it be regarded as moribund, treated with contempt and left to die? Shall it be fought only by propaganda and argument? Or shall the machinery of legislation and administration also be used against it, due care being taken not to move so fast as to provoke dangerous resistance? The activists, answering the last question affirmatively, have definitely obtained the upper hand. No single element of religious freedom exists in Russia except on grounds of temporary expediency. A great deal of misinformation has been circulated in our own country: for example, that every church in Russia has been closed. Hence the astonishment of the House of Commons when a perfectly honest Labour member announces that he has worshipped with a thousand people in a particular Moscow church. I could have said exactly the same thing (at an earlier period) of precisely the same church; I know it well. Such a reply is decisive against ignorant or dishonest misrepresentations of the position. But other things are also true. Of the half-dozen places of worship in which I have attended services at Moscow, at least three are now closed. In February of this year an English correspondent wired from Moscow that the local Soviet reports seventy-three churches closed in the city during the last twelve months. The *Observer* in the same month printed a dispatch from its

Moscow correspondent stating that in Odessa a clean sweep has been made of all churches, mosques, and synagogues. Other smaller towns have also been named as now churchless. The pressure goes on steadily: whether the closing of all churches in the land may need five or ten years or a generation, nothing less is the goal of the party that alone possesses political power. It is said that "the people" call for the closing. There is good reason to doubt the genuineness of the demand in many cases; but in every case it is certain that the decision to close is the act of the political authority. Political authority being the monopoly of the "anti-God" party, an impartial judgment is excluded.

It must be emphasised that the closing of churches or synagogues represents but a section of the policy of making common worship impossible. My own denomination has but few church-buildings in Russia. One of the newest and most important (in Siberia) has been seized within the last few months. According to *Svenska Morgonbladet* of Stockholm (February 27th), the largest Baptist property in Leningrad has just been taken. Baptists have, however, depended for the most part upon halls and rooms hired or lent by sympathisers. Large numbers of these have been closed to them notwithstanding that no alternative provision was available; and private persons have been forbidden to lend their rooms.

V

What of the sufferings of individuals? Taking first the cases of imprisonment and exile, definite statistics are not available—in the nature of the case no one could write freely from Russia. By various means—especially through foreigners who have left the country—names occasionally become known, and in some cases they are of well-known people. The Rector of the Preachers' School in Moscow, Mr. Ivanoff-Klishnikoff, who was also Secretary of the Russian Baptist Union, is of sufficient importance to have been often mentioned. He was arrested last March and is now exiled to Siberia. About fifteen other names have reached me during the past twelve months. The arrests of Baptists and other evangelical Christians in 1929 certainly extended into hundreds. When it is asked what charges are brought against them, the reply is that sentence in the U.S.S.R. is largely by administrative order without trial—a bad legacy from Czarist days. Of course a political pretence is often found. Moreover, detention in prison and severe cross-questioning, followed by release after weeks or months without charge and without explanation, are common methods of intimidation. This "cat-and-mouse" procedure keeps ministers, their families, and their churches in constant nerve-

racking anxiety. It is part and parcel of the technique of persecution. Exile is reserved for the more capable and zealous religious leaders. It does not invariably involve harsh conditions; it is sometimes in fact more merciful than confinement in prison. The end is secured when the man's religious work is definitely stopped.

It is shut down, too, in other ways equally effective. As is well known, ministers of religion have no voting rights in Russia, but are liable to exceptional taxation. The demands upon them are often arbitrarily raised until it is impossible for the minister even with the self-sacrificing help of his congregation to meet them. All his possessions must come under the hammer. Then in his desperate condition comes the suggestion: "There is an easy way out. Give up your office: announce yourself an atheist." In not a few cases men have given way to such pressure. Where such is the case, the object is secured. The steady suffocation of religion is the main concern.

The physical and mental torture of individuals is unquestionable. How unbearable the pressure may become appears in the case of the Mennonites, which has lately attracted public notice. Thousands of an industrious and God-fearing community, that has been in Russia since the eighteenth century and found life not intolerable even under Czardom, have been driven to despair. Happy those who, at the sacrifice of all their possessions, have found refuge in Germany *en route* for the New World! The case of the Mennonites is recent and notorious; it destroys the last element of doubt regarding the unendurable character of the persecution, and it destroys also the excuse that it is directed against the Church which was part and parcel of the old State. Although I have restricted this article as a whole to recent developments, it should also be noted that thousands of persons, including many priests and bishops, are still in exile, and that the exiles in many parts—though not everywhere—live under inhuman conditions.

VI

Other methods are applied in the process of suffocating religion. I will name but one or two of the more important: Take the educational policy. No such institution as the Sunday School can exist in Russia. The formation of any school or class for the instruction in religion of persons under eighteen years of age is definitely forbidden by law, and I know from personal dealings with the Commissariat of Education and with the heads of the Central Executive Committee that if there is one law by which the Communist Party will stand to the last it is this. A "class" is defined as consisting of any number of children exceeding three, and taught by any other person than a parent. From the State

schools—which alone may exist in Russia—religion is, of course, excluded, but not anti-religion! Moreover, there is no veto on the junior Communist organisations, aggressively atheist, which seek to capture the boys and girls, and are largely succeeding. Furthermore, higher educational opportunities are commonly closed to the children of religious families, and by this means a cruel dilemma is thrust upon the parents. I have definite reason for believing that during the last few months the pressure along this line, as along others, has become more severe.

Let it be remembered that the veto upon the religious education of children under eighteen is now in fact extended beyond that age. A church cannot form groups for Bible study; and as no institution can function anywhere without official sanction, even the training of Christian ministers is made impossible by the withholding of the necessary permission. Not until 1927 could the Russian Baptist Union secure permission to open a preachers' school; and this was closed in March 1929, not by formal order, but by the simple method of imprisoning the tutors.

Religious literature is all under censorship. It has been practically suppressed, and had little value even while it continued. One of the earliest strokes against the Baptists, as the new developments of repression began over a year ago, was to reduce the permitted issue of their national magazine from 25,000 (an already insufficient figure) to 2,500. It has now ceased to appear, whether by official prohibition or because the censor's excisions made it worthless I do not know. Other religious papers have likewise vanished during the last six months. The printing of Bibles is no longer allowed, and thousands of copies have been destroyed during recent months.

VII

Specific charges of oppression may be denied, but legislative action is undeniable. Few people in Britain realise that in the original form of the Soviet constitution freedom of propaganda *for or against religion* was asserted as the right of every citizen, and that in May 1929 an amended form of the constitution of the U.S.S.R. excluded the right of religious propaganda while expressly retaining the right of anti-religious. The change was an unmistakable intimation that all evangelisation must cease. The Russian Baptists had a number of district evangelists operating over wide areas; all ceased to function within less than two months of the adoption of the new form of constitution.

It may be said that freedom to worship is left. It is governed, however, by a law adopted in April 1929 which breaks up religious communions into local groups with a registered meeting-place;

forbids their forming any permanent organisation among themselves or raising central funds for common purposes; forbids preachers to function anywhere else than at the meeting-place of their local group; forbids the holding of meetings for children, of prayer meetings for women, and of Bible study circles; forbids the possession of a library, the giving of charitable aid to any member, and I know not what beyond. A formal gathering for formal worship—if a meeting-place can be secured—but all living Christian fellowship made difficult or impossible: that is the extent of the "freedom" of religious profession or worship which is still conceded as a matter of expediency. I doubt if there is anything like a Baptist Union left in Russia; the Siberian Union, I have been definitely informed, has been dissolved by the action of the Government.

The legislation of 1929 has therefore added the following points to earlier repressive laws:

- (1) Suppression of the right of religious propaganda.
- (2) The breaking up of religious bodies into local units whose meeting-places must be registered, and whose members are constantly and directly under police control.
- (3) The isolation of these local units from one another.

The administration has sought to terrorise and paralyse the isolated and enfeebled units by the arrest and exile of leaders, and by subjecting the members to continuous pressure through denial of educational opportunities for their families, exclusion from professional unions, expulsion from houses, denial of rations, and so forth. The technique of persecution has developed in a remarkable degree.

VIII

It is not the case, as some have averred, that nothing new has arisen in Russia during recent months. A great deal has occurred during 1929. Irreconcilable hostility to all religion has found new expression in legislation and administration, and there is abundant reason for educating British public opinion to an understanding of the situation, as well as for calling the Churches to continuous prayer.

Great harm has been done by the admixture of politics. There has also been a mistaken stress upon deeds of cruelty which are sometimes questionable as fact, and in any case, so far as evidence is available, belong chiefly to the past. Attempts to defend the Soviet Government are in not a few cases as completely out of date. The old State Church was in effect a department of the old State: conflict with that institution was inevitable in any new Russia. But that Church has lost all wealth, power, and prestige: it is now

helpless. Is there any reason in the thirteenth year of the Soviet Government for harrying its priests, and keeping bishops in exile under unspeakably cruel conditions? Such a policy is rightly condemned by the conscience of the world.

Natural resentment is apt to produce a demand to "do something." This has arisen largely in professedly Christian circles; but we may venture to ask whether such a call for external action of some kind—in effect political action—does not betray weakness of faith. After all, Christians believe in God and in the moral order of His world, and they believe in prayer. Should not these great convictions be effective to restrain their impatience? The clamour for a severance of diplomatic relations is futile. Severance could do no good, and would fling away some faint possibilities of helping. But if British Christians understand the inwardness of the Russian situation, with its resolute campaign against religion itself; if they realise the significance of a State-promoted atheistic education of the young; if they appreciate the unhasting, unrelenting policy of eliminating churches and silencing ministers; in short, if they visualise with any clearness the relentless mental and physical pressure by which it is sought to shape a godless Russia, their prayers will be intelligent and urgent. Not too often or too emphatically can it be repeated that it is not against the Russian Government as Socialistic or Sovietic that the conscience of the world is stirred; but it does demand genuine freedom of conscience, the liberation of the oppressed, and the right to worship and to preach the Gospel. Our hearts must needs ache for those who suffer because these great blessings are denied.

J. H. RUSHBROOKE.

THE GOVERNMENT OF SPAIN.

THE Spaniard, like the Sussex pig, "won't be druv." And so General Primo de Rivera, most likeable of all Europe's Dictators, has succumbed to the strain of moral and physical exhaustion produced by six and a quarter years of passive resistance, or more accurately (and the parallel with India is closer than would appear) non-violent non-co-operation.

On January 28th, King Alfonso, with his unerring sense of popular feeling, snapped the ties that bound him to the Marques de Estella—ties which most people looked upon as indissoluble—and appointed in his stead General Damaso Berenguer, a distinguished cavalry officer, with the charge of forming a civil Government "to liquidate the Dictatorship" and reviving the Constitutional régime as soon as possible. The fact that General Berenguer, Count of Xauen (Sheshuan), was reputed to be Primo de Rivera's ancient rival and that opponents of the Dictator invariably assigned to the former the rôle of principal in the long-awaited revolt of disaffected Army groups and *politicos* would suggest that this was merely a Palace revolution. General Berenguer did indeed in the early years of the Dictatorship get into trouble for attending a dinner in Madrid where some professors and politicians spoke their minds freely about the Dictatorship. He was sent away to a fortress but, possibly at the King's request, very soon pardoned; and, by way of demonstrating that he bore no malice, the Marques de Estella sanctioned his appointment as chief of the Royal Household. But, as a matter of fact, the proximate causes of the Dictator's downfall were quite independent of the King, nor did they involve any personal issue.

As I have said, the desperate efforts of the Dictator to find a solution of Spain's political and constitutional problem were frustrated by the stubborn attitude of the politically-minded. *El sentimiento de honor* is the supreme national characteristic, as Professor Madariaga and Señor Miguel de Unamuno always insist, and the sense of honour of the country as a whole, as of the individual Spaniard, forbade them to give any positive encouragement to a régime which had violated the letter and the spirit of the covenant between King and nation. None of the men—men like Federzoni or Rocco in Italy—who could build the necessary bridge from the past to the future would raise a finger to help the "usurper," with the all-important exception of King Alfonso himself. The mere threat to restore "constitutional normality," on the other hand, was enough to induce some of the re-emergent military *juntas* (officers' committees) for reasons of professional

jealousy to conspire to oust the man who by "rationalising" the Army bid fair to deprive them of their traditional power behind the political façade. And finally General Primo de Rivera committed political *hara-kiri* by his action, "in a fit of giddiness," he told us, in appealing to the confidence of the principal Army commanders without any consultation of the King. The growing hostility in the Army, on top of his unsuccessful attempt to dragoon the academic world, "rattled" the Dictator, and the fall of the peseta to 39 to the £, the lowest rate since 1898, the year of the Cuban disaster, was the finishing touch. Apart from the general sense of insecurity, since no one could foretell the succession of the dictatorship, this was significant and ominous. It meant that an economic nationalism which had gradually approached more and more the type of an eighteenth-century mercantilist policy was coming home to roost, and there are many who think that this was the main factor in the sum of retribution.

When the Military Directory took over the reins of government in September 1923, they found a country which, for all its immense potential economic wealth, was virtually stagnant. Time after time, sound and far-reaching plans of economic development were set down on paper or were ordered by the central administration. They failed to come to fruition, however, owing to the opposition of this or that vested interest which could always put the necessary spoke in the wheel of progress by stirring up the muddy waters of a corrupt political system. Then, the morality of tax-paying, as the saying goes, was about as low as in other Latin countries, and ever since 1909 the annual Budget deficit had been growing in proportion. To the detriment of Spain's major source of strength, agriculture, Catalan and Basque industrialists had manoeuvred themselves into the key positions, and were able to impose on a succession of weak Governments their will for higher and higher tariffs, thus securing to themselves the gains which had come their way when the rest of the European world was at war. The "hunger tariff" of 1922, finally elaborated when Señor Francisco Cambo, the Barcelona millionaire, was Minister of Finance, is estimated to have cost the Spanish people 1,300 million pesetas annually. Economic development at home was also retarded by the outbreaks of anarchy and syndicalist violence in Barcelona and other big towns, which was itself a reflection of the chronic *desgobierno* (negation of government). The latter was due, of course, first of all to the totally unsuitable parliamentary system, and also to the general apathy with regard to public affairs—what M. Albert Mousset has well called *la nolonté nationale*. Finally, the Spanish peseta had not escaped the effects of the slump in world trade at the end of 1919, and from its proud and lonely

position above par had fallen to the rate of 7.30 to the dollar at the time of General Primo de Rivera's *coup d'état*.

The vice-president of the Directory, General Martinez Anido, met violence with violence, and with the aid of workmen's corporations which called themselves *sindicatos libres* he made short work of the revolutionary turmoil in Barcelona. Order was restored here and everywhere, to the general satisfaction, but, of course, the Dictator, who received active support from no quarter except the Church, could never afford to offend the powerful business interests which continued to feather their own nests at the expense of the patient and long-suffering consumer.

By the end of 1924, improving trade had brought about a *de facto* stabilisation, i.e. internal prices were comparatively stable and in harmony with the external value of the peseta. This seemed to the Government a propitious moment for taking in hand many of the long overdue schemes of economic development, especially in the way of public works, communications by road and rail, new schools, and above all irrigation plans and exploitation of the water power in which Spain is so rich. Then came the successful termination of the Moroccan War, due entirely to the political and military skill of General Primo de Rivera himself, which removed a terrible and senseless burden from the Exchequer as from the mind of the individual Spaniard. Here was a timely fillip to the Government's aspirations to create a "new Spain" in line with the up-to-date achievements of industry and science in other countries, and to some extent this idea seized the public imagination so that the Government obtained not a little support, especially in the provinces, for an ambitious programme of "reproductive" expenditure. In 1926, a kind of Geddes Committee effected considerable saving in the Administration account and hopes ran high for a really impressive national recovery, and were reflected in the special Spanish number of *The Times* that year.

Señor Calvo Sotelo, the Minister of Finance, had every reason to be well satisfied with the omens. In 1927, the Budget was balanced for the first time in twenty years, and a series of financial reforms, especially in the sphere of taxation, comparable with the modernisation of French finance put through by M. Caillaux—the sources of wealth have been re-assessed on a proper basis instead of on figures and notions of the seventies—warranted the Government's claim that Spain was entering an era of material prosperity that had not been enjoyed since the days of Charles III. Wherever you go in Spain there is plenty of evidence that the ambitious efforts of the Government to develop the national estate have borne fruit. And a country which can set its energies to the creation of the industrial and cultural achievements of the Barcelona and

Seville Exhibitions may well boast of its seed-time of good government.

There is, however, the other side of the medal. Behind the imposing façade, the development of commerce and industry has been to a great extent artificial. The "patriarchal" Dictatorship, true to its name, has piled the Pelion of State protection and control upon the Ossa of high tariffs. Without any real understanding of things economic, General Primo de Rivera sanctioned schemes and enterprise far beyond the capacity of the country, and by granting protection indiscriminately, to workers no less than to employers—like the good Sultan of old, raining his bounty upon rich and poor—he has planted a tangle of vested interests—the Spanish term *los intereses creados* (cf. Benavente's play) is peculiarly apt—which it will take many years to weed out. The new Government of General Berenguer has promptly revised the decrees for outstanding expenditure, recognising at the same time that in themselves they were "*inmejorables*" (excellent), has removed restraints from competitive industry, is taking steps to rescind the various monopolies, such as the petroleum monopoly, by which British and French firms have suffered considerably, and so to clear the way to a sounder economic policy. It should be said, in extenuation of General Primo de Rivera and his collaborators, that although, indeed, the Extraordinary Budget which comprised most of this development expenditure followed the bad example of France with her *dépenses recouvrables*, the national revenue was showing such good results that it was confidently expected that the surplus of the ordinary Budget, some 200 million pesetas in the current year, would more than cover the Extraordinary Budget, and by the end of this year Spanish finance would be on a thoroughly sound footing.

There remains, however, the question of monetary policy. Here the lure of prestige blinded General Primo de Rivera as it did for a long time also Signor Mussolini, and indeed a succession of French ministers, M. Poincaré at the head. From 1926 onwards it was the avowed purpose of the Spanish Government to revalorise the peseta. At the beginning of 1927, the solid phalanx of currency speculators, having exhausted other fields, brought their full force to bear on the Spanish exchange and forced a rise in exchange value of the peseta, which was not in fact warranted by the internal economic situation. This, of course, suited the Government's book very well. When, however, for economic reasons, the rise was neither as rapid nor as firm as they had expected, the speculators took fright, to the confusion of General Primo de Rivera, and the peseta came down again with a bump. Then the Government contrived to intervene, in accordance with a special provision

of the Bank of Spain's charter, to arrest the fall and to control the currency. They expended, in fact, 300 million pesetas within the next three years in buying up foreign *devises* without, however, achieving their object. This state of affairs, the external value of the peseta being maintained at a figure greater than its internal purchasing power, meant continually rising prices, and was in effect a stimulus to imports and a check to exports. Combined with the various protectionist measures, this caused a steady increase in the index figure of the cost of living (now double that of 1913), in contrast to most other European countries, where, over the same period, the cost of living was falling. The whole phenomenon of Spain's economic policy is an awful warning to those politicians and business men in this country who are being bitten by the protectionist microbe.

In December 1928 Señor Cambo, the Rathenau of Spain, was allowed to publish in the Press a series of very able and informing articles in which he pointed out to the Government the error of their ways. The Minister of Finance replied weakly, and nothing further happened. Then suddenly last October the latter calmly announced to the Press that the Government had resolved to adopt the very policy of stabilisation which they had so strongly deprecated hitherto—and notably when it was put forward by Señor Cambo. The Government had decided, he said, that official support of the peseta should cease, that Spanish currency should find its own level in relation to other currencies and then be stabilised. The reasons given for this *volte face* are perhaps the most interesting part of the declaration. Observing that to stabilise the currency is "a postulate of the law of nations in contemporary finance," he admitted that Spain could no longer remain an exception to the rule (of a stable international money). Not only that, Spain would wish to play her due part in the Bank for International Settlements, and in order to be represented in that organism a stable currency was a *sine qua non*.

It now appears that the new Government, in the person of Señor Arguelles, proposes to take Señor Cambo's advice. Whether it will be strong enough to introduce the new economic policy for which he pleaded, involving drastic economies, a reduction of profits, salaries and wages, of taxes and charges, a lowering of customs duties, and abolition of subsidies, etc., remains to be seen. But I have mentioned this aspect of the Spanish situation as showing that even a country like Spain, which stands outside the main currents of European life, is carried along by the tide of international collaboration which President Hoover and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald took at the flood last year. In the same way, General Primo de Rivera was shrewd enough to realise that Spain's withdrawal from the

League of Nations was a serious mistake, and during the last two years Spanish delegations have done most useful and constructive work both in the Assembly and in the Conference of the International Labour Organisation. For his untiring efforts to cement the ties cultural and economic with Spanish American countries, and with Portugal, the Dictator deserves the highest praise, and it was fitting that the Ibero-American Exhibition at Seville, the Spanish Wembley, should take place under his régime, and also that Madrid should witness the beginnings of the prodigious university city, founded to commemorate twenty-five years of King Alfonso's reign.

Fitted out with the most modern equipment, technical and personal, and endowed by wealthy patrons of the Spanish race, from the Argentine, Uruguay, etc., no less than the mother-country, this university is intended to be the *foyer* of Spanish culture, and in particular to attract those countless students from Central and South America who at present regard Paris as their Mecca. As we know, the Dictator fell foul of the ordinary universities over a decree granting special privileges to certain private colleges belonging to the Jesuit and Augustinian orders. And here we come to the fundamental cause of the antagonism against General Primo de Rivera which was latent in intellectual circles. The Dictator had perforce to yield all along the line to the demands of the Church to have first claim on Spaniards' education, and the clerical parties seized their opportunity to recover much of the ground that was lost during the forty-seven year Parliamentary period. The closing of the universities was, of course, a deplorable proceeding, but those of us who have had any experience of university teaching in Spain cannot but approve of the Dictator's sally that Spain could get along very well for a year or two without the usual crop of lawyers, doctors, etc., produced by the universities. For in every faculty, the custom of parrot-like memory training has been taken over from theological seminaries. Not only is the student not encouraged to read any other books outside the appointed textbook, but he is examined solely on his mnemonic knowledge of the lecturer's material. Questions to be answered orally are written down on a separate piece of paper, and then thrown together into some receptacle, each student drawing his lot. In this way, as Don Amerigo Castro has said in *El Sol*, "devotion to ritual and unshakable faith in the lottery are agreeably combined." The Dictator can certainly point to the building of four to five thousand new schools under his régime, but the quality of teaching in State schools in a country like Spain must still leave much to be desired. Moreover, General Primo de Rivera was persuaded to impose the *texto unico* (standard text-

books) on all schools and universities, after the manner of his opposite number in Italy. The names of the authors of these textbooks are eloquent enough of the ecclesiastical revival of strength. Not in that way will Spain be fitted to take her place in the modern world. The eloquence of the Marquesa de la Rambla in the National Consultative Assembly some two years ago when she demanded compulsory religious, i.e. Catholic, teaching in all schools gives the measure of the dangers to which the pioneers of modern education have been exposed. Continued efforts were made to cripple such admirable institutions as the Board for the Advancement of Higher Studies (created in 1907 as an independent body loosely connected with the Ministry of Public Instruction), and the *Residencia de Estudiantes* (where I spent one of the happiest periods of my life), which offer those real educational values that are too often lacking in the universities. Only the disinterested zeal of men like the Duke of Alba has saved them, and it is significant that the new Government, in which the Duke of Alba was himself for a short time Minister of Education, has met the general indignation by a measure granting official support to the *Instituto Escuela*, another important link in the above-mentioned educational movement. This secondary co-educational school has been on trial for a period of twelve years, its patrons and staff never knowing from one year to the next whether they would be able to continue. And this definite check to the clerical party is therefore of some importance.

What of the new Government? It is obviously one of transition. In its message to the nation, its style is "not a definitely political Government." Professing loyalty to Monarchy and Constitution, its principal mission is in fact "the reconstitution of Spanish politics." And then there occurs the cryptic phrase, "the Government will demand responsibilities with all serenity, but with inflexible severity." This, being interpreted, means that in order to appease the persistent resentment of the politically-minded and of the Army—in the words of Señor Sanchez Guerra's rebel manifesto of September 1927, "of such glorious, liberal, and constitutional history"—the Government hopes to proceed with elections for the Cortes, whose primary duty will be to clear up the investigation into the King's responsibility in connection with the Annual disaster in Morocco (1921) which was interrupted by the *coup d'état* of the Military Directory (1923). It cannot be too often emphasised that the quarrel of the politically minded in Spain is quite as much with the King as it is with the late Dictator, although the latter was indeed unnecessarily abusive to the politicians. If you look back into Spanish history, you see that the Spanish monarchy has assimilated the living force of both the

aristocratic and democratic strains in the national organism. The attempt to saddle such a monarch with Parliamentary institutions on the English model, which are themselves the result of a process of organic growth, was doomed to failure. And indeed the unsatisfactory relations of King Alfonso with the old Cortes, as much as any other factor, provoked the crisis of 1923.

This helps us to understand why a decision to release the safety-valve which was General Berenguer's first impulse has led to almost a furore of Republican propaganda. The fiery speech of the veteran ex-Prime Minister, Señor Sanchez Guerra, who proclaimed himself a Monarchist still, but willing to acquiesce in a Republic if such were the will of the people, and who strongly attacked the King amid great acclamation, has so frightened the powers that be that they have hastily clapped on the Press censorship again and forbidden further political meetings of similar importance. As was said in the *Nation* dated March 8th, "there was always a fissure between those Spaniards who maintained that a Republic was the best form of government, and those who really wanted to establish it." The question of the moment is whether that fissure has been closed up by the general reaction against the régime of the last six years or, to put it in another way, whether sufficiently solid foundations have been built for a new Spain to arise, inspired by the ideals of the progressive political groups such as the Labour Socialist Organisation and some of those labelled Republican, and in sympathy with the intellectuals connected with the educational renaissance initiated by Don Francisco Giner de los Rios, to which I have referred.

Outside political circles King Alfonso is, as was General Primo de Rivera, extremely popular and deservedly so. And here we are confronted by what is, in essence, the tragedy of Spain, which has recently been so strikingly illuminated by Mr. Aubrey Bell's translation of a book that is indispensable to the understanding of the Peninsula.* The author, Martins, says and says truly:

the originality of the Iberian civilisation consists precisely in the fact that it seeks for a genius which is essentially non-European; forms which belong to the social and historical development of the Aryan races of Europe.

That has meant in practice, all the time, the educated classes pulling in one direction and the uneducated masses in the other. But since, as Martins also shows, authentic political organisation in Spain only proceeds upwards from below, this means that in the long run a democratic Government, based on the physical and social

* *A History of Iberian Civilisation*, by Oliveira Martins. Translated, with an Introduction, by Aubrey Bell. Preface by S. de Madariaga. Oxford University Press. 12s. 6d.

geography of the country, i.e. a congeries of different regions completing one another, must prevail over the tendency to an artificial unity.

In that luckless phrase of Philip V, a Frenchman to his fingertips, "un Rey y una ley," resides the whole tragedy of the last three centuries. The centralised national state, "Castilianisation on the French model," is an exotic plant, and Spanish Liberals have made exactly the same mistake as the traditionalists in deriving their ideas of politics and administration from the French fact, which is anything but their true affinity. (Martins describes admirably the Iberian fact.) And so there is virtually no governing class to appreciate the idea of peninsular federation—on the lines of the Swiss democracy—which many of us regard as the destiny of a country like Spain, where local patriotism and the civic virtues in the narrow sense are the vital forces of the social organism.

In time then—but that time is probably not yet—the government of Spain may cease to be cast in the rigid centralised mould, which indeed in these days is only kept in shape by some form of stratorcacy, the Army having been for a long time the strongest organisation in the State. At present the country seems constitutionally incapable of endowing itself with its "natural" constitution, but after a few more years of the Monarchy we may look forward with confidence to a revival of the Federal Republic that was tried in the chaotic days of 1873 before the Restoration. And, oddly enough, General Primo de Rivera, himself a typical representative of the old Spain, has done more than any of her former rulers to hasten the event. The increased facilities for communication by rail, by road, and by air, cannot but have a lasting effect on a people which has suffered so much from lack of the means of co-ordination that are the sovereign remedy against *l'esprit de clocher*. What is more, the administrative reforms embodied in the Municipal Charter of 1924 and the Provincial Charter of 1927, in the direction of decentralisation, are likely to have far-reaching consequences. From the first the Dictator recognised what an asset the strong local patriotism—*la patria chica*—which strikes even the casual visitor to Spain, might be. He had been Captain-General of Barcelona, and although he got rid of the autonomous institutions which had grown up there—and which were tainted with Separatism, so much was the idea of Madrid as a kind of Paris resented—he used his experience of the *Mancomunitat* to frame a system of local government on the basis of a healthy regionalism that is already bearing fruit and is likely to surprise the pundits when the central Government lets the reins fall from its hands. A genuine interest in local public affairs has been awakened, local economic problems have been tackled and solved with enthusiasm, and the

continual personal visits of the Dictator—and the King—to remote parts of the country have been the means of interesting more and more persons in the conduct of the national life. When every province, every one of the old kingdoms, is free to develop and grow naturally with encouragement instead of opposition from the seat of power, we shall not hear much more of Catalanism or discontent in the Basque provinces.

The foundations are there, then, for a "new Spain," if and when the present reaction of political opinion gathers force enough to sweep away the Monarchy and, as political factors, the Army and the Church. General Primo de Rivera, in a last desperate effort to safeguard the Monarchy, devised an ingenious scheme of constitutional reform—the draft constitution hammered out by the First Committee of the National Consultative Assembly was a workman-like document which certainly did not deserve the chorus of denigration with which it was greeted in the Spanish Press. And the country—or at least that articulate opinion which is likely to count in the next few years—would have none of it. In this the Spanish people was true to type, but perhaps hardly wise. For the transition will not be easy, and it would be a thousand pities if the ablest living Spaniard and the first Gentleman of Spain, King Alfonso, should be forced to leave the country and to witness years of political floundering, because the self-appointed doctors are not yet sure in their own minds what treatment the patient needs. They may prescribe yet another constitution—there were eight such hot fomentations in the last century bringing about a temporary rally and then leading to a relapse—but let them remember that constitutions cannot make societies, only societies can make constitutions, and a long process of education will be required before the Spanish society is choate enough (to borrow Mr. Winston Churchill's word) to make a success of the Federal Republican State.

W. HORSFALL CARTER.

MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCES AND THE RAISING OF THE SCHOOL-LEAVING AGE.

THE President of the Board of Education made his eagerly-awaited statement on maintenance allowances on December 19th, after the Bill to raise the school-leaving age to fifteen had been printed and introduced into the House of Commons. The statement, together with the sub-sections (2) and (3) of the first clause, make clear certain points that hitherto had been a matter of speculation:

1. The scheme applies only to children between fourteen and fifteen.
2. The allowances are to be based on need, and are not to be given universally to all children between fourteen and fifteen.
3. There is to be no flat rate of allowance, but grant will not be paid on any allowance over five shillings a week.
4. Local education authorities will be bound to give the allowance to all children who fulfil the required conditions.
5. The Government will pay grant at the rate of 60 per cent., and the estimated cost to rates and taxes combined in the first full year is £3,000,000.
6. Local education authorities are to be asked to form "a committee to recommend scales of need and a simple procedure for determining eligibility."
7. Both the form and the amount of maintenance allowances will be provisional and will be revised after five years.

Although the President has met the desire of local education authorities that these allowances should be based on need, the main point of attack on these proposals will probably arise from those—mostly members of his own party—who would like to see the allowances universal. The grounds upon which a system based on need is attacked are usually the following:

1. That inquiries into income are degrading, keep the best type of people from applying, and are a direct incentive to misrepresentation.
2. That the adoption of a scale is harsh and inelastic and partakes of the nature of poor-law assistance.
3. That the cost of the inquiry is excessive and that the Government resisted the means test in the case of widows' pensions for this reason.
4. That attendance at a council school is itself a sufficient test of need as "the wealthy classes do not send their children to elementary schools, even the moderately well-to-do rarely do so."*

* Miss Rathbone in the House of Commons, *Hansard*, November 13th, 1929.

1. Those who use the first argument against a means test overlook the fact that a most meticulous inquiry into means takes place every year in regard to every income-tax payer from the millionaire to the man whose income just brings him within the clutches of the Inland Revenue Commissioners. There is every incentive to make a false return whether on the part of the rich man who wishes to avoid paying super-tax, or of the man of more moderate means for whom the various exemptions in respect of children, housekeeper, dependent relations, etc., make a real difference to the amount that he has to pay. There must be many families liable to income-tax who can get off any payment if it can be stated that there are children over sixteen who are still at school. For the ages of the children and the educational establishment which they are said to be attending, the Inland Revenue Commissioners must largely rely—if not entirely—on the statements of the head of the family. This is the case also when exemption is claimed in respect of a dependent relative, when the claimant is asked if any other relative contributes to his support, or of a daughter upon whose services the claimant depends by reason of his infirmity; in the latter case the nature of the infirmity has to be stated. Do not all these statements involve inquiry into intimate domestic matters far more searching than any that are asked for by local authorities in connection with maintenance allowances? And how many of these can be or are satisfactorily checked by the Inland Revenue Commissioners? But because a certain amount of misstatement and fraud are inevitable in connection with the collection of income-tax, is the whole system necessarily condemned or is there any serious suggestion that exemptions should be abolished because of the extra opportunities that they offer for the unscrupulous?

2. The argument that the fixing of a scale with the consequent inquiries into income necessarily makes any assistance based upon the scale partake of the nature of poor-law relief, is surely fallacious. Because poor-law relief necessitates inquiry and a scale it does not follow that *all* inquiries and *all* scales make any assistance based on them of a similar nature—it all depends upon the scale adopted. For some years now scholarships at Oxford and Cambridge and at most of the public schools only carry financial assistance in the case of those scholars who satisfy a "means" test, yet it is never suggested that the recipients of this assistance receive what is equivalent to poor relief. This relief by law must be given on a destitution test, and authorities have varying scales upon which they grant various forms of assistance, poor-law relief, feeding of necessitous school children, cheap or free milk for nursing or expectant mothers and young children, maintenance allowances at central and secondary schools—considerably above the "necessitous" test

for free meals for school children—and a still higher one for university scholarships given by the education committee. The State itself grants its university scholarships on a "means" test, but it is safe to say that hardly one recipient of a State scholarship would be eligible for poor-law relief. Practically all forms of public assistance, whether given by the local authority, State, or bodies such as universities, public schools, or voluntary hospitals, are now given on a means test. The outstanding exceptions are elementary education and treatment of infectious diseases, which are free and universal as a measure of protection to the community. It is surely correct to assume that this has been done in spite of the greater trouble and expense involved because it has been found that it is the only way of spending the available money to the best advantage.

3. But, it may be argued, the Government rejected the means test in connection with those widows' pensions not covered by insurance because of the expense involved in making the inquiry. The cases, however, are not similar. It was stated in the House of Commons that the inquiry into the means of widows would cost £50,000, would have to be undertaken by Whitehall, and would delay the granting of the pensions by several months. In the case of maintenance allowances the inquiries would be undertaken by the local authorities who have expressed their opinion in favour of a means test, and who already possess the necessary staff. Further there is no question of haste in this connection. It is the intention of the Government—according to the President of the Board—to pass the Bill before Christmas 1930, but the Act will not come into force before April 1st, 1931. That allows four months for the necessary inquiries.

4. The argument that attendance at a council school is itself a test can hardly be seriously advanced by those who realise how the boundaries of the council schools have been encroaching upon the domain of the cheaper private school. Unless parents can afford substantial fees for a good private school they are increasingly sending their children to the newly-built council schools. Those which are springing up near the municipal housing estates serve as well the children from the new private subsidy houses, and owing to the high rents that it has been found necessary to impose many of the children even from the municipal houses are the children of clerks, postal officials, and highly-paid artisans. When we come to the children between fourteen and fifteen with free places at central and secondary schools there will be many who cannot be said to need financial assistance. At the present time only 18 per cent. of the children between fourteen and fifteen in attendance at the Manchester central schools receive maintenance grants, and

32 per cent. of the children in the secondary schools.* It is, of course, true that attendance after fourteen is now voluntary, and so only the parents who are able or who are prepared to make the necessary sacrifice send their children to these schools. But these children who now form the majority of those at school between fourteen and fifteen will still be there when the compulsory age is raised although they will then, of course, form the minority. It is not suggested that the majority of children between fourteen and fifteen could stay at school another year without casting a considerable burden upon their families, but only that, if universal maintenance grants were given, a substantial minority would receive help who do not need it, leaving less for those whose need is great. The money available would provide 2s. 6d. a week if distributed to all children between fourteen and fifteen. It would surely be a purely theoretical supporter of the principle of Family Allowances who would prefer the money to be spent this way rather than given in varying amounts according to need.

As the President said in his statement that the decision of the Government to base maintenance allowances on need was taken in order to bring "the method of awarding the new allowances into line with the principle on which awards are at present made to selected children attending central and secondary schools," it may be useful to examine how far the new scheme will fit in with existing schemes. Most of the large local authorities have schemes for maintenance allowances to those children whose school life is prolonged by attendance at central, secondary, junior technical, etc., schools. As, however, only £552,575 was spent on these schemes in 1927-8 the present proposal, confined as it is to one year only, is intended to deal with a much larger number of children. Scales of need at present adopted by local authorities differ, that of Manchester being 14s. per head for each member of the family after deduction of rent for central school pupils, and 16s. per head after deduction for rent for secondary school pupils. There is no fixed scale of grant, and grants vary according to the need of the individual family and the age of the pupil from £3 per annum to £25, the maximum for pupils between sixteen and eighteen years of age. These grants are all given at the discretion of the Education Committee and can be withheld if a pupil's attendances or progress at school is not satisfactory. They are designed to cover the whole of school life and therefore start at eleven, when the child leaves the ordinary elementary school, and continue until the end, whether this be at fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen.

* The larger percentage in the case of secondary schools is accounted for almost entirely by the fact that whereas books are provided free in the central schools they have to be bought by the pupils in the secondary schools.

How will the new scheme fit in with this one, which is roughly typical of all existing schemes?

1. It makes no provision for payment of grant on expenditure and maintenance allowances below fifteen to children attending central schools. At the present time grant is paid at the rate of 50 per cent. on maintenance allowances over fourteen at any post-primary school and below fourteen only in secondary schools. This has been a grievance against the Board on the part of local authorities for some time and this opportunity might have been taken to redress it.

2. It selects one year of school life for special treatment and takes no account of the nine years below or of the one, two, or three possible years above. There is no educational or logical reason for giving maintenance allowances for the year fourteen to fifteen rather than for the year twelve to thirteen; it is merely a matter of political expediency, and in a few years' time, when this reason has vanished, the fact will remain as an outstanding anomaly. Take the case of a child who at eleven accepts a free place at a secondary school. He may not come within the income limit at present adopted by his local authority for maintenance allowances and so gets nothing until fourteen. He may then quite easily come within the income limit under the new scheme—for, as we shall see later, it is evidently intended to be on a more generous scale—and so will receive a grant of anything up to 5s. a week for one year. At fifteen he again reverts to the local authority's income limit under which he was not eligible for any grant. Is this arrangement likely to induce parents to continue the attendance of their child until sixteen and later, with the increasing burden upon themselves of a growing child, or to seek some excuse for breaking the agreement and putting him to work? It would need to be a very optimistic President of the Board who would not fear that this clash between the two systems will not produce at least an unsettling influence upon those parents who have entered into agreements to keep their children at secondary schools until the end of their course.

3. Again, take the case of the child of very poor parents who is now receiving under the local authority's scheme more than 5s. a week. Manchester last year gave grants of more than 5s. a week to 68 pupils between fourteen and fifteen whose circumstances needed it. For one year in his school life this boy will have to have his grant reduced in order to fit in with the new scheme. How can this be justified to the parents who are making enormous sacrifices to give their child a secondary education, and who find that a healthy boy of fourteen does not eat less, but more, than a year ago and who tends to grow out of his clothes more, rather than less, quickly? Political expediency which results in such an in-

justice hardly deserves even so honourable a term. It may be argued that the local authority can, in these cases, continue the higher grant and pay the extra from the rates. But in the first place with the great increase of expenditure—£1,200,000 in the first year, and larger after that, that this new scheme will put upon local authorities—apart from the extra expenditure on buildings and staffs involved in raising the age—they are not likely to add voluntarily to the rate charge, and in the second place it is not clear whether the Government will continue to pay 50 per cent. grant on maintenance allowances under existing schemes for the year fourteen to fifteen or whether all allowances for this year will come under the 60 per cent. grant and the new regulations. But there are also certain fundamental differences between the two schemes.

Maintenance allowances under existing schemes, except in the case of those few authorities who have raised the school-leaving age to fifteen by by-law, are given to children selected first by examination and secondly by need. They are given at the discretion of the Education Committee and no child has a right to them. They are given on educational grounds, that is to say, to enable a particular child to attend a course of instruction which he would otherwise be unable to attend, and they can be withheld if the child's attendance or progress is unsatisfactory. A strong case can be made out for giving the grant wherever possible in kind—namely books, stationery, school dinners, and school uniform—in order to ensure that the money is spent solely on the particular child, and does not go towards the general family expenses. In the case of the new scheme the children who are to receive grants will be selected entirely on the basis of need, and it is not clear whether any condition will be imposed by which the grants will be made to depend on regular attendance and good work. Again the payment in cash or kind depends upon whether the grant is to be regarded as some compensation to the parents for earnings which would naturally go towards general family expenses, or as a means of ensuring that the child himself will be able to benefit from his school course.

These differences arise from the difference between regarding maintenance allowances as an instalment of Family Allowances, given in order to relieve the family of the burden of an extra year's dependency—which has nothing to do with the educational system—or whether they are regarded as a service similar to the provision of meals for necessitous school children and medical inspection and treatment of school children, which are concerned to give the individual child the benefits of a full education of mind and body.

As they are to be administered by the Education Committee, paid for out of the education rate and money allotted from the taxes to the education estimates, it might be presumed that the Government intended the educational aspects to predominate, but that there is some confusion in the mind of the public and of members of Parliament cannot be denied. The difference between the two systems becomes serious when the same child will come under both during his school life, and it is hoped that the regulations to be issued by the Board will do all that is possible to bring the two into conformity with one another.

How many children of those between fourteen and fifteen will be brought within the limits of the new scheme? If a grant of 5s. a week for every child had been contemplated the cost would have worked out at an annual average of £6½ millions for the five years 1931-5. Taking the figures that are given in the financial memorandum accompanying the bill and assuming a figure of £2,500,000 for 1931-2 which will not be a full year, the average cost of the five years will be £3,340,000 which is 51.3 per cent. of £6½ millions. Assuming that every child that becomes eligible under the regulations receives the maximum of 5s. this would provide for 51 per cent. of the children in attendance at school. But if, as seems to be the intention, the grants will vary, say between 2s. 6d. and 5s., about 75 per cent. of the children would be eligible. The task before the committee of representatives of local authorities will be therefore not so much to settle a basis of need which should, in their opinion, deserve a grant, but to find a basis which will allow about 75 per cent. of the children between fourteen and fifteen to qualify—no one receiving more than 5s., however great the need. This does not seem a very scientific method of tackling what is admittedly a difficult and delicate problem, and it is to be hoped that the scheme will be amended in two ways. First that the limit of 5s. will go. So long as the total sum is not exceeded what does it matter to the Government if some of the grants are larger than 5s. in accordance with the needs of the family? Secondly, it is to be hoped that the scheme both as to its basis and as to the 60 per cent. grant will be extended to those children who remain voluntarily at school beyond fifteen. At the present time these number 121,320 for England and Wales, and taking the Manchester figures as a basis of calculation, if 32 per cent. of these require maintenance allowances, it would mean making provision for 30,800 extra children. An additional sum of £400,000 ought to be sufficient and if, as is surely the case, it is the desire of the Government to encourage to the full a school life lasting until sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen, the extension of the more generous system of maintenance grants

beyond the end of compulsory school life is essential. If a uniform scheme, based on the higher scale of Government grant, were now instituted for children from fourteen to the end of their school life, further developments could be left until the scheme is revised at the end of five years. By that time the political necessity for dealing with the special year of fourteen to fifteen will have passed, and reorganisation will be so much further developed that it will be a matter of experience and not of prophecy to determine whether the transference of all children at eleven+ to schools usually further from their homes than the junior schools, and approximating to secondary school standards, will or will not result in an increase of cost to the parents, apart from the cost of maintaining the children. It may then be possible to make a really comprehensive maintenance allowance scheme, on the basis of need and carrying the highest available Government grant, from eleven+ to the end of the school life.

SHENA D. SIMON.

Deputy Chairman, Manchester Education Committee.

SOCIAL THINKERS IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND.

IT was natural that the political and economic revolutions of the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries should be accompanied by a great output of stimulative and interpretative literature. How far these currents of thought and feeling are the reflections of courses of events determined, like the flow of rivers and the growth of trees, by inherent propulsion and environment, or how far expressions of thought and feeling help to mould events and direct conduct, is a deep question to which no plain, confident answer is possible. It is one of many questions raised by a perusal of the remarkable survey of political and social thought just accomplished in two volumes by Dr. R. H. Murray.* Thinkers and writers are doubtless prone to overestimate their influence upon external affairs, just as the practical man feels certain that the conduct of business and politics is the art of skilled opportunism. To the ordinary Englishman the planned and willed direction of any sort of social conduct by any clearly conscious ideal is as fantastic as the acceptance of the opposite doctrine of economic and biological determinism. But there always has been a considerable crop of Britons who are not ordinary in their way of thinking, and it is with the fruits of these independent or eccentric minds that Dr. Murray is concerned. The first thing that strikes us is their number and rich variety, extending, as they do, from the hard economic determinism of the Marxian school, and the equally narrow physical causality of Buckle, to the loose idealism of Ruskin and the Utopian perfectionists. Few of them are primarily intellectualists, in the sense of seekers after reasonable truths valued for their own sake. For just here the practical nature of the Briton asserts itself outside the ring of self-interest, in the selection and application of reasonable theories to desired human ends. So the social thinkers do not easily fall into close schools. Even the Benthamites and later on the Neo-Hegelians do not conform closely to the principles of their respective masters. There has never been a disposition among our thinkers towards the rigid discipline of a fixed system. This is in part due to the restless and explorative character of our people when confronted with dogma and authority. It belongs to our tradition of moral and intellectual liberty.

This very fact makes it difficult to extract from the long array of thinkers in Dr. Murray's book the main trends and tendencies of nineteenth-century thought. It is, indeed, clear enough that

* *Studies in the English Social and Political Thinkers of the Nineteenth Century.* Hefter & Sons, Cambridge.

certain characters of what are termed "our national adventure" have not merely coloured but moulded and directed our thinking. The cluster of economic and social changes which marked the early nineteenth century, the rapid mechanisation of manufacture and transport, the urbanisation of our population, the political dominance of the bourgeoisie, with a corresponding decline of agriculture and country life, called forth a body of new hopes and fears which found expression in our literature of thought and imagination. Perhaps the profoundest character of difference is between those who took history into serious account and those who did not. By the latter I mean those who were convinced that the reasonability of modern man, brought to bear upon the increased control over the resources of nature which applied science exposed, could by his ordered will transform quickly our economic, political, and other social institutions so as to win security and happiness for mankind. This assumption underlay the Utilitarianism of Bentham and Mill, with their enthusiastic rationalism, as on a lower but wider level of rational appeal it nourished the popular acceptance of Robert Owen's *New Moral World*, and his experiments in co-operative commonwealths. That the reasonable will of man should be directed consciously to secure "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" was a moral inspiration accepted by all liberal thinkers of the age, and always figuring as a cardinal principle of the political and economic democracy of succeeding generations. This interpretation of Utility in terms of common happiness might be scorned by wild moralists like Carlyle as belonging to a "pig philosophy," or displaced later in Hegelian writings by some more elevated conception of "the good life." But, released from the quantitative calculus of Bentham, and expressed in a hierarchy of human values, Utility remains the supreme and accepted aim and end of successful endeavour.

The transformation actually achieved in the spheres of politics and industry inspired groups of thinkers, some *laissez-faire* individualists, some pre-Marxian socialists, to an excessive belief in the rapid application of reason and popular education to the attainment of democratic government, and a general achievement of comfort, security, leisure, and other essentials of progress. But in the thought of the age there were important counter-currents of conservatism and even pessimism. There were those who found in the break-up of country life, the anarchy of great industrial towns, the combination of workers, and a conscious demand for wider areas of political power, grave perils to the established order. To the proponents of new theories of social and political control they set forth the barriers of history and its lessons of

continuity in social institutions. The temper and teaching of Burke infused themselves into the mystical conservatism of Coleridge and the strong union of established Church and State with their spheres of authority and discipline which still form the truest strain of conservatism underneath the struggles over property and power.

Though the thinking of the early nineteenth century was so largely practical and utilitarian, the sense of history, fostered not only by thoughtful conservatives, but by romantic poets and novelists, with Scott and the later Wordsworth at their head, was a tempering force of growing importance. When we recognise, as we do, that certain modes of revolution are contrary to the spirit of our people, this is due to a wide and special feeling against sudden violence as compared with moderation and adjustment. We are not logical, or believers in forceful severances from custom and the past. This signifies that besides being "practical" we are "sentimental" in the better sense of the term. Our main and permanently directing influence is not a high conscious idealism, but rather a sense of fair play which expresses itself in the demand for equality of opportunity. It is a significant point of nineteenth-century thought that no considerable section of any political party would openly and consciously challenge this as the guiding principle, both in the political and the economic field.

Does the study of history make for conservatism is a question constantly recurring in the chapters of Dr. Murray. It is closely related to the divergent views of the part played by the "Great Men" in history. And we witness in the record of thinkers an ebb and flow in the importance attributed to "Great Men." There are in truth two related issues: "Are great men, statesmen, and others, the products or creations of the needs and circumstances of their time and place, or are they miraculous creations of chance or providence?" "Do these great men act of their own force, or are they the exécutants of some general will?" On the one hand, the love of the picturesque, and the passionate interest in personality, weight the scale in favour of a sort of Carlylean "Hero Worship." On the other, the more scientific trend of our political science and art leads us to stress general tendencies and forces moulding and often imposing upon statesmen the projects and achievements which rank as theirs. A good deal depends upon the proportionate stress upon human history as Science or Art, or, in other words, upon the part played by novelty in what is termed creative evolution. And here we come to a remarkable evolution of the concept of evolution itself. One of the chief explanations of this flood of thinking is that Burke's general conception of institutions as living organic growths was greatly extended in the nine-

teenth century by the clearer, fuller admission of human conduct, personal and social, as coming within the reign of law.

The revolution in the chief physical sciences, beginning in the later eighteenth century, together with the growing ascendancy of biology as a branch of accurate knowledge fraught with definite human service, had two results. It fastened and extended the idea of law and causal determination upon the great mundane processes, while it brought man for the first time in body and mind within the scope of law. Psychology, sociology, and the several social sciences, especially economics and politics, were creations of this revolution. Scientific probings and approaches there had been in the past, from the great Greek thinkers down to the more formal teachings of Montesquieu, Hume, and Burke in the eighteenth century, but not until the decline of doctrinal theology and the limitations on "free will" which came with nineteenth-century rationalism were man's mind and its processes of thought, feeling, and conduct, personal and collective, claimed as scientific subject-matter to be subjected to exact measurements and determinate rules. With psychology in its individual and collective applications there arose the dominant issue of the part played by human intelligence and a reasonable will in the direction of conduct. The prime outfit of man is a set of instincts, or urges, accompanied by more or less definite emotions, with separate, individual, or specific uses, mainly protective, a psycho-physical equipment, with the brain and nervous system as physical instruments of control. This control, once termed free will and regarded as a special human endowment of God, was now itself brought within the scope of scientific inquiry, with the result that in most rationalist and utilitarian circles its freedom in the old loose sense tended to disappear, though for "practical purposes" the responsibility, which logically should have gone with it, still remained as an admittedly irrational factor in human nature. Darwinian evolution, supervening on this process, brought a soothing conservatism into play, in so far as it fastened the idea of gradualness upon the inevitability of change and tended to eliminate the sudden violent actions either of "Great Men," or of revolutionary impulses (as afterwards conceived by Sorel and his syndicalists) from the orderly processes of history.

More and more attention was drawn to environment and racial traits, the results of environment, as the real determinants in larger social movements. While the extreme doctrine of economic determination had little reasoned or other support in this country, the belief in strong definite drifts of tendency towards a better world, with more humane and more equitable conditions of life, the mid-Victorian liberal-radicalism, became prevalent in all sec-

tions of the community. Goodwill and enthusiasm were not excluded as practical adjuncts, and planned movements of co-operation, trade unionism, party politics, and religious sentiments, were brought into this service of human betterment. Thinkers who pressed for some reasoned harmony between these conscious efforts and the operation of social laws were treated with little regard by a nation bent on doing and averse from thinking. And, after all, it was detailed doing and an "absence of mind," as Seeley expressed it, that drove us to build up an Empire. If this notion played into the hands of mysticism, then, as Bagehot admitted, "mysticism is true." "There are certainly kinds of truths, borne in, as it were, instinctively on the human intellect, most influential on the character and the heart, yet hardly capable of stringent statement, difficult to limit by an elaborate definition. Their course is shadowy: the mind seems rather to have seen than to see them, more to feel after than definitely apprehend them" (ii, 229). It may, I think, be reasonably questioned whether this play of instincts or intuitions resulting therefrom is rightly called mysticism. The British Empire, for example, was in actual history mainly the accumulation of quite clearly conceived pieces of political power, personal prestige, and trading profits. There was no absence of mind in the makers of its several parts, or even in the gradual bringing together and extension of these parts, though there was never until the present day any clear conception of them as a single ordered political and economic project.

It may, I think, be argued that the important distinction between sciences and arts is more vital to the social sciences, inclusive of history, than anywhere else. Mid-Victorian determinism was in danger of having its humanitarian impulses swamped or overborne by the triumphant progress of the sciences. "Things are what they are and the consequences of them what they will be, why, therefore, should we trouble ourselves?" might well be taken as sound doctrine in the age of Victorian peace and progress. In politics and economics it meant free trade, mobility of capital and labour, competition for the survival and success of the fit, and Government keeping a ring of order for individual effort and achievement. This seemed plausible enough until it was upset by the operation of the most distinctive of our moral attributes as a people, the demand for fair play. The extension of "Nature red in tooth and claw" to the struggle of classes, trades, nations, races, in every social area, for the ruthless elimination of the losers designated "unfit," was offensive to the real morality of our people and conflicted with the spirit of sportsmanship which, far more than the formal teaching of Churches and moralists, rules our estimate of conduct. This sense of fair play carries a

passionate toleration of opposing doctrines, creeds, or parties which would make the acceptance of a persecuting policy, like that of Russia and Italy to-day, impossible in England. But that is only its negative side. Positively, it signifies a demand for the measures, legal, political, and economic, necessary to win equality of opportunity for access to everything that enlarges and improves life.

So long as persons were regarded as having a fixed status, and the idea of normal necessary progress was not common, this demand for equal opportunities did not emerge. But with the expanding industrial progress of the nineteenth century, and its political concomitants working towards a democratic form, it rapidly became the badge of liberal mentality. From the acceptance of the truth that all men should have equality of opportunity, it was a short step to the discovery that "freedom of contract and of competition" in the economic field, and equal voting power in the political, did not secure this desired condition.

So we find that among the thinkers and writers of the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries there is an ever-growing attack upon those economic barriers which render formal liberty and equality empty phrases. Hence the demands for reconstruction of industry, either by direct nationalisation or by some co-operative or syndicalist scheme which shall satisfy the worker's sense of "fair play" in the industries which occupy his productive energies. A new attitude towards State and government is clearly involved. For either the State must steep its hands ever more deeply in regular economic administration, or it must intervene with drastic regulations to secure society against stoppages of vital economic processes, or conspiracies of trades to hold up the consumer, or other conflicts within the economic system. These obvious needs have compelled political thinkers to think out more clearly and closely the functions of the State in an ever-changing world, where new powerful forces enter to challenge and sometimes to defy its supremacy. Nor is it the economic struggle alone that is in question. A whole array of thinkers is engaged in attempts to elucidate the respective rights and duties of the State in its relation to other institutions. There is, for example, the status of the Church in relation to State and national government:

The difficulties arising from divorce, education, and Establishment are tolerably obvious when we assume that the Church is a group. When the State recognises divorce and the Church does not; when the State insists on secular education and the Church insists on religious education—these are among the problems raised. A conflict between the things of Cæsar and the things of God is always possible. If the Church Assembly pass a Deposited Prayer Book measure and if the House of Commons rejects it, what is to be the outcome? (ii, 394).

Where members of a nation are organised in many associations, narrower or wider than the State, some commanding a stronger loyalty than that of the State, conflicts may arise for which there is no easy theoretical or practical settlement. The "conscientious objector" professes an allegiance to a principle of higher authority than the State: organised labour asserts the "right to strike" which may hold up some service vital to the national life. Gaol for the conscientious objector, the organisation of middle-class strike-breakers, may be the actual *ad hoc* solution, but it is only a settlement by force, not by reason. To thinkers like Mr. Bosanquet and Dr. McDougall, for whom the national State is supreme among human organisations, exerting by right an absolute authority over all others, all steps necessary to enforce obedience either upon individual citizens or groups of citizens are positive obligations. But the "pluralists" have also a case based on historical and moral considerations. The national State is a modern growth, an institution emerging among more ancient and even more vitally necessary institutions with closer human appeal to the ordinary man. Some of its modern claims appear usurpations of powers and rights belonging by tradition and sentiment to the closer, older bonds of union. Nor can any facile settlement be found for the interrelations of these social groupings, and the relation of each to the State, by any application of the organic metaphor, though it may furnish serviceable analogies. Perhaps the more recent addition of a new problem may help us to a way out. Though the League of Nations as yet claims no large overruling power over national sovereignty, if it lives and grows it must become in some very real sense a federal super-state, maintaining a moral and even a physical authority over the national states in their relation to one another. Peace will appear as the main warrant for such authority, but this negative achievement can never suffice to evoke the moral sentiment that is required. Positive fruits of international co-operation are already seen to be essential to the life of the League, not prevention of war but the formation and growth of world-community upon a co-operative basis for health, knowledge, commerce, moral and intellectual intercourse. Order as the first condition of progress is the underlying policy. If this is the desirable policy upon the international scale, must it not equally be desirable as regards the relation of the national State to its inner groupings? The very name "State" enforces the priority of the conservation of order. But here too order is valued not on its own account but as the guarantee of progress achieved by the many closer and more special associations of men as workers, citizens, and human beings. Dr. Murray brings out through numerous citations, however,

a widespread distrust of the State, especially in its democratic form. Ever since the achievement of the Sovereignty of Parliament the latent suspicions of the efficacy of popular self-government have been growing, and the many recent reversions to autocracy and oligarchy are evidences of a certain intellectual and moral torpor among peoples who had formally espoused the democratic principle. What we may term morally enlightened thinkers, who hold with Bradley that "the community is a real moral organism," and also that the national State is its chief organ of government, are naturally embarrassed by the manifest shortcomings of the State. Holding also that the individual personality is the moral unit and support of a sound community, they are alarmed at the disposition of modern states to undermine, as they regard it, the moral responsibility of individuals by the development of collective services. Though this attitude is chiefly due to a narrow conception of the parts played by the State and Society in the production of wealth and the determination of values, it has played into the hands of the possessing and controlling classes in industry who object to State interference in industry and State assertion to an increased revenue at their expense. Neither of these views, however, accounts for the critical attitude towards democratic institutions based upon the ignorance, incapacity, and indifference of the general electorate, with the consequent alternatives of bureaucracy and corruption, or a combination of the two.

It is a strange stroke of irony that the man who was alike in profession and in final sympathy a champion of democracy, Lord Bryce, should, in his great work on America and in his later studies of democracy, have dealt more damaging blows to its prestige than any of its open antagonists such as Dicey or Lecky. Indeed, Dr. Murray makes it more evident than ever that in this new post-war world the old accepted liberal notion that there was only one true type of good government, towards which even the backward peoples were slowly groping their way, and that the true function of imperialism was the helping hand of the liberal controlling power, are seriously shaken. The general trend of thoughtful opinion recognises that a real consent or assent of the people to acts of government is only possible in the complexity of modern life, provided that larger sections of the electorate will take the trouble to equip themselves with fuller knowledge of the course of political events and will give continuously to politics a larger proportion of the interest and active zest they consume in sport and recreation.

These and many related issues form the staple of Dr. Murray's learned work. One comment I would add. He is too sparing in his own estimates and judgments, desiring, no doubt, to leave

to his readers an unbiassed assessment of the merits and defects of the thinkers whose writings he presents in close epitome. The result is a variety and complexity which makes it difficult for less learned readers to disentangle the general trends of thought from the particular, and to assess the relative importance of influence of the numerous writers upon the wider mind of our people and the course of public conduct. It would be an interesting though a difficult task to endeavour to assess the direct and indirect influence of trends of thought such as the philosophic reflections of Coleridge, Arnold, Green, with their closely restricted areas of direct appeal, and those of Bentham and John Mill, Carlyle and Ruskin. Others, again, of the seminal minds to which Dr. Murray rightly assigns more space, such as Bagehot and Seeley, never obtained a popular public for their writings, though exercising a wide and lasting influence over the cultivated readers of their time and ours. Nor in such a consideration can we ignore the social and humanist power exercised, especially in the first half of the century, by the writers of prose fiction, pre-eminently Dickens, and the new contributions made by Wordsworth and the Romantic school of poetry towards the awakening of a love of nature and humanity in the midst of a machine-made civilisation.

J. A. HOBSON.

THE ARMENIANS—YESTERDAY AND TO-DAY.

AN article under such a title might well be devoted to the various international promises made to the Armenians before, during, and after the World War. Alternately it could be given up to an account of the progress which has or has not been made with the several settlement schemes in Caucasian Armenia and French Syria. But, considering that there are no means of taking active steps for the improvement of the political fortunes of this unhappy race, and that such writers as Mr. John H. Harris and Mr. Joseph Burt have dealt with the refugee problem in recent issues of this Review,* such discussions would be superfluous. My purpose, therefore, is to endeavour to trace the historical phases through which these people have passed during the last few years and in particular to outline the events which have taken place in this connection since the Russian Revolution of 1917.

In some respects the Armenians and their pre-war position were comparable to those of the Poles and in others they much resembled the Jews. The Armenians and the Poles each resided for the most part in three empires, they each disliked their then rulers and they were each faithful members of their respective Churches. Again, the Armenians and the Jews are gifted with the same aptitude for finance, they are able to prosper under adverse circumstances and they are generally unpopular for more or less the same reasons. In the towns the Armenian is the banker, moneylender, and trader; in the country he is often the farmer, and in each case nothing seems able to prevent him from doing better than his neighbours. For example, within a few months of the Adana massacres of 1909, and again in Syria after the war, I have had the opportunity of studying the characteristics of this race and I have been amazed to find the manner in which its members at once begin to make good under new and entirely unfavourable conditions. Moreover, if the Armenians do possess many unpleasant qualities it is necessary to remember the conditions under which they have lived for centuries. Thus without being cringing, sharp, and sometimes deceitful, it would have been extremely difficult for them to preserve their language, religion, and national identity in spite of prolonged oppression.

Whilst no reliable statistics exist, it is probable that, in pre-war days, there were roughly 4,000,000 Armenians in the world. Of these some 2,500,000 resided in the Ottoman Empire, 1,200,000

in Russia, 150,000 in Persia, and the remainder in different parts of the world. Ignoring the other groups, there was a considerable difference between the position of the Armenians in Turkey and Russia. Under the Sultans there was religious and cultured autonomy, there was always an Armenian Question and massacres occurred from time to time. In Russia the Government did not admit an Armenian or any other problem, and it simply made conquests, established order and furthered commercial enterprises. This meant that security existed and that prosperity increased. But whereas at one time Russia had been an avowed friend and protector to the Armenians, largely no doubt in the hope of eventually being able to employ them against Turkey, in later years this attitude was materially modified, and great difficulties were placed in the way of the development of Armenian culture. This change had a variety of causes. After the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, and the independence or practical independence of Roumania and Bulgaria, the Muscovite road to the Mediterranean through the Balkans was more or less closed and the route by way of the Caucasus therefore became more important. About the same time Russian interest in Central Asia increased. Lastly, for the thirty years prior to the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1907, the Tzarist Government was very suspicious of the pro-Armenian policy of Great Britain, and for this and other reasons it favoured stifling Armenian nationalism on both sides of the Russo-Turkish boundary.

Early in 1914 Russia represented the Great Powers in what proved to be a still-born scheme for reforms in Turkey. Nevertheless, when the war broke out there was no real Armenian enthusiasm for either side, the Turco-Russian frontier became an almost continuous battlefield and it is difficult to indicate the cause and effect of the developments which occurred. The Armenians answered the original Turkish mobilisation call, they were treated with harshness by the military authorities, and discontent and desertions became general. The Russians sent Armenian forces to their European front, they employed local volunteer contingents against the Turks, and the Armenians were held by the Ottoman authorities to be largely responsible for the disasters which soon began to overtake them in Eastern Anatolia. For these reasons and because, this time, the Young Turks seemed determined to solve the Armenian Question by exterminating that race, the most dreadful of all massacres was instituted in the summer of 1915. Nobody knows the losses thus suffered, or the Armenian casualties in the war itself, but it seems pretty safe to say that from one half to three quarters of a million perished at the hands of the Young Turks and that, in addition and sooner or later, between one

* (1) *Salving the Outcasts of War*, by John H. Harris, December 1928.

(2) *The Settlement of the Armenians*, by Joseph Burt, September 1929.

hundred and two hundred thousand Armenian men must have lost their lives in fighting for Russia, for themselves in the Caucasus, and for the French in Cilicia. In any case the Russians continued to advance and, by the summer of 1916, they had occupied all the Turkish territory, except Cilicia, ever claimed by or for Armenia. But whilst the Grand Duke Nicholas proclaimed the liberation of the country from Turkish yoke, he tried to prevent the Armenians from returning to their lands, upon which Tzarist Russia desired to establish Cossack settlements.

The Russian Revolution in March and the advent to power of the Bolsheviks in November 1917 altered the whole future trend of Armenian history. These events meant that the Tzarist armies had failed to liberate and to conquer North-eastern Anatolia and that the obstacles to an independent Armenia created by the secret treaties had automatically disappeared. Moreover, before these fundamental changes in Russia, the Turks had begun to reconquer part of their lost provinces and, under the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (March 1918, and between the Central Powers and Russia) they secured Kars, Ardahan, and Batum, which had not been theirs for forty years. Six months earlier a short-lived federal Transcaucasian Republic had been formed, but in May 1918 Armenia, Azerbäijan, and Georgia separated and became independent states. German troops occupied Georgia, the Turks overran the other two republics, and for a few weeks a British force dispatched from Mesopotamia managed to hold its own in the Caucasus. But the armistice signed between the victorious Powers and Turkey on October 30th, 1918, appeared to infer better times for Armenia. The liberation of the subject peoples of the Ottoman Empire had been proclaimed as part of the Allied policy—a policy which then seemed capable of realisation as a result of the opening of the Straits and of the condition that all or parts of the six so-called Armenian vilayets in Asia Minor were to be occupied by the Allies in case of disturbances in that area.

Subsequent events are extremely complicated and confusing so far as Armenia and the Armenians are concerned. Their course depends primarily upon the development of cordial relations between Angora and Moscow, upon the birth and growth of Turkish nationalism, and upon the continuing unfriendliness between the three small Caucasian republics. Russia was determined to re-acquire the oil-fields of Baku, and Turkey desired the possession of Kars upon sentimental if no other grounds. The Allies had the command of the Black Sea, they permitted the Greek landing at Smyrna in May 1919, and they favoured the creation of a big Armenia on both sides of the pre-war Russo-Turkish frontier. The Armenians sent representatives to the Peace Conference, their

claims were treated with favour and they signed the Treaty of Sèvres in August 1920.

But Russia and Turkey were anxious for direct land communications, Denikin's army collapsed, Azerbäijan went Bolshevik in April 1920 and, from that moment, the fate of the other two Republics was practically sealed. Nobody was willing to accept the mandate for Armenia, the Turks feared the permanent loss of the territories secured from Russia in 1918 and, in the early autumn, the forces of Mustapha Kemal Pasha, already in control of Eastern Anatolia, launched an attack against the Republic of Erivan. Armenia collapsed, her very existence was only saved by the replacement of a pro-Allied by a pro-Bolshevik Government in December 1920, and three months later Georgia had also fallen completely under the control of Moscow. These events were regularised by a series of treaties between Angora and the Bolsheviks, the Turks gained everything which they had secured under the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk except Batum and, to all intents and purposes, Azerbäijan, Armenia, and Georgia once more became part of Russia. On the other side of the picture and in Cilicia, where, soon after the armistice, the British and French Governments had endeavoured to concentrate as many Armenians as possible, things went even worse. Here the growth of Turkish nationalism and Mustapha Kemal Pasha's successes against the Greeks increased the difficulties of France. Having made wide use of local Christian irregulars against the Turks, she finally came to the well-known Franklin-Bouillon Agreement with the Angora Government in October 1921. That agreement carried with it material territorial advantages to Turkey, it pushed France back practically to the east of the Amanus range and to the south of the Baghdad railway and it rendered homeless thousands of Armenians who retreated with the French army into Syria.

As before the war, so to-day, there are no reliable statistics about the number of Armenians in the world and as to their actual whereabouts. If one had added together those reported to have been murdered or to have died from privation during the last fifteen years, the grand total would certainly convey the impression that none of this unhappy race can now remain. This is, however, far from being the case, for I believe that there are still from 3,000,000 to 3,250,000 Armenians in various parts of the globe. Of these roughly 2,000,000 are probably in Russia, 200,000 in Syria, 200,000 in Turkey,* and 150,000 in Persia and India. The remainder are scattered, but it seems safe to say that

* The present writer has been unable to find any reliable figures as to the number of Armenians in Syria and Turkey. A total of 200,000 seems altogether too large, at any rate for the latter country, but this estimate is given by reliable authorities who should have reason to know.

there are approximately 120,000 in the United States, 65,000 in France and at least 50,000 in Greece, besides a limited number in Iraq, where £5,500,000 has been expended upon their settlement. The first of these contingents began to go to America during the closing decade of the last century, the second quota has arrived in France in the course of the last few years, and the group now in Greece went to that country after her defeat in the year 1922. Whilst some of the refugees of that time have now been transferred to the Caucasus, it will stand to the lasting credit of the Hellenic Government that, in spite of the magnitude of its own refugee problem, these Armenians were not refused admittance.

Out of approximately 2,000,000 Armenians in Russia there are probably about 400,000 in Georgia, 300,000 in Azerbäijan, and several hundred thousand in the Northern Caucasus and other parts of the country. These figures therefore leave somewhat under one million Armenians who form the vast proportion of the population of Armenia. Although, as already pointed out, a Bolshevik Government assumed control in December 1920, that Republic, together with Georgia and Azerbäijan, were supposed to be independent until March 1922, when the three units were compelled by Moscow to federate into the Transcaucasian Federal Soviet Republic—a federation in its turn bound to the Russian Socialist Federal Republic under the Constitution of the following year.

Present-day Armenia, the first state in which the Armenians have had direct political power since the year 1392, in no sense coincides with the area intended by the Allies because much of that territory went back to Turkey under the Turco-Russian Agreements of some years ago. Indeed, although the state still contains Etchmiadzin, the long time seat of the head of the Armenian Gregorian Church, the country is only about one and a half times the size of Wales and rather larger than Palestine. With no territorial access to the Black Sea or to the Caspian, which must therefore be approached through Georgia or Azerbäijan, the population is mostly made up of pre-war inhabitants; but to these must be added a number of refugees, who fled from Turkey in course of and after the World War, or who have returned from Greece or elsewhere. The local government is, of course, in the hands of Bolshevik or Bolshevised Armenians, for the most part possessed of feelings of local patriotism, but it is reported that Moscow is now trying to impose younger and more extreme nominees, with the object of preventing the development of Armenian nationalism. It (the local government) has the powers common to such units in the Soviet Union, the difference between expenditure and revenue is supplied by Moscow, and the State is

compelled to provide its quota for the Red Army. But education is in local hands: there is now more spoken Armenian than in any part of the world for centuries, and the country shows considerable progress during the last ten years.

The well over 100,000 refugees, who make up more than half the Armenians in Syria, and the probability of the arrival of more, constitute a serious problem to the French. So long as the Turco-Syrian frontier is subject to such emigrations there is always a danger of complications between the two Governments. Moreover, although the majority of the refugees have either been settled on the land or provided with permanent or semi-permanent quarters in the various cities, roughly 30,000 are still in camps in Beyrout, Damascus, and Aleppo. The French have been liberal and sympathetic and they have looked with favour upon the establishment of Armenians in the Antioch district, the Euphrates valley, and elsewhere. This attitude is avowedly due to a desire for the improvement of conditions, but it is also possible that the Mandatory Power, still far from popular, realises the value of winning the support of what is a really material section of the population. Equally the Armenians, always hard-working, money-saving, and persevering, are doing better work, usually for less money than their Syrian compatriots. Such conditions, coupled with the inherent dislike of the Moslem for the Armenian, are threatening to create a situation more or less corresponding to that caused by the presence of the Jews in Palestine. Each of these minorities is an asset to the Administration under which it lives. It is, therefore, to be hoped that the French will give no cause for suspicion that they would be willing to repeat their policy adopted in Cilicia and once more sacrifice a race, the members of which appear to be perfectly loyal to them.

The utmost reserve is necessary in regard to the number of Armenians still remaining in Turkey, but if this amounts to nearly 200,000 souls, then approximately half of these are domiciled in and around Constantinople and the remainder in Anatolia. Their final disasters were the Greek débâcle of September 1922 and the Treaty of Lausanne signed in the following year. These events put an end to all hope of the enlargement of the Armenian State at the expense of Turkey, they indicated that the Christians of that country would no longer be allowed to enjoy the privileges* which had been theirs for centuries, and they left the non-Turks protected only by the minority clauses contained in the Treaty. Since then the Angora Government has shown itself to be nationalistic and anti-clerical in the extreme and it has certainly

* For an article dealing with the Capitulations and Christian Privileges by the present writer, see THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, December 1922.

created difficulties for the foreigners and non-Turks domiciled within its boundaries. Ignoring cultural questions, so far as the Armenians are concerned there are restrictions as to travelling in the interior of Anatolia, and under a regulation introduced in March 1924, these people were forbidden to live to the east of a line drawn from Samsun on the Black Sea to Selefke on the Mediterranean. This means that approximately half Asia Minor is a forbidden zone, that the whole area claimed for Armenia lies within that zone, and that no Armenians may reside anywhere near or even to the due north of the Syrian frontier. As things stand at present it is impossible to say whether the emigration reported from Anatolia into Syria in February is due to attempts to enforce this regulation and to collect the taxes or whether the Turks are actually trying to rid themselves of their remaining Armenians and other Christians.

In conclusion, two things seem clear to the present writer, who has always supported the more moderate claims made by and on behalf of the Armenians. The strongest opponent of Bolshevism must admit that Soviet Russia has done more for them than either her Imperial predecessor or the Powers of Western Europe. Whilst only a small proportion of the race is Bolshevik in principle, there is little wonder, therefore, that a large number of Armenians are grateful to Soviet Russia. Secondly, unless any encouragement given is likely to take practical shape, it is a great mistake for sympathetic outsiders to put forward exaggerated complaints or claims on behalf of the Armenians or other subject peoples. To do so tends to increase rather than to decrease their difficulties and sufferings.

H. CHARLES WOODS.

THE REUNION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES: HOPES AND HINDRANCES.

AS one who from the very beginning of the movement which prepared for the Lausanne Conference took part in the informal conversations between Anglicans and Nonconformists, as a member of the Federal Council of the Free Churches appointed to confer with the representatives of the Church of England in response to the Appeal to Christian People of the last Lambeth Conference, as Deputy-Chairman of the Lausanne Conference itself, I have for nearly twenty years had the problem of the Reunion of the Christian Churches constantly under my close scrutiny, and have been led to receive impressions and form conclusions regarding its solution, which may not be altogether without interest and value in view of the proposals for the United South Indian Church now under discussion, and the decisions regarding this and other relevant matter which the approaching Lambeth Conference will be called to make. Let me speak first of all of the grounds for hope, and then of the hindrances that are in the way of its fulfilment.

I

The first ground of hope is that there is the movement towards reunion, and that the hindrances, which become more evident as the movement progresses, have not arrested although they do retard and hamper it. Those who are not sympathetic to the movement profess usually their belief in the ideal, while magnifying the difficulties in its realisation. Few there are who venture to pronounce it a mistake or a wrong. The rank and file are for the most part indifferent; and even among the leaders in the Churches there are many who give it only a formal support but no personal devotion. But still the movement holds on, because there are some, comparatively few, who believe in it, and, therefore, pray and labour for it. It is impossible in this connection to pass over the names of Robert Hallowell Gardiner and Bishop Charles Brent, the first secretary and president of the Faith and Order Movement. In such a movement, however, numbers do not count. It is not the multitude but the prophetic souls who can read the signs of the times. What philosophy calls the *Zeitgeist*, faith discerns as the Spirit of God guiding men into the ways of the Divine Purpose. It is not presumption which leads a man like the late Bishop Brent to affirm his conviction that God wills union. When the conviction comes to serious and earnest men that they are to devote themselves to a cause, it would require more cogent evidence to the contrary to justify the assumption that they are self-deceived. There

is a growing number who are sharing their conviction, and with most, if not all of them, it is a growing conviction. On this ground that the convictions of men, tested and enduring, are an indication of the Will of God, we may confidently hold that this movement is not a "forlorn hope."

When God acts by His Spirit in the religious consciousness and the moral conscience of men, it is ever in the "fulness of the times." We must not blame the previous generations for not having done what we now recognise to be a duty. For them the hour of action had not struck in the clock of history. By exploration, conquest, colonisation, industry and commerce the world is becoming increasingly unified. In civilisation and culture, morals and religion, all peoples are coming under the same influences.

The African or the Asiatic is becoming my neighbour, in that we can mutually injure or benefit one another. Great Britain at one time tried to pursue a policy of "splendid isolation," that is now impossible; this island is now politically a part of the Continent of Europe. America has been vainly trying to keep itself disentangled from the affairs of Europe; but the new world is coming to redress the balance of the old. The Churches, slow as they are to move, have not been able to maintain their separateness. The Edinburgh Missionary Conference in 1910, and the Jerusalem Council in 1928, the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work in 1925 and the Conference of the World Alliance in Prague in 1928, show that the progressive minds in the Churches realise that for the spread of the Gospel to the ends of the earth, for the establishment of the Kingdom of God in human society, and for the international peace which is the necessary condition of the one and the other, the Christian forces must be united. From the mission lands—China, Japan, India—there comes the insistent cry: In face of the heathenism, in face of the secularism which is displacing the heathenism more rapidly than is Christianity, we cannot reproduce your ecclesiastical divisions, we must be united. Does not the same cry arise at home? A godless secularism is no less a danger even in Great Britain; and the masses are forsaking the worship of the Church. Even if not altogether sincerely the divisions in the Church are advanced as a reason for indifference and neglect. To bear their clear testimony and wield their full influence the Churches are being driven towards reunion.

But it is better to be drawn by desire than to be driven by need. While there are many who maintain that the practical need can be met by some kind of federation, in which the Churches can take counsel together and co-operate, it is being recognised by many that this cannot be enough.

In England the Free Church Councils which seek to combine

the Churches in interest and effort locally, and the Federal Council which seeks to co-ordinate them denominationally, despite many valuable services rendered, have failed to make the Churches as effectively united as the need demands, because still does the denomination or the congregation command a devotion and a service from most Christian people, which cannot be secured, with a few exceptions, for any united agency. Is not the explanation that fellowship in faith and worship is the source of devotion and service? Only as the members of the Churches feel in their inmost heart that they are, as congregations or denominations, parts of a greater whole, will the more immediate loyalty be in due proportion to the more inclusive. Fellowship at the Lord's Table is the desire which is most potently drawing the Churches together; and this demands a more organic unity than the needs which are drawing together require. The hindrance to the common table must be held over for discussion at a later stage.

A further ground of hope is the growing recognition that even such an organic unity need not involve uniformity. Although we must view with sorrow much in the words and deeds both of tyrannical majority and rebellious minority, which is recorded in the history of the divisions of Christendom; yet there were sincere convictions on both sides, in the conservation of old and the discovery of new values of the Church; and simply to ignore the diversities of faith, worship, and polity which have thus emerged, or to attempt to repress them, would be to fail in learning the obvious lesson of the past, that uniformity is a foe and not a friend to unity. Just as in the history of nations it is evident that the development of each has secured distinctive values cultural, moral, and religious, which it would be a loss to suppress in a colourless cosmopolitanism, and only a gain to conserve in a multihued internationalism, so we must conclude it would be foolish and wrong to try to eliminate what has become distinctive of denominations. There are peculiarities, exclusive and aggressive, of denominations which must certainly go into the limbo of oblivion if unity is to be restored. But there are differences which are not inconsistent or repugnant, but complementary and harmonious; and it is well that these should be preserved in diversity-in-unity.

Although there is a tendency in Nonconformist Churches for the layman to depreciate scholarship as having any contribution to make to the solution of the problem; yet I am confident that were scholarship to exercise its full influence on the minds of theologians and ecclesiastics, hindrances to reunion would be removed. For there are many men who profess to have accepted the modern methods of biblical scholarship, but who in their thinking have not escaped the mental habits of their early environment. I can

at the present moment think of an eminent Nonconformist theologian, who in his dogmatics, and especially the exegesis on which his dogmatics rested, is still, unknown to himself, in the pre-critical age; and I can also think of an eminent Anglican ecclesiastic whose views on the early history of the Church have remained uncontaminated by any of the Higher Criticism which he is prepared to apply to the Old Testament. But despite such inconsistencies, the leaven is in the lump, and will yet leaven the whole. We may then consider hopefully some of the ways in which this modern scholarship will affect the matter before us.

(a) I am firmly convinced that scholarship, which is strictly historical and not at all dogmatic in method, has disproved and will still more disprove the assumption that Christ Himself cared so much for the organisation of His Church as to commit to His apostles any such universal and permanent polity as Catholicism (Anglican, Orthodox, or Roman) would impose as a condition of reunion. I do not rely here on Free Church scholars, who might be suspected of prejudice, but on great Anglican scholars, such as Hort and Lightfoot, and most recently the latest book of Canon Streeter. The method which on the contrary Bishop Gore adopts in his book on *The Church and the Ministry* seems to me not to prove his case, but to offer an argument against it. I should not be prepared to incur the responsibility of continuing the divisions of Christendom, did I need to support my case for exclusiveness on so insecure an historical foundation. This scholarship has, I am convinced, a great deal to teach the Nonconformist as well as the Anglican. Just as the New Testament does not lend support to episcopacy as the only legitimate Church polity, so it sets aside any similar claim which might be made for Presbyterianism or Congregationalism. As a Congregationalist I am most rigorous in confronting any exclusiveness of my own denomination with the New Testament. The word *ecclesia* is certainly used of the local congregation at Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Rome; and it is not improbable that this usage of the word comes from its use in reference to the Greek city government. But I do not forget that *ecclesia* is used of the total Christian community in the world, and that this usage is probably due to the Septuagist use of the term in regard to the chosen people, whose successor in God's purpose the Church claimed to be. The local Church is a *Church* in so far as it locally manifests *the Church*; the part can and does represent the whole, however, only if it does not separate itself from, or oppose itself to, the other parts. I cannot find in the New Testament any claim for the kind of independence for the local congregation, which has been so emphasised in the Old Independence. But I do find abundant evidence of the value attached to

the unity of the Church as a whole, possessing in common the same Spirit, forming the one body of Christ, and being fashioned into one temple for God. Paul does in Galatians claim, even vehemently, liberty for the Christian believer from the Jewish law; but never liberty for the individual member of the Church to disregard the duties to others which Christian love enjoins. The Church has not the warrant of the Spirit of God which claims that its organisation is the only valid one, and unchurches other Churches as inferior to itself. This conviction, as it spreads, must break down the barriers of sectarianism.

(b) On the other hand we must fully concede that an organisation is not necessarily condemned because it cannot be traced back to the Apostolic Age. Despite human error and sin, there has been a Divine Providence guiding the Church, and the Divine Spirit has not forsaken its leaders altogether in any age. We may concede that in the early centuries with the peril of heresy or schism on the one hand and the strain of persecution on the other, it was necessary that the continuity and the unity of the Church should be preserved by a more compact organisation, such as the episcopate gave it.

We can acknowledge the relative historical value of the episcopate without committing ourselves to the claim of its exclusive validity. In the same way the revolts against the tyranny of the papal Church can claim a relative historical justification, even if they involve the consequence that division weakened the Church's testimony and influence. The Separatists had this relative historical justification in asserting their independence of queen and bishop that they might reform "without tarrying for any."

It is difficult to imagine how unity could have been preserved in the Church, when authority became tyrannical, and conscience drove men to claim liberty to express Christian truth and grace in what seemed to them better than the authorised ways. A growth of the historic sense should further the cause of reunion, in a mutual recognition by those who stand for unity, and those who strive for liberty, that the two principles need to be reconciled in the form of an organisation which is the best adapted to the historical situation.

(c) The Apostolic Age can teach us the two lessons that the Church, while the Spirit is essential, also needs organisation, and that the organisation need not be uniform, but must be adapted to the local conditions and historical situation. If there be a Divine Providence in man's life it is no secularisation of the Church that in order to bear its witness and do its work it adopts means, and the means best adapted. Organisation as a substitute for inspira-

tion is an evil, from which the Church has often suffered in its chequered career; but organisation as a servant of inspiration is all good, as making manifest the Spirit's presence and effective His power. Some in the Church need to learn that organisation is only a *means*, others that it is a means. If only Anglicans and Nonconformists would learn that the best organisation is not necessarily the oldest or the most or least complex, but that which is best adapted for the Church's present tasks, and that partiality for, or prejudice against, bishops should be subordinated to that test. As the number of those who recognise this grows will the situation as regards reunion become more hopeful.

(d) It is not, however, a return to the letter of the Apostolic Age, but a recovery of its Spirit which can afford us most hope. The inspiration of God's Fatherhood, Christ's Saviourhood and Lordship, the presence and power of God's Own Spirit in personal experience would free us from the bondage of the letter. Many persons affirm that this or that conviction hinders them from making any concession which would make closer fellowship possible; but what they call conviction may be only tradition or convention. A belief or a custom may have been adopted on the authority of the Scriptures, rightly or wrongly understood, but solely on authority. It has passed down through the generations, becoming the tradition or convention, even although, probably, no one would think now of basing it on such a foundation of bare authority today; and although its original basis has gone, men still hold to it as a conviction. If the history of the world is its judgment, so also if the history of some of these convictions were known, it would be their judgment as not essential elements of the Christian faith or life, but as accidental accretions. Just as conscience needs education, so do many of these ecclesiastical convictions, Catholic or Protestant, need to be subjected to a searching scrutiny as regards their history and basis in Scripture; and this would show their comparative unimportance; and the paramount importance of the recovery, away from traditions and conventions, of the freshness and fulness of the life in the Spirit of God. As God's Fatherhood, and Christ's Saviourhood and Lordship in that life in the Spirit become, as they are for the religious consciousness, the essential reality of Christianity, in comparison with which all else is trivial, will it become impossible for the Churches to allow the ancient barriers, built on insecure foundation, to divide those who are one in their faith, hope, love, towards this God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The theologians can by getting us back to this essential reality help us to realise the unity of the Church, even as God is One.

II

We may now turn from the grounds of hope to the hindrances; and first among those we may place what seems to be the conservatism of the religious consciousness. We find again and again that mental development and moral advance outrun the progress of religion. In the name of their religion men have resisted the conclusions of science, and have continued to believe of God's character and purpose what they would condemn morally in their fellow men. Just because religious beliefs mean so much to men do they cling so desperately to them, in fear that they should be left desolate if deprived of them. Because the object of faith is eternal reality, men are prone to invest the temporal expressions of belief and worship with a permanence which does not, by their very nature, belong to them. It is only as men learn to distinguish the essentials from the accidentals of their religion that this attitude can be changed.

Closely related to this hindrance is one already indicated. There is no greater need for our religious and our moral thought to-day than some *criterion* of what is, or what is not, entitled to call itself a religious conviction, or a conscientious scruple. It is a superseded individualism which would claim for the individual religious consciousness and moral conscience an ultimate authority. The prophet has a clearer vision of God than his contemporaries, and the moral reformer is in his insight regarding the good in advance of his age; but the great majority of men are in no way original in the sphere of religion and morals, and simply reproduce the creed or the code of their environment. The home in which a man has been born and brought up usually determines the denomination to which he will attach himself; and its traditions and conventions he will accept as his convictions, and if he is of the pugnacious type he will defend them, as if they were direct communications from God Himself. On what ground may a denomination claim for its creed or its polity an authority which warrants its adherents to regard either as a conviction which cannot be sacrificed in the interests of the unity of the Church of Christ? Is it the Church? Then its claim to be such an authority must be scrutinised. Is it the Bible? Was it ever intended to impose a creed or a polity? If the divine revelation is appealed to, we may ask: was the truth and grace of Christ concerned at all with most of the matters that Churches thus impose on their adherents? My conviction is that if we candidly and courageously pursued this inquiry, we should be brought down to such a personal relation to God, such an experience of salvation through Christ, such a sense of the Spirit's presence and power as alone

essential to secure a foundation of Christian thought and life that consequently most of what Christian people are pleased to call their convictions would be seen in their relative insignificance as having emerged from particular conditions in history, and as, therefore, capable and even deserving of being submerged under other conditions by history. What we need to learn is to distinguish relative historical from absolute spiritual values. Many of the differences that now divide would be seen to be unworthy to be for a moment compared with the accords which unite Christians to one another in common faith, hope and love.

Without minimising the other differences in their power to arrest or retard the reunion of the Churches, we must dwell especially on one difference, which appears even to advocates of reunion as a gulf which can never be bridged; that is the difference between what is broadly described as the Catholic and the Protestant position.

(a) It does seem as if there could never be a reconciliation between those who hold that Christ Himself gave His Church the exclusively legitimate organisation for all lands and ages, that He Himself appointed its first regular ministry and provided for their unbroken succession, that the sacraments He appointed could be the assured channels of the special grace, which in them He bestows, only when administered by this ministry and those who, relying on the continued presence of Christ through His Spirit among believers do not regard any single organisation as essential, emphasise in ministry and sacraments not appointment or administration, but human faith responsive to divine grace. There are, of course, many gradations between the positions thus stated in extreme form; a "Catholic" might, without abandoning his belief in the *esse*, and a "Protestant" without giving up his opposition to the *esse*, meet on the ground of a common acknowledgment of the *bene esse* for the Church; but on the other hand most Catholics would feel that what is not of the *esse* cannot be for the *bene esse*, and many Protestants would feel that to acknowledge even the *bene esse* would involve them in acceptance of the *esse*. Much as I have pondered this matter, I must admit that I have not yet got even a glimpse of the synthesis in which the Catholic thesis and the Protestant antithesis can be harmonised. Protestant as I am, I have tried to understand the Catholic position, so as to rise, if I could, above the opposition, but hitherto I have failed.

(b) Without a solution of the theoretical difference, a removal of the practical division does not seem altogether impossible if only two hindrances can be removed. The first of these is the inclination, a result of controversy, to think and say the worst of the other side. We must frankly admit that the steps of religion

are always dogged by superstition, that the rank and file in most denominations give an interpretation to beliefs and rites which could not sustain the scrutiny of reason or respond to the challenge of conscience. The Catholic who localises Christ in the sacrament, and the Protestant who confines divine inspiration to the Holy Scriptures are both superstitious; the one treats the wafer as a charm, the other every text of Scripture as an oracle; we may call both magic, if we want to fling about disparaging terms, but if we have the love that thinketh no evil, we shall believe that, despite their errors, both are seeking and finding God. If the Catholic assigns virtue and value to a ministry and sacraments in themselves apart from the belief that God has willed and is willing them as the channels of His grace, he is superstitious, and is on the way to magic. But do responsible representatives of Catholicism hold this view? If not, let the Protestant beware of bearing false witness against a brother in Christ. If the Protestant hold that any individual impulse can claim divine inspiration, and can justify disregard of the common Christian history, with the witness it bears to the need of combining law and liberty, the individual right and the social claim, let the Catholic call him fanatic, heretic, or schismatic, if he has a love of judging others, despite Christ's warning. Let him recognise, however, that responsible representatives of Protestantism have a regard for the unity and the continuity of the Church of Christ, and by liberty in the Spirit do not mean licence for each man's whim or fancy. Let each, Catholic or Protestant, believe that the other holds his position in such a way as not to sacrifice his personal loyalty and submission to Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord, that his religion cannot be justly described as superstition or magic. With a Church dominated by such aberrations as have been mentioned, it would be foolish and wrong to seek any reunion.

It has been maintained that unity need not involve uniformity; but it is also generally acknowledged that if the unity of the Church is to be made clearly manifest and fully effective, there must be at least a commonly recognised ministry and commonly accepted sacraments. Without this *minimum* we could not speak of a reunion of the Churches. The thesis and antithesis here are between episcopal and non-episcopal Churches. In discussions on this subject the way out has been proposed, that the non-episcopal Churches shall accept the episcopate as a form of organisation which has in history been proved for the *bene esse* of the Church without being committed to any theory of it; the non-episcopal Churches, in so far as they have indicated any readiness to meet this demand, insist that the episcopate shall be constitutional and representative, and shall, as far as practicable, allow a place in

the organisation for the preservation of the presbyteral and the congregational principle. The requirement made by the Lambeth Conference that non-episcopally ordained ministers should receive an extension of their commission by episcopal ordination seems, however, a withdrawal of the concession that no theory is insisted on, since only on the assumption that the episcopate is essential could the demand be justified. To submit to episcopal ordination would not only, on grounds of religious experience, be impossible to most Nonconformist ministers, but would seem to concede this theory. The proposals regarding South India in waiving this requirement do meet this objection. I cannot myself press any objection to the provision that no non-episcopally ordained minister can be imposed on a church accustomed to and desiring an episcopally-ordained ministry; for it seems to me to be an instance of respecting conscience. Nor does the rule that all future *ordinations* in the United Church shall be episcopal raise any objection, since in an act of the Church of this character all the elements of its organisation should be represented. But the advance along this way is being barred by extremists on both sides. Some Anglo-Catholics are requiring that not only shall the episcopate be accepted, but also the Catholic doctrine must be imposed. Some Nonconformists are insisting that, if episcopacy is accepted, the Catholic doctrine shall be expressly repudiated.

The reason given by both is that an agreement on the fact of episcopacy without agreement on a theory is a compromise. If the difference were glozed over by an ambiguous form of words this objection might hold. But when there is candour on both sides, and no mutual deception, I can see no moral objection. Is not this insistence on agreement in theory before there can be Christian fellowship and common service a survival of an intellectualism which has done so much harm in the Church? Shall a theory of the episcopate be treated as a more weighty matter than such a manifestation of the unity of the Church's life in Christ by His Spirit as shall increase the clearness of its witness, and the fruitfulness of its labours for the world's redemption? Just as the psalmist, when he looked on the heavens, felt man's littleness, so when I contemplate Paul's vision of the one body of Christ, His Church, such matters sink out of my view altogether.

The hopes which I have tried to describe should not mislead any of us who walk in the light of that vision to deceive ourselves into the belief that the reunion of Christendom is on the threshold. The mills of God's mercy as of His Judgment grind slowly, yet they grind exceedingly small, and though in patience He is waiting, with exactness grinds He all. But the hindrances, which

I have also sought to show as fully as I can, should not be allowed so to discourage us as to make us give up the hope that the day of the Church's redemption from its divisions is drawing nearer. A journalist who was at the Lausanne Conference described it as a futility and a fiasco. In that saying he revealed more about himself than the Conference. A man must be incapable of reading the signs of the times if he thinks this movement can be dismissed with contempt. Opposition is a worthier attitude than indifference, for it takes seriously an issue on which the progress of the cause of Christ vitally depends. At least do the hopes for, or the hindrances to, the Reunion of the Christian Churches demand study, reflection, and prayer, so that there will be fitness and readiness to act, when the fulness of the time comes in the divine providence in history and the divine inspiration in the reason and conscience of Christian men.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

project under the control of American financiers, and experience elsewhere indicates that under those conditions Canada would play a very secondary part. The alternative plan would be to recognise frankly that not only Canada, but Great Britain, is deeply interested in the scheme. England and Canada acting together need not ask assistance from New York bankers. They can find 50 per cent. of the money required, so that the project would be on a fifty-fifty basis. England should stipulate that the electrical goods supplied and the workmanship of the Anglo-Canadian moiety shall be British, and that the interests of British and Canadian workers be not overlooked when freights are being fixed by the Anglo-American waterway authority. Such an agreement would place the whole project on a new plane—a worthier plane—and the most stimulating feature of this aspect is that so gigantic a business will require concurrent legislation by Westminster, Washington, Ottawa, and Quebec, to enact regulations for the satisfactory working of the river authority.

Part of the river is entirely in the province of Quebec and much ingenuity will be required to satisfy the King's French-Canadian subjects on this matter, because they claim the right to develop electric power from the St. Lawrence for use in their own province. This is a matter which Great Britain will have to handle with care, because the relations between the Province of Quebec and the Dominion of Canada are regulated by the Constitution granted to Canada in 1867, but there are numerous reasons why England is well placed to induce Quebec to accept President Hoover's proposal.

The present estimate of the cost of the proposed shipway which would enable ocean liners to ply between Chicago and Europe by the St. Lawrence route is £130,000,000. Mr. Harold Moulton, President of the Institute of Economics of the Brookings Institute, who opposes the project, controverts this estimate and substitutes an estimate of £200,000,000. Of this sum he assigns £80,000,000 as covering the power scheme and the remainder as cost of the shipway. He calculates the annual overhead charges for the shipway at £7,200,000, and he cannot see more than 10,000,000 tons of traffic using the shipway by 1940. For the moment let us accept Mr. Moulton's figures. The power scheme would doubtless be self-supporting, and the shipway would perhaps be unprofitable until 1940, by which time the capital charge on the shipway would perhaps reach £200,000,000.

It is, however, absurd to treat the shippers on the waterway as the only beneficiaries of the project. The whole Continent would benefit; the population would increase, the lands would improve in value, the railways would benefit and the residents

near by would find great advantages and lower prices. Trade with Britain would stand to gain enormously if a fair agreement between the two countries could be evolved. It would not, therefore, be unreasonable to charge a fraction of the cost against the Treasuries at Washington, Westminster, and Ottawa, and another fraction against the states and provinces which stand to gain by the local improvement. This would mean a preliminary conference between Great Britain and Canada, so that in negotiations with Washington there should be perfect agreement between the British partners.

At this moment the shipway is blocked on two sides; there is an alternative project in the air, viz. that of cutting an all-American Ship Canal from the Great Lakes to the Hudson River, which would probably cost far more. The main reason for this alternative is political: the route is free from the influence of the English; how can Americans twist the lion's tail if they are in partnership with him on a mighty venture? But I am not discussing the Hudson.

Prince Bismarck used to say that Democracies could not manage foreign policy. It is, however, clear that the Democracies of Britain, France, and the United States came out of the war far better than the Empires of Germany, Austria, and Russia, so perhaps Democracies are not so bad as the great German Chancellor thought. If Washington and Westminster really make up their minds on this question, some way will be found through all the intricacies of the position, and neither provincial rights, nor state claims, nor private interest will clog the wheels of the great Anglo-American Democracy in bringing this scheme to fruition.

This does not mean that the opposition by certain interests in Canada can be properly overlooked—far from it. At present they have succeeded in talking the scheme on to a side track, and we must listen to what they say. They say the present canals are large enough; that ocean vessels would not navigate the canals; that the present arrangements for transshipping cargoes at Buffalo are satisfactory; that you cannot alter established marketing facilities by such means; that it is no use providing cheap transport for Canadian grain because Canada cannot compete with Argentine grain in England; that English shipping fears the fogs and icebergs which trouble the St. Lawrence as it passes Newfoundland; that no ship can be built which would carry Canadian ore and grain both through the canals and over the rough Atlantic to England; that such vessels might be wrecked and damage the waterway—and all this ends up in the plea that somehow the presents ports of Montreal and New York might suffer some loss of trade.

Of course Canada must be supported. There can be no interference with the sovereign rights of the King in Canada. President

Hoover knows that. The joint river authority must be on the fifty-fifty basis. The control of the locks in war must be considered, and there must be regulations for shipping applicable to British, Canadian, and American craft. Quebec has already abundant and cheap electric power; she does not require any of the electric power which would be generated; she does not wish to share power with the United States, but prefers to keep her advantageous position as a means of attracting manufactures to her own territory. The true answer to Quebec is surely altruistic. Here is an inexhaustible supply of running water provided for the service of mankind, and it would be a serious step for any body of men on political grounds to interdict its use by others who require its assistance in the building up of an active and progressive community, to whom electric power has become an urgent need.

If Canada has all the power she requires, that will not justify her in preventing the United States from getting a fair share for her people. It is not thus that Democracies will avoid the pitfalls of the old diplomacy: the time may come when Chicago will desire an extension of the shipway to the Mississippi, and it will then be Canada's opportunity to say on behalf of the British Commonwealth of Nations what Jefferson said to Spain 150 years ago regarding navigation of the Mississippi: "if the right of the upper inhabitants to descend the stream is in any case obstructed, it is an act of force by a stronger society against a weaker, condemned by the judgment of mankind."

Europe is groaning under the regime of frontiers and tariffs. England is happily free, because of her geographical position. We look to the new world, where many start life afresh, free from the theories which cling like damp rags to our limbs; we see there a man—a big man—with a big scheme. Our boys can dig that waterway, and make homes for themselves alongside its banks. It must not be said that England hampered, hindered, or harried President Hoover: of course, the initiative lies with him, but if he knew that Great Britain were prepared to welcome an approach and on certain conditions to subscribe towards the cost, perhaps he would feel encouraged to make the inquiry.

Since writing the above I have read the report of conversations on costs including the proposed Treaty that Canada should pay the entire cost of the Canadian section and the United States should pay the cost of the international section. This is only a camouflage: it hides from no one the fact that public monies of the United States will be spent in Canada and will pass beyond the control of Congress.

R. C. HAWKIN.

ITALY: YEAR SEVEN.

I HAD not been back to Italy for four years. My papers were all in order, but in spite of that as I approached the frontier I began to feel uneasy. The year before, a friend of mine, to all appearances pro-Fascist, had been arrested at the frontier on entering, and had only been released when the consul of the town abroad in which he had spent several months reported that there had been nothing "anti-national" in his behaviour. The wife, too, of a refugee who had obtained a passport to enter and leave Italy had been allowed to enter but not to leave. I felt decidedly agitated. But the police proved extremely courteous. My luggage, however, and all I had on me was examined with such care that it was not finished when the train left, and I had to wait for the next. It was a through train, and took me direct to my destination, a small town in Central Italy. I arrived punctually to the minute. The trains certainly now run to time, as they did before the war. Since during the period immediately after the war their unpunctuality was notorious, the Fascist régime has accomplished something! I was very much surprised, however, as I had not announced the time of my arrival to a soul, to find several constables awaiting me at the station. How they had found out when I was due, I have no idea. The Chief of the Police of the Province (*Questore*) had come expressly from the Headquarters of the Province to meet the previous train, by which I should have come if I had not been delayed at the frontier! It seems that in addition to the efficient organisation of train services, the Fascists know how to organise an efficient secret service.

Down there in the depths of the country, far away from the world, I found myself living in a half-ruined house, among fields only fertile thanks to the patient work of many succeeding generations. Everything appeared to be going on as usual. The peasants worked; the dealers cheated at the fairs; the landowners, who are not unlike English squires, the majority of them titled and with long and rather doubtful lines of ancestors, their pride not equalled by their culture and their means varying according to their position, hunted and looked after their estates; the lawyers, in far too great a number, carried on lawsuits, which they prolonged as far as possible; the doctors cured and killed their patients; the priests recited Mass; and the workmen laboured to add a dish of vegetables to their plate of soup. There were few black-shirts, a good many Fascist badges, and no political life.

The complete absence of any interest in public affairs was the first thing that struck me, when I compared the past and present. In the old days nearly everyone, to a greater or less degree, took an

active interest in the Town Council, the election of the Mayor, the speeches of the candidates for Parliament, and all those small political events which directly concerned them. Now there was nothing. The "Podestà" was appointed by the Government, he did what he liked and nobody might criticise, since his authority "came from above and not from below." The Town Council was abolished. The only people who took the slightest interest in politics were the local Fascist leaders. There was no discussion in public, not even in support of the existing Government. Only when two met together behind closed doors, or in the middle of a field, when it was possible to make quite sure that there could be no one listening from behind walls or hedges, were confidences, often of an interesting nature, obtainable.

Wherefore so much caution in a countryside once so talkative? Of the few thousand inhabitants, only one had been obliged to escape abroad, only three had been sent to the "confino," five or six were subjected to police surveillance, and just a few remembered the bludgeonings they had received during the Fascist "revolution." Yet there was something which was weighing on everyone's spirits. This something was the fear of spies, the conviction that there was no hope of justice for those suspected of not supporting the existing régime, and the prospect of illegal violence, which had not yet eventuated, but which might fall upon them at any moment. I had several conversations with the peasants, and only found one who spoke favourably of Fascism. They are no longer allowed to emigrate, they are obliged to grow certain crops when they consider that others would do better, they are burdened with taxes, they know that Fascist outrages will go unpunished, and they have an idea that there is someone in Rome who can give any conceivable command without there being any possible means of redress. Many of these peasants once belonged to the Christian-Democratic Party, and do not wish, as they are now obliged by law, to pay their contributions to the Fascist Unions of which they are not members.

A land-agent gave me an account of the way in which the elections were carried out. Neither he nor the peasants wished to vote, but lorries filled with Fascists toured the countryside carrying off to the booths anyone they could find. He himself had been caught about four o'clock in the afternoon and had been obliged to go and vote. At the polling station they were given two poll-tickets, one in favour and the other for the opposition. The first was tri-colour, and the colours were plainly visible through the paper. After they had voted, the opposition poll-ticket was asked for by a member of the Fascist Militia, who signed it. The land-agent showed me his opposition poll-ticket signed in this way, which he had kept as a proof of his "national faith," should anyone doubt it. Thus the

secrecy of the ballot was maintained, as there was nobody in the polling station; but the vote was controlled all the same. There were no opposition votes. I was told that in other centres there were a few who had voted for the opposition and that they had been cruelly beaten. I do not believe that in the district of which I am speaking anything of the kind took place. But they talked of what would have happened if anyone had voted against the Government. Although it had not appeared in the papers, this land-agent had heard that in Milan (far enough away it is true, but the news filters through all the same) a number of people had stuck a stamp over the "aye" on their card and so annulled their vote. He said he was sorry the idea had not occurred to him, as he and a good many others would have done the same.

All those of the lower classes with whom I came into contact were discontented. A carpenter told me that he could no longer make any profit on his work, that the taxes swallowed up all he made. The subscription to the syndicate, the family tax, the tax on foodstuffs, and worst of all the tax on production, took every penny of profit on his output. An agricultural labourer earns eight lire (1s. 8d.) a day in that district; 300 lire (£3 5s.) a month, without meals, is considered a good salary. A domestic servant who gets his food, never receives more than 100 (£1 1s.) to 150 lire (£1 7s.). How they manage to exist I cannot conceive. It is true that the cost of living is not high in the countryside, but practically every penny that is earned goes in food alone.

The other typical class of the district is the landowners. Almost without exception they wear the Fascist badge and belong to the Fascist Party. They believe in all they read. Their good faith is marvellous. If you tell them that in one day alone in Turin in the December of 1922 twenty-four people were killed by the Fascists, they say that it is not true, that it is all talk, that no such incident ever occurred. General Capello is not imprisoned: he was condemned to prison, but Mussolini sent him to live in a magnificent villa near Florence at the expense of the State. Mussolini is generally commended, while Fascism is rarely upheld. Everything bad is the fault of the Fascists, but all that is good is due to Mussolini. There are men of bad character in the Fascist ranks, but such men are necessary to a party, and Mussolini, moreover, keeps them down. They go on repeating: "If it had not been for Fascism, Italy would have become a second Russia." Before the Fascist "revolution," the peasants of this district all, or nearly all, belonged to the Christian-Democratic Party. Only in one or two towns was the Municipal Council Socialist. When I inquired what acts of Bolshevism had been committed after the war, they told me that in September 1920, at the time of the occupation of the factories, the Socialist

Town Council sent to one of the richest landowners and demanded ten hectolitres of wine; it was a public holiday and the people wanted to enjoy themselves. The wine was given, was drunk, and was not paid for. It was worth 500 lire (£6 2s.). This was "Bolshevism." The story of the ten hectolitres of wine reached my relations who live abroad in this form: the "Bolsheviks" had burned the house and laid waste the property of the rich man, who from being one of the wealthiest landowners of the district had been reduced to penury. When one realises that these landowners took for "Bolshevism" the seizure of ten hectolitres of wine, one understands that they were frightened, not by that which actually took place, but by that which they had read in the papers about the threat of revolution. In that district there were four brothers, all of them idle people. One was a client of the landowner who had been forced to supply the ten hectolitres of wine. These gentlemen, with another three or four of the same kind, formed a Fascist branch. The landowners gave them arms, money, and cars with which to terrorise the countryside. So the Fascists triumphed in the district.

Among all those landowners with whom I talked, one alone wholeheartedly regarded the Fascist régime as good for ever. The others said that Fascism was only a passing phenomenon: "the country will return to the old régime, but with a new spirit; liberty is, indeed, indispensable to the progress of a people; Mussolini has only suppressed it temporarily; in two years' time there will once again be a Parliament and freedom of the Press; the Special Tribunal, which after all only sentenced Communists (all those who are condemned are 'Communists') will be abolished; people will no longer be sent to the 'confino,' and after all it is only usurers and so forth who are sent there; one must have patience; it is the fault of the anti-Fascists that certain measures have to be taken; if, instead of opposing Mussolini, they worked with him, there would already be liberty again." There is only one thing which the landowners cannot forgive, and for which they even blame Mussolini, and that is the revaluation of the lira. That touches their pockets—the only sensitive spot. They made large profits during the war. The value of land increased enormously, corn fetched 200-250 lire a quintal. It was heaven. Now land is only worth half what it was, corn is sold for 115-125 lire a quintal, and the market price of cattle has dropped one half in a year. For all these troubles, the landowners blame solely the revaluation of the lira at 93 to the pound sterling. They are wrong. The reason is a far more complicated one. But the fall in prices came after the revaluation of the lira and so *post hoc propter hoc*! The landowners with one voice proclaim that they cannot live unless the lira goes up to at least 120.

The famous "Corporations," which are so much talked of abroad,

do not seem to arouse any interest in this small town. They have not yet reached the agricultural classes, and who knows whether they ever will? The intellectuals, and those who belong to the liberal professions, are, for the most part, as far as it is possible to ascertain, anti-Fascist. Educated in the old liberal tenets, they do not easily adopt the new ones. A secondary-school teacher told me that it was impossible to teach conscientiously. Everything is taught according to ministerial circulars. "One day," he told me, "a colleague of mine let himself go when talking to a friend; another colleague overheard him and reported him; the unfortunate man, who depends for his livelihood upon teaching, is now without a job." He looked round to make sure no one was listening; a boy passed and he stopped. Not even in the presence of the deaf is frank speech possible. Coming as I did from a country where liberty reigns supreme, the effect of this terror of other people's ears weighed upon me very painfully.

I was told that there were even more anti-Fascists than was generally believed, but that they did not dare make any organised protest. A lawyer said to me: "You must forgive me for cutting short our correspondence, but I must live. I have two children, and if I am struck off the rolls, as many others have been, I shall be completely ruined. In my heart I am always the same, but in appearance I must follow the crowd." Another lawyer, in the privacy of his office, after having asked me to close the windows, said: "It is impossible to live now." I asked him whether if someone with a hundred followers went to an Italian city and shouted "Down with Fascism," those who were supposed to be anti-Fascist would join in? He replied: "They are anti-Fascist, but they would stay at home from fear. Those who are anti-Fascist by conviction are for the most part terrorised." Police supervision, internment, the mysterious disappearances which occur here and there, the tales of torture in prisons, of shooting parties, all create an atmosphere of nightmare.

Another man, no longer young, who had been one of the best-known lawyers in Rome, noted for his uprightness and wisdom, being anti-Fascist, instead of having his name struck off the rolls, lost his clients one by one. As he had already made a good deal of money, he had no need to worry on this score, as was the case with so many others. He remained obstinate in his passive resistance. The Fascists offered him a senatorship in order to enrol him, but he refused it. He chose to remain true to his ideals. He bore everything in silence. He was obliged to live alone, out of touch with everyone. But he will never take part in any protest. His resistance is unshakable, but it remains passive. He does not defend himself, he does not yield, but he will

never have enough initiative to attack. He introduced me to an old friend of his, who, when the Fascist movement consolidated its position, gave up the exercise of his profession, retired to the country and grew flowers in his garden, never mentioning politics except to a few faithful friends. Once an influential Mason, he is now quiescent like all the Masons. The arrest and deportation of the Grand Master filled him with indignation. He too waits. But for what? That this structure reared on the ruins of the liberty of the Italian people shall fall. But how can it fall when nobody tries to undermine it? It is a curious fact that many of the lawyers, who are known to disapprove of the present régime, still find work. It appears that they are the most intelligent and honest. A Fascist said to me that it vexed him to have to employ as his lawyer a man well known to be anti-Fascist, and who only adhered to the Party outwardly, but that he was the only capable and honest man he knew. In many cases where the difficult conditions of life have obliged these men to give up their ideals, their integrity has remained unquestioned.

I was never in any way molested by the police during my stay in the town of which I have spoken, although discreet inquiries were continually made as to what I was doing. But when I made up my mind to leave, although I had only informed two friends in whom I had implicit faith of my plans, the Commissioner of Police was informed at once, and a young constable was sent to ask me on what day I was leaving, and where I was going. I was filled with admiration! Before returning abroad, I broke my journey at a big town in the north and went to see a young friend of mine. He received me with open arms. He had not changed in the slightest. He had not bowed down to Fascism. But he had no hope of making a career for himself; he did not live, he vegetated. He hardly ever saw anyone except a few faithful friends. Of these one was on the point of becoming a Fascist because, as he said, he was hungry. Almost all the professors at his university were anti-Fascist. How did they show it? They gave their lectures, and returned home and studied. They took no part in politics. By their silence, and by keeping themselves apart, they showed their disdain and their dislike of the existing régime. Willing to give up honours and a career, in order to keep their ideals, they were yet unable to do anything active. And among them are to be found some of the most famous Italian leaders of thought. What about the students? Three or four in that university belong to the Fascist Party. None of them interest themselves in politics. Those who are definitely anti-Fascist keep silence in order not to be oppressed by the few who are Fascist. We talked as we walked. But as soon as anyone approached us, instinctively we were silent.

I met in that same town a business man, a foreigner, who had been living there for a number of years. He hated the Fascists, their régime, the innumerable taxes, the necessity of subscribing to organisations to which he did not belong. But he, too, was a member of the Party! He received one day the card of the Party with an extremely polite letter saying: "Aware of your admiration for and devotion to the *Duce* and Fascism, we have now much pleasure in welcoming you as a member." He was asked at the same time to send his subscription. What ought he to do? Send back the card? That would have spelled ruin; he would have had to leave Italy and the business upon which he depended for his livelihood. He accepted. I met an officer in this man's house. We discussed in a general way the relations between Italy and the other Powers. He assured me that before five years were up Italy would go to war with Yugoslavia. I asked him whether it was the general feeling in the army that war was coming, and whether Italy was preparing for war. He said "Yes," adding that Mussolini tries to give the impression of being on the side of peace in order to avoid arousing suspicion; but "the Italians need land," he said, "and we must conquer it." If there are many madmen like this about Italy, there is a possibility that they really will make war.

The question of the Concordat between Church and State naturally came up in my talks with this person and that. The peasants said that the priests had once more become the masters of the situation. One of the intellectuals told me that the influence of the Church was growing tremendously, and that if the Fascists were sent packing, there was a distinct danger that Italy would fall under the yoke of the priests. In a choice between Mussolini and the Pope, he seemed to think that Mussolini was preferable. Many anti-Fascists have now become less determined in their resistance to the present régime for this very reason. They fear that if Fascism weakens, the Catholic Church will profit thereby. He painted in lurid colours a picture of what Italy would be under the Papal régime. The general opinion seems to be that the Lateran has gained much more than Mussolini from the Treaty.

When I had got across the frontier, I felt relieved. I could speak quite openly, and say what I thought. There was no longer any need to look round first and make quite sure that I was alone. But I carried away with me a feeling of deep regret. Italy is so beautiful, but so impossible to live in. Exile is preferable to a continuous and cowardly hypocrisy.

A YOUNG ITALIAN.

July 1929.

HENRY, PRINCE OF WALES: "A SCARCE BLOWN ROSE."

IN this brief phrase, instinct with love and regret, Sir Charles Cornwallis, Controller of the Prince's Household, may be said to have summed up the whole of the vast torrent of eulogy and elegy which followed the death of his beloved young master. A flower, indeed, he was, beautiful in life and fragrant in memory; but the tragedy of his younger brother's fate fills so great a place in our history that for many he is no more than a name. Had he succeeded his father instead of Charles, the fortunes of England in the seventeenth century might have run on very different lines; but cut off as he was in his nineteenth year, he has left no abiding mark on the annals of our country.

The eldest son of James VI of Scotland was born at Stirling on February 19th, 1593. The Earl of Mar was made his governor, and the Earl's mother, who had had charge of James in his infancy, was given the special care of the child; but at the age of six he was taken out of women's hands and Adam Newton was appointed his tutor. Under Newton he learned to sing, to dance, to ride, and to shoot, to play golf and tennis and to toss the pike; but that his books were not neglected is shown by the list of his studies sent to his father on his ninth birthday—Latin, French, Italian, Philosophy, Fortification, Mathematics, and Cosmography. James is said to have been jealous of his son in later years, but in these early days he certainly treated him with much wisdom and judgment; a letter thanking him for one just received shows that he was too shrewd to be taken in by epistles inspired, if not dictated, by his teachers:

I suspecte ye haue rather written than dyted it; I long to ressaue a letter from you that may be quholly yours, as well maitter as forme, as well formid by youre minde as drawin by youre fingers, for ye may remember that in my Booke to you I warne ye to bewaire with that kinde of witt that maye flye oute at the ende of youre fingers.

The "Booke" here alluded to was the *Basilikon Doron*, the volume of counsels written by the King for his son. It was first published in 1599, when the boy was six years old, and seven copies only were printed, the idea being that it should be "kept close." But when Elizabeth's failing health caused the King of Scotland's opinions to be discussed on every side, it was thought advisable to let the book become public property, and in 1603 an edition was published for general distribution in both London and Scotland. The book is divided into three parts: "I. Of a King's Christian dutie towards God; II. Of a King's dutie in his office; III. Of a King's behaviour

in indifferent things." It is full of excellent advice, and though much of it must have been above the child's understanding, it was intended as a guide for his future as well as for his present years. Others besides kings might profit by such counsels as the following:

Thinke not that the highnes of youre dignitie diminisheth youre faultes (muche lesse giueth you a license to sin) but by the contrairie, youre faultes shall bee aggravated, according to the height of youre dignitie. . . . Let not youre conscience flatter you, but censure yourselfe as sharply as if ye were youre own enemy, then, accoring to youre censure, reforme youre actions as farr as ye may. . . . In the forme of youre meat eating, be nather vnciuill, like a gross Cynicke, nor affectedlie mignarde like a daintie dame; but eat in a manlie, round and honest fashion. Bee alsoe moderate in youre rayment, nather ouer superfluous, like a deboshed waister; nor yet ouer base, like a miserable wretch; nor artificiallie trimmed and decked, like a Courtizan; nor yet ouer sluggishlie clothed, like a Country Clowne.

Elizabeth's death sent James to England in such haste that he was not able to pay a parting visit to his son; but he found time to write him a letter in which he tells him not to let the news make him "proude or insolent; a King's sonne and heire was ye before and na maire are ye yett; the augmentation that is heirly-lyke to fall vnto you, is but in cares and heauie burthens." All Englishmen, he says, must be looked on as loving subjects, and received, "not with that ceremonie as towardis straingers and yett with suche hartines as at this tyme they deserve." The augmentation of his dignity is not to make him less diligent, but more so—"bee earnist in youre studies that at youre meeting with me I maye praise ye for youre progresse in learning. Be obedient to youre maister for youre awin weill and to procure my thankis, for in reuerencing him ye obeye me and honoure yourselfe."

The Queen did not accompany her husband to England, but followed later with the two elder children, Henry and Elizabeth. They were received with great rejoicings in the various towns through which they passed, the most notable entertainment being at Althorp Park, where Lord Spencer provided a Masque written by Ben Jonson. An establishment was made for the young Prince at Oatlands Park, Weybridge, and here, says Cornwallis—

He began to ply his book hard; continuing all his princely sports—Hawking, Hunting, Running at the Ring, Leaping, Riding of great Horses, Dancing, Fencing and Tossing of the Pike—in all of which he did so far excel, as was fitting for so great a Prince; whereby, together with his continual long travel, being ever in action, he came to have a very active and strong Body, so that he would many tymes tyre all his Followers before he himselfe would be weary.

At the age of thirteen—

He began to know himself a little better, and finding himself a Prince indeed, began not only to strive for virtues answerable, but also to chase away the Relicks of Childish Imperfections natural to all, increasing every day in favour with God and man.

Cornwallis's opinion may possibly have been biassed by his affection; but the English courtiers—none too well inclined towards the Scottish newcomers—were much impressed with his quick intelligence and his princely bearing. An interesting description of him is extant, written by the French Ambassador, de la Broderie, to Henri IV. Negotiations for the boy's marriage were already in progress, and all the European monarchs with unwedded daughters were eager for news of the young Prince of Wales, among them being the King of France :

He is a Prince who promises very much and whose friendship cannot but one day be of advantage; I think it highly proper to cultivate it and to manage it early by all means suitable to his age and condition. . . . None of his pleasures savour the least of a child; he is a particular lover of horses and what belongs to them, but is not fond of hunting and when he goes to it it is rather for the pleasure of galloping them than that which the dogs give him. He plays willingly enough at tennis, and at another Scottish diversion, very like Mall; but this always with persons older than himself. He studies two hours and employs the rest of his time in tossing the pike or leaping, or shooting with the bow, or throwing the bar, or vaulting, or some other exercise of that kind, and he is never idle. He is already feared by those who have the management of affairs, and especially the Earl of Salisbury, who appears to be greatly apprehensive of the Prince's ascendant; as the Prince, on the other hand, shows little esteem for his lordship. The Prince has also the reputation of being very decorous in his behaviour, strict in his attendance on public worship and punctilious in regard to the manners of all those in attendance on him or in his service. He ordered boxes in his several houses, causing all those who did swear in his hearing to pay money to the same, which were after duly given to the poor.

It was not until June 1610 that Henry was created Prince of Wales and the ceremony was arranged in a highly spectacular fashion, the Prince being sent to Richmond that he might be fetched thence by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen and brought up the river in a State Barge to Whitehall. Cornwallis describes the City Barges, "with their several Flags, Banners, Colours, Arms, Trumpets, Drums, and Phyfes"; they met the Royal Barges, and "came together rowing down the proud River, which for two or three miles together seemed to be covered with Pinaces, Barges, Boats, and Oars, into Whitehall Bridge." The festivities that followed are

mentioned in a letter from Dudley Carleton to Sir Thomas Esmonde, dated June 17th, 1610: "The Creation was performed on Monday, being the 4th; with much solemnity and good order. The tilting, Masques and fireworks followed, and all this with the greatest bravery that ever I saw in this or any other Court." In one of the Masques at Whitehall the Duke of York (Prince Charles) took part, appearing on the stage with twelve ladies, "all daughters of Earls or Barons." The Duke presented his brother with a sword worth 20,000 crowns, and "the little ladies performed a dance to the surprise of every person who saw them, considering the tenderness of their years and the many intricate changes in the dance which was so disposed that every way soever they moved the Duke was still in the centre." It was well for those who watched the charming sight that no prophetic vision came to them of another and far different scene to be enacted in that same Palace, when Charles—surrounded, not by "little ladies," but by ruthless executioners—stepped forth from the window of the Banqueting Hall to meet his doom.

A Household was formed for the Prince of Wales at St. James's consisting of a number of young gentlemen—"sprightly Blossoms," as Arthur Wilson calls them in his *Life and Reign of King James I* (1653). The "sprightly Blossoms" evidently needed a good deal of watching, but Cornwallis says that the Prince's example was such that "his very eye served instead of a command." Strict rules were laid down: the Grooms of the Chamber were to be neat in their apparel, "not unseemly approaching the Prince with their doublets unbuttoned or their hose untied." Prayers were said twice a day; the Prince was always present and those who failed to attend were docked of their food: "At half-past ten in the morning and half an hour before six in the evening the wicket shall be closed and all such as shall be near the gate warned to repair to Divine Service, which warning if any refuse to obey, the porters shall not permit them to enter until the tables be risen." The Household retired at eight, when the traverse was to be drawn and strict quiet observed.

The Rules are followed by a list of salaries: the largest, £140, was paid to Dr. Hammond, the Physician; £100 to Hugh Bower, the Yeoman of the Beds; £80 to Sir Charles Cornwallis; £50 each to the teachers of music and dancing; £30 to the Librarian; £21 10s. 4d. to Archibald Primrose, Page of Honour; and £13 16s. 8d. to each Groom of the Bedchamber. All of these entries have the word *Diet* after them, meaning that the person named ate at the Prince's expense. A Dietary follows: "For the Prince Highnes' Breakfast, Manchets of Bread, Beef, Mutton, Chickens, Beer, and Wine. For his dinner, Beef, Veal, Mutton, Geese, Capons, Lamb, Lapwings, baked Conies, Pears, Tarts, and Custards." Since Henry's moderation in eating and drinking is frequently mentioned in contemporary

memoirs, it is not to be supposed that all these viands appeared at every meal; but ideas with regard to food were different from those which prevail at the present time: Sir Philip Mainwaring, writing to the Earl of Arundel, describes the way in which "the Prince, his birthdaie hath been solemnized." A feast was held to which every lord and knight invited was to bring some contribution of his own choice: "Sir George Goring's invention bore away the bell, and that was foure large brawny piggs, piping hott, bitted and harnised with ropes of sarsiges, all tyed to a monstrous bag-pudding."

Some of the entertainments then considered agreeable were even more revolting than the coarse profusion of food: in June 1609 the King and Queen took Henry, Charles, and Elizabeth, "to see a Beare that had kild a child—negligentlie left in the Beare-house—baited by doggs and then attacked by two young lustie lions." They were evidently much disappointed by the poor fight put up by the lions, who "skipt up and down and fearefully fled the beare," and the King gave orders that the bear should be baited publicly on a stage and that twenty pounds of the entrance money should be given to the mother of the child. Whether the Prince took any pleasure in the sight, we are not told: that he was of a more humane disposition than his father is certain. Phineas Pett, for instance, the shipbuilder who was employed to prepare a craft in which Henry might be taught the art of sailing, has left an account of the trial that he had to undergo owing to accusations brought against him by jealous rivals. He was tried by James himself and made to kneel during the whole proceedings—"I was at length almost disheartened and out of breath," he says, "but the Prince's Highness, standing near me, from time to time encouraged me as far as he might without offence to his father, labouring to have me eased by standing up; but the King would not permit it." Pett was cleared of the charges, and to show his sympathy Henry took his sister to the shipwright's "humble dwelling," where they talked with him and his wife and "partook of fruit and sweetmeats."

During a visit to Oxford with his father, the Prince was made a member of Magdalene College, but his "residence" seems to have been confined to one dinner in hall, when he spoke "civally" to the students and received gifts from the Fellows. His education, however, was never at a standstill, and it consisted in great part in conversations with ambassadors and other travellers, Sir John Harrington being one of those from whom he loved to hear of life and events in countries beyond the sea. That this desire to acquaint himself with affairs of State was one of the causes of the King's jealousy there can be no doubt. In an anonymous memoir of King James, published in 1658, a copy of which is preserved in the Bodleian Library, the writer says: "I heard by many his father

did dread him, and in particular from Mr. Primrose, the Prince's foster-brother, of high esteeme with him." This, he thinks, may have been caused by "a Malignity conceived in his heart against the splendour of his Son's retinue"; but James had himself ordered the Household on Henry's creation as Prince of Wales, and it is more probable that it was his son's youthful good looks and his bright intelligence of manner that roused the envy of him who was notoriously clumsy in appearance and blundering in speech.

Of the Prince's looks we may form some opinion from the portrait published in Arthur Wilson's *History*. It shows a fine forehead, clear and well-opened eyes, an oval face with rather full lips and the line of a budding moustache. Cornwallis states that he was five feet eight inches in height, straight and well-formed, with broad shoulders and a small waist—"hair of an auburn colour, a piercing, grave eye, a most gracious smile and a terrible frown." Of his disposition he says:

Naturally shame-faced and modest; most patient, which he shewed bothe in Life and death; slow to anger, that even then, when he was most times offended, he would (overcoming himself) say nothing; merciful he was after he had a little punished the offenders; neither did he judge rashly, but after due examination of bothe Parties. Dissimulation he esteemed most base, chiefly in a Prince: nor by Nature being able to flatter, fawn, nor use kindly who deserved not his love. Quick he was to conceive anything, not rash, but mature in deliberation, yet most constant, having resolution and courage; thinking nothing impossible that ever was done by any, and very pitiful and tenderhearted to any in misery. . . . With the eyes of his spirit surveying the mighty inheritance whereunto he was heir apparent, he did also strain to be the better furnished (if ever his shoulders should undergo so great a burden) with Furniture befitting the same.

His hatred of flattery was shown in his selection of chaplains, for he would appoint none who showed any trace of servility or who were neglectful of their ordinary clerical duties. That there were dissensions in the Church, then as now, is shown by Cornwallis's remark that "he was most ardent in his love to Religion and his heart was bent by some means or other (if he had lived) to have in some way compounded the unkind jars thereof."

Of the many schemes with regard to his marriage it is unnecessary to speak in detail, since he took little part in them. In almost the last letter that he wrote to his father, dated October 5th, 1612, he mentions various princesses whose names had been brought forward, and adds the significant comment:

If I have incurred the same error that I did last, by the indifference of my opinion, I hereby crave pardon of your Majesty, holding it better for your Majesty to resolve what

course is most convenient to be taken by the rules of State, than for me, who am so little acquainted with subjects of that nature. And besides, your Majesty may think that my part to play, which is to be in love with any of them, is not yet to hand.

It was believed that he had a secret plan in his mind of going abroad to look for a wife on his own account, without interference from statesmen or courtiers; but with all his other intentions, it was frustrated by the illness that now attacked him. In a medical treatise, *The Illness and Death of Henry, Prince of Wales*, by Dr. Norman Moore (1882), the symptoms which appeared during this October are diagnosed as those of typhoid fever; but nothing was known of typhoid in the seventeenth century and its symptoms were attributed to the Prince's excessive love of fruit—to his fondness for swimming in the river when at Richmond—to his habit of walking out in the dews of evening—and, by a large number, among whom was the Queen, to poison.

Cornwallis laments the hurried journey that he took to meet his father at

Beevor Castle in Nottinghamshire—notwithstanding my persuasions to the contrary, he determined to ride that great journey in two days; according to which he set forth on Friday by one of the clock in the morning from his house at Richmond, coming to Finchinbroke beside Huntingdon, a house pertaining to Sir Oliver Cromwell [an ominous name, had Henry but known it] by ten of the clock in the morning, which as they say is three-score miles in nine hours posting, where he remained that night; the next day having six and thirty miles to Beevor Castle, where he met his father just at the time prefixed.

But though its origin was disputed, the fact that a fatal germ had invaded his system was clear to all. It is probable that precious time was lost, for Cornwallis states that Dr. Hammond “not daring to be too bold with his Highness' Body, only used slight remedies.” A marriage had been arranged between his sister Elizabeth and the Count Palatine of the Rhine, and in spite of headache and languor he insisted on meeting the bridegroom and showing him every attention. On October 24th he played tennis with him, when “as though his Bodie had been made of brass, he did play in his shirt, as if it had been the heat of summer; during which time he looked soe wonderful ill and pale that all the Beholders took notice thereof, muttering to one another what they feared.”

The next day, Sunday, though his illness was visibly increasing, he persisted in going to the private chapel in St. James's, where the chaplain preached from Job xiv, 1—“Man that is born of a woman,” etc. Cornwallis considers this a proof of the “wonderful Providence and goodness of God,” and applauds the way in which the preacher “did thunder out the mortal misery of man.” The

service over, Henry crossed the Park to Whitehall, where he heard another sermon in company with his father, after which they dined. This was the end of his activities, however, for after dinner he was forced to return to St. James's “for all his great courage, and lay on his bed in pain and a thirst which after this could never be quenched but with death.” For the next day or two he managed to get up for a few hours, but on the Thursday he was too ill to rise and about seven o'clock on that evening a sign that was considered fatal appeared in the sky directly over St. James's, “the colours and shew of a rainbow,” the sun being set at the time. Dr. Hammond called in other advice and Dr. Mayerne, the King's Physician, urged his colleagues to treat him “as some meane person; forgetting him to be a Prince, otherwise he said because he was a Prince he must die”; but nothing seems to have been done except that “he was plied with all sorts of Cordial Juleps.” On November 4th “a Cock was cloven by the back and applied unto the Soles of his Feet, but in vaine.” But the lack of remedies was not the patient's only disadvantage: people of all sorts were allowed to crowd into his bedchamber and the unfortunate lad was “questioned strictly of his Faith, of his Religion and the Church to which he belonged,” by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who further pointed out to him “the inconstant and frail nature of the joys of earth,” and insisted on his sending for a chaplain to say prayers in his room, though Henry assured him that he said them “quietly by myself.”

It is not much wonder that all this disturbance was followed by swooning fits; but the swoons led to more disturbance, for the bystanders “made such wonderful great shouting, weeping and crying that they brought him to again.” The Archbishop, “with streams of tears,” called in his ear, “Sir, hear you me? hear you me? hear you me? If you hear me, in certain sign of your faith, hold up your hands.” This he did, while his servants made such “howling cries,” that Cornwallis says Death heard them and though “offering to thrust in his dart, yet pulled it presently back again.” The King did not join in the “howls,” for “unwilling to stay so near the gates of sorrow he removed to Theobalds in Hertfordshire there to wait the event.” The one person whom Henry is said to have asked for was his sister: in a letter written after his death to Sir Dudley Carleton by a friend in London the passage occurs:

The Lady Elizabeth is much afflicted with this loss and not without good cause, for he did extraordinarily affect her and during his sickness enquired for her, and the last words he spake in good sense they say were “Where is my dear Sister?” She was desirous to visit him and went once or twice in the evening, disguised for that purpose, but could not be admitted, for his disease was doubted to be contagious.

Charlotte Mew was born on November 15th, 1870, in Bloomsbury, and was the daughter of a brilliant architect. Her mother was a little Victorian lady who was not fitted by birth, upbringing, or disposition to do battle against the three giants which haunted the lives of that family as they had haunted the life of Jefferies—disease, despair, and poverty. There were three daughters and one son—Cobham, Charlotte, Anne, and Freda. In 1927 Anne passed away after months of suffering, and Charlotte was left alone, the last of the family. This seems to have been the final blow from which she never recovered. There was "no object left in living," she said. Always a victim to ill-health, she rapidly grew worse, until on March 24th, 1928, she died in a London nursing-home. Her life may be summed up as a tragedy of sorrow and adversity. She was one of those at whom we wonder, because they "can love so much and yet be so shut round with a wall of darkness."

I believe she was better known in her earlier days as a writer of short stories. Certainly she attained to a very distinguished prose, and Henry Hasland told her that if she would forgo every family and social claim, and shut herself away to write, she might accomplish great things. But that was not to be, and the gift, which owing to the pressure of circumstances was repressed in prose form, found lyrical utterance in those short "swallow-flights of song" by which we know her. I do not know when she first began to write verse, but stray poems appeared from time to time in various periodicals, until in 1916 seventeen of them were published in volume form by the Poetry Bookshop for 1s. In 1921 this book (called *The Farmer's Bride*, after the opening poem) was re-issued with the addition of eleven new poems, and in April of last year a small posthumous volume called *The Rambling Sailor* made its appearance. Although it adds to our treasure-store, this new book does not supersede the first volume in beauty or power. These publications constitute the whole of her poetical output. Who knows how this small handful of poems might have been enriched if it had not been for her lack of self-confidence? She was governed by the same critical faculty which ruled Alice Meynell—that spirit of self-criticism which allows no rest to a poet of such a nature, ordaining that she shall for ever revise and prune and discard.

Like another Charlotte (who also had a sister named Anne), she learnt in a hard school, and it would have been no wonder if her expression of beauty had grown somewhat repelling. Indeed this was the impression her poems gave me when I first read them, and I was inclined to dismiss them with this hurried verdict. But although their appeal was not immediate, they haunted the

memory and refused dismissal, drawing me back again and again until my thought was trapped by their unusual beauty. When one knows her poems, the apparent gloom drops from them as a cloak of mist from the shoulders of the hills, revealing the tender strength of one who has known the deepest darkness; a courage that walks more steadily than mere contentment; a faith that lies deeper than any verbal creed. Out of a life of deep tragedy and care, there rings like a trumpet-call her triumphant conviction—"Nothing is true that is not good." The same thought finds repetition again and again in her poems: "This is not a real place; perhaps by and by I shall awake." "It is only in our dreams the things that kill us live." The "hard cruel truth of life and humanity," as she calls it in a moment of unusual bitterness, stuns her rather than drives her to despair. Although it is not an exaggeration to say that every one of her poems either propounds a problem, recites a woe, laments a sin, asks an unanswerable question, or tells the tale of some tragedy; yet like a golden thread running through them all, there is a continual suggestion of joy—not the leaping river of joy which gleams in the sunshine, but those dark waters that abide, secret and strange, in the deepest pools. The secret of her power lies not only in beauty of word and in mastery over rhythm, but rather in her sense of spiritual values, from which she draws her conviction—"Nothing is true that is not good." So mingled are the thoughts of hope and pain, as quickly changing as cloud-shadows under the wind, that one hardly dares to call any poem, phrase, or word wholly sad or wholly gay. "Joy and pain, like any mother and her unborn child, were almost one." One feels that, for her, thoughts, events, things, words are all heavily charged with meaning of another realm than ours, and that we may wrong her by a too hasty or casual interpretation. That which to us appears gloomy, to Charlotte Mew may have been the necessary accompaniment of joy:

For some of us there is a passion, I suppose,
So far from earthly cares and earthly fears
That in its stillness you can hardly stir—
Or in its nearness lift your hand,
So great that you have simply got to stand
Looking at it through tears, through tears.

Even Nature is alien. Like two people of opposite dispositions who live in one house, the very enforcement of intimacy quickens into alienation what might have remained mere indifference. But to Charlotte Mew this inscrutable face of Nature brings comfort. To one bruised by life, there is a Lethe to be found in the unresponsiveness of things around us:

The larks that cannot praise us, knowing nothing of what we do,
And the divine, wise trees that do not care.

She is even inclined to doubt if there can be "a heavenlier world
than this," and if there is,

Will the strange heart of any everlasting thing
Bring me these dreams that take my breath away?

Nature is a messenger, not a throned monarch, a pathway rather than a consummation. There is something more our own than hands or feet or head—these dreams of ours who have very lovely faces—how does one bury them she asks, "they are not of the earth and not of the sea." For the tired heart at the end of the journey there is the space of sleep too sound for waking beneath the wet grass and the sweet earth, but for the spirits of men the chain is snapped, the door unbarred—"and we will not speak of life or believe in it or remember it as we go."

In much of her poetry she touches depths of self-condemnation that are rarely reached or expressed by poets, for by their very nature—which is ordained to seek for beauty in all—they cannot be wholly self-despising. But Charlotte Mew is ruthless to herself, to "this dark ditch, the soul of me," and laments "the poisonous fangs that bite us through and make us do the things we do." When one looks at her portrait—the quiet, gentle face, with the sad eyes, and lines of perplexity about the brow, the whole presenting a picture of fastidiousness and sensitive feeling—it is difficult to believe that it stands for one who wrote:

I think that my soul is red
Like the soul of a sword or a scarlet flower.

Always she is seeking and failing to find some power more lovely than the wandering passion of our feet, yet more life-filled than tame, bloodless virtues, "pale as angels smirking by, with folded wings." She will not accept peace unaccompanied by passion. Yet passion without peace fails to satisfy. So the endless quest continues. Sometimes there comes a faint glimpse of the fair country that lies beyond the distant hills, then the mists obliterate it again. Is there any way of release? We may change the things for which we care, but not the way. The dream in us is all that matters—cling to it though torn to shreds—neither life nor death nor any other thing can wholly take it away. But no beauty, no dream, no truth is accepted by her unless it holds in it—as a lamp its flame—that vital glow of passion, even if it be at the cost of storm and rent skies.

Sometimes one wonders if the dream of her quest was not unlike the star for which Richard Jefferies watched and waited from his attic window one summer evening. He knew when its appearance

was due, knew even what should be its exact place in the heavens; but though dusk came on, and grew deeper, the star did not shine. He was just about to conclude that he must have mistaken its position, when suddenly a puff of air blew through the branch of a pear-tree which overhung the window, a leaf moved, and there was the star. A constellation hidden by a branch; a universe by a leaf. A dream concealed by "this muddy vesture of decay."

There is a peculiar intensity of feeling and expression about the poems of Charlotte Mew which almost makes one feel that they are spoken *sotto voce*—in that kind of strained whisper which bears the burden of unutterable thoughts. Very few of the poems flow easily. Their speech is staccato, the phrases broken, and the metre (except in a few lyrics) follows the fluctuating urge of the emotion, as a boat follows the swell of the wave. It is rhymed verse, but no stanza repeats the pattern of the one before it. We find a line of eleven feet jostling one of two feet. Yet we remain unperturbed. Never was verse less studied in its art—and here lies one of the secrets of its power. It is the spontaneous expression of the pressure of thought within.

One is continually being asked for a key to her poetry—but where may it be found? In her life? In some isolated tragic happening that left its imprint on her mind and coloured all her work? In the weary round of continual poverty and ill-health? Or is it to be discovered deeply hidden in her own nature, in those introspective meditations which stamped even her youngest photographs with that look of brooding? Is there any one poem or line which may give us a clue? Or is there no solution at all, and must Charlotte Mew as people knew her—lover of action and full of life and wit, and as we know her by her poems—a creature of passion and storm—forever remain a mystery? My only answer can be that if there is a key to the poems it is better that she should possess it. One would not betray her confidence if she were alive, and why should death allow us to break the seal? There is no key in the poems themselves. Her thought, but not her life, is in them. Is not this the greater art? A poem should be like Vaughan Williams's musical ecstasy for the "Rising Skylark"—an interpretation rather than a reproduction. Mere photography may give a representation of facts, without Truth, but it is art which transmutes and penetrates to the Beauty which is Truth. The lions of Trafalgar Square, "who'll stand and speak for London when her bell of judgment tolls," appealed to Jefferies as being more true, more real than the lions of the forest, because, he says "to these has been added the heart of a man." It is that addition which distinguishes the work of art from a mere mechanical reproduction of the impressions of the senses.

The objective nature of Charlotte Mew's work baffles the reader who is continually looking in it for clues to her life. She is entirely unrevealed in such poems as "The Fête," "Madeleine in Church," "Nunhead Cemetery," or "Pécheresse," and in other French poems it is the places, and their reactions upon other people rather than upon herself, of which we have the expression.

Her work has been compared with that of Alice Meynell, and it is interesting to discover similarities of thought and treatment, but it is far more closely related to the poetry of Emily Brontë. One has to remember, however, that both Alice Meynell and Emily Brontë were poets of an earlier age, and much of their poetry would be impossible to the less sentimental age of Charlotte Mew. All three sister-poets possess one small peculiarity of expression, though it is less noticeable in Charlotte's work—lists of words in which the meaning is unfolded and a sense of climax attained. Here is Emily Brontë in her familiar "Last Lines":

With wide-embracing love
Thy spirit animates eternal years,
Pervades and broods above,
Changes, sustains, dissolves, creates and rears.

And Charlotte Mew in her description of the travelling circus sings of—

The smell of beasts, the smell of dust, the scent of all the roses
in the world, the sea, the Spring,
The beat of drums, the pad of hoofs, music, the dream, the dream,
the Enchanted Thing.

And of the Crucified Lord she tells, Who was—

Of Youth, of Spring,
Of sorrow, of loneliness, of victory the King.

While Alice Meynell in "Christ in the Universe" writes:

Of His earth-visiting feet,
None knows the secret—cherished, perilous;
The terrible, shamefast, frightened, whispered, sweet
Heart-shattering secret of His way with us.

But their strongest point of sympathy is that strange realisation of mingled joy and pain which finds such frequent expression in their poems. "Darkness and solitude shine, for me," exults Alice Meynell, and "Delight has taken pain to her heart." Emily Brontë writes:

I shall smile when wreaths of snow
Blossom where the rose should grow;
I shall sing when night's decay
Ushers in a drearier day.

And phrases such as "memory's rapturous pain," "divinest anguish," and "rapture made me weep" recur again and again in her verses. Enough has already been quoted of Charlotte's work to prove her kinship with this sense of duality.

Some of Alice Meynell's loveliest poems are sonnets, and this is significant, tokening an ordered mind and heart; for only the poet who has his thoughts, words, and metre under perfect control can achieve a good sonnet. Charlotte's turbulent spirit could never find its expression in any set form of verse.

In spite of these opposing qualities, however, there is much in the work and natures of these two poets that is akin. Both were lovers of London and wrote of it again and again. Both used a kind of mental shorthand by which phrases are clipped and sentences condensed until the meaning is in danger of becoming obscured. But it is this very economy of thought which gives such power to their poetry. There are three illuminating lines in one of Charlotte's rare love-poems which are interesting to compare with a line from Alice Meynell, who whispers:

Thou dost beset the path to every shrine.

Charlotte cries out:

His is the only face I know,
And in the dark Church, like a screen,
It shuts God out; it comes between.

Alice Meynell's vision is more completely satisfying than that of either of the others, whose writings hold in them such a comfortless, questioning note.

Two poems of Charlotte Mew and Emily Brontë are similar in thought, but very different in treatment. In "Sea Love" Charlotte describes the changing heart, with a touch of bitterness in her irony. In Emily Brontë's poem "My Lady's Grave," the dweller in the land of death "is changed and careless too," and even if he who is left behind should weep, "she would not in her tranquil sleep return a single sigh." But the language of the poem is placid, philosophical, and resigned, whereas "Sea Love" is a flying spark from the anvil of Charlotte's deep insight and imagination. Both were poets of the storm—Emily of the cold-driven snow, Charlotte of the sweeping rain. Both found exultation and pain mingled in "the old Morte d'Arthur, fight you must" spirit with which they faced life, and both had learnt that strange truth that joy and grief may grow from one stem, for Emily sings:

If my spirit's sky was full of flashes warm,
I knew not whence they came, from sun or thunderstorm.

In conclusion, one may suggest a comparison between three poems whose outlook, style, and expression seem perfectly to represent

the three poets: "The Quiet House," by Charlotte Mew, "Remembrance," by Emily Brontë, and "Parted," by Alice Meynell. Three *in memoriam* poems, and the same chord struck by each—but how differently. The same theme—but with what wide variation of treatment. For Charlotte there is no alleviation in the beauty of earth or sky and no compensation for the pain of separation. Emily Brontë apologises to the memory of the dead for being beguiled by other desires and hopes than those inspired by memory, and for having learnt that existence may be "cherished, strengthened, and fed without the aid of joy," and she sternly denies her soul its burning wish to hasten after the lost one. Alice Meynell goes farther than either of the others, and accepts compensation without any tinge of regret:

I shall not have him at my feet,
And yet my feet are on the flowers.

Three messages—Alice Meynell's the unity of all things, the knowledge that there is no separation; Emily Brontë with her affection buried in the grave with the loved one, yet reaching out with all the vigour of her youth towards the compensating happiness of other things; Charlotte Mew—blind to all comfort, all beauty, all hope in this world, alive only to the reality of love, the vision of completion, the beauty of the world of the spirit. Hers is the joy of the pioneer who fearlessly steps out into the darkness to follow the call of his soul, no matter into what strange lands he may be led.

When the call came to Charlotte Mew there was a glad, swift response. For her it was a moment of triumph. It finds expression in "The Forest Road." In this poem she touches the highest point of her art, and more—it stands as an expression of her faith, as an epitome of her life, and as a vision of the freedom which was to come to her at the last:

The road! the road!
There is a shadow there: I see my soul,
I hear my soul singing among the trees!

LORNA KEELING COLLARD.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE NAVAL CONFERENCE (*continued*).

4. *French Philosophy.*

AN outline of what took place in the first three weeks of the London Naval Conference was given in these pages last month. In those three weeks the various delegations had made known their initial views, and it had been made clear that the naval appetite of France would become a probable obstacle to success. The history of the following month confirmed one's fears. Before the Conference started France had announced (Memorandum of December 20th, 1929) that she would not accept any binding undertaking in London, but would regard the work to be done in London as advisory only, the substantive work to be reserved for the League of Nations Disarmament Conference. After the Conference started, her tactics were to demand for herself a larger navy than she had ever had, with a sombre disregard of the ostensible purpose for which the Conference had met; and to use that demand as a lever wherewith to extract from the other Powers a new security pact such as bore no relation to that purpose. It would perhaps be improper, however justified one might be on the severe and simple ground of truth, to describe the French method as one of disguised blackmail; but it is at least an arguable contention that propriety in this matter is less important than an honest recognition of the general danger resulting from the remarkable unwillingness of French diplomacy to abandon militarism as a method. The Kellogg Pact proscribed that method. Yet France, although she signed the Pact, in effect ignored its meaning.

Expressed in its crude form, the policy persisted in by France up to the eve of the Chequers conversation of March 16th was that France would not only not reduce her navy, but would even increase it unless the other Powers combined to promise that they would defend her if she were attacked in the Atlantic or in the Mediterranean. Both Mr. Stimson and Mr. MacDonald refused up to March 16th to consider so preposterous a demand; but the really interesting thing was that M. Tardieu, having entered a conference for the reduction of navies, had the assurance, in defiance of the other four Powers, to turn it, or try to turn it, into a conference for the increase of navies. Does democracy get the politicians it deserves? M. Tardieu probably believes that France, having been invaded twice in a lifetime in spite of her militarist defences, is thereby proved to be right in her faith in those militarist defences: but is the whole of France equally lacking in a sense of logic? Moreover, the classical example of the efficacy of

the opposite philosophy is made available by recent history. In January 1923 the French armies invaded an undefended German territory. The invasion was a farce and a delusion, and the French armies in the following year had to be withdrawn. The only real damage that was done was the damage to French diplomatic prestige. Public opinion throughout the world made it impossible for France to keep her armies in the Ruhr; and Germany was saved precisely because she was disarmed. Pacifism, whether imposed or voluntary, was proved in that case to be a realistic and effective instrument of security.

5. *A Division of Opinion.*

The fourth plenary session of the Conference was duly held on February 11th. Mr. Alexander submitted to it the case for the abolition of the submarine. He quoted the experience of the Great War in support of his contention that submarines are useless for defence but powerful in attack. He embellished his argument by suggesting that, if the submarine were an effective defensive instrument, then Great Britain would stand to benefit by it more than any country. Yet the British proposal was to abolish it. "The Powers here represented," he said, "have built, are building, or have authorised over 400 of these vessels designed for submarine warfare. They are expensive in maintenance, they have most complicated machinery, and a very high proportion of skilled personnel is required to man them. They are very expensive to build. They require extensive provision in the way of shore establishments and depot ships to maintain them. Their abolition would in itself, therefore, achieve enormous reductions in armaments expenditure. But the saving would not end there. Indirectly, such a decision as we urge would accomplish almost equally large savings in the provision of destroyers and anti-submarine units—so immediate that, if the Conference agreed to abolish the submarine, we could immediately sit down together to reduce the figures which would otherwise appear as necessary under this head. The total economy would therefore be enormous."

In the alternative, said Mr. Alexander, Great Britain would "endeavour to confine the submarine to defence by limiting it strictly, both in size and in numbers. In that connection we should be prepared to accept the lowest possible limits that can be suggested, again both in numbers and size. We should also propose to the Conference that, if submarines are to be retained, most definite conditions should be laid down and agreed upon, with a view to preventing these vessels from being used as commerce destroyers in violation of international law and practice, and the standards of conduct which public opinion most certainly demands.

To that end we should seek to revive the agreement signed at Washington on February 6th, 1922, but which was not fully ratified by the signatory Powers, to regulate the attack of merchant ships by submarines, in accordance with the rules and practice set out in that Treaty."

Mr. Stimson then explained the change of view that had taken place since 1922 in the American view of submarines. America was now in favour of abolition. "The argument that the submarine is a purely defensive weapon," he said, "seems to us difficult to reconcile with the offensive use which has been made of it at great distances from its home ports. Furthermore, I feel that there is a very weighty argument in the fact that the construction and maintenance of submarines impose upon all navies higher levels in those classes of ships which are used against their submarines—namely destroyers and light cruisers. The essential objection to the submarine is that it is a weapon particularly susceptible to abuse, that it is susceptible of use against merchant ships in a way that violates alike the laws of war and the dictates of humanity. The use made of the submarine revolted the conscience of the world, and the threat of its unrestricted use against merchant ships was what finally determined the entry of my own country into the conflict. In the light of our experience it seems clear that in any future war those who employ the submarine will be under strong temptation, perhaps irresistible temptation, to use it in the way that is most effective for immediate purposes regardless of consequences. These considerations convince us that technical arguments should be set aside in order that the submarine may henceforth be abolished. It seems to the American delegation that we have a common interest in the abolition of the submarine; first of all, for the purpose of suppressing costly weapons which we can forgo by agreement and by the abolition of which we reduce our requirements in other classes of ships; and, second, for the purpose of eliminating for the future the dreadful experiences of the past."

Admiral Takarabe thereupon joined issue. He opposed the proposal for the abolition on the ground that the submarine is a legitimate instrument of defence, although it could be misused, as indeed could aeroplanes; but Japan, he concluded, "is second to none in giving her full support to an undertaking to outlaw the illegitimate use of a legitimate and defensive agency of war."

Signor Grandi deepened the good impression he had already made by submitting a short statement thus: "Italy is ready to renew an undertaking restricting the use of submarines against merchant ships. She is even prepared to go farther. The Italian delegation share the view that at the present stage of the problem

a discussion on the abolition of submarines would be in the interest of disarmament. We do not object in principle to the abolition of submarines if all the naval Powers concur therein, and if such an abolition is to exert a decisive influence in bringing about that drastic reduction of armaments which the whole world desires."

France in the person of Mr. Leygues, of course rejected the Anglo-American proposal. "The submarine," he said, "works by surprise; it lies in wait for the enemy, but has ambush ever been excluded from warfare? It hides under water, but does not the surface ship sometimes try to hide behind a screen of smoke? It attacks other warships without warning, but does the most powerfully armed surface ship wait to open fire till she herself is within range of her opponent?" He ended a long speech by declaring on behalf of the French delegation that: "(1) They cannot accept the abolition of the submarine; (2) They are ready to concur in an international agreement regulating the use of the submarine."

Thus did the Conference register its first disagreement. It was commonly assumed that, because France and Japan were not disposed to abolish the submarine, the submarine could not be abolished. It could at best be only "humanised." The buffoonery of that word had by now become acclimatised in St. James's Palace.

6. *Inertia at the Conference.*

During the rest of the week following the fourth plenary session public interest in the Conference was badly and rapidly deflated. The moral capital with which the Conference had started had been largely wasted by the ill-concealed scepticism of the French delegation. It was found tiresome even by the most unconquerable enthusiasts to continue an analysis of rival memoranda and figures of which the purport, in so far as they had any purport at all, was obscurantist and destructive. It is easy to prevent progress towards naval or any disarmament. When M. Tardieu returned to Paris for his usual week-end and did not come back because he was beaten in the French Chamber on the Monday (February 17th), public opinion throughout the world was relieved rather than disappointed. The events of the preceding week, on their merits as contributory factors towards the work of the Conference, are hardly worth recording. On February 12th the first Committee wearily examined the rival British and French theses about the methods of limitation, and was content to pass on for further consideration by the delegations certain observations which tended only to increase the general boredom. On February 13th both the French and Japanese delegations issued further memoranda, full of figures, defining, not for the first time, their general attitude towards the work of the Conference. As before, the main interest,

exasperating as it was, attached to the French memorandum. The hardly disguised motive of that memorandum was to plead the case for a big French navy. The Japanese memorandum did not add substantially to what Mr. Wakasugi had said at the fourth plenary session. On February 15th Mr. Henderson, speaking at Birkenhead, had nothing to say about the progress of the Conference, although he claimed that the project of abolishing battleships and submarines was steadily gaining in public approval throughout the world. He put a blind eye, as it were, to his periscope in so far as France loomed within vision.

It was not a disaster, so far as the Conference was concerned, when on Monday, February 17th, Mr. Tardieu was defeated by six votes (286-280) on his Finance Bill. A respite was granted to those of the delegates in London who had become a little impatient over the obstinacy of the French tactics.

6. *A French Respite.*

The French domestic crisis conformed to type. The balance of parties in France being so delicate that Governments can be thrown up or pulled down by the narrowest shifting of votes, it was not surprising that within a fortnight M. Tardieu was restored again to power. In the meantime an obscure politician, M. Chautemps, had formed a ministry, but had survived only one day of stormy weather in the Chamber. On February 25th he faced the Chamber with his ministry, invited the Chamber to vote its confidence in him, and was promptly defeated by fifteen votes (292-277). His confusion was greeted with cries of "Vive Tardieu!"—M. Tardieu having been beaten only the week before by the still smaller margin of six votes.

The farce of French domestic politics was thereby illustrated. It results from the interplay of three main groups of parties (the Right, the Centre, the Left), none of which has a majority over the other two combined, and each of which is itself split into more or less discordant parties. Governments (often, as in the case of M. Chautemps, Governments literally of the day) depend upon transient compacts and secret bargains. There sometimes results a wholly artificial ritual of ministry-building, carried out in hollow deference to some precept of constitutional form. The perfect example was given in 1924, when M. François Marsal formed a Government, although he knew, and each of his ministers knew, and every deputy in the Chamber knew, that he would resign the moment he met the Chamber. It was a ministry that did not even start with a majority. Such pleasantries are not the least attractive feature of French politics.

M. Tardieu duly constituted his new ministry in the early hours

of Sunday, March 2nd, and the Naval Conference was able to resume its work in the week then beginning. While M. Tardieu had been in the wilderness, Signor Grandi (February 19th) had in his turn submitted a detailed statement of the Italian attitude to the Conference, but for all its statistics it added nothing new to what was already known. The essential point of the Italian case remained a demand for parity with any other continental power. Before the full Conference was resumed there was some desultory talk of a Three-Power naval pact, Italy being ruled out because her policy was directly related to the policy of France; but the talk did not produce anything tangible. What did result was a softening of American rigidity about eight-inch guns, whereby the problem of naval limitation, so far at any rate as the three chief naval Powers were concerned, was pulled further within negotiable scope. Any rejoicings there might have been were, however, darkened by the shadow of France. When on March 7th the French delegation, headed by M. Briand, again took part in the work, the immediate effect was an almost total cessation of that work by reason of the renewed stalking of an old French bogey. Mr. MacDonald had made no secret of his dissatisfaction with the condition of stalemate that had descended on the Conference. He was anxious to finish the Conference before April 14th, the projected day of the British Budget, his incidental concern being to have some specific Five-Power commitment to naval reduction such as might ease the burden on the British taxpayer. France, however, is a rich country, the second richest in the world after the United States, made rich by the World War and its aftermath, because the British taxpayer is paying French war expenses and because concurrently German reparations are going mainly to Paris. One heard it argued unofficially in the Carlton Hotel, but by a person of serious standing in the French delegation, that the United States and France being enriched, and Great Britain being impoverished by the war, it would be logical on the part of Great Britain, having for that reason granted parity to the United States, to grant it for the same reason to France. Was this a naval disarmament conference? Or was it, in the mind of post-war France, a manoeuvring for position in a bigger war than ever? One need not be alarmed. For the next sixty years Great Britain will be much too poor to pay for the next French war; and France is much too sensible to engage in war at her own expense.

During the week-end March 9th-11th M. Briand held certain discussions with Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Stimson, and other members of the American delegation. He is one of the most genuinely pacific men in Europe, but he is a square peg in a

round hole. He talked in London under instruction from Paris; his instruction was not to talk for the moment about naval reduction, but to engage in the form of subtle blackmail above alluded to, designed to extract from the other four Powers another of those security pacts for which France pines. M. Briand therefore, while prefacing his submission with the axiom that war between the five Powers was unthinkable, proceeded to urge that the five Powers should enter into a pact for mutual assistance in case of war. The League of Nations Covenant, the Kellogg Pact, the Locarno Treaties were not enough, even though at that very moment a committee of eleven persons was sitting in Geneva engaged in the work of harmonising the League Covenant with the Kellogg Pact. There was no ground for any expectation on the part of France that the United States would enter into such a commitment. There was every ground for assurance that Great Britain would not enter into it. Yet M. Briand had to raise it, and in raising it had to distract the Conference from its real business.

On Sunday night, March 9th, Mr. MacDonald broadcast to America a statement which, for all the optimism of its tone, had something of a sting in it. He started thus: "You ask me 'What of the night, watchman?' and I call across to you 'All is well.' " But he soon showed that all was not well. He is a brave man and does not suffer failure gladly. "Circumstances," he said, "which none of us could control, have delayed our official progress for three weeks. We have, however, used the time well for negotiating difficulties between delegations. . . . We shall not agree to base any treaty which may result from this Conference on entangling military alliances. That would undo in spirit and in policy the work of the Conference. But some of us will strive to secure as an essential part of the agreement a pledge of goodwill and pacific intention similar to that made by the President and myself after we had convinced ourselves that a naval agreement was possible. The bonds of war are not and cannot be the security of peace. Such a pledge ought to allow programmes to be reduced to a minimum if we have any confidence in each other's signatures. Our two delegations [i.e. the British and the American] are on the highway to eliminating our own differences and are co-operating most cordially in negotiation with the other Powers to overcome difficulties and to build up step by step a naval agreement which will reduce building programmes, abolish competition, put an end to distrust and menace, and create an equilibrium in strength which will bring tranquillity to the minds of the nations and lead to further results in the process of disarmament."

A "FINAL" REPARATION SETTLEMENT.

The main value of the settlements reached at The Hague as a result of the August 1929 and the January 1930 Conferences was that they were as final in quality as such arrangements can be. Not only was there a definite funding arrangement applied to Germany's reparation debt, but a limit was set to the claims and counter-claims that have disturbed Central and South-eastern Europe for the past ten years. Such, however, is the restlessness of present-day Europe that no sooner had the Hague instruments been signed in January than German prophets began to speculate on the probable duration of the "Young" Plan, and Hungarian propagandists began by various subtle methods to speculate on the chances of re-opening the controversy about the dispossessed Magyar landowners of the Succession States. It would, however, be unwise to take seriously either the prophets or the propagandists aforesaid. So far as the non-German reparations were concerned, the arrangements made were as final as words could make them. The two funds set up were specifically limited to a maximum sum, and it is improbable that Budapest or its emissaries will succeed in perverting the meaning of simple language. So far as Germany's reparations were concerned, her liability was crystallised into a definite series of annuities, relieved of all the "Dawes" uncertainties depending upon such unknown factors as the Prosperity Index.

The second Hague Conference took less than three weeks, and at the end of it no fewer than fourteen agreements were unanimously concluded by no fewer than twenty Governments, namely Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Great Britain, Australia, Canada, India, New Zealand, South Africa, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Yugoslavia, Poland, Portugal, and Rumania. The agreements are described as "a general liquidation of the financial questions raised by the war and the subsequent treaties of peace," their object, as postulated by the experts who drew up the "Young" Plan, being "to ensure the definite return to Europe of normal financial and economic conditions." The text of the agreement reached is given in the British Blue Book "Miscellaneous No. 4 (1930) Cmd. 3484."

I. *The German Settlement.*

The agreement with Germany has the effect of putting into operation the so-called "new plan" or "Young" Plan, that is to say the plan drawn up by the experts on June 7th, 1929, together with the agreements reached at The Hague on August 31st, 1929, and January 20th, 1930. For the first time since the war Germany's

liability is reduced to the finite form of annuities payable in each of the years 1929-87. The figures are the same as those recommended by the experts, the Conference thereby adopting the experts' view that such annuities "can in fact be both paid and transferred by Germany." The only element of uncertainty left is that Germany has the right in case of need to postpone the transfer or payment of part of an annuity for a period not exceeding two years, although the German Government specifically by the terms of the agreement undertakes to make every possible effort to avoid having to make use of that concession.

What may be called the new reparation machinery resulting from the agreement is the Bank for International Settlements, which is to receive the payments from Germany and to distribute them among the creditor Powers. The Reparation Commission is abolished, as is every other organisation designed to exercise control or pressure over Germany. For the future Germany's reparation debt is an ordinary commercial debt to be dealt with on the usual business principles. It is provided in the agreement that in case of any dispute about the debt the decision shall be reached by arbitration.

The agreement was to begin to operate when it had been ratified by Germany; when the German laws had been passed that were necessary for giving effect to it; when it had been ratified by four of the following Powers, namely Belgium, Italy, France, Great Britain, and Japan; and when the Bank for International Settlements had been constituted.

2. *The Non-German Settlement.*

In some ways the settlement reached about non-German reparation was the more interesting of the two. Few people in the world are still young enough to take a lively interest in German reparation. Since 1919 we have had so many conferences about Germany's debt, there has been so much cry and so little wool, so much expenditure of primitive passion that most people are nauseated with it. One therefore reacts with something near freshness to the discovery that something new has been done in the field of war debts and reparation. Until the second Hague Conference met in January there had been no attempt even to settle the complicated system of liabilities and counter-liabilities that for ten years had agitated the Central European Powers.

The financial relations of the Central and South-eastern European Powers is a complicated subject, but The Hague Conference contrived to reduce it to some sort of simplicity. In one way the settlement reached recalls the settlement of the "Borah" claims of 1927. When Senator Borah stirred up American feeling to the

point of demanding British compensation for American losses incurred under the blockade of 1914-17, few people at first took him seriously, because by the same argument the United States would logically be liable for her share of the blockade damages suffered by the remaining neutrals after 1917. Senator Borah, however, has the quality of persistence, and he succeeded in jockeying the United States Government into action. That Government and the British Government contrived, however, to thwart him. It was arranged that the United States should present a claim for the damages suffered by the United States from the operations of the British navy in seizing contraband of war destined for enemy countries, but that on the other hand the British Government should present a counter-claim for British services rendered to American ships in the same period, such as salvage, the sale of stores, petrol, and other commodities, repairs in ports which had not been paid for. It was further agreed that the claim of each side should work out at exactly a quarter of a million sterling, and that each side should accept the claim of the other. That innocuous transaction was duly incorporated in diplomatic form. The resultant British White Paper, "Treaty Series No. 4 (1927). Notes exchanged between His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States of America. Regarding the disposal of certain claims arising out of the recent war" (Cmd. 2877), was a pleasant diplomatic document, for its practical meaning simply was that a stupid and tiresome controversy was quietly dropped, and no payment was made.

The method adopted in the settlement of the non-German reparation controversy by the second Hague Conference was even more complicated, and the result was nearly as simple. Not much cash is involved, except perhaps that Greece obtains what to her will be a substantial windfall. That is not surprising when it is remembered that Greece was represented at the Conference by so good a negotiator and business man as Mr. Veniséllos. He has the tact as well as the acumen to recognise that Greece was not the only country that was seriously damaged by the Great War. In conversation he admitted that Great Britain shared with Greece the distinction of having been the chief victim of the war. By the time the second Hague Conference was over Mr. Veniséllos had succeeded in inducing his colleagues to raise the Greek share of Bulgarian and Hungarian reparation payment from the Spa percentage of 12.7 per cent. to a new percentage of 76.73 per cent. He thereby ensured for Greece the bulk of those particular reparation payments.

There were three aspects to the continental muddle that the second Hague Conference had to disentangle. The first was the

commonplace muddle of reparation for war, whereby certain defeated enemies were in diplomatic theory liable to victorious allies to pay for the damage. Concurrently there was the diametrically opposite phenomenon of indebtedness on the part of the victorious allies towards the defeated enemies; that is to say, Austria and Hungary had firm claims on the Succession States for various categories of losses incurred through the secession of those territories that were incorporated in the new states, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Jugoslavia. There was the still further complication that the Succession States, who were technically allies, had a liability to their more powerful allies of the West. The theory of that liability was that the smaller states, Czechoslovakia for instance, had been liberated from their oppressors, and that the work of liberation had been performed by the said great Powers. Those great Powers therefore demanded what in effect was a fee for services rendered. In 1919 Czechoslovakia signed a bill for the equivalent of thirty millions sterling on that account.

The Conference therefore had to consider a triangular series of problems, involving liabilities from allies to enemies, from enemies to allies, and from allies to allies. The first of them, namely war reparations proper, had for its context the treaties of peace signed after the war. The Treaty of St. Germain imposed a liability on Austria; the Treaty of Trianon on Hungary; and the Treaty of Neuilly on Bulgaria. It was impossible in the years immediately following the war to define the liability of any of those three countries, and not even the unpractical political economists of 1919 were so preposterous as to expect any payment from those countries at that time. It soon became obvious indeed that, if those countries were to be saved from economic disaster, the flow of money would have to be to them and not from them. Not only therefore did the treaties of peace not prescribe a final reparation liability in those cases; they did not define even a provisional liability. By 1923 the League of Nations, inspired by Sir William Goode, rescued Austria by means of a loan and then proceeded, under the same inspiration, to rescue Hungary in the same way. The problem meanwhile of assessing the reparation liability was not even approached till 1924, when Hungary undertook to pay a certain limited annual sum for an interim period of twenty years. It was a hand-to-mouth arrangement, and although it was tacitly surmised that in 1943 some further liability would be imposed on Hungary, there was no specific agreement to that effect.

Apart from that provisional arrangement in the case of Hungary, no money had crossed any of the Central European frontiers as a result of any reparation liability. When the second Hague Conference met it was felt that something really beneficial would be

done if the suspense and unsettling uncertainty of the Central European financial relationships could be removed. The process of removing them was something of a bear-garden, but the result was all milk and honey. It appears not to be true that Mr. Snowden threatened to lock the representatives of the small Powers in a room and to keep them there without food or drink until they had reached a settlement; but it is true that he permitted himself some Philippic speaking for their benefit. After an all-night sitting they composed their differences, with the result that a comprehensive settlement was reached that went beyond what most people had dared to hope.

The main features of the settlement are the following:

In the case of Austria little difficulty arose, because no serious person for seven years past had ever expected that Austria would pay any reparation whatsoever. The Hague Agreement therefore formally cancelled her whole liability under the treaty, put an end to her relationship with the Reparation Commission, released her from the obligation of obtaining that Commission's consent for future loans, and provided that the liquidation of her property should now cease. The cancellation of her reparation liability did not affect her continued liability under certain special arrangements already signed for administrative measures arising out of the disruption of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

By the Treaty of Neuilly Bulgaria's liability had been fixed at 2,250 million gold francs (say, ninety million pounds sterling). Capitalised at 5 per cent., that would involve a service of about four-and-a-half million sterling a year. In 1923 the debt was reduced by more than three-quarters, to the new figure of 550 million gold francs (say, twenty-two million pounds sterling), a sum that would involve an annual service of a little over one million sterling. By The Hague Agreement the debt was cut down still further by about 50 per cent., with the result that Bulgaria is left with a liability of about half a million sterling per annum for thirty-six years. The whole process therefore from the Treaty of Neuilly to The Hague Agreement involved a reduction of Bulgaria's liability by no less than seven-eighths. The exact annuities due from Bulgaria are these:

- 1930 (April 1st): 5 million gold francs (£200,000).
- 1930-39: 10,000,000 gold francs (£400,000) a year.
- 1940-49: 11,500,000 gold francs (£460,000) a year.
- 1950-65: 12,515,238 gold francs (£600,000) a year.

Those payments will be made, after the manner of Germany's payments, through the Bank for International Settlements. It follows from the new agreement that the Reparation Commission

will have no further competence over Bulgaria, and the Inter-Allied Commission for Bulgaria will be disbanded.

Greece emerges from the Conference with something like the settled prospect of receiving the equivalent of one and a quarter million sterling a year in cash. At the August session of The Hague Conference Mr. Veniséllos had extracted from the British, French, and Italian Governments a promise that Greece should be paid out of non-German reparation an additional average annuity of nine million reichsmarks (£450,000) to complete her cover for war debts, and a capital sum not exceeding 80 million reichsmarks (four million pounds sterling) to meet her claims for damage incurred during the period of Greek neutrality. At the second Hague Conference, therefore, Greece was assigned, in satisfaction of that promise: one, the whole of Bulgarian payments from April 1st, 1927, to April 1st, 1930, inclusive, which payments had not yet been distributed; and two, 76.73 per cent. (in substitution for the Spa percentage of 12.7) of the future annuities payable by Bulgaria and of those payable by Hungary up to 1943. In so far as anything may be left after Mr. Veniséllos has had his fill, that remainder will be distributed according to the Spa percentages. The British Treasury will receive the highly gratifying sum of £3,000 a year.

The greatest fun in this dull and sombre business resulted from the settlement of the Hungarian claims and counter-claims. In some ways the settlement of those claims had the merit of originality and the saving grace of irony. There were two aspects of this particular muddle: there was Hungary's liability as a defeated enemy under the Treaty of Trianon; there was also the liability of the Succession States towards Hungary's dispossessed nationals. As for Hungary's war liability, the 1924 arrangement, which was made as a condition of the issue under the auspices of the League of Nations of the reconstruction loan, Hungary was to pay till 1943 an annuity beginning at seven million and rising to fourteen million gold crowns, roughly equivalent to a quarter of a million sterling rising to half a million sterling. By The Hague Agreement that arrangement is confirmed with the difference that the annuities will be paid to the Bank for International Settlements and the Reparation Commission will have no further relations with Hungary. The Hague Agreement further stipulates that for the succeeding period, 1944-66 Hungary shall pay an annuity of thirteen and a half million gold crowns (about 560,000 pounds sterling) as a full and final discharge of her liability under the Treaty; but as if to provide for incipient squeals from Budapest, reasonable or unreasonable, those later annuities will not be paid in cash, and in one sense will not be paid at all. They at any rate will not constitute

a net charge on the Hungarian Budget, because they will be set off against the payments due to Hungary from Czechoslovakia and from the other Succession States under the second part of the scheme, which will now be described.

It is the second part of the scheme that gives the greatest ground for satisfaction. It concerns the vast network of Hungarian claims against the Succession States on account of properties expropriated as a result of the Agrarian Reforms. It was provided in the Treaty of Trianon that the landed property of Hungarian nationals situated in the territories annexed to the Succession States should be retained by the owners and should not be subject to liquidation. Under the agrarian laws of those states, however, the landed property of such Hungarian nationals, in common with other landed properties, had in fact been expropriated. The confusion was further confounded by the well-known problem of the Hungarian "Optants" of Rumania, which arose from the fact that the treaty which gave to Hungarian nationals in Rumania the right to opt for Hungarian nationality, was signed after the law had been passed in Rumania which expropriated the property of the subjects concerned. The pandemonium resulting during the past ten years from Hungarian claims on account of crown lands and properties, commercial properties, church properties and Optant properties has reduced Central Europe to a state of nervous unrest. The unrest was worsened by the gift of propaganda bestowed by providence on Hungarian nationals and their friends. Before the second Hague Conference met it was the view of those officials and of their friends that the particular claims of the "Optants" should not be settled as part of the general body of claims, but should be settled separately on their merits. The danger of that pretension was that a loophole might be left for continuing uncertainty in the extent of Hungarian claims. Fortunately, and as a result of certain firm arguments submitted to the Hungarian delegation by some of the other delegations, Hungary agreed not to persist in that tactic.

Having thus cleared the ground, the way in which the Conference proceeded to reduce the chaos to order was both effective and agreeable to all concerned. The arrangement made was that the method of settling claims by means of Hungarian claimants vying with Czechoslovak defendants before a Mixed Court should be abandoned, and that instead the defendants should be translated into a fund. Obviously a claimant who has to make out his case against a fund would be wasting his oratory and his emotion in so far as he said anything that was not strictly relevant and mathematical; and in so far as it takes two dogs to make a dog-fight, the Magyar dog in this case was robbed of his opportunity.

It was decided to set up two separate funds: the first of them to be known as A fund, or the Agrarian fund proper, out of which should be met the claims for expropriation arising out of the agrarian laws of the three states. The maximum amount of that fund, that is to say the maximum liability on account of those particular claims, was fixed at 240 million gold crowns (ten million pounds sterling). After that fund has been exhausted, no further claims from Hungary on account of agrarian expropriations can be considered. The second fund, to be known as B fund, was constituted in order to meet the remaining claims of all categories, that is to say the claims of the Habsburg Archdukes, claims rising out of the expropriation of church properties, the local railway companies, and other commercial properties. It is limited in amount to 100 million gold crowns (four million pounds sterling). The whole point of fixing the maximum liability in that way is that the Succession States shall know firmly and definitely the total liability they will have to face. There can be no reasonable doubt that fund B as well as fund A does constitute a final liability in that respect. Otherwise there would be no sense or meaning in it. Article 6 of Annex 3 of the "Agreement relating to Hungarian obligations under the Treaty, in reference to fund B" states clearly that "the fund shall in no case be under obligation to pay more than the total of its assets derived from the annual receipts specified above." If plain English means what it says, there can be no doubt what that means. Yet one heard it argued in quarters known to be friendly to the Hungarian Government that that sentence did not mean what it said; that Mr. Snowden in his Blue Book not only did not mean what he wrote, but meant the exact opposite; that Dr. Beneš was all wrong; and that the whole point of the satisfaction generally felt about the agreement reached was mistaken. It was indeed argued in those quarters that fund B did not constitute a final liability, and that it would still be possible for Hungarian nationals to present supplementary claims. It would be a waste of argument to refute such propaganda, for the Hague instruments are clear and precise.

The sources from which the two funds are to be collected are four in number and include the whole of the annuities payable by Hungary after 1943. By that means is constituted a kind of fountain whereby the post-1943 reparation payments of Hungary return to Hungary in the form of compensation for agrarian losses. The second source is to be the payments made by the Succession States on account of claims recognised or the realised value of properties restored. Next, six countries (Belgium, France, the British Empire, Italy, Japan, and Portugal) agreed to contribute to that fund their entire assets under the existing reparation settle-

ment with Hungary, that is to say their receipts up to 1943. It seemed probable, however, that those three sources together might not be enough to balance the receipts against the liabilities of the funds. It was therefore decided that Great Britain, France, and Italy should contribute the rest. Between them they agreed to contribute a maximum amount of 6,600,000 gold crowns a year, France and Italy each contributing 40 per cent., Great Britain the remaining 20 per cent. Mr. Snowden in his Blue Book estimates that the maximum charge involved to Great Britain under this scheme will be, for the years 1931-2, £25,000 a year; for eleven years after that (1933-44) £55,000 a year, and then for a further twenty-two years (from 1944-66) £19,000 a year. The Blue Book explains that "this contribution will be met out of the payments due to Great Britain under the agreement with Czechoslovakia, so that these agreements as a whole will not entail any net charge on the Exchequer." It is a pleasure to find a Chancellor of the Exchequer who is capable of deriving consolation from the thought that a payment he is to make can be met out of receipts from other sources. How else could it be met? In this case it is true that the British share of the Czechoslovak payment would more than cover the British liability to the funds, but Great Britain was entitled to receive Czechoslovak payment in any case.

By an agreement dated September 10th, 1919, Czechoslovakia signed a "Cost of liberation" debt of thirty million pounds sterling, but no payment had yet been made, nor had the counter-claim presented by Czechoslovakia ever been settled. It was agreed at The Hague that Czechoslovakia should pay thirty-seven annuities of ten million marks each (£500,000) in full satisfaction of the debt. Of the proceeds Great Britain will receive about £67,500 a year.

The work done at The Hague, especially in its non-German aspect, contrived to combine the interests of all the parties concerned. Central Europe will at last be relieved of a ten years' controversy which has had an increasingly unsettling effect. Dr. Beneš, in addressing the Czechoslovak National Assembly on January 30th, characterised the Conference as being the occasion of "an entirely new spirit" in Central Europe. "I do not wish to exaggerate," he said, "but I can safely say that the road to agreement among the Central European countries is open."

March 16th, 1930.

GEORGE GLASGOW.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS

	PAGE.
1. REVIEWS	525
THE FRANCO-RUSSIAN ALLIANCE; THE CALL FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY; THE DYING FALL OF LATIN LYRICS; NEW LETTERS BY JOHN RUSKIN; SIR SIDNEY LEE; THE HISTORY OF THE EDUCATION OF ENGLISH GIRLS.	
2. SHORTER REVIEWS: "Zehn Jahre Versailles"; "The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1928-29"; "The Childhood of Art or the Ascent of Man"; "The Pioneer Work of the Teachers of Great Britain and Ireland 1883-1929"	540
3. NOTICES OF BOOKS: "Sir Thomas Clifford Allbutt"; "One of Ten by Number Nine"; "Daguerreotypes"; "Cantaloupe to Cabbage"	543

THE FRANCO-RUSSIAN ALLIANCE.*

We are gradually increasing our knowledge of the system of alliances out of which the World War arose. As the German and Austrian archives were opened first, we know more of the Triple than of the Dual Alliance; but the French have already published two volumes of the great series which is to reveal their policy from 1871 to 1914, and the Russians are about to launch an enterprise of equal magnitude. In ten years there will hardly be a diplomatic secret of this period left. Meanwhile we may be grateful to the writers who summarise and discuss the enormous mass of information already available.

M. Michon deserves the honour of translation, for his book is of absorbing interest. Though not a professional historian, he knows his sources and can make his points. He writes with passionate indignation of an alliance which in his opinion brought infinite suffering to both countries as well as spiritual degradation to his own. As framed in 1891-3 it was, he believes, relatively harmless, though even then it filled a good many French heads and hearts with intoxicating visions of *Revanche*; but with the extension of its duration and scope on Delcassé's visit to St. Petersburg in 1899 its defensive character was modified, and

* (1) *The Franco-Russian Alliance, 1891-1917*, by Georges Michon. Translated by Norman Thomas. Allen & Unwin. 15s.

(2) *The Franco-Russian Alliance, 1890-4*, by W. L. Langer. Harvard University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 21s.

with the support of Russia's ambitions in the Near East during the Balkan wars it became a positive danger to the world. The author speaks with loathing of the cruelty and corruption of the Tsarist régime; but he is scarcely less furious with the politicians and journalists of a nominally democratic Republic who fawned upon an autocrat, refused to realise the rottenness of Russia, prolonged the enslavement of a great people by financing its oppressors, and, worst of all, allowed France to be dragged into war in a cause in which she had no direct interest. The hero of the volume is Jaurès, patriot, internationalist, and martyr, who with tongue and pen implored his countrymen not to invest their savings in a business doomed to bankruptcy, nor to risk conflicts which Russia was far too weak to sustain. The alliance, he declares in his Preface, is now without a single eulogist. The moral of this eloquent and hot-blooded indictment is that the French people should in future avoid such dangerous entanglements, and insist on knowing in every detail the obligations to which they are or may be committed by their rulers.

Of far greater importance, though of less popular appeal, is Professor Langer's *The Franco-Russian Alliance, 1890-4*, on which the author has spent many years, and which ranks among the dozen best books on European diplomacy in the generation before the war. In addition to mastering the vast mass of printed material, the distinguished American scholar has examined the documents of his period in the Vienna archives, and the new light derived from this source would alone render the volume a contribution to history. Even more remarkable than his knowledge is the serene impartiality with which he relates and analyses the policies of the various Powers.

Professor Langer gives us much more than his title suggests, for the Franco-Russian Alliance is only one element in the tangled drama which he presents. Beginning with a careful study of the Bismarckian system, he proceeds to describe the new and unwise departures made by his successors. Caprivi is treated with greater respect than he usually receives; but German policy from the fall of Bismarck to the World War was never controlled by a single hand. One of the most valuable features of this book is that we are reminded in every chapter of the extraordinary complexity of the task of modern statesmen. The Franco-German antagonism was of course a permanent factor; but even here the relations of the two Governments were continually changing in temperature, and the attitude of the other Powers varied with bewildering rapidity. The Franco-Russian alliance is generally conceived as mutual insurance against Germany; but Professor Langer shows that it was aimed at Great Britain rather than at Germany. For

Alexander III and Giers, in turning reluctantly towards Paris, never dreamed of helping France to recover the Rhine Provinces by war or of fighting the Central Powers for the realisation of Russian aims in the Near East. The picture of European statesmen painted in these pages is extremely unattractive and indeed almost repulsive; but we are assured that none of them during this period was working for war. Yet a situation can be very dangerous even when no responsible statesmen desire war; for no Great Power could be sure of the others, even if nominally allied. English readers will be particularly interested by the emphasis on the dangerous isolation in which we found ourselves in the nineties, and the important rôle assigned to Italy will come as a surprise. Professor Langer shares M. Michon's dislike of the Franco-Russian Alliance, which he regards as both needless and dangerous for France, and in the long run disastrous to Russia. An extensive bibliography concludes a volume of exceptional interest and importance.

G. P. G.

* * *

THE CALL FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY.*

The approaching Lambeth Conference of the Bishops of the Anglican Church throughout the world is turning attention once more to the problem of Reunion. Hitherto these Conferences have dealt with the problem in general, and the Lambeth Conference of 1920 set forth the broad outline of a scheme in its "Appeal to all Christian People." The approaching Conference, however, will have to deal with specific proposals for reunion, particularly in South India, which are based on the principles of the Appeal. Hence, an influential group of Liberal Evangelicals have contributed Essays to a volume entitled *The Call for Christian Unity*, which they describe as due to "the Challenge of a World Situation." The volume is edited by Canon V. F. Storr and the Rev. G. H. Harris, the Editorial Secretary of the Church Missionary Society. The articles deal with the subject in a comprehensive way, the attitude of the writers being considerably influenced by Canon Streeter's recently published book on *The Primitive Church*, and by the writings of Dr. Headlam, the Bishop of Gloucester.

While the Editors say that each essayist "is responsible only for the opinions expressed in his own essay," the volume exhibits a common point of view which is presented with ability and attractiveness by the different writers. It is perhaps impossible to bring

* (1) *The Call for Christian Unity*. Hodder & Stoughton. 7s. 6d. net.

(2) *The Christianity of To-morrow*, by J. H. B. Masterman, Bishop of Plymouth. Cassell. 7s. 6d. net.

novelty to a subject about which so much has been written and said in recent years, but this volume is characterised by vigour and freshness in its handling of the question. An element of special interest and importance is to be found in the essays dealing with the movement towards unity overseas, particularly in China, Persia, and India. The article about China is contributed by Professor Cho-Wei, M.A., D.C.L., the Acting-President of the Central China Christian University, Wuchang. Archdeacon Hunkin gives a very important historical survey of the relations of the Church of England and non-episcopal ministries, showing how continuously the ministries of the Reformed Non-episcopal Churches were recognised by eminent representatives of all schools of thought in the Church of England down to the rise of the Tractarian movement. Archdeacon Hunkin concludes by the italicised statement: "This recognition has never been withdrawn."

The volume closes with an appeal by Canon Storr to the coming Conference at Lambeth to carry forward the movement towards unity by "the honest and thorough-going revision of our scale of spiritual values." It worthily represents a point of view which is of growing weight, not only with Liberal Evangelicals of the Church of England, but with those who have accurate knowledge of Church history. It probably also represents the opinion that is coming to prevail widely among the laity of the Church of England, despite the activity of the Anglo-Catholic movement. It is to be hoped that the volume will have an extensive circulation.

The Bishop of Plymouth has written a valuable and suggestive book, entitled *The Christianity of To-morrow*. It is not, he tells us, intended "for theological students or ecclesiastical persons." The circumstances of his life have brought him "into contact with a considerable number of the men and women who are on the outer circle of organised Christianity, and who would gladly believe, if they could, that the Christian religion is not a spent force." For such people Dr. Masterman provides an account of the Christian faith and of the Church which, while modern and progressive in its outlook, is Catholic and Evangelical. It is thoroughly modern without being Modernist.

The Bishop deals, in successive chapters, among other subjects, with The Present Situation, The Eternal Purpose, Jesus Christ, The Fatherhood and the Kingdom of God. He gives his views on Christian Education and the Reunion of the Churches. Two chapters are devoted to The Bible of To-morrow. He concludes by dealing with The Finality of Christianity. In the vision of the future with which he closes the author sees the Christianity of To-morrow "growing more tolerant of intellectual uncertainty, more

intolerant of moral slackness. I see it leaving behind the vain dream of uniformity, and reaching out to the nobler ideal of unity in diversity. I see it exchanging the easy optimism of fancied security for the more bracing recognition of the stern conflict that lies before it, offering to men the sacrificial fellowship of the cross of Christ. I see it, not claiming to solve the enigmas of life, but evoking and training the faith that can see enough to trust 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.' " We heartily recommend this book to the attention of the people for whom it is written, and especially to the young people who will be instrumental in shaping the Christianity of the future. J. S. L.

* * *

THE DYING FALL OF LATIN LYRICS.*

The gifted author of *The Wandering Scholars* which was published in 1927 told the reader that her "study of the *Vagantes* is little more than the scaffolding of its subject. It was begun as an introduction to a book of translations from mediæval Latin lyric soon to be published, and outgrew the original intention, without outgrowing its limitations."

The outgrowth of original intention was all to the good since Miss Waddell's study of the *Vagantes* is a book that no lover of books would part with and it is an entrancing story upon which Professor Saintsbury, the "last and greatest lover" of the rhyming mediæval Latin lyric, could and did most amply bestow his blessing. But the lyrics themselves were also wanted, and here they are in a form that must make Professor Saintsbury not the last but the first and best of new crowds of lovers of the wonderful, and at times "gravely impish," late or mediæval Latin songs.

In a noble tome (alas! uncut for hungry readers inept with the ivory or brazen knife) we have the Latin music on the left page and the exquisite English renderings on the right. They are more than translations, more than translations in rhyme. They are from the pen of one who has dipped deep into another world than ours; a world that was singing before the troubadours sang: an early mediæval world when Latin had become once again—for who can doubt that the common people of early Rome sang in rhyme their ruder songs—a thing of light tenderness, a muse that loved, as every lover loves, the spring. Miss Waddell connects the mediæval age with "The Virgilian *Copa* and a handful of lyrics by the Silver Age" rightly since they show that there is a continuous tradition. Petronius is followed at

* *Mediæval Latin Lyrics*, by Helen Waddell. Constable. 21s. net.

once by four lines from a MS. of St. Rémy at Rheims which might have come from the Greek Anthology.

Young and gold haired, fair of face,
Thou gav'st me tender kisses in my sleep.
If waking I may never look upon thee,
O Sleep, I pray you, never let me wake!

Strato, the contemporary of the Emperor Hadrian, sings in Greek of the lovely Moeris, "whether she has kissed me too, I am still to seek; for if it is true, how, once thus rapt to heaven, do I go to and fro upon the earth?" Had the writer of the manuscript at Rheims access to the anthology of Strato of Sardis, to the Palatine Anthology itself? Indeed many of these poems seem to have a Greek rather than a Latin source, and it must be remembered that the Greek epigram lingered on into the tenth century.

At this time of the year it seems fitting to refer to some of the lyrics of love and springtime though to do so means passing over the exquisite poems of Ausonius exquisitely rendered. But among the latest of the Silver Poets is Paulinus of Nola whose lines for St. Felix's day, January 14th, open the southern spring-time. The greenfinches with their gay voices tell him that the spring has come on St. Felix's Feast. Alcuin's *Lament for the Cuckoo* is lovely in its sadness, but it is rather the sadness of the old world than of the new, and the same may be said of his lost nightingale, though Miss Waddell makes the music of the mystic bird live in her version.

So brown and dim that little body was,
But none could scorn thy singing. In that throat
That tiny throat, what depth of harmony,
And all night long ringing thy changing note.

Here, indeed, is nature itself, as natural as the unknown Greek poet that calls the cicala "the roadside nightingale of the nymphs." But about the tenth century the forerunners of the troubadours are at work.

Now the snow's melting,
Out the leaves start,
The nightingale's singing,
Love's in the heart.

What boots delay, Love,
Since love must be?
Make no more stay, Love,
I wait for thee.

And again:

Goes forth the scarlet spring,
Clad with all blossoming,
Sprinkles the fields with flowers,
Leaves on the forest.

Dens for four-footed things,
Sweet nests for all with wings,
On every blossomed bough
Joy ringeth now.

There is sadness, of course, since, as à Kempis was to declare some centuries after, "without sorrow there is no living in love," and the cloistered Abelard in his *David's Lament for Jonathan*, strikes the note with an exquisite epigram.

Low in thy grave with thee
Happy to lie,
Since there's no greater thing left Love to do;
And to live after thee
Is but to die,
For with but half a soul what can life do?

It sounds like Abelard's Lament for Heloise herself, and the modern translator rightly says that in this poem "the passion that never escaped in those strange remote letters to Heloise for once awakes and cries." The note, indeed, is evident in the last lines of this superb mediæval love-song.

Peace, O my stricken lute!
Thy strings are sleeping.
Would that my heart could still
Its bitter weeping!

It is, indeed, a relief to turn from the story of Abelard and Heloise—is there no hope that the passionate love-songs have survived in some manuscript unawares?—to the rollicking jollity of the nameless Arch-poet, a twelfth-century "reckless and gallant ghost" wandering from court to court and monastery to monastery and the author of "the greatest drinking song in the world." In his *Confessio* we have "the first articulate reasoned rebellion against the denying of the body." He is wholly outspoken.

For on this my heart is set:
When the hour is nigh me,
Let me in the tavern die,
With a tankard by me,
While the angels looking down
Joyously sing o'er me
Deus sit probitius
Huic potatori.

In another drinking song from the thirteenth-century bundle of vagabond and other songs, only discovered at Munich about a hundred years ago, Miss Waddell translates the opening line *Potatores exquisiti* by "to you, consummate drinkers." It requires a good deal of courage to question this rendering, but the next line, "though little be your drought," seems to show that

the idea is that these drinkers were artists in the way of wine-tasting and the classical meaning of the word was intended "to you, the choicest drinkers." Consummate gives to the ordinary reader the idea of quantity rather than quality. But Miss Waddell has got the vagabond-note of the song of these elderly drinkers in fine fashion. Some lovely things of another order altogether Miss Waddell culls from the Munich manuscripts. The spring song of unrequited love, "'tis winter still for me," is wonderful, and the same can be said of the song.

O Youth, be gay!
Green is on every spray,
And April, sweet of breath,
The old earth garnisheth.

Spring is the note of many of the songs that are contained in this old book originally from the Monastery of Benedictbeuern in Upper Bavaria. The note of spring was indeed passing through the world, the new world. Chaucer is about to sing of spring, and other singers too in other tongues in France and Italy. It is delightful to realise that these Latin singers forestalled the vernacular of many lands in their heralding of a new age, the first renaissance, and it is pleasant to think that a poet in her own right has in our day, with a combination of music and learning that is rare indeed, given to a world that is facing a new spring and fresh renaissance the beauties and the hopes that inspired men and women so far away in time, so close in the eternal verities of human things.

The birds sing fair,
Shining earth,
Gracious after travail
Of new birth,
Lies in radiant light,
Fragrant air.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

NEW LETTERS BY JOHN RUSKIN.*

Mr. Howard Whitehouse has done excellent work in editing these for the most part hitherto unknown letters by John Ruskin, since, apart from the delightful chatty missives that come from the heart and mark the born self-revealing letter-writer, these are letters that justify the title given to this book: *The Solitary Warrior*. Some new light is thrown on the tragedy—for it was in a sense a tragedy—of Ruskin's relations with Miss Rose la Touch. He had known her and her family since 1858, when she was a child and

* *The Solitary Warrior: New Letters by Ruskin*. Edited by J. Howard Whitehouse. George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 7s. 6d. net.

he was thirty-nine. The children of the family idolised him and then—they grew up. In 1866 when he was forty-seven he proposed marriage to Rose, but the parents were (quite naturally) hostile to the proposal, and Rose was uncertain as to her affection for him. A nine years' agony followed, and at last Rose died in May 1875 when he was fifty-six. The idea that he persecuted her in his desire to wed her is wholly ridiculous, but the discrepancies of age made the parental attitude and that of the girl wholly understandable. Yet the nine years of uncertainty made Ruskin in many senses a solitary figure, and in the twenty-five years that were to elapse ere he too joined the great company of the departed he never forgot her, and in the pages of *Præterita* told the story of his early friendship with Rose.

Before the beginning of this incident of his middle life he had already written four volumes of *Modern Painters*, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, *The Stones of Venice*, and in 1860 began his social campaign with the immortal essay entitled *Unto this Last*. In 1866 he published *Ethics of the Dust* and *The Crown of Wild Olives*, and in 1869 he was appointed Slade Professor at Oxford. He was one of the most famous men of his day when the tragedy of Rose la Touch and his intense vision of social reform came together to harden for a time his tender soul. Neither should have had this effect, but in fact Ruskin was not like other men of his own intellectual and spiritual standing. His essential simplicity and pureness of nature could not understand rebuff either in a personal love-affair or in a much more important love-affair, his love for the people and his hatred of *laissez faire*. In fact the movement for social reform had begun long before Ruskin plunged into the fray and founded, when he was forty-eight, in the year 1867, the still existing St. George's Guild and co-operated with Miss Octavia Hill. The famous *Fors Clavigera*, a monthly writing from his hand, was launched in 1871 and continued with some intermissions until 1884, and was a new strength to the cause of social reform. There was some laughter in respect to the Ruskin theories of economics, for intellectual England was still in the hands of Mill, and when it turned out that Ruskin was right, that *laissez faire* was wrong, it was too late to eradicate the sense of injury. Ruskin writes in the new year of 1874:

I had no conception when I began the battle, how solitary I should find myself in it. Every one fails me and the tremendous power of self-deceived mammon-worshippers, bleeding the life of all humanity, is something too horrible to face. I go against it without looking at it—the putrefying Dragon is so much more ghastly than the old Living one. It is curious that Turner is the only living man in Europe who fully understood the battle.

In the case of any other man than Ruskin this would be put down to pure vanity, for at that date the Education Act was passed and all the reformers were working from every side. Ruskin was not solitary save in so far as he made himself solitary by introspection, while the reference to Turner is absurd, since all over Europe the reformers had been at work since 1848. It is true that Italy was still a dirty place physically, swarming with beggars and discontent, and no doubt all the European countries and England itself were suffering from slums, poverty, and low wages, but the new age had been born.

Ruskin's real contribution to the new birth was the fact that he made educated people, and especially people of the rich manufacturing class, read in perfect English about imperfect and sometimes infamous social conditions. His influence not only emanated from his wonderful books but from Oxford. He moved the entire nation and not least those who pretended to believe that his economics were all wrong. F. Denison Maurice and he in their several ways worked wonders, but it is wrong to attribute too much to their efforts, since the people were alive at last to their wrongs and the neglect (one main root of the whole matter) of their interests by local authorities. Ruskin saw the coming of new sanitary conditions when the Local Government Act of 1888 and the London Act of 1891 became law, and he almost saw the great Education Act of 1902. He died at Coniston at the age of eighty in 1900. Mr. Whitehouse supplies his edition of these welcome letters not only with six reproductions of drawings by Ruskin and a hitherto unpublished portrait in crayons of Ruskin in 1864 by Samuel Laurence, but with a most attractive and enthusiastic introduction and a valuable chart of Ruskin's times.

* * *

SIR SIDNEY LEE.*

This invaluable selection of the late Sir Sidney's Lee's lectures and essays comes at a fitting time since, as Dr. Boas points out, a new phase of Shakespearean textual criticism has opened and there is a tendency to forget among the younger folk of textual critics the immense service that Lee has rendered to the world which thinks about Shakespeare the man and Shakespeare the writer, and to the world of letters generally. Lee, though not indifferent to the textual criticism, so to speak, of the Shakespearean text, never specialised in the subject and once he wrote ironically "it is then in Shakespeare's 'stops' that we must seek for the final proof of

* *Elizabethan and Other Essays*, by Sir Sidney Lee. Selected and edited by Frederick S. Boas. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 18s. net.

his dramatic genius." Dr. Boas says on this point, "thus some of his younger contemporaries were alienated, and tended to depreciate or ignore his services to Elizabethan scholarship."

The textual criticism has, of course, its uses, but it is in the higher criticism of Shakespeare's work that Lee shone, and not for the first time since the Renaissance have textual and higher criticism come to blows. Lee agreed with Browning's view of Shakespeare and did not agree with Emerson's view. In the brilliant essay on "Shakespeare's Art" Lee says, with his own quiet humour:

The external evidence reveals a genial, business-like man, working rapidly and methodically; a modest man, not overrating his own achievement at his friends' expense; one who outwardly betrayed sympathy with normal middle-class interests or ideals. Robert Browning, among literary men of the Victorian era, was in these regards not unlike Shakespeare. Browning in social intercourse proved, as a consequence, something of a disappointment to ecstatic worshippers.

Lovers of old books will have a new joy given to them on reading Lee on the subject of Shakespeare and the Inquisition. Shortly before the war there was lent to Lee the actual Second Folio (of 1632) which "underwent near the date of publication the strange experience of official expurgation under the authority of the Spanish Inquisition." It had been brought to England for valuation on behalf of the English College at Valladolid, and to the library there after a brief snatch of free English air it has returned to continue some three centuries' sleep. The English College was founded by Father Parsons in 1589 and it was the refuge of English Catholics on the march. In the year 1632, the year of the publication of the Second Folio, eleven new students, greatly daring, went forth to the College from England, nine followed in 1634, and ten in 1636. One or other of these carried the Folio and put it beside Froissart. But it had to meet first the Spanish Inquisition. Cervantes "circulated without hindrance," and why not Shakespeare? The licence of the Holy Office appears on the title-page, but "it was subjected to the minor penalty only of expurgation" which duly and kindly was carried out by a Jesuit named Guillén Sanchez, the forerunner of Mr. Bowdler of the nineteenth century. Strangely enough there is a First Folio also in Spain carried thither in 1622 by the famous Count de Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador in England. It remained in the library of the Gondomar family until 1873, when it passed by gift to the royal family of Spain. The manuscript marginal comments should be published. Lee notices that after 1650 another copy of the Second Folio was acquired by King Louis XIV's librarian for the Royal Library at Paris. It is now at the Bibliothèque Nationale.

There are various other papers of deep interest reprinted and lovers of Italy will specially admire them, but of one series of essays some special words must be said. These are lectures given in America, and not less interesting is the paper entitled "The Example of Spain" in which Lee defined "what Shakespeare and his contemporaries knew of the New World; to track their information to its source and to suggest something of the influence which the knowledge exerted on the current thought and feeling of the Old World." It is the first four essays which were written in 1907 and reprinted from *Scribner's Magazine*, and are reprinted in book form here for the first time. These essays do not go further than the year 1607. Dr. Boas says of them:

The papers cover the activities in North and South America of England, France and Spain till the beginning of the Stuart period. And in the first paper, "The Example of Spain," Lee pays a fervent tribute to Castilian enterprise and valour in the western hemisphere, and insists on "Spain's priority as explorer, as scientific navigator, as conqueror, as settler." It was Spain that set the precedent to other European nations of colonial organisation, and they were attracted by "the pregnant and pervasive force" of her example. France was the first to follow in her wake, though, as is set forth in the paper "The Teaching of the Huguenots," she struck out with original ideas of her own. To the French, and especially to the Huguenots flying from persecution, the New World appeared as the "unfettered land of freedom," and in the native communities they looked to find the innocence of the primeval golden age. *The Tempest*, according to the view set forth in the paper on "The American Indian in Elizabethan England," provided in the picture of Caliban and otherwise an ironical comment on such visions.

Dr. Boas suggests, and rightly, that Lee "is too insistent on the gloomier sides of English overseas activities in the sixteenth century," and adds, "since he wrote in 1907, it has been proved that as early as 1516-17 an English expedition was organised to go in quest of the 'new found lands.'" It is true that the expedition failed through mutiny, but John Rastell the printer and dramatist, who was one of the "venturers" gives the real ideals of England:

O, what a thyng had be than,
Yf that they that be Englyshe men
Myght have been the furst of all
That there shulde have take possessyon,
And made furst buyldynge and habytacion,
A memory perpetuall.

However, Dr. Boas, despite his criticism of Lee's gloomy generalisations, says that these four papers render "in broad and effective sweep the splendid epic of European adventure and endurance in the New World which was the counterpart of its mighty

achievements in poetry, drama, and the pictorial arts." This is a deserved and epigrammatic recognition of a scholar whose work is certainly destined to live long and not only by association with the name of Shakespeare.

* * *

THE HISTORY OF THE EDUCATION OF ENGLISH GIRLS.*

Mrs. Gardiner's laborious work on the study of the development of education for women in England from Saxon times to the nineteenth century ought to have been noticed before. However, the work will be a standard one, stimulating new research, and the field that it covers may conveniently be noted now. Mrs. Gardiner's first point is that there are to be found in the great Christian Fathers standards for girlhood and womanhood which indicate "an ideal type of womanhood and outline a type of instruction which, modified but never superseded, has influenced the upbringing of English girls, of indeed the girlhood of most European countries, to the present day." This is a most important basis and it must be kept in mind to-day, when there is more freedom for the life of womanhood, in England and America at any rate, than at any other time in the history of the world. Perhaps St. Jerome and those who echoed his opinions in the Middle Ages and the late Renaissance, such as Guido de Colonna and Vives, went too far in the limitations which they deliberately placed on the freedom of girls, and especially in the sphere of art, but it must be remembered that the organisation of public education for girls had made little progress till comparatively late times. The nunnery schools, which Mrs. Gardiner traces back to the fifth century, in their very nature made freedom, as we understand it, impossible, and not less impossible in England than in France. The most that could be done was to add to Christian piety some intellectual and technical knowledge. The Abbess Hild in the seventh century showed what could be done in this way in our Northern England and Hildelith, Abbess of Barking, carried on the work in the South. This teaching was for adult women, but we may surmise that there were schools for girls in the abbeys.

The Palace Schools, such as Charlemagne's, must have had a larger field, since he associated with these "reading-schools for children both of servile and free status" and the English Alcuin played a part in the movement, while there can be no doubt that Theodulf of Orleans in 797, rather earlier, had intro-

* *English Girlhood at School: A Study of Women's Education Through Twelve Centuries*, by Dorothy Gardiner. Oxford University Press. 10s. net.

duced the parochial system of education for children of both sexes. There is no reason to suppose that the parochial system was not followed, in so far as it was possible, in England before Abbot Ælfric at the end of the tenth century translated Theodulf's capitulary. Moreover, King Alfred definitely provided for the establishment of schools for *infantes* of humble birth, though possibly this does not apply to girls. The habit of children of both sexes attending school together was probably well formed before the Conquest, and certainly in the noble class both scholarly and technical education in handicraft, "especially the craft of the needle," was continued throughout Saxon times. Mrs. Gardiner makes an excellent point that the succeeding age of chivalry "tended to unfold the emotional and artistic nature of a girl to a degree that undoubtedly ministered to her happiness." It is unnecessary to adopt Mrs. Gardiner's foreword: "Slender and lacking in depth as were the acquirements of the ages of chivalry." Possibly Miss Waddell would not agree with Mrs. Gardiner on the point. The acquirements of the age of chivalry were both deeper and richer than Mrs. Gardiner thinks.

Possibly it would have been worth while for Mrs. Gardiner to have analysed Domesday Book and the structure of the English land tenure in search of material for educational history. The results would have been fruitful, not only in the general question of education, but the development of the parochial system in its relationship to the manor and therefore to the education of serf children. This is a line which has to be followed. But Mrs. Gardiner follows another and more direct line. She first examines the educational opportunities, before the Black Death, of the girls of the noble and knightly classes, and then deals with the girls of humble origin. The nuns of the Order of Sempringham, says Miss Rose Graham, might have been educating girls who were not intended to become nuns at least till 1223, and certainly women recluses took pupils and perhaps received fees. In France at the end of the thirteenth century schoolmistresses were known. In the opinion of the present writer both sexes attended what we may call the parochial schools. In these schools the 8th Canon of Westminster of the year 1200 forbade the charging of money for the licence to teach, and this was based on an injunction of the great educationist, Pope Alexander III, and would clearly apply to the teaching both of girls and boys. The use of the term schoolmistress was common enough. In Dan Michel's *Ayenbite of Inwyrt*, written in 1340, Avarice is referred to as "the Maystresse that heth zuo greate scole that alle guoth thrin vor to lyerni." In 1404 we get a "magistra scholarum" at Boston, while in 1406 the Statute of Artificers affirms the parental right of sending

girls to school. This indicates some little doubt as to the previous power to send girls to school, but it does not really amount to much. The introduction of English as the medium of teaching immediately after the Black Death must have affected the grammar schools chiefly, but it is interesting to note that at the end of the thirteenth century Lady Dionysia de Monchensy asked Walter de Bibelesworth to write a book, which he duly wrote, with the object of teaching Anglo-Norman to children of gentle birth. The request came from a woman. Mrs. Gardiner says that a century later women "in regard to general estimation were . . . in the trough of the wave." This view seems too generalised. Indeed the amazingly rapid spread of Lollardy after the death of Wyclif seems to have had a great effect upon the studies of women, as Mrs. Gardiner duly notes, while Lady Paston represented a widespread type of competent middle-class educated women.

The coming of the printing press almost coincides with an age when more or less learned women gave their patronage to education, and the records consulted by Mrs. Gardiner show that there were many books, printed or unprinted, that especially appealed to women and are duly recorded as the property of women. Culture certainly existed in the last century of what we call the Middle Ages. The middle classes in that century, the century of rich merchants, were provided with schools and tutors for their girls, and tutelage, or boarding out, did not only consist of learning to knit and observing good manners. The nunnery schools still existed and they taught Latin to the end of the fifteenth century, though perhaps not long after that date. Mrs. Gardiner is specially interesting in her section on "The Renaissance and the Education of Women" and particularly in the passages relating to Italy and Spain. The feeling in England may be summarised in the phrase of Sir Thomas More, that learning seemed to bind him to his children "more straitly than nearness of blood." Among families of position the lead of the English universities for the education of men was followed with respect to the girls, and no better account of the movement begun by More is to be had than that given by Mrs. Gardiner. It is true that material is plentiful, but the author has made the best use of it. Mrs. Gardiner sees a decline in the age of Elizabeth, but this is not wholly in accord with the views of Mulcaster.

The seventeenth century was the period of gradual decline despite the fact that the boarding school for girls became an educational force. We are told that "the first 'public school' for girls of which any record can be found was the Ladies' Hall at Deptford, patronised by the daughters of the nobility and gentry." This, of

course, was due to the proximity of the Court at Greenwich, but such schools multiplied. The full accounts of these schools and of the general aspects of seventeenth-century education are important. The question of the education of the poorer girls is probably more important, however, than the education of the rich. The Statute of Apprentices of 1563 was meant to secure education and technical knowledge for the people. The most important chapter, in some ways, in Mrs. Gardiner's very able book deals with the apprenticeship of girls in various areas, first before the Reformation from the thirteenth century, and secondly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It represents long and laborious research and much of the material is new even to the educational expert. The chapters on the girls' charity schools, on the eighteenth-century boarding school and eighteenth-century education for girls as a whole, are most interesting and make a necessary prologue to the slow revival of education for girls and women in the nineteenth century. The book as an entity must charm the reader with its appreciation of early culture, with its wide grasp of educational opportunities in the days of the English renaissance, and in the painful research needed to show the transition from ages of romance to the hard grip of the industrial revolution. There are many special problems still unsolved, but, as in every good book, the inducement to solve them is created.

J. E. G. DE M.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Zehn Jahre Versailles,* edited by Dr. Schnee, ex-Governor of German East Africa, and Dr. Draeger, is a valuable collection of monographs on the political and economic consequences of the Treaty of Versailles and on the grounds for its revision. The Preface explains the purpose of the book and reveals the spirit of indignant protest by which it is inspired. All the political confusions of the last ten years, we are told, all the material privations, all the spiritual troubles which have afflicted the German people trace back to that evil day, June 28, 1919, when the dictated peace was imposed upon them by force and threats. Some English readers may be tempted to reflect that Germany's sufferings were ultimately due not so much to the Treaty of Versailles as to her declaration of war against Russia and France and the invasion of Belgium in 1914; for the humiliating peace was the result of the lost war, and the war itself, though not desired by Germany, might have been averted by her statesmen. French readers, again, would doubtless maintain that the ultimate cause of the troubles of 1919-29 was the Treaty of Frankfurt in 1871. Opinions, however, naturally differ according to our standpoints. The Editors go on to explain that they have no desire to reopen old wounds, but merely to point out the devastating

* Brückenverlag. Berlin. Two volumes. 1929.

operation of the Treaty in the ten years of peace, from which Germany has been the chief, but by no means the sole sufferer; for the recovery of Europe has also been retarded. The volumes are intended, above all, for the German people, as an aid in the endeavour to strengthen their national consciousness and to recover their spiritual and material power, in order to take part in the international struggle for the peaceful revision of the Treaty. The campaign is still in its infancy, for Germany has not yet regained full recognition as an equal and sovereign great power. This trumpet call is followed by instructive chapters on the grounds and the movement for revision by Dr. Marx, Dr. Schnee, and other specialists, dealing with the relation of the Treaty to the Fourteen Points, the crazy demand for the wholesale extradition of "War Criminals," the charges of barbarity in waging war and governing colonies, and the accusation of sole responsibility for the catastrophe. The second half of the first volume analyses the economic consequences of the Treaty—the diminution of Germany's economic power, the paralysis of her foreign trade, the inter-nationalisation of her waterways, and above all the long and complicated issue of Reparations. The second volume is concerned with the political consequences of the treaty. The opening chapter, summarising the losses of territory, the limitation of armed forces and other diminutions of sovereignty, is followed by a discussion of the treatment of German property abroad and of colonial claims. The later and larger part of the volume is devoted to the tasks of the League of Nations—arbitration, disarmament, the mandate system, the conditions of labour, economic and intellectual co-operation. The third volume, edited by Karl V. Loesch and Max Boehm, deals with the fortunes of the territories which Germany was compelled to cede, and forms a very useful contribution to the history and problem of minorities.

* * *

The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1928-29, edited by Dr. S. G. Owen* for the Council of the Classical Association (the twenty-second year of issue), includes articles on Roman Law and Comparative Philology, subjects that "have not been treated recently." Roman Law is dealt with by the very competent hand of Professor de Zulueta, of Oxford, who says that the last survey was made in 1920, covering 1918-20, and that it is impossible to make up lost ground. In fact he covers a great deal of ground in discussing foreign and English papers on the subject. The Cyrenean inscriptions of Augustus have been dealt with by J. Stroux and L. Wenger, V. Arangio-Ruiz, V. Groh and H. Malcovati. The latter in the second edition of his *Cæsar's Augusti Imperatoris operum fragmenta* prints these edicts from Cyrene, "though unfortunately," says Mr. Hugh Last, "without the Sc. Calvisianum." Mr. Last also says that "D. Macfadyen tries to deny that the edicts prove Augustus to have exercised an *imperium majus* over the public provinces." Professor Zulueta notes the edition by Fritz Schultz of the so-called *Regulæ* of Ulpian. Both Schultz and Lenel agree that it is not by Ulpian. A new Oxyrhynchus fragment of Gaius has been published by Kubler in a supplement to his edition of Gaius. Wlassak's new work on Roman procedure is favourably noticed. "Wlassak insists that the draft pleadings

* Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith Ltd. 3s. 6d. net.

proceeded from the parties, or rather their jurists, and not from the prætor. Thus the development of the edict was the work of jurisprudence." Dr. Cary in his attractive article on Greek history notes the death of K. J. Beloch, "a bold critic of early Greek tradition and a pioneer in the writing of Hellenistic history. This scholar's last articles, written at the age of eighty, retain all their characteristic vigour and directness of argument." Dr. Cary notes that "with the help of the new chronological text from Oxyrhynchus, W. S. Ferguson has subjected Athenian history in the early third century to a thorough reconstruction, with the result that the usurpation of Lachares must now be dated back to 300 B.C." Dr. Giles in his paper on Comparative Philology seems to show that a good deal of dust is blowing about on the subject of the history of the Indo-European languages and of languages so old that they must be called new. Professor Fraser has been smiting Dr. Herman Hirt on the one subject, while Forrer, Friedrich, and Götze are plunged in battle on Hittite inscriptions.

* * *

The second and revised edition of Mr. H. G. Spearing's invaluable book entitled *The Childhood of Art or the Ascent of Man: a sketch of the vicissitudes of his upward struggles, based chiefly on the relics of his artistic work in prehistoric times** is very welcome. The work was first published in 1912 and since then, as Mr. Spearing says, "there have been notable archaeological discoveries in many parts of the world," but not sufficient to make it necessary to reconstruct any part of the treatise. In fact they have added details, whether in Spain, Greece, Egypt, the Babylonian area, Persia, Baluchistan, the Indus area, and China, which emphasise the value of the original work. Mr. Spearing notes in his preface one small but important fact, the discovery by Mr. Woolley at Ur of a figurine of an ass. The date is about 3500 B.C. Before this "no representation of an ass in the round had been discovered in any part of the ancient world, although wall paintings of that animal are to be seen in early Egyptian tombs." The point of interest seems to be that the horse as a beast of burden must be dated within the second millennium before our era, and the rareness of images of the ass seems to show that neither ass nor horse were beasts of burden before, at any rate, the year 2000 B.C. This point is not made by Mr. Spearing, but it is a likely deduction from the scanty presentation of the ass. The ass was evidently not at Ur or Kish a beast of burden, but a beast of worship. The first volume deals with palæolithic and later work, the second with Chaldean, Cretan, and Greek Art. The chapters dealing with advanced Greek Art are excellent, and show the place of art in the advancement of the human spirit from apparently small beginnings.

* * *

Miss Henrietta Busk, the well-known educationist, is to be congratulated on the brief but valuable record which she has published under the title of *The Pioneer Work of the Teachers' Guild of Great Britain and Ireland 1883-1920*. The Education Guild (as it had been called since 1922) was wound up last year, having seen accom-

* Ernest Benn Ltd. Two volumes. 42s. net.

plished its two great goals, the registration of teachers and the organisation of national education under the Education Act, 1918. The Guild had done nearly half a century of earnest, noble work. As early as 1875 an Education Society was founded for the discussion of problems, and by 1883 it became clear that it was desirable to form "some central authority or corporate union such as every other profession possesses." Thus a Guild came into existence "to promote the welfare and independence of Teachers, and by means of an organisation to create a closer bond upon the broad lines of agreement which underlies all grades of the Profession." The Guild was perhaps the first body to recognise that Teaching is a profession, and as a profession must be organised and controlled. The prime movers were Miss F. M. Buss, Miss M. M. Blackmore, Miss E. Connolly, Miss F. Hadland, Mr. Francis Storr and Mr. Courthope H. Bowen. The first president, elected by the members of the Guild in February 1884, was Dr. Percival, then head master of Rugby, and there was a noble list of vice-presidents including Mr. A. J. Mundella, Rev. Brooke Lambert (Vicar of Greenwich), Dr. R. W. Dale, Professor Dowden, Canon Farrar, Sir Joshua Fitch, Professor Huxley, Lord Leighton, Dr. Magrath (still happily with us), Dr. H. J. Roby, Professor Henry Sidgwick, Miss Welch, and Miss Wordsworth. In Buckingham Street for six years the Guild carried on its many activities and established registries for men and women teachers. The Guild was incorporated in 1885, and branches were started, fifty in all. In 1887 Mr. Herbert B. Garrod became secretary and held the post almost up to the date of his death in 1912, with wonderful and inspiring success in the great efforts made by the Guild in the regions of the registration of teachers and of education reform. Miss Busk gives full details of those activities, a record which is part of the history of English education through an anxious half-century of national life. The educational historian must possess this little book, copies of which may be obtained of Miss Busk at 14 Taviton Street, W.C.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Memoir by Sir H. D. Rolleston of that eminent man and physician Sir Thomas Clifford Allbutt* must have been a difficult task, since Allbutt "kept very few letters, did not write a diary or leave any unpublished reminiscences, and very few of his early contemporaries are now alive." He was born at Dewsbury, in Yorkshire, on July 20th, 1836, and Sir Humphry Rolleston says that his life falls into three main divisions—early life and education, until he started practice in Leeds (1836-61); life as a hospital physician and consultant in Leeds, terminating with three years as a Commissioner in Lunacy, when he lived in London (1861-92); and the last thirty-two years as Regius Professor of Physic at Cambridge (1892-1925). The Memoir of this remarkable man—the "wonderfully consistent energy, versatility, wide sympathies, and scholarly culture of this leader of his profession"—traces in detail his professorial life, his steady influence on lay opinion, and his all-embracing humanism.

* Macmillan. 15s. net.

The book entitled "One of Ten by Number Nine"* is quite charming in its unconventional record of a singularly happy family life, every chapter of which is in a sense, or often actually, something complete in itself, as in the description of sports and outdoor pleasures dealing with horses, dogs, shooting, rowing, fishing, gardening, even golfing. The literary *format* which Mr. Archibald Allen has conceived is almost unique, entirely simple, and quite convincing. There is something for everyone who has any consciousness of the true significance of family life. It is difficult to choose, but many readers will love the chapter "How I spent Uncle George's Money," since it shows that the writer at the age of nineteen was just as simple in matters of business (dear Uncle George!) as he is in his method of style a very great many years later. The eldest brother is responsible for the sketches that illustrate the book, as irresponsible and delightful as the text. There is only one fault with the book, its price. A cheap edition would find a ready market.

* * *

"Daguerreotypes"† by Ada Wallas (Mrs. Graham Wallas) consists of nine delightful sketches of the life of a middle-class nonconformist family sixty years ago. The sketches of the many characters are drawn with a clear distinctness which makes them live again; the grandfather with his strict religious views mingled with great kindness of heart; the little dressmaker who looked on the Family as a god, and yet was filled with a shrewd commonsense; the ladies who kept a small select school to eke out their meagre income, are only a few of the delightful people to be met in this little book. The reader's only regret is that the book is all too short, and it would be interesting to hear how the new High School progressed and what people thought of it when the first aversion against it was over.

* * *

A little book devoted to the cooking and serving of green vegetables has recently been written by Mrs. Philip Martineau. She is obviously an expert on the subject. In "Cantaloupe to Cabbage"‡ the reader will find a short thesis on the preparation of "the kindly fruits of the earth," followed by over a hundred pages full of recipes, many of which are declared to be quite new. The average individual must be surprised to realise that there are several hundred ways of serving foods which are often condemned as plain and dull. But the fact remains that the eating of green food is considered essential by the medical profession, especially among children. "Looking back to one's own childhood, it is surprising to see the amount of vegetables thought necessary for children to-day," and for adults too for that matter. Part of the *chef's* art is to create an appetite for the ordinary and essential foods, and Mrs. Martineau is helping him in his task. But when all is said and done, vegetables are by their nature generally plain and auxiliary dishes, though, often, potatoes have made a full meal. Green food is most enjoyable as well as being most beneficial when not contaminated by adulterous ingredients which destroy their purity and food value.

* Ernest Benn Ltd. 10s. 6d. net.

† Allen & Unwin Ltd. 5s. net.

‡ Cobden-Sanderson. 7s. net.

THE NAVAL CONFERENCE AND AFTER.*

IN the invitation to the Five Powers His Majesty's Government explained that the Conference was summoned to consider the categories not covered by the Washington Treaty, as well as changes that might be necessary in that Treaty itself; the object being to facilitate the task of the League's Preparatory Commission in preparing the draft convention for the world conference for the limitation and reduction of armaments. This should be borne in mind in estimating the value of any agreement resulting from the Conference.

Official summaries, or memoranda, of the views of each of the Five Powers were published in the early days of the Conference, all of them unanimous in expressing the hope that its primary purpose might be achieved, viz. prevention of competition and reduction consistent with national security, implying thereby the reduction and limitation in cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, submarines, and auxiliary craft, and a reconsideration of present battleship strength and replacement. Certain points referred to in these memoranda may be specially mentioned and are quoted here against the country's name.

Great Britain. (a) In estimating its naval needs the Government must take into account its obligations under the Covenant, partly offset by the security afforded by its provision of mutual support. (b) The resulting agreement should run until 1936, and in 1935 a further conference should be called.

France. (a) A statement of the proposed strength of the French fleet in 1936 showing a considerable increase on existing figures. (b) A declaration that armed conflict with the U.S.A. or Great Britain is "unthinkable." (c) Readiness to consider favourably any form of agreement for a mutual guarantee of security enabling the absolute requirements of each Power to be transformed into relative requirements. (d) Any decision in London should be correlated with the problem of the limitation of land and air armaments.

Italy. (a) Prepared to accept any limit, however low, provided it be not exceeded by any other Continental European Power. (b) Reduction of armaments is the natural outcome of the Covenant and the Kellogg Pact, and the means by which nations can show the value they attach to these treaties and prove their loyalty to the pledges given.

Following on these memoranda the Conference got to work on the main questions, the result of the discussions being noted below so far as they are known at present. For though the final results will be given full publicity the discussions throughout have been

* This article was written before the publication of the full official statement of results.

almost exclusively in private, contrary to the procedure followed by the Preparatory Commission at Geneva, which sits with open doors (a practice which has much to commend it). The main questions discussed appear to be the same as those referred to in my article on the "Prospect of the Conference," published in the January number of this REVIEW, and are mentioned here in the same order.

I. *Method of total tonnage limitation.*

On this point it seems probable that an adjustment will be accepted between the French "compromise" proposal and the British counter-suggestion, viz. the division of ships into five or six categories with a certain definite tonnage for each as follows: (1) capital ships, (2) aircraft carriers, (3) cruisers with guns over six inches, and cruisers with six-inch guns and below, (4) destroyers, (5) submarines, and possibly, (6) special vessels.

Transfers to be allowed from one category to another except in the case of the first two, and a year's notice to other Powers whenever the right is exercised.

II. (a) *Postponement of replacement of existing capital ships.*

(b) *Reduction in size and armament of future capital ships.*

Regarding (a), the postponement of replacement means a saving to this country of £51 millions (First Lord of the Admiralty, January 29th). A further economy, i.e. in upkeep of existing ships, will probably also be achieved, for whereas according to the Washington Treaty the battleship strengths (which to-day stand at 20, 18, and 12 for Great Britain, U.S.A., and Japan respectively) were to be reduced to 15, 15, and 9 by 1936, it is now proposed that the lower figures be achieved at once by scrapping all in excess. As regards (b) it appears that a reduction in size to a maximum of 25,000 tons will be accepted, and a reduction of the largest guns from sixteen inches to fourteen inches or twelve inches. The age limit however is apparently to remain at twenty years. The British memorandum expressed a desire to see the battleship disappear altogether, as being a very doubtful proposition in view of its size and cost and the development of air and submarine attack. Italy expressed her willingness to examine abolition favourably; French opinion also appears to be favourable, but the U.S.A. and Japan doubtful. In view of the above opinions it may be remarked that the present battleship strengths might well have been further reduced to 10, 10, and 6 without loss in security, and the size and armament of the future capital ship reduced to a figure very much lower than the 25,000 tons and fourteen-inch gun now proposed. It is not necessary to repeat the arguments in support of this further reduction,

arguments which are unanswerable provided the lower limits are universally accepted. There is no other action that would result in such great economies and so materially reduce the burden of naval armaments, and as agreement has now been reached to postpone replacement of capital ships, at any rate until 1936, it is much to be hoped that by that date a considerably lower figure than 25,000 tons will be accepted.

III. *Abolition or reduction of the submarine.*

The proposal for abolition urged by the British and American delegations and supported by Italy was opposed by France and Japan principally on the grounds (a) that the submarine is a defensive weapon, (b) of the right of smaller naval Powers to possess vessels corresponding to their requirements, and (c) that the submarine is regarded by Japan as the most convenient means of defending the waterways of her many scattered islands. In default of abolition Britain and America pressed for limitation to the lowest possible size, as a result of which it is understood that two classes have now been accepted, (1) submarines over 2,000 tons and (2) those of 2,000 tons and less. In the first class the number is to be limited to three for any one Power with a unit displacement not exceeding 2,800 tons, and a maximum calibre of gun of six inches. In the second class the maximum total tonnage only is mentioned and a maximum calibre of gun of five inches. Further, all parties agreed to make the submarine subject to strict control by law, in other words, to humanise its use. These results can only be described as most disappointing, though not unexpected. The French argument that the submarine is a defensive weapon could easily be controverted and in any case cannot apply to the larger size she demands. In fact the term "defensive" applied to any armaments is purely arbitrary, depending entirely on the circumstances of the moment. As however both France and Japan were resolute against abolition, reduction and limitation both in size and numbers was the only alternative, but it is greatly to be regretted that a very much more drastic limitation both in size and number has not apparently been obtained, especially as any increase in submarine tonnage of one Power may materially affect the destroyer tonnage of the others.

IV. *Determination of ratios of strength, and*

V. *Determination of the tonnage allowed for each Power.*

On these two questions, the most important of all and rightly described by Italy as fundamental, discussion quickly revealed divergence on the all-important matter of security, with the result that a Five-Power agreement is not yet obtainable. The problem of relative strengths can never, of course, be solved by

formulae because, as Mr. Norman Angell has pointed out,* you are dealing with factors of power (trade routes, naval bases, mercantile marine, coaling stations, etc.) which it is impossible to equate. The question is fundamentally a political one. The basis of any reduction must be the Covenant (as regards members of the League) and the Peace Pact, and armaments are the measure of the extent to which nations in fact regard these treaties as giving them the security they desire. Judged by this standard the results are disappointing. Here in fact are Five Powers who have all solemnly renounced war as an instrument of national policy, each (or four of them at any rate) urgently in need of money for peaceful development, all of them burdened with war debts, faced with a world expenditure on armaments of £900 million a year (50 per cent. of which was spent in Europe)† and yet unable to reach a complete and inclusive agreement permitting a really effective all-round reduction in armaments.

No wonder that the "man in the street" is puzzled. You and the rest of the world, he reflects, have pledged yourselves to settle no dispute in future except by peaceful means, and yet you find it impossible to reach a general agreement to reduce your armaments. Who then is the enemy you fear? There has been no answer to that question. All declare their pacific intentions and emphasise the defensive nature of their respective armaments. Great Britain and America agree that war between them is out of the question. France is "happy to declare her profound conviction that armed conflict with the U.S.A. and the British Empire is equally unthinkable,"‡ and that her naval programme corresponds with a strictly defensive policy in conformity with the Covenant and the Peace Pact. Italy considers reduction of naval armaments to be the natural outcome of the same international agreements, and that it is by reduction that nations can show the value they attach to the treaties and prove their loyalty to the pledge they have given. Armaments, she considers, should be exclusively defensive. Japan only desires the force necessary for her national defence in Far Eastern waters. Similarly also Great Britain and America have repeatedly declared their naval strength to be measured by the requirements for defence of sea-borne commerce. So armaments are declared by all to be only for defence, though as already noted they must be aware that the term "defensive" merely confuses the issue, as all armaments *can* be used offensively, and it is just that fear of their being so used that troubles them all. Italy, for instance, emphasises her dependence upon her maritime communications

* *Foreign Affairs*, April.

† Mr. Snowden, February 9th, 1930.

‡ French Memorandum, February 13th.

for three-fourths of the imports essential to the life of her population, and France the protection of her colonies and overseas trade of £260 millions. All have in mind the fear of attack. But by whom? It might be concluded from this that each Power would be most concerned about the armaments which are *superior* to their own, but this is not so. For instance, what appears to concern France and Italy most is not their marked inferiority to the strongest naval Powers, but the question of their strength relative to each other. A pretty muddle indeed, and yet it should be apparent to all that the danger from any would-be aggressor would be lessened, and not increased, by a proportionate reduction all round, a self-evident fact which was strongly emphasised by Mr. Gibson of the United States at Geneva in 1927. "Even if the danger of war is admitted," he declared, "it would be guarded against just as well by maintenance of relative strengths at low levels as at higher levels."

What then stands in the way of an immediate proportionate reduction amongst the Five Powers? America we know will reduce to any level provided it is not lower than the strongest naval Power. Italy will accept any figure, no matter how low, provided it is not exceeded by France, and France, in the words of the French memorandum of February 13th, "would never be alarmed to see the U.S. or Great Britain either reduce or increase in order to reach agreement." Consequently it might be inferred that the reduction by the British Empire to a minimum of fifty cruisers and the cancelling of about 60,000 tons from our projected building programme,* would have resulted in a considerable reduction in the French building programme. Unfortunately, however, that has not been the case, in fact the very reverse. France will not reduce without further guarantees of security, and claims in any case superiority to Italy outside the Mediterranean. These two questions are the chief obstacle in the way of a Five-Power agreement, the French views on security and the relative strengths of France and Italy. In respect to the latter negotiations are to be continued between the two countries and ourselves after the adjournment of the present Conference, therefore no useful purpose would be served in discussing it further here. But the French desire for further guarantees of security involves the whole question of sanctions under the Covenant and the extent of the commitment, or obligations, of its signatories under Article 16, and is a matter of first importance. By Article 8 of the Covenant its member States are pledged to a general reduction of armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety *and* the enforcement by common action of international obligations, in other words

* Total tonnage cancelled since January 1st, 1928 (First Lord of Admiralty in Parliament, March 12th).

by collective action against the treaty breaker. This was declared by the unanimous resolution of the eighth Assembly of the League of Nations to be the principal condition of success in the reduction of armaments, namely, "that every state should be sure of not having to provide unaided for its security by means of its own armaments, and should be able to rely also on . . . organised collective action, which should aim chiefly at forestalling or arresting any resort to war." And by Article 16 of the Covenant the Council has to recommend the forces which member states shall severally contribute to protect the Covenants of the League. The interpretation placed on this obligation was unanimously and clearly stated by the Allies in an annex (F) of the Locarno Treaty, namely, "that each state member of the League is bound to co-operate loyally and effectively in support of the Covenant, and in resistance to any act of aggression, to an extent which is compatible with its military situation and takes its geographical position into account."

Although this seems clear enough the application of sanctions generally, and in particular Great Britain's commitments under the Covenant, have recently been questioned in the Press, and collective action is condemned as contrary to the spirit of the Peace Pact. "Making war," it is said, "to stop war." It has even been suggested that as the Peace Pact renounces war (except for defence) all other signatories should remain neutral in the event of the Pact being broken. Also the provisions of Article 16 are described as cumbrous and obsolete (*Observer*, April 6th), and as committing the country to unknown obligations, involving, as a Member of Parliament put it, the use or possible use of the British fleet in other people's wars. These questions are of first importance, especially as regards disarmament, and they can be answered as follows:

1. The Pact does not cancel the Covenant. We have accepted its obligations, and no Government would shirk its responsibilities for the maintenance of world peace. "There can be no question of any modification of the League Covenant" (*Times*, April 2nd). Party leaders have said the same thing, as for instance Sir Austen Chamberlain's emphatic declarations at the eighth Assembly of the League in 1927: "We have," he said, "accepted all the obligations of the Covenant which are common to us all, and I beg you, I implore you with all the earnestness in my power, not to cast doubt on the extent or sacredness of the obligation which we all have signed."

2. The use of the British fleet without the consent of the British Government is a question which can never arise, and to suggest it is completely to misrepresent the nature of our obligations under Article 16. The recommendation of the Council (as to the use of

armed force) must be unanimous, and as Great Britain is a permanent member of the Council there can be no use of the British fleet (or any other arm) without the consent of the British Government.

3. If collective action to forestall or arrest resort to war (i.e. action against the Law Breaker) is wrong, what is the alternative? If nations cannot rely on collective action if attacked, can they be expected to reduce their armaments? We have to face the fact that until armaments have been much more drastically reduced the *only* alternative to organised collective action is for every nation to depend on its own strength alone. Each would then seek preponderance of power, with the inevitable consequence of a renewed competition in armaments, which none can afford, and war.

Critics of Article 16 argue that moral persuasion would suffice; that nothing is less likely than that any single country by flagrant aggression will defy all the rest of the League and all world opinion. But surely such defiance would be much more likely if the would-be aggressor knew it would only have to deal with the other party to the dispute, and that all other member states would remain neutral. Yet though no appreciable reduction of armaments can be expected, in the writer's opinion, unless every state is sure of not having to provide unaided for its security by means of its own armaments, it does not follow that organised collective action necessarily implies the use of force by the League. It is important to note the wording of the unanimous resolution of the eighth Assembly already quoted, namely, "that organised collective action should aim chiefly at *forestalling* any resort to war." That is, that the first step for collective action in case of emergency should be a joint conference, a method of implementing the Peace Pact which should be accepted as absolutely essential. It is in fact the method envisaged by Article 11 of the Covenant to "Safeguard the peace of nations," and which appears likely also to receive the support of America, judging by the suggestion in Mr. Hoover's Armistice Day address that "the Peace Pact might be implemented by joint conference in case of crisis in order that action may be stayed and the aggressor subjected to the searchlight of public opinion." The question appears to have received the support of the American delegation at the Conference on the understanding that it should not be raised until a Five-Power agreement has been reached, the U.S. being "determined her action (as regards Conference) should not be regarded as a *quid pro quo* for reduction by any other Power" (Mr. Stimson, March 25th).

It therefore appears that the belief that the problem of reduction of armaments could only be solved if considered in

relation to the Covenant and the Peace Pact has been fully justified and confirmed by the discussions of the last three months. Any agreement for reduction is only possible if based on these two treaties and the loyal observance of them by *all* signatories. A Five-Power agreement covering all the points referred to will not be achieved at present, but the capital ship and submarine proposals are accepted by all, and a complete agreement has been reached between the U.S., Great Britain, and Japan including all categories of vessels. It is certainly a great achievement that the three greatest naval powers in the world have come to an agreement, acceptable to all of them, limiting the number and types of warships of all kinds to be built during the next five years, and eliminating any competitive naval construction between them. The approximate tonnage figures of the three Powers, *for cruisers only*, are given below.* This agreement is the supreme fact of the Conference and meanwhile negotiations are to be continued between France, Italy, and ourselves to come to an agreement in unison with that of the Three-Power Pact. It remains to consider our own position in relation to other Powers as affected by this new agreement, especially with reference to certain criticisms directed against the Government's decision to accept fifty cruisers as the maximum for our needs after taking into account the measure of security afforded by the signature of the Pact of Paris and its obligations under the Covenant, partly offset as they are "by the security afforded under the Covenant by its provision of mutual support."† This measure of security and the provision of mutual support are the very essence of the matter, for the argument stated in the January number of this REVIEW (previously referred to) cannot be too often emphasised, namely, that having accepted parity with the United States we have not (and cannot expect to have again) a dominating superiority of naval force that would ensure the security of our sea-borne commerce under the conditions affecting international trade to-day if engaged in "private" war. The security afforded under the Covenant must be taken into account. As a matter of fact, once the days of "splendid isolation" were passed we have always relied on some form of mutual support, and a comparison of relative cruiser strengths to-day with that before the last war is therefore instructive.

In 1914 we had approximately one hundred and ten cruisers including some of very small fighting value, and the rest of the world one hundred and sixty-three. The probable enemy then was the Triple Alliance with seventy-one, giving us a

	British Empire	American	Japan
* Total cruiser tonnage	339,000	323,500	208,850
† British Memorandum of February 7th.			

relative strength of 1.55 to 1. This superiority was quite insufficient without the help of our probable friends—the Triple Entente—and so, as is well known, we disposed our fleets with their co-operation and support in view, and with Japan as an almost certain ally. (Our battle fleet, for instance, was withdrawn from the Mediterranean and our battleships from the Far East.) What is the situation to-day? Counting only cruisers actually completed we have fifty-four* as against eighty-eight* for the rest of the world, a striking all-round reduction compared to 1914, the corresponding cruiser strength for the other four chief naval powers being U.S.A. sixteen,† Japan twenty-nine,† France fourteen,† and Italy twelve.† Who is the probable enemy to-day? There is no naval alliance to consider. War with the U.S.A. can be ruled out, and the same should apply to Japan, for the simple reason that it would be impossible for either of us to bring such a war to a definite conclusion. But whoever the possible enemy may be we must again take into account, as in 1914, the co-operation and support of our probable friends, and in 1930 it is not the Entente we look to but the League. The Government memorandum of February 7th referred to this question of relative strengths in these words: "If naval establishments were not to be a menace, an equilibrium must be established between them through international agreement made for periods at the end of which they should be renewed. The present agreement should run to 1936 and in 1935 a fresh Conference." It has been explained (Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, February 13th) that our own reductions are dependent on adequate limitations of projected building programmes made by other Powers, but being ourselves the strongest naval Power we have been fully justified in setting this example. For, as stated by Mr. Gibson at the Geneva Conference in 1927, "the present deadlock can only be broken by the decision of the Powers possessing the greatest armaments to initiate measures of reduction."

Little in fact will ever be accomplished unless each country is prepared to give practical effect to the words spoken by H.M. the King in his address at the opening of the Conference: "All nations have varying needs demanding special consideration, but if each is equally determined to make some sacrifice as a contribution to the common good I feel sure your deliberations will be crowned with success." Finally it may be repeated that the agreements reached will have to be considered at Geneva not only as regards the naval armament of the other countries not represented at the Conference but also in relation to land and air reductions, and perhaps more particularly to the limitations imposed on Germany, limitations which it would be absurd to

* Figures taken from table of effective fighting ships, *Brassey's Annual*, 1930.
† Some of these are over twenty years.

imagine can be enforced for all time regardless of what is done, or not done, by the rest of the world. No doubt France's immense military superiority ensures for her security at present, but it will be impossible so to maintain it in future without imperilling peace. And the same would apply to any other nation. It is beside the mark to refer to the pre-war days, when it was blindly accepted by all that to maintain peace you must prepare for war. The world has entered definitely on a new way of life, and the League has given practical proof of its efficiency and effectiveness in settling no less than twenty-three international disputes in the last ten years, six of which involved one or more of the Great Powers and in eight of which fighting had actually started. It is therefore of particular importance that the public of all countries should be well informed on all aspects of this question which so closely affects their peace. In the words of M. Briand at the tenth Assembly: "The Peace Pact will mean just what the people choose to make it mean!" And exactly the same might be said of the Covenant. If the people are really concerned about peace, if they really mean business, they can make the Pact and the Covenant the means of ensuring it, and the basis of the drastic all-round reduction of armaments which should naturally follow.

S. R. DRURY-LOWE.

Postscript.—According to the official White Paper (Cmd. 3547), issued since the writing of the above article, the total cruiser tonnage of 339,000 (fifty cruisers) for the British Empire, under the Three-Power agreement, includes fifteen eight-inch gun cruisers, total tonnage 146,800, leaving a balance of 192,200 tons for thirty-five six-inch gun cruisers, an average of approximately 5,500 tons per unit, for this smaller type.

Our present strength of fifty-four cruisers (completed) includes thirty-seven six-inch gun vessels of an average tonnage of 4,400, of which fifteen become due for replacement between now and 1936, allowing twenty years as the age limit.

It will be observed therefore that although our total cruiser strength is to be reduced from fifty-eight (completed and building) to fifty, the average size and power per unit will be increased. The following table* gives the total cruiser tonnage under the Three-Power agreement compared with the present tonnage (completed and projected) for each of the three Powers, allowing twenty years as the age limit.

	British Empire	America	Japan
Present (completed, building, and projected)	363,550	300,500	208,100
Three-Power agreement	339,000	323,500	208,850

* Figures taken from Government Blue Book. Fleets (British and Foreign Countries). January 1930.

FIRST THOUGHTS ON THE NEW HOUSING BILL.

THE most remarkable feature of the debate in the House of Commons on the Second Reading of the new Housing Bill was the general agreement as to the conditions of the housing problem to-day. It was recognised on all sides that the gigantic effort which has been made during the last ten years in building nearly a million and a half houses at a cost of a thousand million pounds and rehousing a fifth of our population had entirely failed to bring any benefit to those who were most in need of help, and that our slums are to-day as grave a reproach to our civilisation as they were at the time of the Armistice. It was also agreed that nothing had been done to diminish overcrowding, and that this was definitely the worst feature of the slums, particularly the fact that in perhaps a quarter of the houses in the poorer areas bedroom accommodation is so lacking that adolescent and adult sons and daughters are forced to share the same room.

But agreement went further than this; not a word of criticism was heard on the Second Reading as to the burden on the Exchequer of the new subsidies proposed by Mr. Greenwood. It is a very encouraging sign to housing reformers that all parties in the House of Commons means business in this matter. It was also agreed that the reason for our failure to deal with the slums was that the rents of the houses which have been built since the war are beyond the reach of slum dwellers. Further, although local authorities have generally passed resolutions in favour of housing large families, those who have administered the letting of the houses have tended to give the first chance to "good" tenants, that is to say, those with a fairly large income and few children. I have recently made an investigation into the average size of the family in municipal houses, and in a number of housing experiments carried out by voluntary societies. These experiments are on a small scale, say from twenty to a hundred houses, and are useful mainly because they are carried out by people who have studied social conditions and are making experiments in letting houses at low rents to large poor families. The result of the investigation was very striking. The size of the family in municipal houses was between four and five, average four and a half. In the case of Manchester I am ashamed to say that it was actually under four. In the voluntary schemes, where the instructions of the committee to house those who needed it most were properly carried out, the number varied between six and eight, the average being over six and a half.

The voluntary societies have succeeded in getting the large fami-

lies, who can only afford eight to ten shillings for a three-bedroomed house, out from the slums; the municipalities, in many cases, have left them there, and have filled their houses rather from the more respectable and richer population of the outer parts of the city. As a concrete illustration of the way in which we have been housing the wrong people, may I cite the following instance. In a house built with the aid of the Wheatley subsidy, let at 13s. 9d. a week, I found a foreman and his wife living with a grown-up son and daughter, both earning. There was as much as £8 a week going into the house. And these people were benefiting by a subsidy of about 4s. a week! I then went to a condemned area in the city and saw the wife of a railway worker who was earning 53s. a week. She had eight boys and a girl, and another child was expected in a month. The two eldest were earning 26s. The total income was just under £4 for eleven people. There were three bedrooms, but it was a very bad house in a court, with one tap for five houses and one water-closet for three families. Rent 5s. 6d. She was a highly respectable woman, and, though it seems almost incredible, the house and the children looked clean and well cared for. She said she could manage quite well now that two children were earning; previously she had to take in a lot of washing in addition to looking after all those children. She is, of course, receiving no subsidy; on the contrary, her rates are heavier in order to contribute towards the subsidy for the other family. This struck me as a vivid illustration of the mistake we have been making in giving subsidised houses to well-to-do families, and leaving those who most need it not only without help, but to share the cost of the subsidies.

What is the right line of advance to remedy these evils? We come here to the end of agreement, and find that there are two sharply contradictory views. There is the official Conservative view which is that whenever subsidies are granted prices go up, whenever they are removed prices fall, that all that is necessary is gradually to reduce subsidies, and costs will come down till the houses can be let at an economic rent and private enterprise will again function freely. This means, in practice, doing nothing and waiting in hope that things will come right by themselves. This has been argued time after time in the House of Commons; it has been pointed out in reply that the present cost of the cheapest family house is £350, that there is keen competition in the building industry, and that to abolish the subsidy and let the house at an inclusive economic rent of 10s. would mean that it must be built for not more than £150. This is utterly out of the question, and most of us believe that to adopt this policy of "do nothing" means to leave the slum dweller where he is and to allow

the slums steadily to deteriorate. I have, however, no doubt that many people sincerely believe that this *laissez-faire* policy will have the effect they suggest, and I am sure that speeches in the House of Commons by party politicians will never disturb that belief. May I repeat the suggestion I have previously made, that this is a subject eminently suitable for the Economic Advisory Council. I am confident that an inquiry by any such competent economic authority would make clear the position as to the relation between subsidies and prices, would prevent Parliament from wasting its time on endless discussions of the subject which lead nowhere, and would give the Government of the day a definite economic basis on which its housing policy would be founded. Meantime, progressives of all shades of opinion, and many Conservatives, decisively reject this *laissez-faire* policy. We believe that prices are competitive in the building industry and not likely to fall substantially, that unfortunately wages are unlikely to increase at the present time; and that the only way of housing those who cannot afford the present rents is by some additional subsidy.

The only comprehensive report which has recently been published on this matter is *A Policy for the Slums*,* prepared by a Committee of the National Housing and Town Planning Council. This was a Committee of about thirty persons, including experts of every kind, members of local authorities, representatives of the building trades, employers, and trade unionists; members of all political parties. They came to the unanimous conclusion that the slum problem could be solved only by the provision of the largest number of family houses, that is, three-bedroomed houses, at inclusive rents ranging from 7s. to 10s. They came to the conclusion also that an economical local authority could build such houses to let for inclusive rents of 10s., but that a 7s. house could only be obtained by a special subsidy. They pointed out that as regards urban districts every man who was in regular work, though he only earned labourer's wages, could afford a 10s. house so long as he had no family. But that all the lower-paid workers, during the period when they had the expense of supporting a number of children, were unable to pay more than about 7s. And they came further to the unanimous conclusion that the most economical way of giving this additional subsidy, and of ensuring that it was only given to those who actually needed it, was by means of a children's rent allowance in the form of a rebate on the rent. It is an interesting, and, I think, important point that the majority of the Committee at the beginning of their sitting were strongly against a children's rent allowance. After studying the matter for six

* P. S. King & Sons, Ltd. 6d.

months, and after one single resignation from the Committee, they unanimously signed the report recommending children's rent allowances as the right solution of the problem.

We are now in a position to consider how far the new Bill is likely to meet the needs of the slum dweller. It seems to me that the test of its effectiveness is a dual one. (1) Will it provide an adequate supply of low-rented houses? (2) Will it induce local authorities to move the large poor families from the slums into these houses? Dealing, for the sake of simplicity, only with the urban areas, the new Greenwood subsidy amounts to ninepence a week for each individual moved out of the slums. This will, on the average, amount to a substantially larger sum than the grant at present available under the Wheatley Act, and the local authorities may make a pool of the surplus grant and may distribute it among the various families rehoused on any basis they think fit. In other words, this Bill introduces for the first time a system of differential renting, under which the subsidy will be based not on a fixed amount per house, but on the needs of the family. This is a great and courageous innovation. It was attacked in the House of Commons by Mr. Chamberlain and by Sir Kingsley Wood as "perilous," but their arguments were singularly unconvincing. I think there is little doubt that, if the 7s. house is to be provided, it can only be done either at a cost ruinous to the Exchequer or else on a basis of differential rents which in fact must amount to children's rent allowances.

The effect of the Greenwood as against the Wheatley subsidy is that, if a family of four is to be housed, the Greenwood Bill gives them an allowance of sixpence, and that for each additional child there is a further reduction of the rent of 9d. If, as Mr. Greenwood suggests, half the houses are let at full Wheatley rents, then the reductions on the other half become twice as great, and are equivalent to a 1s. for the fourth child and 1s. 6d. for each additional child; a very substantial contribution to the cost of bringing up a large family, and a real inducement to the local authority to house the large family.

There is, however, a very important clause, Clause 23, Section 2, which lays down that the number of persons for whom subsidies shall be granted shall be limited to those for whom new houses are rendered available. What does this mean? It may mean that when a local authority submits a scheme in which, say, a thousand people are to be displaced, they will be forced at the same time to submit proposals as to the number of houses to be built. The Ministry may insist on 200 houses to house the thousand people. If so, then the whole basis is altered and the subsidy really becomes a subsidy not per person but per house. If it is fixed at

five persons per house, then it is simply equivalent to increasing the Wheatley subsidy from 2s. 6d. to 3s. 9d. In that case the local authorities have no incentive to get the larger families out of the slum; there is nothing to prevent them from continuing the policy that so many of them follow, of putting the good tenants into the new houses and leaving the children in the slums. I may illustrate the difference as follows. Assuming in the case of an improvement area that sixty persons have to be moved out and provided with new houses, will the local authority be compelled to provide twelve houses at the rate of five persons per house and receive five subsidies per house, or will they be allowed to take out larger families, say families of six, and build only ten houses receiving six subsidies per house? Is there to be a rigid rule as to the number per house determined before the removal is actually done? In that case the Greenwood subsidy becomes a subsidy per house and the local authorities have no incentive to get out the large families.

Or is there to be flexibility, encouraging the local authorities to get out the large families and allowing them extra grants when they do so? It seems to me that in the former case the Greenwood subsidy is simply an increase of the Wheatley subsidy and that all the same errors of giving subsidies to people who do not require them will be repeated. In the latter case, it comes near to being a children's rent allowance, and though not in my opinion in the best form, will almost certainly be effective in beginning the movement on a large scale of removing the children out of the slums.

I have dealt hitherto with the new grant and its effect—by far the most important part of the Bill. There is, however, one other novel and interesting proposal: the proposal to constitute "improvement" areas which, without necessarily clearing away the houses, shall by repair and by the reduction of overcrowding be brought up to a good standard and prevented from degenerating. This proposal requires careful consideration. If we consider the case with which I am most familiar, that of Manchester, we have something like fifty thousand old houses in the centre of the city which are not condemned as unfit for human habitation. They are two-up and two-down houses in long and dreary rows; they have no baths and no amenities of any kind; as a rule no damp-proof courses, and all of them ought to go in the next twenty years. Meantime, by far the worst feature of life in these houses is the overcrowding.

How is an improvement area to be chosen? If say a block of one thousand houses is selected, and, in the course of years, brought up to a good standard and all the overcrowding abolished, the area would be surrounded by exactly similar houses where

gross overcrowding would continue—just across the other side of the street. It seems illogical and undesirable to bring this sort of area up to a really good standard before tackling the worst cases in the other fifty thousand houses. Nothing is said in the Bill about the size of the improvement areas except that in London they should not include less than ten houses. I asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health whether she would allow the fifty thousand houses in the centre of Manchester to be an improvement area. Miss Lawrence replied that this was exactly what they did not want; their idea is rather to constitute areas of say five hundred to one thousand houses. So far there seems to be an inclination to welcome the improvement area as a method of "orderly development." I am not at all satisfied as yet that the policy is wise or desirable.

Apart from the two main points with which I have dealt, there are many useful provisions in this Bill, for giving more freedom and responsibility to local authorities, for accelerating the procedure of slum clearance; and there are other more doubtful proposals, such as the building of very small houses for old couples. A violent attack has already begun on the Bill because it does not improve the compensation to owners of good property which may be pulled down for a slum clearance scheme. But all these matters are of minor importance as compared with the question as to whether the Bill will provide the necessary low-rented houses for drawing the families out of the slums.

The more economical local authorities are to-day building a good family house and letting it at an inclusive rent of 10s. a week under the Wheatley Act. It is estimated that, if prices do not increase, it will be possible under the Greenwood Bill to let half the houses at 10s. and the other half at an average of 7s. 6d. This should go a long way towards meeting the requirements of the situation on two conditions. The first is that prices do not rise. Sir Kingsley Wood pointed out that after the Wheatley Act became law prices rose by £50 a house. A similar rise now would destroy the value of the Greenwood Bill. But at the time of the Wheatley Act there was a shortage of labour in the building trade. The effect of that Act was to draw one hundred and fifty thousand workers into the building industry; to-day there are one hundred and fifty thousand workers in the building trade unemployed. There is, therefore, room for an immense expansion in house building without overloading the trade, and, in these circumstances, another substantial rise in the cost of building ought not to occur.

The second condition is that local authorities should do their share of the work. It is understood that they have accepted the Bill and it is to be hoped that they will proceed to build large

numbers of houses. Certain local authorities are still charging rents of 12s. and over for their family houses; if these local authorities are to deal effectively with their slums they will have to overhaul their building methods and bring down their costs to those of the more economical and efficient authorities. It is also essential that, when the local authorities have built their houses, they should get out of their habit of housing the so-called "good" tenants, that is the small prosperous families, and seek out the poor large families who need their assistance.

The Bill has been received in a very friendly way in the House of Commons and it is to be hoped that it will quickly become law. There will certainly be a fight on the subject of landlords' compensations, but it is to be hoped that no party will allow a matter of this sort to interfere with the smooth passage of so urgent a Bill. The one big thing about the Bill is that it introduces for the first time the principle of differential rents, which is vital to an economical solution of the slum problem. Let us hope that all parties will unite, as a Council of State in Committee, and endeavour to make the Bill as effective a piece of machinery as possible for the solution, at long last, of the slum problem.

E. D. SIMON.

BRITISH INDUSTRY AND THE SPIRIT OF DEFEAT.

WE do well in these days of doubt and difficulty to recall that the century between Waterloo and the World War was marked by a continuous series of alternate periods of good trade and bad trade in which, at each successive slump, there were many who despaired of their country. After the Franco-German war, as after the Napoleonic wars, there was an accentuation of depression and commercial panic. Never yet, even in times of peace, did the course of trade, any more than that of true love, run smooth. The recurrence of "trade cycles" puzzled the economists, and drove Jevons to the fanciful suggestion that the periodicity of the sun spots, with its profound effects upon mundane conditions, was the prime cause of trade variations. As the worst point of each depression was usually divided from the height of the preceding boom by no more than a few years, it is rather surprising that in lean years business men did not look forward with more hopefulness, or learn in years of fatness to apprehend that lean years would certainly follow. But the lesson never seems to have been learned. And to-day, despite the recorded experience of commercial variations in peace and in war, and despite the shortness of the interval which has elapsed since the conclusion of the greatest war of history, we have only too many evidences of an exaggerated pessimism of outlook. Enterprise is dogged and thwarted by a defeatism which if unchecked would undoubtedly fulfil its own direful forebodings.

Those who have lived through forty or fifty years of change can testify as to the contrast which happily obtains between the outward aspect of our society to-day and its appearance in years not remote. The truth is that while trade has moved in alternations of good and bad, the general trend of the curve, although composed of a series of waves, has been upward. The standard of life has been rising all the time. So true is this that in the trade depression of 1930 the general appearance of the British people is strikingly better than was the case in the best trade years of the end of the nineteenth century, or for that matter even in the good years of trade immediately preceding the War. The factory girls of 1930 are better dressed on a week-day evening than were the middle-class girls of the eighteen-nineties on a Sunday; indeed the disappearance of "Sunday clothes" is one of the most striking testimonies to the extent of the industrial and social advance. The working family of 1930, even with one of its members unemployed, makes a better show to-day than was made by a family of the same class when in full work, not long ago in

our annals. Those who have had the experience of addressing popular meetings in recent years, and can carry their minds back to such meetings of a generation ago, can testify to the remarkable change for the better which has occurred in the aspect and bearing of working people. I have seen working-class fancy dress dances since the War which for taste and bravery of attire have outshone middle-class affairs of the same character of twenty or thirty years since. Not less significant is the spread of luxury, the growth of public restaurants where cheap refreshments can be enjoyed in comfortable or even palatial surroundings, the building of entertainment palaces in every town, the enormous sale of suit-cases in days when all classes and not merely a limited few take holidays by the sea, and the universal possession of bicycles or motor-cycles. In sum, we are now contriving to earn by commerce such a volume of imports and to conduct such a volume of home trade as places at the disposal of a greatly enlarged population a better living than obtained in the best trade years of pre-war history.

We may with advantage set out the official records of British commerce in the period 1860-1913, little more than one-half a century. It was a period which began and ended with a year of booming trade. In the following account I contrast the exports of British goods in the successive boom and slump years with the imports of "manufactures" in these years and with the trade union unemployment rate. The commerce figures are those of the Custom House and Board of Trade. The unemployment rate is the Government's official figure based upon the returns of the trade unions. It is an account which removes many misconceptions:

THE BOOMS AND SLUMPS OF HALF A CENTURY.

Year.	Exports of British Goods		Trade Union Unemployment	Imports of 'Manufactures' for Home Consumption.
	In Boom.	In Slump.		
	Million £.	Million £.	Per cent.	Million £.
1860	136	—	1·9	22
1862	—	124	6·0	27
1865	166	—	1·8	32
1868	—	180	6·8	41
1872	256	—	1·0	47
1879	—	192	10·7	57
1882	242	—	2·3	65
1886	—	213	10·0	63
1890	263	—	2·1	74
1893	—	218	7·7	75
1900	291	—	2·4	110
1904	—	301	6·4	116
1913	525	—	2·0	164

Here are the vagaries of commerce at a glance, and the concurrent variations in employment. The importation of goods "wholly or mainly manufactured" (to use the official designation) hardly appears to be a cause of unemployment, for we see that in the years of good trade the importations of manufactures are invariably greater than in the previous period of slump. Thus in 1900, when the unemployment rate was 2.4 per cent., which may be regarded as very near the irreducible minimum in competitive industry, the imports of manufactures were £110 millions, whereas seven years previously, when the unemployment rate was nearly 8 per cent., the imports of manufactures were £75 millions.

Turning to British exports, it should not be forgotten that between 1872 and 1896 there was a considerable fall in prices—a factor which, of course, affected the import figures also. When changes in prices are taken into account, it certainly appeared in 1900 that Britain was approaching the stationary in her export trade. The late Lord Rhondda (then Mr. D. A. Thomas, M.P.) in his memorable paper on Coal Exports read to the Royal Statistical Society in 1903, pointed to this fact, and attributed it to a decline in the relative strength of our coal position which was to be expected in the nature of the case; Britain could not hope forever to retain an especial advantage in exports derived from coal-power, when two other great coal-powers existed in the world. Lord Rhondda, indeed, and no one was better qualified to express an opinion on the subject, clearly anticipated in 1903, after a most careful survey of all the relevant facts, that we could hardly expect a further enormous expansion in our oversea commerce. He put it that British relative retrogression, if it continued "will prove to be due, I think, to circumstances largely beyond human control, and over which man disquieteth himself in vain."

But what followed? *The period 1900-13 proved to be one in which British exports expanded as never before.* More remarkable still, they contrived to expand in a world in which Britain's foreign competitors also made big gains. The British increase is shown in the table just quoted, but the facts have such significance for our subject-matter that it is well to set out the comparative exports of the chief competitors:

THE EXPORTS OF NINE NATIONS IN THE PERIOD 1900-1913.
(In millions of £.)

	1900.	1910.	1913.
United Kingdom	291	430	525
United States	286	356	510
Germany	231	367	496
France	164	249	275

THE EXPORTS OF NINE NATIONS IN THE PERIOD 1900-1913—Continued.
(In millions of £.)

	1900.	1910.	1913.
Italy	54	83	100
Austria-Hungary	81	101	115
Holland	141	218	258
Belgium	77	136	143
Switzerland	35	49	55

This astonishing record of progress begins with 1900, the figures of which were justly acclaimed as a best on record. Yet British exports of British goods increased in thirteen years from 291 to 525 millions, or by 80 per cent. At the same time the exports of the United States increased from 286 to 510 millions and those of Germany from 231 to 496 millions, while France, Italy, Austria, Belgium, and other countries recorded gains hardly less remarkable. It was a period of universal expansion. There was a certain rise in prices. Wholesale prices, which had been continuously falling between 1873 and 1896, then rose again. In 1900 prices were at the same level as in 1893 and 1897; they remained almost stationary in 1900-5 but then rose, and in 1913 were about 15 per cent. higher than in 1900. As the increase in British exports in 1900-13 was 80 per cent., there was a very large increase in the actual volume of exports.

We have not to seek very far for the explanation of this new and unparalleled expansion of commerce which immediately preceded the World War. It is true that foreign competition increased, but it increased in a world whose wealth was being brought to market as never before. Men were beginning at last to deal with the world's resources on a large scale. The instruments of science were being applied to the world's materials with such effect that purchasing power advanced in all the world's markets. There proved to be ample room for all competitors, and the eve of the War found Britain exporting her productions in a volume which would have been deemed impossible not many years before.

On the eve of the War, British trade, although still good, was in slight decline, and the probability is that if peace had been preserved we should in a few years have reached another slump, to be endured and defeated in due course. There is no good reason to doubt that in peace the large-scale development of the world's resources would have continued, but at an accelerated rate. Irregularly, but nevertheless assuredly, British exports and prosperity would have expanded with world commerce, not necessarily retaining as high a proportion of the world aggregate, but nevertheless recording an actual increase yielding a rising standard of life! As Macaulay said in 1830, "On what principle

is it that, when we see nothing but improvement behind us, we are to expect nothing but deterioration before us?"

Now let us put the question quite plainly: *What changes made by the War should justly lead us to believe that British prosperity must wane?* Let us first note that the thoughtful mind observed those prospering years which preceded the War not without apprehensions for the future. The nation's wealth was a new thing—"five generations make its little span." As recently as the middle of the eighteenth century, England was a poor country with no apparent prospects. The getting of coal with steam, the smelting of iron with coal, the machinery made possible by the now plentiful supplies of iron, the railways and the steamships begotten of inventions suggested by the needs of coal-getting, had quickly changed a poor nation, an exporter of raw materials and an importer of manufactures, into a comparatively rich nation exporting manufactures and importing not only materials but food with which to feed a nation which had largely sacrificed its agriculture. Was the process stable? Had it an essential permanence? These were profoundly important questions, and while answers could be given to them in terms of the ultimate, no answers could be given with assurance as to the near future. Writing in 1914 one could say "this is certain, that coal will pass," but no guess could be offered as to what great source of power would succeed it or—what is quite as important from the British point of view—whether that new sort of power, when discovered, would give to the three great coal nations, Britain, America, and Germany, the same predominance which they possessed by virtue of coal resources which enabled them to produce four-fifths of the world's coal.

It had been, moreover, for some time apparent that Britain was falling behind in the application of her coal. Dr. Sebastian de Ferranti, the distinguished engineer who died a few months ago, had vainly proposed the electrification of British power, the erection of a chain of one hundred super-power stations, and the covering of the small British area with a network of transmission lines. The proposal fell upon deaf ears. In electrical engineering Britain before 1914 had so neglected her opportunities that she became a pupil where once she had been a teacher. The neglect of electricity was typical of a general contempt in practical affairs for the modern scientific advance; in many branches of the chemical industry Britain had hardly begun to make headway. Two visits to Germany in those eventful years, in which I had special opportunity of seeing industrial operations and civic developments, had convinced me that we could not continue to neglect scientific education and research without most serious

results to our economy, and my introduction in the House of Commons of the first Continuation Schools Bill was a tribute to a most fruitful German example.

The World War put these and many other things to test. We were to find in a few brief years that British battleships could be more easily destroyed than German battleships, that we lacked adequate supplies of steel, that the neglect of the chemical trade left us without means of making high explosive just as it left us without a dye industry of merit, that we lacked optical glass and scientific instruments of precision, that even while within the Empire we possessed enormous deposits of zinc ore we left them to the Germans to develop, and that in the haste to amass material wealth it had been forgotten that industrial slums do not favour the production of man-power. It is a sorry catalogue of revelations which could be indefinitely extended.

But the War fortunately revealed more than neglect; it proved also that under the spur of necessity the nation possessed the skill and intelligence to bring into use neglected inventions, to adapt its economy to an unparalleled situation, to increase its material production despite the drain upon its manhood, and to reconstruct its industries under fire. "In the reproof of chance stands the true proof of men." Whatever the inadequacy of British adaptations, the inventions, the achievements of British work in 1915-18, and especially in the last two years of the contest, were sufficient proof, if proof were needed, that Britain could still hold her own.

In 1930 the source of British prosperity, our coal, remains for practical purposes undiminished. Whatever the remote future may bring, it is certain that coal remains in the present, and will remain in the near future, a determining and overwhelming source of relative advantage. It is true that Britain lacks the water-power or "white coal" of Italy, France, Switzerland, the United States and Canada, but coal-power is still greatly superior to water-power in point of volume. Thus Italy, I was informed by Signor de Marchi at Rome in 1926, aims at producing from water-power the equivalent of 50 million tons of coal per annum, but this is only one-fifth of the power yielded by British coal. In America coal-power dominates water-power.

Then there is oil, but while the life of the world's petroleum is uncertain, nothing is more certain than that it will be exhausted in a comparatively short space of time, while still the world's coal-measures remain scarcely diminished. While, therefore, at present the increasing use of oil in motors and motorships is a relative disadvantage for Britain, that relative disadvantage has a narrow time-limit. When oil has to be distilled from coal, British coal will regain all the margin it has lost in this respect.

It is of even more moment to observe that the very fact that Britain has not yet fully availed herself of modern power developments makes us entitled to hope for much when the leeway is made up. I have recalled the post-war de Ferranti scheme and the vain efforts that were made by many, including the present writer, as long ago as 1905, to awaken the nation to the urgent need for general electrification. We have only just got seriously to work on this practical means of stimulating every industrial, social, and civic activity. At long last we have our Electricity Commissioners delimiting super-power zones and making schemes for their supply, and a Central Electricity Board carrying these schemes into practice with the backing of national credit. The Electricity Commissioners have divided the country into seven great zones of production and supply, and within them the great and responsible problem of electrical production and its co-ordination is being worked out. Whereas at the present time the capacity of British electrical generating plant is roundly nine million kilowatts, additions have been planned which will add another six million kilowatts in the next ten years. The number of giant super-power houses will be about one hundred, as in the scheme proposed twenty years ago by de Ferranti.

So, what amounts to a new industrial revolution is in process of accomplishment, although it may be respectfully doubted whether there is yet sufficient rapidity of execution, or whether the nation has yet grasped the possibilities which open before us through the sea-change which can be wrought by electrical means. Universal cheap power, spread economically over the country as coal-power cannot be spread, can breed new industries and enlarge old ones, and assist us to make industrial transfers and to re-house many millions of our people.

If we had exhausted every effort, developed our natural resources to the highest, and educated and trained our personnel to the standard that obtains in Germany and the United States—if we had done these things and, having accomplished them, found our prosperity failing, we might well have cause for a pessimistic outlook. We should have shot our bolt and failed. But that is not the position. For us the second industrial revolution has still to be accomplished. We must remove the reproach that while Great Britain is an island signally favoured by nature for the development of power, we have neglected a quite simple and straightforward piece of development. If, like Italy, Britain had no coal, and had to invent a substitute calling for engineering schemes of the most difficult character, there might be some excuse for the condition of the British power system of 1930. *The measure of our past neglect is also the measure of future possibilities.*

As with engineering, so with business organisation. We have just been reminded by Mr. Barnard Ellinger that British cotton spinning and manufacturing is carried on in about 300 large and small towns and villages by about 1,800 different firms and that the trade's exports are dealt with by some 700 merchants! It was in spite of this obvious lack of organisation that in 1929 the British cotton trade contrived to export goods worth £130,000,000, *being one-half of all the cotton goods exports made by all the world's exporting countries.* We are told that the new and intense rivalry of Japan in the Eastern markets for cottons is founded upon better organisation, in which a few master-minds short-circuit operations which for Lancashire are involved in an amazing degree of traditional complexity.

So the old hand, the original inventor of the factory system, the possessor of one-third of all the world's cotton spindles, is advised to reorganise its methods, from the purchase of cotton to the selling of its output. In this and many other connections the talk is all of rationalisation, which means the thorough reorganisation of a trade in all its branches and the elimination and discarding of its uneconomic factors. There is no doubt whatever that necessary reorganisation will be effected, and that when it is accomplished Britain will be in a much stronger position in the export trade. Despite all existing faults of organisation, British exports (of British goods only) in 1929 were valued at £730 millions. This figure, allowing for difference of values, represents a rather smaller exportation of goods than in the extraordinarily good year 1913, but it also represents *a much bigger exportation than was made in good years not long before the War broke out.* After all, it is really matter for congratulation that some ten years after the War Britain is found exporting more goods than she exported ten years before the War.

For let us remember what the War compelled us to do. We sold out most of our dollar securities to pay for American war supplies, and in addition contracted an enormous American debt which costs us 38 millions a year for interest and capital repayments (an annual payment to America which is to continue for two generations longer!). We dislocated our finance, our industries, and our shipping to maintain ourselves and our allies in the field. We deliberately dissolved shipping lines to concentrate ships in the Atlantic to break the submarine siege. We harried our *entrepôt* trade. We strengthened by our very needs the shipping and industries of the United States and Japan. We were left at the end in a position in which we saw one-half of the world's gold, the very basis of credit, diverted to the United States and there largely immobilised. And yet we contrived in 1929 not only to pay, by our

exports of goods and services, for the £1,220,000,000 of imports which we brought in, but to earn a credit balance of trade of £150,000,000, representing addition to our foreign investments. I am at a loss to know what there is for gloom in such an achievement.

The fall in prices of the last few years, culminating in a headlong recent descent, has created serious problems of adjustment, but the combination of cheap money, cheap food, and cheap raw materials in 1930 can hardly be regarded as a menace for Great Britain. Exports are hindered for a time in the process of adjustment and as primary producers overseas lose purchasing power; against this we have to bear in mind that we are getting our imports so much more cheaply that fewer exports are required to pay for them. Moreover, the national return from overseas investments becomes greatly enlarged in quantity and real value by the fall in prices. If we take our invisible exports in 1930 conservatively as roundly £500,000,000 (of which nearly £300,000,000 is accounted for by interest on overseas investments), the fall in prices presents itself in this connection as the command of a greatly increased real importation (real national income). With the stimulation of a low bank rate, and with raw commodity prices within reasonable distance of the level of 1913, we are probably at a point where the upward climb to a new prosperity will begin. There is current, I notice, a curious fear of low prices which ignores the fact that only through cheapness can industry advance to new levels of plentiful production. In this connection, the lag of retail prices in 1930 amounts to a serious handicap; the benefit of falling prices is being tardily passed on to the consumer. The tradition of war prices and dearness dies hard, but it must pass if we are to reap the full benefit of the powers of production which science has given us. *The notable increase in world production which is the main cause of the recent fall in prices is the prelude to an increased consumption liberated by the price adjustment.*

These words are necessarily written before the Chancellor of the Exchequer propounds his annual Budget for 1930-31, but already it is known that the national expenditure will reach roundly £780 millions, of which only one-third, or £260 millions, is for the purposes of peace, the great balance of £520 millions being roundly composed of £360 millions for interest and repayment of old war debts, £50 millions for war pensions, £40 millions for the army, £52 millions for the navy, and £18 millions for the air services. It is a matter for regret that the War Loans were contracted at unnecessary cost in days when we thought it necessary, while compelling the service of life, to apply the attraction of high interest to patriotic lenders, but at least we have the consolation

that the greater part of the war debt charges are paid to British subjects and do not represent a drain of exports. In relation to the national income of about £4,000 millions, the national expenditure is high, but there is nothing to show that it is unduly interfering with the saving of new capital; according to the figures of the Midland Bank, the public issues of 1928, apart from Government loans, amounted to £362 millions and of 1929 to £253 millions. The chief enemy of capital saving in these years was the disreputable preying upon investors in the City of London, which probably diverted over £150 millions to purposes of waste. Outcry as to taxation is frequently heard, but those who utter it forget that two-thirds of our taxes are raised for war purposes and that over £400 millions represent War Loan payments and war pensions; as those honourable obligations must be met, there might surely be a truce to complaints which ignore the hard facts of the case. It is for very serious consideration that since the Armistice some £700 millions have been spent upon the relief of unemployment; not upon work but upon maintenance. There is every hope, as I have said, that what is abnormal in the British trade position will disappear and that a new British prosperity will enlarge the national wealth and income. There remains, in the meantime, the problem of special unemployment consequent upon the War, and it is for argument whether the tentative policy which has been adopted by successive governments of palliating distress and devoting comparatively small sums to employment upon new economic capital works should not be extended to dimensions adequate to the situation. That, however, opens another chapter too long for treatment in this writing.

It should be pointed out, however, that prosperity does not abolish unemployment. It is indissolubly connected with competitive industry. Take, for example, the boasted, almost idolised prosperity of the United States. Who could instance a more envied (I do not say enviable) condition of prosperity than was enjoyed by the United States in April 1929, when the worship of the dollar rose perhaps to its highest recorded point in economic history? In that month the education officers of Philadelphia, in concert with certain economists, canvassed 31,551 Philadelphian families embracing 58,866 wage-earners. According to the bulletin of the United States Bureau of Labour Statistics, Volume 30, Number 2, "It was found that 7.8 per cent. of the 58,866 wage-earners in these families were idle because of inability to find work." Thus let us remind ourselves that prosperity in its ordinary sense and full employment do not go hand in hand even in the most lauded of material worlds. We have yet to learn how to distribute prosperity, work—and leisure.

I have already quoted some pertinent words from Macaulay; here is the remainder of the passage written a century since:

"A million a year will beggar us," said the patriots of 1640. "Two millions a year will grind the country to powder" was the cry in 1660. "Six millions a year, and a debt of fifty millions!" exclaimed Swift; "the high allies have been the ruin of us." "A hundred and forty millions of debt!" said Junius: "Well may we say that we owe Lord Chatham more than we shall ever pay, if we owe him such a load as this." "Two hundred and forty millions of debt!" cried all the statesmen of 1783 in chorus; "what abilities, or what economy on the part of a minister, can save a country so burdened?"

In truth, we bear the burden of 1930, if not lightly, more easily than that of 1830, and I think the balance of probability is strongly in favour of the belief that, within twenty years of this writing, we shall have added to the British national income a sum at least as large as the £780 millions of national expenditure which confronts us in Mr. Snowden's budget.

LEO CHIOZZA MONEY.

GREECE AT HER CENTENARY.

GREECE is at present celebrating the centenary of the London protocol of 1830, which made her an independent state. She is able to keep the centenary of her independence now instead of in 1921, the more appropriate date, because party passions, then in full blaze, have died away, and the last ten months have been conspicuous for peaceful progress.

The Republic, founded six years ago, has undergone the change of President without the least friction. When, to the regret of everyone except himself, Admiral Kountouriotis resigned the Presidency on December 10th, 1929, it was obvious that his successor would be Mr. Alexander Zaïmes. Six times Prime Minister, High Commissioner in Crete, Governor of the National Bank, this most silent of Greek statesmen had devoted his life to the public service, following the traditions of his family, the Cavendishes or Russells of Greece. A moderate man without enemies or ambitions, he had only one drawback, that, born 74 years ago, he was nearly as old as his predecessor in the Presidency. The fact that his wife is a foreigner was no obstacle, especially as the social duties of a Greek President are slight. There was, indeed, no other serious candidate, as was shown by the voting on December 14th, when Mr. Zaïmes received 257 votes against 22 recorded for Mr. Kaphandares. The latter is too active a politician to retire to the dignified leisure of Government House; and, being a man of strong will, would probably, as President, have come into conflict with the powerful Premier. As for the latter, he declined the suggested candidature because his work was not finished and the limited powers of the President were unsuited to his character. As Premier he has continued to be omnipotent and ubiquitous. His capacity for work is prodigious; there is never a day when he does not make a speech, receive a deputation, or write a letter and even sometimes a leading article. His mileage in the course of the year is enormous; during the last ten months he has visited Rome, Paris, London, Prague, Buda-Pesth, Belgrade and Geneva, and been twice at The Hague. His second visit there in particular was a great diplomatic success; the Opposition leaders, especially Mr. Kaphandares, a great authority on finance, acknowledged his services there in the question of reparations, which had raised the Greek share of the Bulgarian and Hungarian reparations from 12.7 to 76.73 per cent., and secured for Greece £10,000,000 over the sum needed to pay her debts. But this has been only a part of his activities. He holds the portfolios of Hygiene and Aviation, in order to show his special interest in these newly-created departments, with specialists

as his under-secretaries, and during the visit of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Michalakopoulos, to Egypt in March, to examine the needs of the large Greek colony there, he temporarily directed that ministry also. He went on board ship to attend the naval manœuvres and spoke in the Chamber on naval defence with quotations from the works of experts. Sure of an overwhelming majority in the Chamber, where he has 190 out of 250 deputies, he has now been Premier for the last 22 months—a period only equalled in recent times by himself. His ministerial crises have been insignificant, but since he took office in July 1928, he has had three Ministers of the Interior, three of Foreign Affairs, three of Communications and two of Marine. General Kondyles' letter of December criticising him for "leading the country to political anarchy" reacted on its author, and, while leaving the Premier unscathed, caused the resignation of the only Minister who was one of the small Kondylist party of eight in the Chamber. The Royalists have given him less trouble than some of his own followers. Mr. Tsaldares, the Royalist leader, who with his party withdrew from Parliament because the Premier included in his Cabinet last June General Gonatas, Prime Minister when the "Six" were executed in 1922, resumed attendance at the sittings, when, after the Presidential election, Mr. Venizelos reconstructed his Cabinet and General Gonatas retired to the Governor-Generalship of Macedonia. Party politics have, therefore, been happily dormant, and the election of a prominent Royalist, Mr. Merkoures, as Mayor of Athens was ascribed to his high reputation as an administrator when he held that post years ago. Mr. Venizelos has testified to the value of Mr. Tsaldares' objective criticism in Parliament and, unlike some dictators, recognises the utility of an Opposition. He has submitted important foreign problems to the Committee of Foreign Affairs, of which all the party leaders are members.

Turkish diplomacy loves procrastination, and the negotiations between the Greek and Turkish Governments, and consequently the proposed visit of Mr. Venizelos to Angora, have been postponed. But his speeches on naval policy with regard to Turkey made an excellent impression on the Turks, and for the first time in Greek history the Turkish Minister at Athens officially attended the *Te Deum* on the anniversary of the beginning of the War of Independence. "So long as I govern," said Mr. Venizelos in laying the foundation-stone of the harbour at Kavalla, "there will be no military enterprises. We wish to establish the refugees and live at peace with our neighbours." In a similar spirit he addressed the International Peace Congress, which met in Athens last October. Consequently he has been able to concentrate his attention upon internal and

social problems, like Bismarck when the wars for Germany's unity were over. Although unfavourable to the grant of the parliamentary vote to women, he has given the municipal suffrage to those over 30 years of age who can read and write. In Greece the female is only slightly in excess of the male population, 100 as against 98, or 52,214 more women than men. But the percentage of illiteracy among women is high, although during the academic year 1928-9 out of the 6,040 students of the Athens University 506 were ladies. There is, however, a danger of semi-education, which Mr. Venizelos is resolved to prevent. When Governments were weak, the students on several occasions caused serious difficulties, involving the fall of the Cabinet. Such were the "straw hat" riots in the time of Otho, the "Gospel" riots of 1901, the "Oresteia" riots of 1903. When, however, in January the Athenian students agitated for easier examinations in consequence of the considerable percentage of those "ploughed," and attempted to force their way into the Rector's study, the police occupied the University and the Government acted vigorously. A deputation of students was so unwise as to seek an interview with the Premier, a past-master of dialectics, who plainly told them that they had broken the law, and that he would not permit Greece to be flooded with a mass of half-educated graduates, as there were already too many lawyers and doctors. The outgoing Rector in his report on the academic year 1929-30 stated that 29 per cent. of the candidates had failed to pass the matriculation examination in consequence of the higher standard now required. Even so, however, the number of students was about 40 per cent. higher than in 1910-11. Of course, the area and population of Greece have greatly increased since then, but there are now comparatively few "unredeemed" Greeks who formerly flocked to the Athens University.

A certain amount of Communist propaganda has taken root on the uncongenial soil of Greece. An attack was made by Communists upon the Yugoslav Legation, but so clumsily planned that the assailants broke the windows of the adjacent house of the Governor of the Bank of Greece in mistake for the Legation. Various persons, among whom were three foreign agents with large sums of money upon them, were arrested, and papers found in their possession proved that revolts were planned for February 28th and March 12th, that last August sums had been assigned for propaganda in Greek towns, including a subsidy for the Communist Athenian daily newspaper, which had conducted a violent campaign against King Alexander, and that in 1929 the propaganda fund reached £4,000. A Bolshevik circular was published addressed to the Greek Communist Party, and containing instruc-

tions for propaganda in the army and navy, and for collaboration with the Bulgarian *comitadjis* to secure the independence of Thrace and Macedonia. Nothing could be less popular in Greece than this last item. Heavy sentences were inflicted; the two Communist anniversaries passed off without disturbance, and the Communist organ naïvely reproached the base middle-class Government, which, like the rhinoceros, "when attacked, defends itself."

As a matter of fact, Mr. Venizelos has a good record of working-class legislation to his credit, although the initiative in social movements goes back before his time, to the "Sociological Society," founded by Mr. Papanastasiou in 1908. But he has told both workmen and civil servants that above their interests stand those of the Greek people as a whole, and that taxation cannot be increased for the benefit of any privileged class, nor the Government be intimidated by the threats of its employees. This language, unusual in the mouth of a democratically elected Prime Minister, is not that of a demagogue. But Mr. Venizelos admires Pericles rather than Cleon: his Thucydidean translation has familiarised him with both, and as a man of action he can judge them better than can a mere scholar. Having been elected by a popular vote he intends to govern.

Since the war, brigandage had been the plague of Epeiros and the neighbourhood of Olympos. Since Mr. Venizelos took office thirty-seven Thessalian brigands have been captured or exterminated, besides the notorious chief, Babanes, long the terror of Olympos, whose head, upon which a high price had been set, was cut off and brought to Ellassona. The powers of the Towns' Police, which has been organised by a British Mission since 1918, have been extended, and its chief, Colonel Coke, who succeeded Sir Frederick Halliday on October 3rd, has now three British assistants. The Premier, who is honorary president of the Society for the Protection of Animals at Canea, has warmly supported the sister society in Athens. He has ordered the settlement of the long-pending question of the indemnity due to this Society for the loss of its hospital for animals, which was requisitioned by the Ministry of War without compensation. The Society has, thanks to his intervention, now received an indemnity of £2,666. He has also announced his intention of asking Parliament to amend and extend the law of 1917 for the protection of animals, and with that object has invited the police and the council of the Society to draw up amendments and make suggestions. Credit is due to Mr. Roupfos, chairman of the Society, for the ability and care with which he conducted the negotiations with the Government, and to the Greek Press, and notably to the eminent publicist, Mr. Nirvanas of the *Hestia*,

for constant expressions of sympathy with the cause of animals. The maltreatment of animals in Greece is not due to cruelty, but to ignorance and, in some cases, to such tenacious superstitions as that which will allow kittens to die a lingering death by exposure and starvation because it is considered unlucky to drown them, and that which insists on the slaughter of a cock when a foundation-stone is laid. The Greek colony in London would be performing an act of patriotism in assisting the Society in Athens, for nothing injures Greece so much in the eye of the northern visitors as the acts of cruelty to dumb animals which they have witnessed, notably the transport of cattle by sea. Propaganda in Greek schools is especially necessary, and orders to that effect were given by Mr. Nikoloudes, when he was Minister of Education, and by the present Government. In this Greece may set an example to her neighbour, Albania, where kindness to animals has lately been preached by Miss O'Leary, an English lady, with the prompt support of the Government.

The improvement of Greece by public works is proceeding now that politics are silent. In October was completed the Marathon dam, by which the water of two streams is impounded so as to form an artificial lake, connected, by a tunnel under Parnes, an aqueduct and an iron siphon, with another reservoir just outside Athens, whence it will be distributed throughout the city and suburbs. The Ulen Company, which is carrying out these great works, hopes that by the beginning of next year Athens will at last have an adequate water-supply, for years her greatest need. In November was cut the sluice, constructed by the Foundation Company, for draining into the Vardar the lakes of Amatovo and Ardjan, between Salonika and the Yugoslav frontier. These works not only restore 15,000 acres to cultivation and prevent the malaria which infested Amatovo, as our archæologists found when they excavated the pre-historic mound there, but, when completed, should save the harbour of Salonika from being silted up by the deposits brought down into the Thermaic Gulf by the Vardar, as muddy now as in the days of Strabo. A new loan of £8,000,000 for roads and the drainage of marshes, especially in Thessaly, Epeiros and Macedonia, is being floated. The second most urgent need of Athens after water is drains, and at last steps are being taken to provide a system of drainage. At present, whenever there is a torrential rain, there is no means of carrying off the water, which rushes down from the precipitous sides of Lykabettos carrying all before it, and converting the steep streets into water-courses and the level avenues into lagoons. The great storm of February, the worst deluge since 1896, made the usually trickling Ilissos overflow its banks as in 1925, rendered 200 families home-

less and caused the deaths of several people. The real remedy for this is now being taken. It is proposed to dig a deep trench round the base of Lykabettos, to catch the water pouring down from the rocky hill. Thus not only will the damage be prevented, but tons of water will no longer be wasted—a great consideration in the parched land of Attica. Practical works of this kind are the best, because the most durable, way of celebrating the centenary, and will benefit the population of Athens long after the festivities of 1930 have been forgotten. The best way of commemorating the past is to confer practical advantages upon the present and the future generations.

The present year will see the end of the institution which has done more than anything else to convert Macedonia from a desert into a fertile province. The Refugees' Settlement Commission will end its seven years' labour on December 31st, in accordance with the Convention signed at Geneva on January 24th. Mr. Palles, one of the two Greek members of the Commission, estimated the number of refugees at 1,221,849 at the date of the census of May 15th, 1928, and the birth-rate among them has increased since then, while the death-rate, owing to a better water-supply and improved sanitary conditions, has fallen. The Commission has already transferred to the Greek Government its "agricultural, veterinary and allied services" together with all persons employed on "the stallion, cattle, pig and poultry breeding stations, nurseries, model farms and experimental plots," besides the Macedonian and Thracian dispensaries. At the end of this year the Greek Government will come into possession of all the rest of the Commission's property and conduct its work in future, possibly with the assistance of a foreign observer. It will pay £60,000 annually to the International Financial Commission for the amortisation of the Refugees' Loan of 1924, and there will be a first mortgage on all the real estate handed over by the Commission to the Government till the complete extinction of that debt. Thus the bondholders are secure, while, as regards the refugees, the Government has undertaken before the end of the year to secure for them "a clear and indisputable title" to their lands. Their settlements cover 2,097,611 acres, but, as there was no ordnance survey, which had to be made by the Commission, only 848,515 acres had been definitely mapped out with the boundaries of each holding. This work is proceeding apace.

Greece, always important to Great Britain from her geographical position, has become still more so since she became an indispensable link in the chain of the Imperial Air Service to India. During the present year the conductors of this service have abandoned the route across Italy for that via Germany, Belgrade,

Salonika, Phaleron and Crete. The Greek Aviation Ministry, the under-secretary of which is a practical aviator, has shown a disposition to meet the British requests and has given permission to fly over the previously prohibited military area between Salonika and the Yugoslav frontier. The technical difficulties of flying along the Vandar and Morava valleys are considered not so great as the financial conditions involved in the Italian route, and in bad weather the sheltered bay of Eleusis will be used for landing, instead of the open bay of Phaleron, while in Crete the planes will land at Spinalonga, or Mirabello as that ancient Venetian fortress, one of the two last possessions of the Republic in "the great Greek island," is now called. Efforts are being made to divert to Greece some of the revenue derived by other lands from tourists. At present most of those who come travel on big steamers, stay for a few days or hours and spend little ashore. The Delphic festival of the present month in continuance of that of 1927 is expected by its promoters to attract visitors, but for the British May is a less available month than April, which is considered too cold for outdoor performances at the altitude of Delphi. To facilitate the visits of tourists, roads are to be made to the chief archæological sites where they do not already exist; thus, a road is nearly finished from Levadeia to Delphi, which will greatly shorten the journey from Athens. What is wanted is clean but not luxurious hotels in country places. In view of the fact that within the last ten months two trains, one the Simplon-Orient express, have run off the line between Amphikleia and Sianokladi owing to the crumbling away of the subsoil after heavy rains, it is very desirable that that dangerous track over Mount Othrys should be used only for light traffic and not for the heavy international trains which connect Greece with Western Europe and carry the mails from London. An alternative line for express trains could be built on a more solid foundation. Another important new railway needed is that bringing Bulgaria into direct connection with Salonika by prolonging the line from Petrich as proposed at the International Peace Conference, for both countries would profit by the exchange of their products and Bulgarian trade would benefit the port of Salonika. Trade in general improved in 1929, for during that year Greece imported goods to the value of £35,401,415 and exported goods to that of £18,587,189, both figures much in excess of the previous year. But the cost of living in Athens is still high; although it has fallen somewhat, the index-figure for February was 18.79 times what it was in 1914. But Greece has now enjoyed for some years the blessings of internal peace; the military no longer make *pronunciamientos*, but attend to their own business; the politicians

no longer upset Cabinets, but attend to the business of the country; and the sixteen Athenian dailies publish interesting articles on social and historical subjects instead of describing the last "revolution." At peace and on good terms with all her neighbours, Greece is enjoying on this, the centenary of her independence, the greatest of all blessings which can fall to the lot of any country in south-eastern Europe—that of having no history!

WILLIAM MILLER.

THE PALESTINE REPORT.

THE Report of the Commission* sent out to "inquire into the immediate causes which led to the recent outbreak in Palestine, and to make recommendations as to the steps necessary to avoid a recurrence" of such events, was laid before Parliament on March 31st. Appointed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that body was made up of Sir Walter Shaw, the long-distinguished Colonial Judge, and of three Members of the House of Commons, one of whom represented each of the three political parties. The Commissioners spent somewhat more than two months on the spot, they listened to the evidence of over 120 witnesses and to speeches by the representatives of the Government, the Arabs and the Zionists, and they visited many parts of Palestine and Transjordan. For these reasons, the Report agreed to by all the Members and the Note of Reservations signed by Mr. Snell, the representative of the Labour Party, who in general takes a more favourable view towards Zionism than do his colleagues, are documents of momentous importance and weight.

In some ways the Report, and particularly, I think, Mr. Snell's Note, are highly satisfactory. They contain a vast amount of important political information, heretofore in possession of only the limited few; they prove a determined attempt to investigate the causes of the murderous rioting of August last and, though Mr. Snell goes further than his associates, there is no divergence of opinion as to the nature of the actual outbreak. On the other hand, the principal Report and to some extent Mr. Snell's reservations are open to criticism for at least three distinct reasons. Whilst Mr. Snell considers that the Palestine Administration is not entirely free from responsibility, the Commission as a whole finds that the Government is practically blameless. In one way this is all to the good, but in another it is unpleasant to realise that a considerable number of people†, looking to British rule for safety, have lost their lives without any particular person or persons being held answerable for the crisis as a whole. Again, whereas the Report proclaims a desire not to go beyond the terms of reference and whereas obviously the public wished to hear complete details, the Commission certainly seems to have exceeded the purposes for which it was intended in entering fully into such questions as Jewish immigration, the land problem, and the Constitutional development of the country. Lastly, even if it would be highly beneficial for His Majesty's Government to make a clear statement

* Report of the Commission on the Palestine Disturbances of August 1929. Cmd. 3530. Price 4s. net.

† 133 Jews and 116 Arabs were killed besides 198 Jews and 232 Arabs being wounded sufficiently seriously to require treatment in hospital.

of policy and to explain the meaning which it attaches to various passages in the Mandate, the contradictory nature of the whole position and especially of the different undertakings to the Arabs and to the Jews, may well make this a serious task.

With these preliminary remarks and in order to be as brief, clear, and impartial as possible, I propose to divide my more detailed discussion of the Report into three sections dealing respectively with the nature of the disturbances, their more immediate causes, and the broader reasons leading to the present Arab discontent. The Commission finds that the outbreak in Jerusalem on August 23rd was from the beginning an attack by Arabs upon Jews, and that no excuse in the form of earlier murders by Jews has been established. The events were not premeditated, for the most part they took the shape of a vicious assault by Arabs on Jews, accompanied by wanton destruction of Jewish property, and they neither were nor were intended to be a revolt against British Authority in Palestine. Equally well, whereas Mr. Snell thinks that it might not have been "fundamentally wrong" to have furnished selected Jews with a means of defence, and that the Government should have issued an official *communiqué* denying that the Jews had designs upon the Moslem Holy Places, the Commission as a whole finds that no blame can properly be attached to Mr. Luke, the Chief Secretary and acting High Commissioner, for any measures which he took or did not take, and that Major Saunders (the widely respected and much-liked Commandant of the Police in August last) deserves the greatest credit for his work during the disturbances and for the manner in which he gave his evidence. On the other side of the picture the Commissioners rightly and correctly declare that the policy of reducing the garrison was carried too far, that the Intelligence Service in Palestine proved to be inadequate and that, although the conduct of the British police is worthy of the highest commendation, the Palestinian police were not to be relied upon when faced by racial disturbances or by the necessity of using force against their co-religionists.

One of the most important and the most controversial sections of the Report deals with the positions, attitudes, and rôles of the Mufti of Jerusalem and of the Palestine Arab Executive, and here there are considerable differences between the general opinion of the Commissioners and the reservations of Mr. Snell. The Grand Mufti, who belongs to the distinguished Husseini family and who possesses a great deal of personal charm, is by far the most important religious leader in Palestine. He is accepted by over 650,000 Moslems out of the total population of about 900,000, and he is President of the Supreme Moslem Council. That body manages all the religious properties and Courts, it deals with the

Government in matters appertaining to these questions, and it controls a considerable number of mosque schools, in which education is largely confined to religious subjects. The Palestine Arab Executive is an unofficial political organisation, it claims to represent the opinions of the 80,000 Christian Arabs as well as of the vast majority of their Moslem compatriots, and its policy has always been nationalistic and uncompromising in the extreme.

In the course of the Inquiry the Zionist Executive made far-reaching complaints against the Mufti and the Arab Executive—complaints resolving themselves into a charge that the disturbances of last year were largely the direct result of organisation and incitement, the main responsibility for which must be attributed to these two authorities. The Commissioners, as a whole, find that whereas the Mufti "was influenced by the two-fold desire to annoy the Jews and to mobilise Moslem opinion on the issue of the Wailing Wall" he had no intention of utilising this religious campaign as the means of inciting to disorder. Moreover, whilst after the disturbances had broken out the Mufti co-operated with the Government in their efforts both to restore peace and to prevent the extension of disorder, the Report proceeds that he (the Mufti) "like many others who directly or indirectly played upon public feeling in Palestine must accept a share in the responsibility for the disturbances." Adopting a corresponding attitude towards the Arab Executive the Commissioners find that definite accusations against that body are negated by the known facts, but that members of the Executive probably "exacerbated racial feeling after the disturbances had begun" and that for their failure, during the preceding week, to declare "publicly and emphatically that they were on the side of law and order neither the Mufti nor the Palestine Arab Executive can be acquitted of blame." Mr. Snell has "not the least doubt that he [the Mufti] was aware of the nature of that campaign [of anti-Zionism conducted by some of his followers] and that he realised the danger of disturbance which is never absent when religious propaganda of an exciting character is spread among a Moslem people." Equally, he finds "it difficult to believe that the actions of the individual members of the Executive were unknown to that body or indeed that those individuals were acting in a purely personal capacity."

So much for the actual nature of the outbreak. We now come to its more immediate causes, where, broadly speaking, the Commissioners support the Jewish case. Here the chief things were certainly the Wailing Wall and various developments connected with it. That Wall is part of the Harem-esh-Sherif, which is an Islamic Place of real sanctity, and legally it is the absolute property of the Moslem community. On the other hand, the Wall forms a section of the Western Exterior of the Ancient Jewish

Temple, it is regarded with the greatest reverence by the religious Jews, and their custom of praying there extends back at least to the Middle Ages. The Wall is therefore a Holy Place (I believe the only Holy Place in Jerusalem) in which both the Moslems and the Jews have a direct concern; from time to time questions have arisen about its use, and in September 1925 a ruling was given which forbade the bringing by Jews of seats and benches to the Wall, even though these were intended for the support of worshippers who were aged or infirm. Three years later, and in the autumn of 1928, the question was raised in an acute form by the Jewish introduction of a screen on the pavement in front of the Wall, by the forcible removal of that screen by the police, and by the publication of a White Paper* in which the doctrine of the maintenance of the *status quo* was upheld. These events reassured the Arabs, but were distasteful to the Jews, and the Moslem authorities exercised to the full their rights in the neighbourhood of the Wall. There were considerable building operations, among other things destined to convert the pavement in front of the Wall into a thoroughfare. Furthermore the Jews were seriously annoyed by a muezzin, stationed in the immediate neighbourhood of the Wall, who called the Moslems to prayer five times a day, and by the playing of music, accompanied by shouting, in a garden close to the Wall. In the end there was the Jewish procession to the Wall on August 15th, which was opposed by the acting members of the Zionist Executive and the even more regrettable Moslem counter-demonstration on the following day—demonstrations both of which unfortunately seem to have been unpreventable.

Running parallel and often closely bound up with the developments at or near the Wall were a series of other conditions and events, worthy of remark and often of censure. The Society for the Protection of the Moslem Holy Places and the Pro-Wailing Wall Committee each conducted a campaign of propaganda on this all-important subject. The activities of both these Societies are deserving of censure, but it is necessary to draw some distinction between them because, whilst the first was earlier in the field and founded and fostered by some of the Moslem leaders, the second was viewed with disfavour by the official Zionists. A further cause of the disaster was the liberty of expression in which some sections of the local Press were allowed to indulge. Neither side can be exonerated from blame on this score, but here, too, the worst offenders were a number of the Arabic newspapers, and the Commissioners recommend that the Palestine Government should examine the Press Law actually in force and that the attention of Senior Officers should in future be drawn to any articles of an

* Cmd. 3229. 2d. net.

inflammatory character. Moreover, whereas the deliberate agitation of the less educated Arab people played its part, the enlargement of the Jewish Agency, under resolutions passed by the Sixteenth Zionist Congress just before the outbreak, is held to have been a cause of apprehension among the Arabs.

In the limited space here available, it would be impossible to enter into details concerning the broader causes of the present situation—causes where the majority of the Commissioners are for the most part unfavourable to the direct or indirect interests of Zionism. The problems of immigration, the land, and the Constitutional position are each worthy of articles such as this. Besides large sums provided by other Jewish institutions, the Zionist Organisation has expended about seven million pounds in Palestine since November 1917, the net Jewish immigration between the Armistice and the end of the year 1928 amounted to 75,000, and there is no doubt that the Commissioners are correct in saying that Jewish enterprise and Jewish immigration, when not exaggerated, have conferred material benefits upon Palestine. If this is accepted, and it must be accepted by any traveller who has seen the results of Jewish enterprise, then it is largely a question of the number of Jews to be admitted, of the method of their admission and of the manner of their selection.

There are three principal classes of immigrants. The first is the one of independent means, the second is the person who at the time of his arrival is dependent for his maintenance upon a resident in Palestine, and the third is the working man who hopes for employment. In practice the numbers of the first two classes have been unlimited, with the sometimes unhappy result that immigrants, originally possessed of the required capital,* have lost or expended it, thus being thrown upon the labour market. In the case of entrants under the Labour Schedule, the Zionist Executive applies twice a year to the Administration for a given number of certificates. That application is considered by the Chief Immigration Officer, the High Commissioner decides the number of certificates to be granted, and the actual selection of the candidates falls to the Jewish Authorities. The Commissioners as a whole assert that in practice this task is left to the General Federation of Jewish Labour, that this body has regard to the political creed of the newcomers rather than to their qualifications, and that such a system cannot be defended. Mr. Snell is unable to associate himself with many of the criticisms about immigration made by his colleagues, he points out that the Zionist Executive assumes responsibility for the maintenance of immigrants for twelve months,

*The amount varies according to other qualifications, but may be taken to be a capital of £500 or an income of £60 per year.

and he gained the impression that the Zionist Executive "itself decides how many certificates shall be allotted to each particular country and that its decision is based upon its knowledge of the situation in each and of the needs in Palestine." There may be room for improvement and it is certainly necessary to limit the number of immigrants as this has been limited during the last few years. But it seems inconceivable that the Zionists, who bore a large proportion of the burden of maintaining the unemployed, would wish to increase their number or that they would be so short-sighted as to ignore the necessity for securing the best available immigrants.

The two principal controversies about the land are as to whether the Jews have purchased or are being allowed to purchase a too large proportion of the Palestinian soil, and as to whether proper precautions are being taken to protect the Arab tenants. Upon both these questions, it is pretty clear that the majority of the Commissioners favoured the Arab standpoint. The cultivable land in Palestine amounts to roughly 2,750,000* acres, at the time of the Armistice there were approximately 55,000 Jews in the country, and about 100,000 acres of land† were then in Jewish hands. To-day the total population is just under 900,000, there are 150,000 Jews, and some 225,000 acres of land belong to Hebrew organisations or to Hebrew proprietors. Such figures mean that the proportion of land in Jewish hands has not increased as rapidly as the Jewish population, and that whereas the Jews now constitute approximately one-sixth of the inhabitants, they own less than one-twelfth of the cultivable land. The Commissioners are certainly right in suggesting that inquiries should be made by experts as to the prospects of improved methods of cultivation and they may or may not be correct in saying that the country cannot carry a large agricultural population without changed farming conditions. But the Jewish case is that those conditions are being and can be improved, that they pay a very high price for the land, and that any owner should be free to sell in case he desires to do so.

The position of the tenant is more serious and more complicated. Much of the land belonged or belongs to absentee Arab landlords and, provided they secure a good price, they do not care what happens to their co-nationals, the tenants. In 1921 the Government promulgated an Ordinance under which the transfer of property was not to be sanctioned unless the tenant was provided with sufficient land for his maintenance. But this Ordinance did not work well, its objects were not achieved, and the tenants usually accepted Jewish money and absented themselves. Consequently,

* With one exception the figures here quoted are taken from the Report of the Commission.

† *Survey of International Affairs* 1925, Vol. I, p. 381.

in July last a fresh Ordinance was introduced, under which financial compensation for disturbance or for improvements was made legal. The new law therefore in a way recognises a process in operation for years, certainly it will not prevent the tenants from receiving compensation and then grumbling, and the Government is alone in a position to decide whether it is necessary to take further steps to prevent the alienation of interests bound up with the soil.

Though Mr. Snell does not consider that an Arab desire for self-government contributed in any degree to the outbreaks, the majority of the Commissioners believe that this question is greatly aggravating the difficulties of the local Administration. Each of these contentions may be true, and the Commission is certainly correct in regretting that the Arabs did not accept the offer of a Legislative Council made to them in 1922. But even after that proposal and after the primary elections for such a Council had been boycotted by the majority of the population in 1923, two further opportunities were given to the Arab leaders to co-operate with the Government. The first of these would have entailed the reconstitution of the Advisory Council, with a membership conforming to that proposed for the Legislative Council, and the second foresaw the formation of an Arab Agency on the lines of the Jewish Agency. That such proposals were rejected and that the events of last year took place surely prove that the position in Palestine is not yet ripe for any form of real self-government.

The Commission finds that of four minor Arab complaints, discussed in the Report, some are not well founded and none can be regarded as serious grievances. This should put an end to the agitations about the Rutenberg and Dead Sea Concessions, about the position of certain Arabs who claim Palestinian citizenship, about the high level of taxation, and about the remission of part of the debt due by the Town Council of Tel-Aviv. It therefore only remains to say that no British Cabinet can, will, or should give up its sacred charge in Palestine and that the Balfour Declaration, the Jewish National Home, and the protection of the rights of other sections of the population are interdependent. For these reasons the Prime Minister rightly stated in the House of Commons on April 3rd that there can be no question of receding from our obligations, and that His Majesty's Government intend to do equal justice to all sections of the community. It is to be hoped that both the Jews and the Arabs will do their best to facilitate that task.

H. CHARLES WOODS.

WHY BISHOPS?

IT cannot be denied that we who insist on the need of Bishops in the Christian Church incur a grave responsibility. We add one more to the many difficulties which hinder the union of Christians. We ought therefore to scrutinise very closely the arguments on which we rely, and the result is not always satisfactory. Some of them remind me of a remark made by Liddon in one of his caustic moods. "I think it is a pity," he is reported to have said, "that our Bishops claim recognition on the ground that they are of the *bene esse* of the Church. I can show pretty conclusively that they are of the *esse* of the Church, but I find it hard to place them in regard to its *bene esse*." Other defences challenge a less personal criticism. It is sometimes argued that episcopacy is required for the maintenance of unity. The same ground is taken also in defence of the Papacy. Neither institution seems to have been conspicuously successful in this respect, and episcopacy in England does not come well out of a comparison with presbytery in Scotland.

Something weightier is alleged when it is argued that Bishops are needed for the perpetuation of the sacred ministry. Here again the question becomes personal, but in a more serious and delicate fashion. We are bound to advance with the utmost caution and delicacy an argument which implies the disqualification of a ministry actually exercised by men whom we hold in profound and sometimes in affectionate respect; but if it is sound, it ought not to be ignored. For my own part, I am not convinced that the need is conclusively proved. I acknowledge the weight of the fact that during the greater part of Christian history none were admitted to the sacred ministry without ordination by a Bishop. This does raise a presumption that such ordination is necessary; but does it prove that the requirement is anything more than disciplinary, imposed for good reason by ecclesiastical authority? If it is no more than that, it can, on canonical principles, be dispensed with, should a case of necessity or other just cause arise. Doubts of the absolute necessity are strengthened by a well-known practice of the Catholic Church. I have several times been called upon, as a Priest, to lay my hand along with the Bishop's on the head of a man being ordained to the priesthood. I find it difficult to believe that on those occasions I did nothing; that the imposition of my hand was merely a gesture of assent to what was being actually done by the Bishop himself alone. The practice dates from the time of St. Paul at latest. I cannot doubt the Pauline origin of 1 Tim. iv, 14 and 2 Tim. i, 6; the two passages, read together, describe the practice still followed, and

moreover they will bear either of the interpretations now put upon it. There is, therefore, a case for presbyteral as a possible substitute for episcopal ordination, even if it be ruled out by the disciplinary order of the Church.

But presbyteral ordination is not the only substitute to be considered. I have been much impressed by the way in which so staunch and informed a Catholic as Sir Thomas More regarded a case of necessity. The problems of Utopia are not practical politics, but they may sometimes throw light on questions of procedure. More left it an open question whether his Utopians, converted and baptised by their Christian visitors and then left without Bishop or Priest, might not of themselves appoint men to minister in the offices of religion. That seems to amount to what we know as Congregationalism. It is put forward on the ground of necessity; and it is well to remember that eminent English divines, at the time of the Reformation and afterwards, acknowledged the ministries of the Reformed Churches abroad on the same ground, alleging that Bishops were not to be had. The impossibility may seem to be factitious, due to the refusal of the services of Bishops quite accessible, but I do not wish to enter on that debate; I am concerned only with the nature of the plea. To say that episcopal ordination may be dispensed with on the score of necessity is to say in effect that it is normal but not essential. There is a considerable weight of opinion leaning in that direction. This being so, it is difficult even to argue, on the ground of ordination, that the episcopate is of the *esse* of the Church; it is hopeless to look for the conviction of gainsayers. On what other ground can it be argued?

I am unwilling to be drawn away from my particular question, but the personal respect of which I have spoken impels me to consider a practical corollary. Assuming episcopal ordination to be normal but not absolutely necessary, we may find two lines of conduct open to us in a given case. With full knowledge of the circumstances we may fall back on the maxim *quod fieri non debuit factum valet* which St. Augustine borrowed or invented for the solution of a similar problem. Or again, we may earnestly beg men whom we respect as equal, or even as superior, to receive the normal qualification which we have and they have not, that we may work together in the Christian ministry with the more complete equality, spiritual and external. If we act so, we must be prepared to do exactly as much for any who ask it of us.

I return to my proper subject. If the necessity of episcopacy cannot be conclusively asserted on the foregoing grounds, is there any other ground on which it may be pressed even at the risk of hindering Christian union? The problem should be exactly

stated. The existence of episcopacy is not in question; it does exist in the Christian Church, and there is not the remotest prospect of its disappearance. Nor should there be any obscurity about the definition of the Christian Church: it is the whole company of believers in Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world. In the Church, so defined, episcopacy exists. The question in debate is concerned with the relation of individual Christians, or groups of them, to that episcopate. What can make the episcopate a necessary institution? There is only one possible answer. It is necessary if it be in accordance with the will of God, revealed in the original constitution of the Church. That constitution was remarkably simple. It is clear that our Lord committed to the Apostles the whole work of the Gospel. The mission of the seventy, recorded by St. Luke, is evidently temporary and local; the mission of the Apostles is as evidently universal; they are sent to the whole world, and no limit of time, short of the ultimate consummation, is anywhere suggested. The idea frequently entertained, that their work was done when they had borne witness to the Resurrection and started the organic development of the Church, will not bear examination. When St. Paul says that we are "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets," we must be cautious in arguing from a metaphor, but it is clear that he did not think of them as a kind of temporary scaffolding. With the same caution we may almost as confidently observe that an expanding structure will require an expanding foundation.

That an expansion of the apostolate did occur is unquestionable. St. Paul himself is an example of it. But he is only one of a considerable number recorded. Matthias and Barnabas are obvious cases. When Paul paid his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion he found Peter there, "but other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother" (Gal. i, 19). James was therefore become an Apostle. Silvanus and Timothy, joined with Paul in responsibility for the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, expressly call themselves Apostles (ii, 6). When St. Paul calls Titus "my partner and fellow-worker to you-ward" (2 Cor. viii, 23), I suspect that he is putting him in the same category, but in the absence of the actual title I will not insist. In Romans xvi, 7 Andronicus and Junias are named as "notable among the Apostles." Here are eight or nine found within a comparatively small field, well known to us because the work of St. Paul has been so conspicuously well recorded. There were other fields with which we have little acquaintance. From some of those other fields may have come the men of whom St. Paul complains as "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming them-

selves into apostles of Christ" (2 Cor. xi, 13). Whoever and whatever they were, it is obvious that genuine Apostles must have been fairly numerous if pretenders could hope to pass for such. The same trouble appears many years later in one of the Epistles to the Seven Churches, where we read of men who "call themselves apostles, and are not" (Rev. ii, 2). There would be no point in claiming an office which was not known to be in existence. Roughly contemporary with the Apocalypse is the Didache. Here are found in some undetermined region of the Church men highly respected as Apostles or Prophets, itinerating in the work of the Gospel.

This mention of Apostles and Prophets, linked together as in 1 Cor. xii and Eph. iv, calls for a brief note on nomenclature. In the former place there is a list of functionaries said to have been "set in the Church" by God: "First apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, divers tongues." In the latter, the ascended Lord is said to have "given some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." In both alike Apostles and Prophets head the list; the former begins as with a graded hierarchy, but this feature disappears in the latter. A striking feature of both lists is the absence of Presbyters, who certainly existed at Ephesus, and probably also at Corinth. This has been explained on the ground that the functions here enumerated were *charismatic*—a word not found in the Greek of the New Testament, but invented to indicate direct appointment by a gift of the Spirit—whereas the Presbyters were normal officials of an organised Church. The distinction has been abandoned, chiefly because it is clear that St. Paul regarded every such official as having his proper *charisma* from the Spirit. Something else must be sought in the titles of these lists.

Examine the title of "evangelist." What is an evangelist? Evidently one who evangelises. But this is the specific work of an Apostle. "Christ sent me not to baptise," says St. Paul (1 Cor. i, 17), "but to evangelise." When "Smectymnuus" argued that Timothy could not have been a bishop because he was an evangelist, Thorndike weakly replied that it would be as reasonable to "conclude that Philip was no deacon because he was an evangelist, and contradict the Scripture that saith, 'We entered into the house of Philip the Evangelist, which was one of the seven.'" He might with better scholarship and much greater force have pointed out that St. Paul, when bidding Timothy "do the work of an evangelist" (2 Tim. iv, 5), was charging him with apostolic functions. We have seen, indeed, that before this time he was already no less than an Apostle. The Prophet also, who

is here described as set for a special function in the Church, is not simply a man who has and can exercise the gift of prophecy, for in this same Epistle St. Paul says that every believer normally has that gift: "Ye all can prophesy." He also ranks with the Apostles, and the same may be said of the "teachers" who come next in the enumeration, bearing the familiar title of the Rabbi or Doctor of the Law in the Jewish polity. Barnabas and Saul are named among the Prophets and Teachers at Antioch in Acts xiii, 1; immediately afterwards they are apostles. Silas or Silvanus, whom we have seen to be an Apostle when writing to the Thessalonians, is a Prophet in Acts xv, 32, when he first joins St. Paul.

The conclusion seems to be that all those who are described as set in the Church by God, or as given to the Church by the ascended Lord, are men of apostolic standing, though in different grades. That there were gradations of dignity is clearly implied when St. Paul protests that he is not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles. There is no difficulty in supposing this title to have been used sometimes generically, sometimes specifically, for those of the highest grade. As compared with all these, the Presbyters occupy a lower place. They are appointed and controlled by men of apostolic rank, and they are officers, not of the whole Church, but of a local congregation. They are therefore not included in the lists that we have examined.

This digression will be found justified, I hope, when we pass on from the accumulated evidence showing the continuance of the apostolic title and the existence, in considerable numbers, of men fulfilling apostolic functions.

After the Apocalypse and the Didache there is no more explicit evidence of the same kind. Only a short space of time, if any, separates them from the next two authorities of which we must take account, the Epistle of Clement and the Epistles of Ignatius to five Churches in the province of Asia. In both of these the original Apostles, with St. Paul included, are mentioned as if of unapproachable dignity, and the title is reserved to them. There is no ground for supposing that in this respect the writers fully represent contemporaneous usage, and the point is not of first-rate importance; but I have to reckon with it. Clement, then, does not announce himself as an apostle. Indeed, he does not write in his own name at all, but in the name of the Roman Church—"the Church of God which is in sojourn at Rome." There is no reason for doubting the ascription of the epistle to a writer of the name given; who or what he was remains uncertain. His namesake Clement of Alexandria once calls him bluntly "the Apostle Clement" (Strom. iv, 17), but that is more than a hundred

years later. That he was a man of considerable prominence seems to be indicated by the stories which tradition wove about his name, opening the way much later to a whole cycle of romance. Such evidence, however, is not required. His writing shows his character in a clear light. If he does not name himself as an Apostle in the epistolary style of St. Paul, his epistle is none the less wholly apostolic. He reproveth the disorders in the Church of Corinth less vehemently but with little less authority than was exerted by St. Paul in similar circumstances. It should be observed that the trouble was due to disputes among the Presbyters. Incidentally it becomes clear that there was at Corinth no ruling authority over the Presbyters such as we shall find in the Churches of Asia addressed by Ignatius, and the lack of this was perhaps a contributory cause of the disorders.

I come to the Ignatian Epistles. Ignatius, condemned at Antioch presumably on the charge of refusing to pay the customary divine honours to the Emperor, was remitted to Rome for punishment. Travelling in the irksome custody of soldiers he was, like St. Paul, allowed much liberty of intercourse with friends. He addressed letters to five Churches in the province of Asia, some of which he also visited; another to the Church "which locally presides in the region of the Romans," and a seventh more personal to Polycarp of Smyrna. The certain prospect of death in the arena filled him with an exaltation of spirit which accounts for the strained language sometimes employed by him, but Dr. Streeter's attempt by the method of psycho-analysis to infer that his mind was unhinged is quite unconvincing. The epistles show a perfectly sane understanding of the circumstances of the several places, and for the first time we have a clear account of the organisation of a local Church. In each there is a group of Presbyters and another of Deacons; definitely superior to them is a single ruler, who bears the title of Bishop or Overseer. This applies only to the Churches in Asia. Ignatius was perhaps not well acquainted with the organisation of the Church at Rome; at all events he says nothing about it.

How shall we understand these Bishops? The title, as we know, had once been common to all Presbyters. We are not, however, concerned with titles, but with powers; and the powers exercised by them appear to be exactly those which we have previously seen exercised by Apostles over Presbyters and all the faithful alike. Ignatius goes so far as to say that the Presbyters must be subject to the Bishop as the Apostles were to Christ. The language offends, but the meaning is harmless. The inference is that in the ordered hierarchy here depicted the Bishop is in fact an Apostle. The continuation of the Apostolate traced up to this

point is thus carried forward. Three objections only seem to carry weight against this conclusion. The first is that Bishops of the Ignatian model have never been called Apostles. The second is that Ignatius himself contrasted Apostle and Bishop. The third is that the two officers are fundamentally different; the Bishop is strictly an officer of a local Church; the Apostle was not locally stationed, but was rather itinerant.

To the first objection it might be a sufficient answer that powers and not titles are in question; but there is more to be said, which I postpone.

The second objection is true in fact, but the meaning of the contrast should be noted. It is found in two places. The only Apostles whom Ignatius mentions by name are Peter and Paul. In Rom. iv, 3, he writes: "I do not command you like Peter and Paul. They were apostles, I . . ." But what does he say of himself? He does not say, "I am only a Bishop." He says, "I am a convict." In Trall. iii, 3 the contrast is in the same terms. A Bishop as such is not contrasted with an Apostle.

The third objection breaks down on both sides of the comparison. James, one of the chiefest Apostles, appears to have been fixed as locally in Jerusalem as any Bishop of Asia in his own city. On the other hand a Bishop of the Ignatian model is by no means so straitly fixed in his own city as the objector supposes. Ignatius calls himself sometimes Bishop of Antioch, sometimes Bishop of Syria. Duchesne inferred that there was no other Church in the province but that of Antioch, and pointed out that in the middle of the second century there was similarly but one Bishop for the whole of Gaul north of the Narbonensian province. Later still the Bishop of Alexandria had charge of the whole of Egypt. These were certainly apostolic labours. It is difficult, however, to believe that no local Churches were as yet established in the extensive and densely peopled region of Syria, where the Faith had been so long preached, and it is far more probable that in calling himself Bishop of Syria Ignatius indicated a superior authority extending over several Churches, some of them perhaps furnished with Bishops of their own. There is something worth following up in Dr. Streeter's paradoxical suggestion that at Antioch and elsewhere Archbishops may be found more primitive than Bishops. The Bishops of Asia themselves were not entirely absorbed in their local pastorate. Shortly after the visit of Ignatius, Polycarp of Smyrna was consulted by the Church of Philippi beyond the sea, and sent a letter full of apostolic advice and exhortation; Ignatius also begged him to keep an eye on the needs of distant Antioch, and at the end of his long life we hear of him at Rome, whither he had gone to attempt the

settlement of a troublesome question about the observance of Easter. I may add that in the later development of the episcopate the intervention of a Bishop beyond his own immediate sphere of operation becomes common form. He works in Synod with others; when he sits in an Ecumenical Council, his pastoral care extends to the whole world. The proposed distinction between Apostle and Bishop vanishes on close inspection.

Equally evanescent is the sharp distinction drawn between the titles. There was, beyond all doubt, a tendency to restrict the use of the title of Apostle. "The Twelve Apostles" became, with scant respect for St. Paul, a standard form of speech, and it appears in the Apocalyptic vision (Rev. xxi, 14) of the Holy City coming down from Heaven. This restriction was permanent, but adjectival uses of the term abound. I have not found one in the slender remains of the Christian literature of the second century. Afterwards they became common. Tertullian's "Cathedræ apostolorum" is not to the point, for he was referring to special sees founded by original Apostles; but for Cyprian "Cathedra Petri" was the natural designation of a Bishop's seat of authority, and two centuries later Gildas the Wise made the same use of the phrase in Britain. I have not traced this elsewhere, but *sedes apostolica* was constantly so used. The indefatigable investigator Thomassin gathered an immense array of quotations showing its use throughout Gaul, Spain, and Africa down to the end of the eighth century; a reference to the *Formula* of Hormisdas extends the evidence to the East. It can hardly mean anything but a seat of authority occupied by an Apostle. Any possible doubt is removed by the occurrence of *Apostolatus tuus*, "Your Apostleship," as a mode of addressing a Bishop. These fashions died out, chiefly perhaps because the growing claims of the Papacy caused the term *Sedes Apostolica* to be reserved as the designation of the Roman See. The change of fashion does not invalidate the previous evidence showing that the Christian Church, while hesitating about the free use of so venerable a title, did regard every Bishop as in substance an Apostle.

I conclude that the episcopate is indispensable for one reason alone; it is the Apostolate, the one fundamental ministry of the Church, the only one of Divine institution, given to the Church, set in the Church, by God Himself.

T. A. LACEY.

ENGLAND AND THE COMING ARAB FEDERATION.

CONTRARY to the wishes of the enemies of Great Britain, another link has been added in the long history of Anglo-Islamic friendship by the recent meeting of the two most powerful Arab potentates through English effort on the coast of Iraq; for both the Wahabi hero of Mecca and King Feisal, on meeting each other on board a British warship in the Persian Gulf on February 23rd last, expressed their deep gratitude to the High Commissioner for taking steps in arranging that Conference. The just appreciation of these facts is important because the cause of rivalry amongst these Arab potentates and their failure in not coming together was hitherto laid at the door of British designs. "If they continue to quarrel," said Sultan Ibn Saud at the conference, "they are solely to blame, not Great Britain."

An agreement of nineteen clauses, which has been signed between Iraq and the Dominions of the Hijaz and Najd, as the result of this meeting, contains a few noteworthy points amongst others. It recognises the mutual independence of the two countries. Diplomatic representations are resolved. It outlaws tribal raiders, and agrees to the extradition of fugitives from justice. A permanent frontier commission is to be appointed; and all disputes are henceforth to be settled by arbitration.

To a superficial observer, the signing of the instrument might merely mean that no more Wahabi raids, such as startled the world a few years ago, would now harass the Baghdad Government; and that beyond the fact that two neighbouring states have resolved to live in peace the matter is therefore of local interest. In effect it has a wide significance, as it concerns more than half of the Moslem world; and is but the contemporary beginning of the great Arab federation which in time might well have a potent influence from Morocco to the fringes of the Far East. For we cannot forget that it is from Arabia that Islam arose and spread, and from what I have seen at Mecca I can state that the original flame of the Prophet still burns with white heat in that cradle of the Arab race, and the people of the desert retain that sense of leadership which was theirs more than 1,300 years ago. They would have a great following in any federation that they might undertake to organise.

In the evolution of their past history, the Arabs have certainly been divided, but it is a moot point whether any severe cleavage rent them to hopeless irreconcilability. The Arab revolt against the Turks would have come even without English help, for every son of the desert considers himself charged with a mission. With

these patent facts before us, we should dismiss the idea from our minds that what occurred in Arabia during and after the Great War was any real index of the mind of those people. It was a period of great excitement, of giving vent to old grudges in which the foreigners did not hesitate to join. The thought of a great federation of Arabia was never out of their mind, and this reconciliation of the House of Husein and the Wahabis is symptomatic of the original ideals.

Perhaps the earliest indication of the Arab national movement is to be found at Beirut in 1860, when a newspaper called *Nafar Suraya*, "The Syrian Trumpet," began to publish articles exhorting all Arabs to unite for a national federation; and when *El Jenan*, "The Shield," flashed in headlines its motto: "Love of our country is an article of faith," it caused the Turkish administration much concern. It was Syria, too, that ultimately helped the younger Turkish party in order to regain the Arab point of view for a national unity. But the first definite proclamation of the Arab committee was made in 1905, in which its members evinced a desire to unite all Arabia and to break away from Turkey. They proposed a liberal constitutional monarchy under an Arab king, making the holy places of Islam in Mecca and Medina an independent state, and its king the Khalifa of the Faithful. In the autumn of 1914, again, the leaders of Arab nationalism arranged a congress of princes and tribes at Kawait, and Talib Bey of Basra, who worked for the idea, was markedly successful in approaching the Amirs and Chiefs of Najd, Jabel Shammar, Kawait, Mohammarah, and the representatives of the great Muntafik tribes of southern Iraq.

In the meantime the European powers were not idle in regard to the Arabian conditions. The Germans had been pouring men and material into the desert, their active propaganda was being furthered in Yeman and Iraq, and in order to checkmate it a secret Anglo-French agreement was signed on May 16th, 1916, in which the French recognised that in the Arabian peninsula England possessed "special political interest"; and thenceforth Great Britain went deeper and deeper into the Arabian mire by financing King Husein and Sultan Ibn Saud. Some £6,000,000 were paid to the former and the latter was subsidised to the extent of £5,000 a month, almost down to 1924. Curious situations arose from time to time, for the battle of Turabah between Husein and Ibn Saud was fought in May 1919 when both parties were receiving subsidies from England, one from the Foreign Office and the other from the India Office. The only apology for these blunders which has been given is that the Allies wished to remove all Turkish control from Arabia. That, of course, was done by the Turks themselves as

soon as they came under the wise leadership of Mustafa Kemal, for the very first article of the Turkish National Pact of January 28th, 1920, was to acknowledge the independence of Arabia; and ever since there has been no difference of opinion between the two.

To those who have followed the Arabian tangle it might be a matter of interest to know that, whereas the progress of Husein's power and his challenge to the growing prestige of the Wahabis resulted in fierce fighting all over the Arabian peninsula, yet in the main, whether Hashimites or people of Najd, both had always the idea of Pan-Arabism at the back of all their struggles. When Feisal was received by the Council of Ten at Versailles in February 1919 as representative of Hijaz he put forward claims for an Arab federation. The Sultan of Najd almost to the day was haranguing his Wahabi followers on the same subject of Arab nationhood.

But King Husein went a step farther by proclaiming himself as the Khalifa when the Angora Assembly banished Prince Abdul Majid in 1924; and it seemed that the consolidation of an Arab federation under the Hashimite banner was complete when both Palestine and Syria accepted him as the leader of the faithful. But he reckoned without the Wahabi warriors of Najd, and the mandatory interest which England and France had already substantiated in the Near East. On the fall of King Husein, the entire Arabia lay at the feet of the Wahabis; the entry of Sultan Ibn Saud's troops into Mecca had in its outward expression increased the chances of the Wahabis for the hegemony of Arabia, or at least of such portions of the peninsula which Ibn Saud could justifiably annex; yet the more important result of his success was that henceforth upon him fell the mantle of a hero who could bring about a grand federation of the men of his race, and Husein's sons ruling over Iraq and Transjordan were considered to have lost all claim to that task.

The Wahabi king, long before his entry into Mecca, where latterly he invited an All-World Moslem Conference, had felt the call of his mission of Arab leadership, so it seems; for the revival of the Ikhwan movement which is the result of his genius cannot be said to have only a localised interest as far as Najd is concerned. Amongst the nomads of the desert he had been infusing a Wahabi spirit with a zeal and skill which prepared his followers for justifiable expansion. It was no easy task for him to curb the raiding instincts of the Badu; and to bring about a national cohesion Arabia had to contend with the difficulties of conflicting interests between the nomads and the settled population of the oases. By giving fresh life to the old Wahabi tenets, he organised the Ikhwans, "the Brothers," and founded the first of their sixty colonies at Artawiyah. With State aid, the Ikhwan colonies of the

tribesmen grew apace to discharge the dual function of agricultural soldiers. This system of keeping an inexpensive army, it might be said, was not unknown to the Romans. In Arabia, however, it produced a binding factor amongst the settled and the nomads as at the same time the movement served to destroy the tribal disunity which had been the cause of so many raids and counter-raids in the past.

Not only on account of the progress that the Wahabis have made in Arabia and the territories which they have acquired, but also owing to the hypnotic force of character of Ibn Saud, the cause of Arab federation should be well served. He banished the causes of tribal unrest by planting agricultural colonies all over the desert where nothing grew before, he removed many of those practices of religion which, although never forming a part of the faith, had yet always served to bring about priestly thralldom, and the directness of his character singles him out from the rest as the all-important man of Arabia under whose banner the federation of his race can be made a reality.

But in dealing with the subject of the unity of that peninsula, the natural question arises as to what form should such a federation take, who should preside over its destinies, and what might be the probabilities of its attitude in regard to Europe and the rest of Asia. If linguistic affinities are to form the basis of this discussion then one would have to include Northern Africa, the Sudan, and even Java, within its orbit. As regards the religion of Islam the same obtains, but clearly the review has to be narrowed down to the geographical limitations of Arabia from Yeman in the south to the Turkish frontier in the north, and from Beirut to Basra west-eastwards. In this area, in race, language, religion, and to a marked degree in the relation of their history there is a general basis of uniformity. But here, too, varying degrees of progress are to be met with: a desert Arab who lives under his black tent and moves from day to day has a somewhat different point of view from that, for instance, of one who sits sipping cup after cup of coffee in the wayside booth at Damascus.

As with individuals, so with states, one notices that there are differences. Yeman is being governed very much after the old Turkish model; strict discipline reigns supreme under a benign autocracy in Najd and Hijaz; Iraq has a kind of pseudo-independence with the possibility of independence in 1932 when she enters the League of Nations; the real status of Transjordan under Amir Abdullah awaits explanation; Palestine and Syria are definitely under the mandate system. An Arab federation in such a heterogeneous system of political apportioning at first sight appears ridiculous. But it is so only to those who have had no first-hand

experience of the Arab; for if there is any people under the sun who never forgets its racial and religious associations it is unquestionably the men of Arabia. The nomad problem has been solved already by the Sultan of Mecca, and his qualifications as a wise ruler and statesman of vision cannot be doubted. The hope is that he will retain what he has already got and exercise a good influence over his neighbours. He is essentially a man of peace, so long as none infringes upon his legitimate interests. Under him both Najd and Hijaz are already growing powerful.

Iraq has made unprecedented progress under King Feisal, so much so that from being a mere Turkish province it may soon have the status of an independent kingdom. Transjordan is not lagging behind, and therefore it is not mere imagination to hope that these three neighbouring states could work out a joint programme of an Arab renaissance under their own respective kings, and within a very short time find a solution for the Palestinian difficulties. Some observers have however stated that, if a working arrangement between the three desert kingdoms of Hijaz, Iraq, and Transjordan could be made, the federation could not be complete without Palestine and Syria, where a different constitutional mentality is developing which is more or less opposed to autocracy, however benign. So far as Syria is concerned, perhaps that objection is tenable, not so much on account of the political outlook as because of the fact that an important element of minorities might resent an amalgamation with the rest of Arabia; especially as the so-called Syrian nationalists some little while ago had actually made a claim upon Palestine. The Jewish minorities in Palestine, of course, are far too insignificant to loom large in this discussion, for ever since that unfortunate Balfour declaration was made it has never ceased to irritate the entire Moslem world. The remarkable degree of intelligence that marks the present people of Palestine, of which perhaps the flower is the Grand Mufti, is not averse to Arab national feeling; indeed, the latest disturbances there make it all the more possible for the people of that region to come within the Arab federation as equal partners.

Many Western alarmists, however, seem to see a germ of Pan-Islamism in an Arab federation. In the first instance no such idea of aggressive Islam should penetrate the minds of the faithful because none is contained in the Koran; and when Pan-Islam was preached few failed to discover in it the necessity of Abdul Hamid to organise the movement as a defensive measure for consolidating his own position as an autocratic Turkish ruler. The Arab federation, by the very nature of the fact that a vast majority of its members would be Moslems, could perhaps be called a Moslem federation if you take religion into the calculation, but it is essen-

tially a race movement; and as such I see no reason to believe that it would, or indeed could, challenge the material resources of the West. In certain forms it would be a movement for good neighbourliness and peace, only working for the consolidation of its own potentialities and for the regeneration and preservation of its own noble culture. To the Moslems beyond Arabia it would appear a movement of worthy endeavour; and especially for the British Empire would it provide the surest bulwark against those forces of disruption which are working amongst its Moslem subjects.

IKBAL ALI SHAH.

PAUL HEYSE (1830-1914).

GOETHE'S conception of "*Weltliteratur*" as an all-embracing, stimulating, socially and politically beneficial factor in the intellectual life of a nation had found its echo in the work of the Romantic Schools in Germany. Translations from Romance and Oriental literatures helped to widen the outlook of those interested in *belles lettres* and were mediately instrumental in drawing the attention of scholars and *littérateurs* to the neglected treasures of old German literature. The study of the Italian, French, and Provençal narrative literature strongly influenced the original work of such past masters of the novel as Th. Storm, K. F. Meyer, and G. Keller, giving form and substance peculiar to the short story by following Goethe's terse definition: "What is a short story but the description of an uncommon event in its evolution? This is its true idea." But the masters just mentioned had only utilised the *technique* of their models, their own works remaining strictly national. It was left to Paul Heyse, German in his upbringing, but steeped in the spirit and form of Romance literatures, to create in his novels (in prose and verse), and in some of his dramas, works of such unmistakably Southern perfection of outline and compressed psychological analysis, that they might easily pass muster as Italian or French when translated into those languages—were it not for the iconoclastic spirit of Hegel and Strauss pervading the author's "*Weltanschauung*."

Heyse possessed—as only a few modern Austrian novelists like Ferdinand von Saar or H. v. Hofmannsthal could claim—that secret of never allowing literary form to degenerate into formalism, a gift to which Hebbel refers in his lines:

That secret, wondrous to behold;
How poet's art has subtly sought
In eddying streams of crowding throngs
To blend in one: form, feeling, thought.

Heyse owed a great deal of his artistic complex to his parents and the happy circumstances of his education. His father was professor of classical philology at the Berlin University and had, through his position as private tutor to young Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, the *entrée* into the intellectual *élite* of the Berlin of his day. From his mother, whose family name was Salomon (later changed into Saalig), he inherited a decided strain of Oriental imagination coupled with a strong dose of healthy free-thought, a leaning which brought him at an early date into the bad books of reactionaries and which made even the most modern historian of German literature, A. Bartels, say some bitter words about the "Halbjude" Heyse. After some half-hearted studies of

classical philology, he turned his attention seriously to Romance languages under the guidance of Friedrich Diez in Bonn. In 1850 his first drama, *Francesca von Rimini*, was published, bearing already distinct traces of two of the author's most prominent traits of character: his æsthetically restrained pagan sensuality and his untrammelled freedom of moral outlook; Paolo addresses Francesca with the words:

The pressure of thy dainty fingers made
The walls of my Christianity collapse
As if they were a feeble house of cards.

And Francesca proudly disclaims any guilt before her outraged husband:

I've nothing to repent: God loved me so
That He did let me share my bliss with Paolo,
And He will also take the stain from me
Of having been thy wife!

The year 1852 he spent in Italy working in libraries and editing old Italian and Provençal texts. In the Vatican library he had the misfortune to incur the wrath of the custodian, who had heard about the "immoral" verses of the young Protestant. "*Scacciatelo subito!*" (kick him out quick!) was the verdict of the stern upholder of old Roman morality, so that the young philologist had to quit the library without having accomplished his task. In 1854 King Max II of Bavaria invited Heyse to stay as his guest in Munich, supplying him with a small salary which enabled Heyse to marry the daughter of the historian of fine arts Kugler. From this date onwards the poet's biography is, with the exception of the ordinary vicissitudes of life, the history of his works. After his wife's death in 1861 he married again, lost two of his children, was unusually fortunate in his friendships with E. Geibel, G. Keller, and Th. Storm, and enjoyed a constantly growing popularity with the enlightened section of the German public, only dimmed by the threatening storm of modern naturalistic literature which he, the once bitterly attacked amoralist, heartily detested and, seeing only the outward sordidness of it, exposed to ridicule and contempt in his novel *Merlin* (1892).

Heyse was, in the words of the brilliant historian of German literature M. Adolphe Bossert: "an aristocrat of intellect and taste, of charming and gentle manners, indulgent to human frailty, and who treated morality as a matter of personal and delicate importance," a picture which the student of the poet's life and works is sure to endorse. His literary activities may be divided into two sections: his reproductive work consisting of translations, editions of foreign prose with masterly introductions; and his original output, novels, dramas and lyrical poetry. As a

translator Heyse ranks, even amongst his privileged nation of great propagandists of foreign literatures, as a past master. Leopardi, Giusti, Alfieri, Parini, Foscolo, Manzoni were all preceded by his excellent introductions, testifying to his serious philological training. A number of Shakespeare dramas in the new edition to which Bodenstedt, Freiligrath, Wilbrandt, and others had been contributing were rendered not only with faithful adherence to the poet's thought and form, but with such perfect command of German poetical technique that they read like originals. With Hermann Kurz he edited a comprehensive collection of German and foreign short stories, again with valuable prefaces.

But his greatest title to fame as a translator rests with his *Italienisches Liederbuch*, a *florilegium* of Italian folk songs collected from the different provinces, and, in conjunction with another great translator, E. Geibel, the *Spanisches Liederbuch*. Both collections proved an inexhaustible source of inspiration for composers like Brahms, Hugo Wolf, J. Marx, and others. Particularly in Wolf's settings of the *Spanisches Liederbuch* we notice that the words for the composer's finest songs were chosen from Heyse's translations, thus proving the poet's subtle *flair* for musical rhythm and atmosphere. Altogether Heyse was keenly interested in music and painting, although his taste was far less catholic in this regard than in literature. He never took to Wagner; his friend Kalbeck, the musical critic and great "*Brahmsianer*," may have been responsible for this one-sidedness. In painting, his predilections went to Van Dyck and Velasquez, his strong sense for "outline" and technical finish thereby manifesting itself.

Heyse was, as translator and propagator of foreign literatures, the *liaison* officer between the cultures of Latin countries and Germany. As novelist he continued the same mission in so far as impeccable form of artistic expression is concerned; but he did more. Although the "*Jungdeutsche Schule*," captained by Heine and Boerne, had artistically suffered bankruptcy, their literary work being too highly coloured by political and journalistic considerations, it had certainly achieved one of its aims: greater elasticity in thought, moral outlook, and literary expression. Heyse's views could not escape being influenced in his own work by the social trend of his times, particularly in that department which made him one of the "*Fuehrende Geister*" in literature: the novel.

Goethe's definition of the novel became widened and deepened by him, as a passage in his *Jugenderinnerungen* called "From my workshop" will show: "We expect of a short novel; worthy

to be called artistic, that it should represent an important human document, an intellectual and moral conflict by unfolding in an uncommon event a new side of human nature. The peculiar charm of this *genre* becomes evident through such an event, being energetically compressed and limited within a small frame." It is this "moral conflict" which becomes more and more the centre of Heyse's ambition as a novelist. It is interesting to watch his evolution as an artist in the theoretical disquisitions which he frequently intersperses in the introductions to his works, as e.g. in the preface to his "Moral novels" (1869): "Society cares, after all, more for the preservation of the species, the immediate material interests of the average human being. The aristocrat of intellect, the revolutionary nature, however, does not acknowledge within the province of morality any higher court of appeal than his own conscience."

This moral tenet, which seems to be nothing but an amplification of the slogan of "Emancipation of the flesh" preached to satiety by the "*Jungdeutsche Schule*," becomes sublimated in Heyse's great novels: *Kinder der Welt* (1873) and *Im Paradiese* (1885).

Everyone in these two novels is practically at war with what is considered the traditional ethics of society, especially regarding the sexual relations between man and woman. Toinette in *Kinder der Welt* is a frank determinist: "I know," she says, "that my fate is the result of my racial conditions." And in another passage she expresses a view which forms the moral basis of most of Heyse's novels: "There is only one *real* refinement of character, to be true to oneself. The vulgar will always hearken to what people say, and ask their advice how to act at a given moment. Who has nobility of soul in himself, lives and dies by his own standards and is thus above the dictates of society." Even Lea, one of Heyse's most spiritual creations, feels the call of the blood and—there she is the forerunner of our most modern broadcasters of sex—proclaims it unabashed! "How powerless is all so-called oneness of intellectual unions against the unreasoning elementary cry of human nature, gagging freedom of decision and depriving even the wisest of their self-restraint." And yet Heyse's men and women in those two novels (the rather caricatured Lorinser and some minor characters excepted) never overstep the borderline of self-chosen moral freedom to plunge into anarchy. It is freedom within a higher, socially independent, moral atmosphere of sexual life, but not free, promiscuous sexual relations, for which the author stands in these novels, which made such a stir at the time of their publication.

But it was in the short story that Heyse found the greatest opportunity to display his deeply searching analytical faculties

and his highly developed technique. His wealth of motives, originality of invention and diversified local colour must, however, not blind us to the fact that we have to face a certain sameness of central idea linking up his numerous tales under one heading; they are not so much stories dealing with the fate of human beings in general, as a huge treatise on the havoc wrought by the alluring charm of woman—at least of a certain type—by her over-readiness to give herself unreservedly to the object of her affection or sudden sexual desire. The heroine of the *Reise nach dem Glück* expresses this quite candidly: "Unless our own heart points the right way, we are always likely to go astray. Once before I became miserable by not listening to the call of my heart. Now I shall follow its advice, even if it merely whispers to me." This feminine note in Heyse's novels may account for Bismarck's dictum: "They are not written for men."

Even Heyse himself must have been conscious of a certain monotony of his *leitmotif*, a fact which made him frequently turn to subjects lying off the beaten track, artificial in their essence, and sometimes repulsive in their treatment. I only refer to *Auf Tod und Leben*: the hero kills his wife at her own request (she is suffering from an incurable disease); finally he is convinced by a very attractive young lady with an elastic conscience that his action was right, a motive expressed rather brutally in one of the poet's *Epigrams*:

'Tis a soothing thought, indeed, to know
That we may consider this rotten life
A one-sided contract 'twixt God and ourselves,
To be cut in two by the surgeon's knife.

To the same class of novel belong *Himmlische und irdische Liebe* and *Der Kreisrichter*, so-called "*Künstlernovellen*," a famous picture forming the background.

This often morbid desire to represent complicated psychological situations brings Heyse sometimes perilously near the modern naturalistic school as in *F.U.R.I.A. (Femina Universi Regina in Aeternum)*, in which a pathological case of religious mania, aggravated by erotic hysteria, is treated with the utmost virtuosity and almost Goya-esque realism. In some of his stories, however, his psychology becomes so artificial as to leave the reader in doubt whether the author was not trying to pull his leg: e.g. in *Geteiltes Herz*, the subject of which reminds us at once of Goethe's *Stella*, but not to the advantage of the younger poet. At any rate, Heyse was probably conscious of this story's deficiency when he made the hero say: "The knowledge of the workings of the human heart is still in its infancy, however old the world may be, and the majority of people have not yet gone further than their A B C,

experienced though they may think themselves." This slight leaning of our poet towards the morbid and artificial provoked Geibel's criticism about *Luise* in a letter to the author: "Your story *Luise*, though splendidly written, represents a painful pathological case. There are better subjects at hand than such hopeless aberrations of nature. I am not blaming you for having written it, for in this way you may have got rid of a good deal of unhealthy stuff in yourself."

But in his finest short stories as in *Der Verlorene Sohn*, where he combines psychological insight with human interest, he certainly reaches the high-water mark of the narrator's art. The last two pages of this story, in which the mother views her murdered son's body in the mortuary, belong to the greatest achievements of German prose. It is altogether regrettable that this story, in which Heyse's art and individuality are particularly evident, should be neglected for *L'Arrabiata*, a certainly delightful story, but a little too reminiscent of the "nice" kind of novel suitable for a finishing school for young ladies.

Heyse as a dramatic poet would require a chapter by itself. His output in this *genre* is almost as prolific as that of the novelist—thirty volumes! But whilst even his opponents on moral grounds will not deny his success as a narrative poet, his greatest admirers must own that his dramas did not appeal to the taste of the public. Heyse himself confessed that he was not a born dramatist: "I lack grip upon the realities of life!" But if we discount this deficiency from which even a great dramatic genius like Browning suffered, we shall find a great deal to admire in Heyse's dramas. As in his novels, he looked for his subject-matter to distant times and countries, thus forfeiting the interest of the average theatregoer, who prefers to listen to the discussion of topics connected with his daily life. In one of his finest dramas, *Don Juan's Ende*, he shared the fate of most authors dealing with a subject which seems to be monopolised by Mozart's opera. Gottfried Keller, who particularly admired Heyse's dramatic powers, could not dissociate himself from this popular failing to appreciate a new version of Tirso de Molina's *Burlador de Sevilla*: "However grand," he writes to Heyse, "the conception of your Don Juan may be, the mere fact that I do not want to hear about any Don Juan after Mozart's opera accounts for my inability to relish even the best tragedy on this subject."

Heyse's pronounced individualism shows itself also in the choice of his protagonists and in their psychological delineation. Tullia, in the *Sabinerinnen*, kills her Roman husband on the bridal night; tormented by the memory of her deed, she confesses to her sister:

Shun not the God of Love! None can escape him!
 Meet humbly his advance and bow before him.
 With deadly wrath he hunteth the rebellious
 And sucks her blood. Has not the pityless God
 Subdued the virgins all? But I alone
 Who dared to fight him, suffer for my freedom!

Fate played Heyse one of her strange tricks when Angelo Vlachos's *Hadrian* was awarded the first prize at a dramatic competition in Athens. The Greek author suddenly, to the surprise of his dumbfounded countrymen, dropped Melpomene's mask and told them that he had fooled the jury by palming off as his own the drama of a certain Paul Heyse, translated into Greek! And yet Heyse was never to see his *Hadrian* performed on the German stage, splendid though it was in style and even effective from a manager's point of view.

His greatest achievement in drama was *Alkibiades*, dealing with a typical Heyse case: the struggle between the moral consciousness and independence of the hero and the lure of worldly success, represented on the one side by Timandra, the Greek slave, and on the other by Mandane, the Persian Princess. Greece wins. When Pharnabazos asks Alkibiades: "What can Timandra be to thee?" Alkibiades answers:

She is a glimpse from home that follows me
 Like some old piece of furniture we take
 Upon a journey, which in foreign lands
 Grows dear to us because it speaks of home.
 Now am I used to her; her voice resounds
 Like an old slumber song my mother sang
 To soothe the unruly boy—it's Greek—that's all!

Heyse always remained true to his ideals as *artist* and—strange as it may sound in view of the violent attacks made on him by the Churches and Philistines—as *moralist*. He voiced these ideals so fittingly in one of his epigrams that it may stand as the motto of his whole life:

To absolve from sins which made us free
 From long-decayed morality:
 Though crime you call it, I proclaim
 Poetic justice as its name!

M. JOUBERT.

RELIGIOUS TEACHING IN THE PROVIDED SCHOOLS.

IT is to be hoped that the reorganisation of our elementary schools which is now taking place will carry us a stage further in the direction of a single system. The present dual system perpetuates the difference between the State-provided and the denominational non-provided schools, and makes the Church appear as the poor relation of the State. Teaching in the non-provided schools may be as good, or even better, than that in the provided schools; traditions in particular cases may be older and richer, but the fact remains that the State can draw on the (apparently) illimitable resources of the rates and taxes while the Church has to depend on the voluntary offerings of its members who have already been mulcted of their involuntary payments for national education. Therefore the old school buildings used by the denominations become less and less attractive in comparison with the provided schools; and if new building is necessary in the regrouping of schools into primary schools for children under eleven and senior schools for children over that age, the Church may find itself unequal to the demand. Moreover, the extremists are less truculent than they were a generation ago, and there is a widespread desire to avoid the renewal of controversy over the religious instruction of children. It may be possible to find a way of ending the old division, if adequate arrangements are made for religious teaching in all the schools by teachers who are interested in the subject and qualified to teach it. Naturally some safeguards would be needed both for the children of those parents who desire no religious teaching for their children and for those who desire some additional teaching in accordance with the tenets of the denomination to which they belong. It should not be beyond the wit of man to devise a satisfactory scheme which will meet these requirements.

Meanwhile, the Commission on religious education appointed by the Archbishops in its Report presented to the Church Assembly last October and the resolutions of the Free Church Council at Nottingham in March go a long way to meet each other. This marks a wonderful improvement on the spirit of 1902. It seems more than likely that "the Syllabuses of Religious Instruction agreed under the control of the Local Education Authorities by representatives of the Church of England, the Free Churches, and the teachers" may become the basis of religious education in all the elementary schools. Even the Minority Report for the Church of England (representing the stiffer denominational position) admits that "there are few (provided) schools where no religious instruc-

tion is given and that there are council schools where the instruction is really good." It may also be added to this understatement that there are Church schools where the religious teaching is very poor and the syllabuses in use are both antiquated and unsatisfactory. The Minority Report goes on to expound the weaknesses of Cowper-Temple religious teaching; but while the Cowper-Temple clause does not permit any instruction in denominational catechisms or formularies it does not necessarily imply that Scriptural teaching of an absolutely colourless character should be given. The Church of England Minority Report seems to define Scripture instruction as the teaching of Bible History. A study of the better type of syllabus in use in the provided schools will show that it is much more than that. Indeed, all that the Report goes on to require in "religious teaching," viz. "the idea of God and the conception of sin, heaven, and hell, and the redemptive side of our Lord's life, as the basis and inspiration of life and conduct," is also taught. How could it be otherwise if the New Testament were really expounded? The provided schools in many cases go even further than these requirements, for there are some authorities in which the authorised syllabus bases all its Bible teaching in the upper standards on the Apostles' Creed. What is urgently needed is that satisfactory schemes of Biblical and extra-Biblical teaching should be worked out for all the elementary schools, provided and non-provided alike.

The Church of England majority is generous in its acknowledgment of the excellence of the religious teaching in the provided schools. It declares that syllabuses of religious instruction that have been drawn up in recent years are uniformly good, but that the large majority of existing syllabuses are in urgent need of revision. Many are antiquated in their point of view, lacking in any idea of gradation of standard, and either scrappy or overcrowded. These criticisms are completely fortified by a careful examination of the majority of the syllabuses in use. Fortunately there are thousands of teachers in all parts of the country who are both keen and effective in this particular work, and are not prepared to be limited even by the restrictions of a meagre and unintelligent syllabus of religious instruction. We have heard a good deal in recent years of the good schemes that have been adopted by various authorities, those issued by the West Riding of Yorkshire and the Cambridgeshire Education Committees being the best known. In each case they represent the joint work of teachers and Biblical scholars. These schemes are good types of a study of the Bible which is essentially Christo-centric and recognises both the growing revelation of God to his people and also the growing development of the child-mind. Other authorities have followed these

good examples, in many cases accepting them for their own schools and, in some cases, improving upon them. Those issued by Manchester, Winchester, Northumberland, Oxfordshire, and Middlesex have all of them points in their favour and represent a healthy variety of treatment of an important subject. There are two main methods of treating the Biblical material in the schools. In the first case the psychologist rules and endeavours to produce the appropriate moral and religious teaching at the right stage of the child's development. He then arranges his lessons from the Bible to enforce the right moral at the right time. The other method is to follow the historical development of the religious ideal in Israel and in the Church and to allow a similar development to reproduce itself in the child's mind. This may be an equally good method from the point of view of child psychology, and it does not outrage the chronological sense. The interval between Moses and the book of Daniel is allowed to appear and some conception of the meaning of the Bible as a whole becomes possible. The moral lessons arise incidentally as the history is followed.

The best that can be said for the many out-of-date syllabuses that are in use all over the country is that for the most part they do try to follow some kind of chronological scheme. It is true that they make no allowance for the changes in Biblical interpretation that have taken place during the last fifty years and therefore follow a pedestrian course through the Old Testament from Adam to "Elisha or Nehemiah" and through the New Testament from the beginning of St. Matthew's Gospel to Pentecost or to the end of the Acts of the Apostles. Not only is it true for them that the prophets do not live for ever, but they might never have existed at all. So also the epistles might never have been written apart from a few selected passages that are to be memorised by the children. The great majority of the older schemes of religious instruction are of this type. In some cases the lessons are set out in some detail, in others the outline only is given on a single page. Some authorities have no printed syllabus, but a typed outline is circulated in the schools. Some print their syllabus at the end of a little hymn-book. One ancient and historic city that does this gives one page of the hymn-book to the whole of the religious instruction during the whole school life of a child. As half the page is given up to a list of passages of Scripture to be learnt by heart, it follows that the syllabus itself is condensed into a space two inches broad by two and a half inches long. For many years the schools under this authority have been divided into three groups for the Scripture lessons. The study of the Old Testament in the first group takes the children from the Creation narrative to Noah or Abraham; in the second division they follow the history of the children of Israel

to the crossing of the Jordan, while the third and last division reaches Elisha. In this third and last division (standard iv and upwards) all that is prescribed for New Testament study is St. Mark's Gospel or Acts i-xv, and "the Lord's Prayer illustrated and explained." That is to say that the four important years which round off the life of children in the elementary schools in that city may be given up to that programme alone.

Similarly one obscure Part III authority in its programme gives up the year before leaving school to the study of the life of St. Peter in St. Luke's Gospel, and to nothing else in the New Testament; while the Old Testament study for the next and closing year is "the lives of Elisha and Daniel." Another authority of that type prescribes for the whole school life of its scholars twenty moral lessons with Biblical illustrations and a few selected passages from the Bible for reading. It is one of the authorities in the London area that allows the children in its schools to study the Old Testament as far as the sixteenth chapter of the Book of Judges, though it is true that it does allow them to venture into the early parts of the Acts of the Apostles. This is not the case with one of the greatest cities of the West. The children there do not stray beyond the Gospels in their New Testament studies, while in the Old they are allowed to investigate the Old Testament as far as the death of Joshua. There is one Welsh authority that devotes the last two years of school life, so far as Old Testament study is concerned, to the first three chapters in the Book of Daniel. Even the largest and most important authority in this country has a syllabus of Bible instruction which may spend the last two years over "Lessons from the Book of Ruth" and nothing else in the Old Testament except a few passages for memorising. The syllabus was approved in 1913, but that in use in Liverpool was adopted by the old School Board in 1899. It is true that in this case neither London nor Liverpool leads the country. What is true of London applies with even greater force to most of the authorities in the London area with the exception of the Home Counties. Kent has adopted the Cambridgeshire syllabus, Middlesex has just produced a new and satisfactory syllabus of its own. Surrey did this a few years ago, and Essex is in the act of doing it.

While London and most of the London suburbs have schemes of religious instruction that cry out for revision, it is not surprising to find that many provincial authorities have schemes that are much less satisfactory. It would be invidious to mention these authorities by name, but one important Midland town prints for the whole of its syllabus for standards v, vi, and vii:

- (a) Old Testament History. As in standard iv with the following: Lives of Elijah, Elisha, and Daniel.

RELIGIOUS TEACHING IN PROVIDED SCHOOLS. 613

- (b) New Testament History. As in standard iv with parts of Sermon on the Mount and portions of Acts i-vi.
(c) Repetition. As in standard iv with parts of St. Matthew vi and vii.

This dates back to 1909. The sister town, on the other hand, revised its syllabus in 1925, but has not yet secured more than a bald outline on the old lines, i.e. Adam to Daniel and St. Matthew to the middle of the Acts. While the county town is so unimaginative it is interesting to find that the county is much more enterprising. The claim is made for its rather elaborate syllabus that it has been drawn up on "truly educational lines." There is, however, something unreal about a scheme which uses fragments of Scripture from all parts of the Bible to teach standard i "What I am." Standard iv advances to "My duty to God," and standard v studies "My duty to man." There is an intelligible scheme here, but not until standard vi is the chronological sense or the demand for unification allowed any say. This is probably due to an excessive respect for child psychology, which asserts that the gang instinct manifests itself about this age and is therefore satisfied in the Scripture lesson by a study of the growth of that gang in the Old Testament known as the children of Israel and the New Testament gang known as the Church. This plan is frankly adopted by another authority and a good teacher might make something of it.

It is a surprising fact that the chief sinners in the provision of the religious syllabus are by no means always the weaker and smaller authorities. One important town gives the last three years of school life to the study of the Acts of the Apostles and closes its Old Testament studies with "Elijah, Elisha, and the Babylonish Captivity." Another influential town only allows half a sheet of paper for its syllabus and indicates its wishes by such directions as "eight stories from the Old Testament" or "eight stories from the Life of Christ." Perhaps this is better than the formula that frequently occurs in these old-fashioned syllabuses: "Three miracles and three parables" for standard i followed by "Six miracles and six parables" for standard ii. It is one of the biggest towns in the north of England that follows a scheme drawn up twenty-six years ago, taking standard i as far as the Tower of Babel, standard ii to Jacob, standard iii to Moses and, finally, rushes standards vi and vii from Absalom to the Captivity. Never in these schemes do we find a reference to any material for lessons other than the historical books. Certain Psalms may be learnt by heart, but there is no attempt made to explain what the Book of Psalms represents. Amos and Isaiah, Jeremiah and Job, to say

nothing of the Maccabees, might never have existed. Perhaps the worst syllabus of all is one that devotes the whole of two years of Old Testament study to the lives of those interesting but remote ancestors of ours, Adam, Abel, and Noah. It may be said that no sensible teacher would follow these schemes, and it is well known that this often happens. Such enterprise is not generally encouraged. One truly rural authority after printing a very weak syllabus on one sheet of paper announces that any considerable departure from this scheme must be submitted to the secretary. Some authorities print a few prayers to be used at the opening and closing of schools and some do not, but one of our greatest towns announces that it prescribes no official prayers except the Lord's Prayer. "Teachers must submit sets of prayers they wish to use." Another large town only allows the lesson read at the opening of the school to be explained and the headmaster is responsible for the lectionary for the year. This is the nearest approach to the use of the Bible without note or comment that has been found, and there must be very few schools where there is no regular and systematic study of the Bible.

It would be a pity to close this rapid survey on a note of shrill complaint. There is no principle of Gresham's Law at work here; on the contrary the good schemes are steadily driving out the bad ones. It is refreshing to find new schemes that reveal much devotion and thought in their preparation coming into use. The proposed syllabus for York City, not yet adopted, is one of the best. The new syllabus for Chesterfield is far better than anything that London or the London area can show. Aberdare has long had a scheme that aims successfully at moral and religious instruction. The Macmillan syllabus is one of the best, though it makes rather too heavy demands on teacher and scholar. Burnley and Sheffield have set people to work in preparing their religious syllabus for schools, who have given their minds to the task. When all the satisfactory schemes have been enumerated the fact remains that there are about 100 religious syllabuses in existence, now being used in the provided schools, that are in drastic need of revision. There is no need to call in the Biblical scholar to secure this verdict; anyone who had studied the graded Sunday-school lessons produced by the British Lessons Council would say the same. There is no reason why the approach of the day school to this subject should be so much less intelligent and less scientific than the treatment of it by the Sunday school. If we are ever to secure one system of elementary education in this country, we must begin by making the scheme for religious education the best that the teachers and the representatives of the Churches can produce.

A. W. HARRISON.

THE AFRICAN SLEEPING-SICKNESS.

IT is hardly realised by the general public that the African sleeping-sickness, the terrible scourge which claims the greatest sacrifice of human life and causes the severest economic losses, is extending the areas of its visitation very rapidly, and if not checked in time will certainly become at no distant period a serious menace to Europe.

An international scientific sleeping-sickness expedition, which was despatched by the League of Nations and worked in British colonies, returned not long ago. Experts of many nationalities, but no Americans, were members of the expedition, and their work appears to have made further contributions to the scientific knowledge of sleeping-sickness. This is all to the good, but there is already sufficient scientific knowledge available to exercise effective control over the disease. What is urgently needed is the organisation of men and funds. In the first decade of this century the British already achieved an admirable and practical success in dealing with sleeping-sickness in Uganda. Two hundred thousand out of the 300,000 inhabitants of the north coast of Lake Victoria Nyanza had fallen victims to this scourge: the British rescued the remainder by removing all the surviving inhabitants to another district where the carrier of the disease, a tsetse fly, did not exist. The focus of the disease, which had been destroyed at its centre, has nevertheless gradually spread farther northwards, down the Nile and into the Sudan. The disease also tended to spread farther southwards, creeping along both banks of Lake Victoria Nyanza. But when it reached the frontier between Uganda and German East Africa, which at that time intersected the middle of the Lake, the Germans under the leadership of Robert Koch attacked it so energetically, both on the east and on the west bank, that it was brought to a halt at this point and the southern coastal districts of the Lake, which were in parts densely populated, were spared, although the disease-carrying tsetse fly is very common here also. The Germans achieved this success by concentrating all those suffering from sleeping-sickness in camps which were set up in districts free of the tsetse fly, so that transmissions of the disease no longer occurred. In addition to this, the Germans carried out extensive deforestation in the districts endangered by sleeping-sickness, in order to destroy the sleeping-sickness fly, which can only live in the shade of bushes in the vicinity of water. These two instances, which are already twenty years old and have not remained un-repeated in the interval, show that there is no need of further scientific research—however valuable that may be—in order to take effective measures against sleeping-sickness. We have to-day

much better means of combating it than we had at that time, in the form of more effective remedies. The chemical industries of various countries have discovered such remedies, which have been extensively applied and appreciated in Africa. But in spite of all this, sleeping-sickness has greatly enlarged its areas since the beginning of the Great War and is still ever on the increase.

There are, above all, three causes which have favoured sleeping-sickness: *First*.—The Great War, which spread to Africa, not only caused the interruption of all measures to combat sleeping-sickness for a number of years, but also brought in its train great migrations of the native population, owing to fear of approaching hostile forces and of extensive military conscription, which did not spare even the sleeping-sickness areas. It has, for instance, been proved that three Congolese soldiers belonging to the Belgian Expeditionary Corps in wartime were found suffering from sleeping-sickness in a district of German East Africa in which sleeping-sickness had previously never existed, but where a focus of sleeping-sickness developed after the war. Other cases of sleeping-sickness may owe their origin to a similar cause.

Second.—A further cause of the spread of sleeping-sickness consists in the fact that of late a second variety of tsetse fly has assumed the transmission of the disease. Formerly, only the *glossina palpalis* was held to be the carrier of sleeping-sickness. It was ascertained, however, a few years before the beginning of the war, that sporadic cases of sleeping-sickness occurred in areas in which only the variety of tsetse fly adapted to the steppe climate, the *glossina morsitans*, already known as the carrier of the tsetse disease of animals, could also be taken into consideration as the carrier of sleeping-sickness in human beings. This was called the Rhodesian sleeping-sickness, after the name of the country in which this fly—as a second carrier—was first discovered. Before the war Rhodesian sleeping-sickness never appeared in the form of severe epidemics, but only attracted attention as an endemic in scattered individual cases. But since the Great War larger epidemic foci of Rhodesian sleeping-sickness have unexpectedly developed. The foci of the disease which have newly come into being in the Tanganyika Territory and the sleeping-sickness in the Sudan are of the Rhodesian variety. The fact that the *glossina morsitans* has also assumed the transmission of sleeping-sickness means a very considerable intensification of the danger for Africa, because the area of dissemination of the *glossina* is enormously great and also because this variety of tsetse fly is not connected with water and the damp climate of the virgin forest in the same way as the *glossina palpalis*, but is much more free to move about and consequently more difficult to destroy.

Third.—The third cause which enables sleeping-sickness not only to maintain the position which it gained owing to the war, but also to make further advances, is the lack of skilful colonial doctors in Africa. The German doctors, who were relatively numerous and very zealous in combating epidemics, have been removed. The German colonies have been placed under British, Belgian, and French administration respectively. All these Governments already had extensive sleeping-sickness areas in the African colonies which belonged to them. In the mandates regarding German colonies further sleeping-sickness areas have been apportioned to these three Powers, with the result that none of them has been sufficiently equipped entirely to fulfil its hygienic responsibilities.

Since their experiences in Uganda, the British have not ceased to combat sleeping-sickness in their colonies and they have been successful in many places. But when one remembers that the sleeping-sickness areas under British administration, from Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Tanganyika Territory, Uganda and down the Nile to the Sudan, form an almost unbroken line of about half the length of the whole of Africa, it is easy to realise that it is hardly possible for them to organise unaided the necessary public-health personnel to combat sleeping-sickness on such an extensive scale. Their measures to check the disease have been rendered still more difficult by the fact that their sleeping-sickness areas in the west march for long distances alongside countries which suffer still more severely from sleeping-sickness, and from which fresh cases are continually imported. This explains the fact that their efforts have so far not been completely successful. At a meeting of the Imperial Social Hygiene Congress which was held in London in October 1927 Sir Frederick Lugard, Member for the British Empire of the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, invited attention to the increased need of public-health personnel in Africa. He said that in the British possessions in Africa there were still considerable areas without regular medical services, and added that the appointment of permanent resident doctors with a knowledge of the natives and their language was of far greater use than the construction of handsome hospital buildings. He also referred to the malnutrition of the natives in many parts of Africa, particularly on the Congo, adding that there the natives were often half starved before the harvest.

The French were tardy in adopting practical measures to combat sleeping-sickness. Although this sickness, following the course of the great tributaries of the Congo, had already made its way into French Equatorial Africa at the end of last century, the French watched the penetration of the epidemic into their colony without raising a finger against it. Indeed they devoted little interest,

especially in matters of public health, to this colony, overgrown for the most part with tropical virgin forest which gave them little promise of economic advantage. The French civil doctors not unnaturally preferred the more comfortable life and remunerative practice in the highly developed French colonies to a lonely struggle in the virgin forest, and the few military doctors stationed in the colony were powerless against the forcible penetration of the epidemic.

It was much later before sleeping-sickness made its way into the neighbouring Cameroons from the French colony, but at the beginning of the war the Germans were already hard at work trying to eradicate the then not very extensive foci of the scourge. The war, which interrupted the battle against sleeping-sickness, was followed by a greater spread of the disease, especially as the expeditionary forces extended their operations into sleeping-sickness areas. After the war the French, under their mandate for the greater part of the Cameroons, took over all the infected areas there and found plentiful laboratory equipment in the German sleeping-sickness camps, but they were unable to combat the disease with the same vigour, as they had not a sufficient supply of doctors at their disposal.

In May 1923 the French made a *rapport provisoire* to the League of Nations, in which they described a special procedure for combating sleeping-sickness introduced by them in French Equatorial Africa and the Cameroons, which they called "atoxyl-sterilisation" and also "prophylaxis." They planned to send a doctor with native assistants on tour twice a year through each sleeping-sickness district and to inject all natives suffering from the disease with atoxyl. It was hoped to destroy so much infectious matter in this way that the scourge would soon have spent its force. In this preliminary report statistics are also given of the work done and results obtained, and hopes are entertained of the complete mastery of sleeping-sickness. But in the *rapport complémentaire* which appeared in April 1925 the increase of sleeping-sickness in many places had to be admitted, and the report makes public very adverse criticism on the *prophylaxie* method by French experts. It is to be gathered from the report that the French had abandoned this method. The numerous proposals for improvement contained in the *rapport complémentaire* all demanded a greatly increased medical staff; while the French Government had not even succeeded in raising the small number of doctors necessary for the prophylaxis method. And so sleeping-sickness was allowed to run its course. It was only in the Cameroons that individual French military doctors exerted themselves to combat sleeping-sickness energetically. But as they were too few and their remedies too limited, the local

successes which they achieved remained without influence on the ever-advancing march of the scourge. In April 1926 one of these doctors in the Cameroons, Professor Tanon, published an article in *L'Afrique Française* entitled *Il faut sauver l'Afrique noire*. In this article he denies that there is any lack of doctors in France, and affirms that the blame for the absence of colonial doctors lies with the local *gouvernements* in Africa, who had grown accustomed to satisfying their public-health requirements by means of the cheap military doctors of the colonial troops, whose recruitment was constantly on the decline. They did not wish to recognise the fact that the civil doctors, who had themselves to bear the cost of their long and expensive studies, could not be content with the wretched pay of the military doctors. In addition to the lack of doctors in the French African colonies, there is, he says, a similar lack of European assistant surgeons—it has been recognised everywhere except in France that the colonial public-health service requires such assistance. Professor Tanon goes on to say that in countries like Equatorial Africa and the Cameroons which are afflicted with cosmopolitan diseases and sleeping-sickness, all of which have steadily increased for the last thirty years, the lack of medical personnel is appalling. The situation in the Cameroons is, he remarks, particularly serious, almost the entire population being infected in many regions. The mandated territory, he says, possesses such abundant sources of aid that they would suffice for its deliverance without further assistance if properly applied; but the colony of Equatorial Africa could not dispense with subsidies for the relief and prevention of sleeping-sickness.

A few months after this public announcement by Professor Tanon, on July 8th, 1926, a decree of the French Colonial Minister appeared by which a *mission permanente de la maladie du sommeil* was created. The personnel was to consist of ten doctors, twenty European and 150 native assistants: the director was to receive far-reaching powers and be placed directly under the *Commissaire de la République*, and the salaries of the doctors and assistant surgeons were to be increased by considerable allowances and subsidies. This *Mission Permanente* was appointed for the Cameroons only, but in view of the present spread of sleeping-sickness the personnel must be characterised as very limited, especially in view of the further consideration that the doctors of the mission are not only appointed to combat sleeping-sickness, but are also expected to take over the whole of the other public-health services in the sleeping-sickness areas. The French Equatorial colony was not taken into account at that time, and it was not until January 1928 that it was decided to form a similar mission for French Equatorial Africa, consisting

of ten doctors for a period of five years, under the leadership of the Director of the Pasteur Institute in Brazzaville. It must remain a matter of doubt whether one such mission will suffice to maintain the struggle against sleeping-sickness with any prospect of complete success in the numerous and very extensive epidemic areas of French Equatorial Africa.

The state of affairs in the Belgian Congo colony has, however, reached a still more critical stage. On the Congo for the last forty years, ever since the white race has been developing more active communications and trade, sleeping-sickness has gradually but steadily spread ever farther and assumed a malignant epidemic character. Sleeping-sickness does not indeed appear in the form of epidemics which break out suddenly, like smallpox or yellow-fever, nor is a life-and-death crisis for the patient reached in the first few days of illness, as is the case with these other epidemics; the course of sleeping-sickness is much more of a chronic character. Its germs feed slowly on the internal fluids of the person attacked and, at first, permit of longer periods of apparent well-being, and it is only months later that an ever-increasing weakness, and finally extreme prostration and debility, make their appearance and continue for months before death comes as a release. Sleeping-sickness is inexorable. He who is attacked by the disease succumbs to it, if he is not saved in time by the application of a remedy. In accordance with its chronic character, sleeping-sickness only spreads slowly. When it has been introduced into a village by a sufferer, only a few persons are infected and become ill through the agency of the tsetse fly. It may be years before a larger number of the villagers are infected. But then, when numerous tsetse flies have absorbed the germ of infection, things may move quickly until the whole village is dead or until the few remaining inhabitants have fled in despair to other districts where they, already infected, form the nucleus of a new epidemic. It is precisely in this manner that sleeping-sickness on the Congo has gradually crept farther and farther and, following the streams in the great riverain areas, spread to an enormous extent. In the wake of the northern tributaries it has infected French Equatorial Africa as far as Lake Tchad and has forced its way through this colony to the Cameroons. In the north-east, sleeping-sickness has followed the trade routes and reached the Sudan. The origin of sleeping-sickness round Lake Victoria Nyanza may, without any doubt, be traced to importation, after the manner described above, from the Congo. Towards the east the disease crossed the Congo border on the Russini River and on Lake Tanganyika, and formed a powerful centre among the Warandi. The Germans attacked it vigorously for seven years, and checked it considerably, but had not entirely mastered it at the

outbreak of the war. Towards the south also, the Congo sleeping-sickness spread farther into the districts of Katanga and Angola. Thus the Congo undoubtedly forms the origin and centre of a great Central African belt of sleeping-sickness, with the danger of the disease spreading to all adjacent countries and creating new centres of infection. If it is desired to fight the disease at its source and eliminate this danger, energetic steps must be taken in the Belgian Congo.

According to Belgian estimates, over two million natives in the Congo Colony have died of sleeping-sickness, which means that about 10 per cent. of the entire population have succumbed. In the *rapport provisoire* of May 1923 to the League of Nations, in which the French report sounds so optimistic, the Belgian account strikes a very depressed note. The attempted compulsory isolation and treatment of the sufferers are reported to have failed owing to the resistance of the natives. Deforestation is said to have been of no help, for, six months after the trees had been felled, thick bush had sprung up which offered good protection for the flies. The removal of villagers to places free from tsetse fly also proved impracticable. This method of reducing the number of germ-carriers was mentioned as far back as 1910, but was not carried out for lack of personnel. It was found after medical examination of 621 villages in various regions of the Colony that, out of 73,549 natives, 8,922 were suffering from sleeping-sickness, which means 12.1 per cent. of infection. Some doctors report local improvements, but in the majority of districts an increase of the disease. In the chart attached to the report, nearly the whole of the Colony is shown as more or less infected with sleeping-sickness, but, on the contrary, the mandated territory of Ruanda-Urundi, previously in German hands, is free from it.

In the *rapport complémentaire* of April 1925 to the League of Nations, the following figures are given by Dr. Schwetz as the result of two years' observation and treatment of the natives suffering from sleeping-sickness in the Kikonit Territory:

First examination	...	...	12.8 per cent.
After one year's treatment	...	...	9.9 per cent.
After two years' treatment	...	...	6.0 per cent.

These figures, it is true, were arrived at without microscopic blood tests, and only by feeling the glands, which considerably affects their reliability. In Urundi, where the fight against sleeping-sickness on the part of the Germans was interrupted by the war before they had finally concluded the struggle, and where the Belgians had found no cases in previous years, the disease is reported to have broken out again. Dr. Schwetz expresses himself very

unfavourably regarding the moral qualities of the natives educated in the Congo Sanitary Schools, from which they have obtained diplomas. Dr. Schwetz had felt compelled to hand over a number of these natives to the police authorities for serious misdemeanour. He further says that as soon as a native is allowed to exercise authority, however little, he has a tendency to abuse it. The native requires constant watching, but away in the bush it is not always possible to keep him under observation.

In recent years voices have been raised in Belgium demanding an increase and amelioration of the hygienic provisions for the natives, but unfortunately far-reaching improvement in sanitary organisation on the Congo is beyond the means of Belgium to effect. This little country has been unable from the very beginning to find the necessary number of pioneers for a colony eighty-four times larger than itself. The great majority of the doctors employed in the Colony were foreigners from different countries, and the various languages spoken rendered intimate collaboration difficult. The fight against sleeping-sickness on the Congo in its present stage presents a gigantic task which would be most difficult to fulfil. The only innovation that the Belgian Government was able to announce in the debates in the Belgian Chambers in the spring of 1927 on the improvements in the sanitary service was that of the intended foundation by the University of Louvain of a hospital, with a school of medicine for the natives in the Colony. Thus exactly that system of employing native assistant surgeons to supplement the inadequate staff of doctors which the *rapport supplémentaire* says has proved a failure, is to be further extended. In the interim there has been such a lack of workers in the Colony that the Belgians have transferred a large number of natives from the mandated territory of Ruanda-Urundi to the mining district of Katanga, without considering the danger of the further transmission of sleeping-sickness and other perils awaiting the transferred natives who have come from a very different climate and are accustomed to quite different food and mode of living. Under such circumstances depopulation must make further rapid progress.

Hardly any other nation has worked with such ardour and success in the elimination of various epidemic and endemic diseases as the United States of America, but they have not yet turned their attention to the African sleeping-sickness, which is of all diseases the most deadly. Who is to fill the gaps left by the exclusion of the Germans, and who is to come to the aid of the Belgians in the Congo?

AFRICANUS.

THE ACTIVITY SCHOOL IN AUSTRIA.

"THERE they go!" says an envenomed voice, and my startled look follows the uplifted, pointing chin of a middle-aged woman to a group of about twenty-five small girls, shepherded by a young teacher with harassed eyes. Why the venom? It is just an elementary school-class going for a "teaching walk," such as can be seen any day—and they pass through the gates of the park, to my relief and probably to that of the little teacher, for the Vienna streets are anything but kind to foot passengers. The owner of the voice enlightens me; it now mingles a sneer and a whine with the venom—a fascinating combination. "There they go! Walking—just *walking*—in the middle of the week, in the middle of the morning. Of course the hussy likes a walk better than doing honest work, teaching those children the three r's, which is what she is paid for. Just laziness—that's what is at the bottom of all this new-fangled stuff, says I, the same as the eight-hour day and what not. In my time——"

But I have walked on. I have heard it all before. When I was younger and more optimistic I used to explain patiently—not that it was any of my business. I used to remind the mothers, waiting for their offspring at the gates of the schoolhouse, like me, and voicing much the same plaint as the one above, how tired one single little child can make its mother by indefatigably asking "why" and "wherefore" and "how," so that after an hour or two with the child she feels drained of all strength and more exhausted than after a day's washing; I asked them to multiply this exhaustion by twenty-five or thirty; I told them that the teacher could not, as the mother sometimes will, end the torture in exasperation by exclaiming: "Ask me another and I'll smack your face!"—because, not only is smacking forbidden and against the principles of progressive education, but because the purpose of the teaching walk is just to make the children ask questions, the more the better. I related to them the fact that some teachers break down after these walks at first, simply worn to shreds after two hours, while they will easily stand four hours' continual class teaching; and I begged them to draw the conclusion that it could not possibly be laziness that had inspired the new regulations. It was not the walks alone which roused the indignation of many mothers and even more of fathers. The reform of the elementary schools of Vienna, which has been carried through by the Vienna Municipal School Board with its Socialist majority and extended to the whole country later, in spite of reactionary opposition, is such a drastic one, and some of its measures so easily lend themselves to ridicule, that it took a long time to convince the parents of its advantages.

The activity school (they call it "working-school" here, in contrast to the old "learning-school"), the progressive school of Austria, particularly of Vienna, is not an Austrian speciality in its several elements. Its creators—hundreds of teachers working together, some well known, others anonymous to this day—have taken ideas and experiences wherever they found them, and have built up by synthesis, carefully testing every new principle in "trial classes" before it was made general, a new edifice which as an organic whole has won the admiration, and is the object of close study, of experts from all over the world. In fact, like the new tenement houses, it has become quite an attraction of Vienna. It is an achievement which truly merits admiration, not only in itself, but also because of the immense difficulties by which the work was handicapped, being begun immediately after the Revolution of 1918, in the terrible post-war time when unemployment, misery of the mind and the body, starvation and demoralisation, absolute bankruptcy of social-mindedness, had taken hold of the majority of parents and teachers alike. In addition to this there was the ebb in the treasury of the city, and the enmity and active opposition of the strong reactionary minority. But it has been done, and done well; and while many new ideas in child psychology and education are so exaggerated and mechanised elsewhere (especially in the United States, where the means for experimenting are unlimited) as to arouse the comprehensible scorn and ridicule of experts, the Austrian school is regarded by them, if not with unrestrained approval, at least with universal respect as a unique achievement.

The object of the new school is to draw out the child's individuality, to make it fit for grappling with life, for adapting itself to the unknown future that lies before it. For while former generations could at least gauge approximately what was waiting for their children, the rate of progress (or at least the rapidity of development) to-day is such that we must reluctantly admit we do not know for what we have to prepare our children. The inference is that we must make these children as independent, as responsible, as strong in body and mind, as we possibly can in the shortest time. The acquisition of knowledge (which may be quite useless to them in their unfathomable future) comes second. They must, above all, learn to decide for themselves and to form their lives themselves. This is in direct opposition to the old school, which had believed in knowledge about everything—going so far, with the philosopher Herbart (who strangely enough was a friend of Pestalozzi's), as to suppose that knowledge of the ethical, for instance, is identical with the will and the power of acting ethically. The leading principles in working towards this object are the following: First, *activity* (called the working-principle here). The old school simply taught

the children; that is, dictated to them through the mouth of the teacher the amount of knowledge it wished to instil into them, making sure that they had mastered it and memorised it by a rigid series of examinations; this was—and is in the grammar schools—the universally practised system ("learning-school"), in its time a remarkable progress as compared with the "drill-school" prevalent up to the time of Pestalozzi and later. In the activity-school the children are made to act themselves, to ask and answer, to use their senses and their brains, to work out—as much as possible—the course of study by themselves, carefully led on their way by the teacher. For this purpose of untrammelled conversation the forms are arranged in a semicircle, so that the children can see each other and speak easily, the teacher does not throne high above them, a fear-inspiring figure, but, if not walking about among them, sits at his desk on the same level as themselves. The classes which formerly had as many as sixty pupils (forty-seven was the average) now have about thirty (with forty for the maximum, but that is very rare), so that the rigid discipline necessary with a large number can be foregone.

This principle of activity is helped out by the second: *object-teaching*, as opposed to the exploded abstract teaching through books and empty words. The schoolroom widens, it takes in the street, the town, the country—book and school learning are superseded by pulsing life. The children are made to observe closely and to account for their observations, they are taken for walks and excursions, they are shown small objects at school, they tell what they have seen and heard when by themselves at home and elsewhere. Before learning to read maps, for instance, they are taken to a hill near Vienna and are shown a real range of mountains, the shoulder of a hill, a slope, a hilltop, a valley, a ravine, a river and its affluents, the horizon. Next day in school the trip is talked over. Then the children reproduce in sand the landscape they have seen, helped out by the teacher where their memory fails (but this is not always necessary, they generally piece it out correctly by themselves). They also try to reproduce the villages they have seen, with matchboxes for houses. They look at their handiwork from a ladder, thus getting a bird's-eye view, and now they draw a plan, as well as they are able, on the blackboard. Then, and only then, are they taught to read the printed map of the country they have seen.

Third comes the *concentration of study*. In place of the rigid old syllabus with its non-related and watertight compartments (reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, composition, history, geography, science, singing) the lessons constitute a uniform whole. This is accomplished by fixing beforehand for each week the central

everything depends on the individual teacher, much more so than under the old. Formerly a teacher of mediocre faculties and mediocre energy, working more or less by rote, could do quite well and show up fair results. To-day it wants a magnetic personality, unusual gifts, iron nerves and will, imagination, and an inexhaustible fund of loving patience on the part of the teacher to take the class along with him or her. As the number of such persons is limited, we find much greater differences than formerly in the children who leave school, and hence also the differences of opinion as to the system.

The best type of teacher sends out into the world children who in every respect are high above the old average in knowledge of the world and of their immediate surroundings; in practical and manual accomplishments; in the power of easily expressing themselves graphically and correctly, whether in writing or in speech; in book learning; in manners; in independence; in strength of character—in short, in personality. The worst type of teacher, on the other hand, only just manages to teach them the three r's, with a smattering of science, and lets loose insufferable little imps, not only ignorant, boisterous, and ill-mannered, but cocksure and conceited as well, the terror of their new scenes of activity and of their unlucky families.

PAULA ARNOLD.

FRANCE AND NORTH AFRICA: 1830-1930.

Une diplomatie résolue, adroite et prévoyante l'a longuement préparée; au point de vue militaire elle reste un modèle de précision dont on a trop peu cherché à se rapprocher; malgré les tâtonnements inévitables, son exécution est digne de la même admiration.—GENERAL MANGIN, at Algiers, 1923.

THE year 1830 was memorable to France for two principal events, the beginning of her conquest of Northern Africa and the Revolution which hurled King Charles X from the French throne. An eleventh-hour attempt was made to avert the latter by exploiting the honour and glory of the former happening; but matters had gone too far for such an effort to stand a chance of success, and a thoroughly unsatisfactory régime went down to the accompaniment of some tears and a little bloodshed. Fourteen years previously, a gallant British fleet commanded by Sir Edward Pellew (Lord Exmouth) had reduced the fortifications of the pirate city of Algiers to a heap of ruins and had rescued and restored to their homes in all parts of the world upwards of 2,000 Christian slaves. It might well have been supposed, indeed, that Great Britain was the Power best fitted to undertake the task of conquest and empire in Northern Africa; but England had her hands full in many directions, and in the sequel it fell to the lot of France to embark upon an adventure which, after the lapse of a hundred years, finds her to-day in possession of a huge, wealthy and prosperous territory embracing the fine colonies of Algeria, Tunisia, and, by arrangement with Spain, Morocco.

In the twenties of the nineteenth century, the French Consul at the court of Hussein, Dey of Algiers, was M. Deval, a Levantine by birth and a man of somewhat vacillating character. For several years a considerable sum of money was in dispute as between the Dey and certain French subjects who had claims against two Algerian merchants for grain, etc., supplied. This matter dragged on until 1827, when, as the sequel to a sharp message from Baron Damas, French Foreign Minister, to the Dey, the latter publicly insulted M. Deval by striking him "with his fan."* France at once took action. In June a fleet of thirteen ships sailed from Toulon for Algiers under Commodore Collet, who presented an ultimatum demanding an abject apology for the insult to the French Consul, a salute of one hundred and one guns from the Dey's palace, and the utmost respect from the latter's corsair fleet for all shipping flying the French flag. These terms were haughtily rejected by the proud Hussein. A rigid blockade of the Algerian seaboard was thereupon declared,

* L. T. Cave, *The French in Africa*.

and was carried on by a reinforced French fleet until June 1829. The cruiser *Alerte* then entered the Bay of Algiers and her commander had two interviews with the Dey. Neither of these conferences effected anything, while the *Alerte* was fired on while still carrying her white flag. In reply to questions addressed by the European Powers, and notably by Great Britain, the French Premier (Prince Polignac) stated that it was the intention of France not only to receive reparation for the Dey's menaces and insults, but also to put an end for ever to piracy and Christian slavery in the Mediterranean. Accordingly, in February 1830 preparations for a combined expedition on the grand scale were begun, and by mid-May a great fleet of 11 sail-of-the-line, 24 frigates, 27 brigs, 7 war-steamers, and a number of gunboats assembled off Toulon under the command of Vice-Admiral Duperre.

And what about the co-operating land force? Two of the ablest general officers who had deserted the Emperor Napoleon in his hour of need were eager rivals for its command, Marshal Marmont, "the traitor of Essonne," and General the Comte de Bourmont, who was now (1830) Minister of War in Charles X's tottering Government. The choice fell upon de Bourmont, who, though a capable soldier, had played a despicable part during and after the fateful "Hundred Days." He had been with the luckless Marshal Ney when the latter's troops had declared for Napoleon at Lons-le-Saulnier in March 1815, and was a witness against Ney when the latter stood his trial for treason in the ensuing December.

The dramatic moment came when de Bourmont was called to give his evidence. He had been an *émigré* and a Royalist soldier in La Vendée before he made his peace with the Empire. He and General Lecourbe had been Ney's lieutenants during the crisis at Lons-le-Saulnier. It would be difficult to clear him of a large complicity in Ney's overt act of treason. But on the march from Lons-le-Saulnier he slipped away from the column, reached Paris, and reported to King Louis XVIII that he had been a reluctant spectator of the Marshal's defection. After the flight of Louis he remained hidden in Paris, and then, having seen how events would develop, he rejoined Napoleon. He obtained the command of a brigade in Gerard's corps, but during the actual advance to cross the frontier he deserted to the Prussian outposts and rejoined the exiled King at Ghent, posing once more as a pronounced Royalist. It is of interest to note the contrast between the fates of Ney and de Bourmont. The former was sent to execution. The latter, after all his changes from side to side, had a remarkable and successful career. He commanded a corps in the French intervention in Spain in 1823, won the victory of Sanlúcar, and took Seville. For these services he was made a Peer of France. He was Minister of War in the Polignac cabinet of 1829, and in 1830 was

given command of the army embarked for the conquest of Algiers. He captured the city on July 5th, and was rewarded with the rank of Marshal of France.*

De Bourmont's army for the reduction of Algiers consisted of 30,410 infantry, 2,815 artillery with 1,246 horses, and only 500 (three squadrons) of cavalry, it being deemed that mounted troops would not have much place in the conquest of a seaport. In addition to the siege-train, the artillery included 48 field-pieces and 28 mountain guns. The infantry was in three divisions, commanded by Baron Berthézène, Comte Loverdo, and the Duc d'Escars. Volunteers serving with the forces included a young engineer officer named De Lamoricière—destined to deathless distinction on African battlefields—and Captain Sir Thomas Mansell, a gallant naval officer who had served with Exmouth at the bombardment of Algiers. The Duc d'Angoulême was present at Toulon when the expedition set sail on May 25th, 1830. It was the evening of June 13th before the fleet found itself off Algiers, whose "sea-defences had been considerably strengthened since 1816, and it had been previously determined to make the principal attack from the land side; the fleet therefore steered a westerly course for the promontory of Sidi-Feruch, the spot which the Emperor Napoleon I had fixed upon twenty-three years before as the easiest point on which to effect a landing." Early on the 14th, 20,000 troops and some field-guns were landed and a few enemy guns captured. The invaders' position had been consolidated when, on the morning of the 19th, a heavy Algerian attack developed. It was headed by Ibrahim Pasha, son-in-law of the Dey, and chief of the Janissaries, who had at disposal some 30,000 men including 3,000 Turks. His plan, a bold one, was to turn the invaders' left flank while the Dey of Constantine dealt with their right. For a while the fighting was close and bloody, and at one time the French 28th Regiment was in danger of being cut off; but de Bourmont in person rode to the threatened spot and, d'Escars' division joining in the fray, a general advance took place to shouts of "*Vive le Roi!*" The enemy broke and fled, losing their camp, much booty, and great numbers of killed, wounded, and prisoners. The French, who christened their initial success on African soil the battle of Staoueli, returned their own casualties at 7 officers and 500 men killed and wounded.

Although the unfortunate Ibrahim Pasha was now in disgrace with the Dey, the latter did not at once remove him from command owing to the intercession of his wife. Meanwhile the French started road-making and bringing up their siege-train, etc. On June 24th, Ibrahim attacked them again, at the head of 8,000

* A. Hilliard Atteridge, *Marshal Ney*.

Algerian soldiery and a powerful force of Arabs. Some severe fighting ended in their partial discomfiture, and on the 25th the defenders were driven from the slopes of Mount Bouzareah, which the French fortified with eight redoubts. In these operations de Bourmont's son, a subaltern in the 38th Regiment, lost his life. Powerful as it was from the sea side, the Dey's capital had little save the "Emperor's Fort" by way of land defences, and this work contained the magazines. Covered by a sustained fusillade from the ships of the squadron, de Bourmont established his headquarters some 2,000 yards from the Emperor's Fort. Ground was speedily broken, and by July 1st three batteries were in position. Their fire, with that of the fleet, rapidly rendered the fort untenable. Its garrison deserted it, blowing up their magazines and retiring into the city. The 17th of the Line had the honour of hoisting the flag of France over the Emperor's Fort.

Algiers had actually fallen after an investment of slightly less than three weeks. Many Christian captives were released and much booty was secured. Hussein tried hard for better terms, but de Bourmont would grant him nothing short of unconditional surrender and immediate deportation of himself and family: it is not surprising to learn that the fallen Dey "burst into tears." He embarked in the *Jeanne d'Arc* on July 10th, and eventually passed away at Alexandria in 1838. The following is the text of the convention signed by de Bourmont and Hussein on July 5th, 1830:

The Fort of the Casbah, the other forts connected with Algiers, and the port of that city shall be delivered up to the French troops this morning at ten o'clock (French time). The General-in-Chief of the French army agrees to give His Highness the Dey of Algiers his liberty and to allow him to take possession of his personal property. The Dey shall be free to retire, with his family and all that belongs to them, to the place he shall fix upon as his future residence, and as long as he remains in Algiers he, as well as his entire family, shall be under the protection of the French army. A guard will be charged with the safety of his person and that of the different members of his family.

The General-in-Chief gives to all the soldiers of the Militia the same advantages and the same protection. The exercise of the Mahometan religion shall remain free, the liberty of the inhabitants of all classes shall be respected; their religion, their commerce, and other occupations shall be placed under no restraint; their women shall be respected: for this, the Commander-in-Chief specially pledges his honour. The exchange of this Convention to be made before 10 o'clock this morning, and the French are to enter as soon after as possible into the Casbah, and will successively take possession of all the other forts of the town, and the harbour.

Such was the brilliantly rapid inauguration of what was destined to be a French Colonial Empire in Northern Africa. It unfortunately practically synchronised with the overthrow of Charles X's régime in France, one result of which was that, while de Bourmont was created a Marshal, a list of "honours and rewards" for his subordinates was not forthcoming from Paris. He made tentative advances from Algiers in various directions, but these movements amounted to little, and on August 17th—news having arrived of the revolution in Paris—the Bourbon flag was replaced by the tricolour in the fleet and army of occupation. And on September 2nd, General Clausel—another of Napoleon the Great's former prominent officers—arrived at Algiers to take over the command from de Bourmont in the name of Louis Philippe's Government.

It is of interest to recall that it was Clausel who inaugurated and was responsible for the enrolment and organisation of native Algerian levies as soldiers of France. He began with two battalions of the *Zouaoua*, a Kabyle tribe, and two regiments of light cavalry which developed into the celebrated *Chasseurs d'Afrique*. As for the still more renowned French Foreign Legion, it had its origin in a number of foreigners of various nationalities who drifted out to Northern Africa in the wake of the French army of occupation.

Under instructions from the new Government at Paris, Clausel proceeded with the conquest of Algeria. Reinforcements had arrived, and operations were undertaken against the powerful provinces of Medeah and Oran. Incidentally he enlisted the services of a young Mameluke, Yussuf, who proved an invaluable subordinate. In characteristically French fashion, a salute of twenty-one guns was fired in celebration of the first passage of the Atlas Mountains by a French army. Nevertheless, Medeah proved a hard nut to crack. It is about fifty miles from Algiers and 3,000 feet above sea-level, and it fell to the invaders at a cost of 200 casualties. But Clausel found himself receiving insufficient support from home, and on January 4th, 1830, he evacuated Medeah and returned to Algiers. Shortly afterwards Paris refused to ratify a treaty concluded by Clausel with the ruler of the neighbouring kingdom of Tunis, and he was in turn superseded by General Berthézène, who arrived in Africa to find himself in command of less than 10,000 troops and surrounded by a menacing population. In another fruitless expedition against Medeah Berthézène lost 260 killed and wounded. It was evident that his time in Algeria was up, and his successor turned out to be Savary, the Duke of Rovigo of Napoleonic days. Savary's brief rule of the half-subdued colony was one of terror and

oppression, and he broke faith with the tribesmen on more than one notable occasion. When he resigned his command, nominally on the ground of ill-health, in the spring of 1833, the French in Algeria had had two or three leaders in three years. They now numbered only 23,500 troops with 1,800 horses, and, apart from Algiers and its environs, their territorial gains were almost negligible. Was the new conquest to be lost?

By this time, moreover, the celebrated Abd-el-Kadr, Emir of Oran, was beginning to make his influence felt. He was only about twenty-four, and he was destined to oppose the French in Algeria and Morocco for some fifteen years. One of his European prisoners describes the Emir as having been "very small in stature, with a long, deadly pale face and languishing eyes, aquiline nose, small, delicate mouth, thin, dark chestnut beard, slight moustache, and exquisitely formed hands and feet." Marshal Soult characterised him as one of the only three men then living "who could legitimately be called great"—the other two being Mehemet Ali and Russia's famous opponent Schamyl, therefore all Mohammedans. After a brief interval, the Baron Voirol succeeded the Duke of Rovigo in the Algerian command. He seized and occupied the port of Bougie after severe fighting; but presently Clausel, now promoted Marshal, returned to Algiers, not before a treaty had been signed with Abd-el-Kadr which more or less granted him sovereign rights over Oran, and which France disputed. In the defile of Makta Abd-el-Kadr inflicted heavy losses on a French force. Reinforcements were sent out from France, Clausel was recalled, and Marshal Valée led in one of the most brilliant episodes of the whole war—the siege and storming of the rock-fortress of Constantine, in which "the stubborn Arab proved himself a worthy antagonist to the fiery Gaul."* For this striking success Valée was appointed Viceroy of Algeria. Two of his most trusted military subordinates were King Louis Philippe's sons, the Duc d'Orleans and his brother the Duc d'Aumale. The latter was chiefly responsible for the brilliant capture of Medeah in 1840. Meanwhile Marshal Bugeaud took over the Algerian command from Valée, and in the spring of 1841, when he found himself in command of an army of occupation increased to 73,000, he defeated Abd-el-Kadr near Miliana. That irrepressible chieftain next devoted himself to fomenting a Kabyle rising on the grand scale, but General Changarnier, detached by Bugeaud for the purpose, acted so vigorously that the revolted tribesmen submitted by the middle of 1843.

In capturing Abd-el-Kadr's *smala*—or movable headquarter camp, containing his wives, horses, booty, and a vast army of

*L. T. Cave, *The French in Africa*.

retainers—the young Duc d'Aumale performed a feat which was perpetuated on canvas by the brush of Horace Vernet. The Duc had but 600 worn-out troopers with him at the time—yet he struck this blow when, according to Abd-el-Kadr himself, the *smala* contained *sixty thousand* human beings! The success achieved was stupendous, the "bag" of 4,000 prisoners including the Emir's mother and chief wife *plus* a vast treasure. In the words of Marshal de St. Arnaud—afterwards French generalissimo in the Crimea, then serving in Algeria—"it was good, it was brave, it was magnificent." In fact, "the most decisive reverse suffered by Abd-el-Kadr throughout his struggle with the conquerors of Algeria was inflicted in what was almost an accidental encounter with a few troops of horse."* This heavy blow accelerated the flight of Abd-el-Kadr into Morocco, where he obtained the support of its Emperor, Abder-Rahman. Bugeaud promptly warned the latter to dissociate himself from the Emir, but without avail. The French thereupon moved towards the river Isly, where the enemy were known to be concentrating. Meanwhile, Bugeaud was notified that the Prince de Joinville, with a naval squadron, had bombarded Tangier. "Prince," replied Bugeaud, "you have drawn a bill upon me and I engage to honour it. To-morrow I shall execute a manœuvre which will bring me in touch with the Emperor's army before he is aware of it. The day after I shall defeat him!"

Isly was fought on August 14th, 1841. Bugeaud could oppose but 6,500 infantry and 1,500 cavalry to 45,000 of the foe, but, as he picturesquely explained to his staff, "They are a mob while we are an army. We shall be in the form of a boar's head, of which the right tusk will be General Lamoricière, the left tusk General Bedeau, the muzzle General Pélissier, and I shall be the ears." The result was an overwhelming victory. Abd-el-Kadr escaped from the battlefield, and actually evaded capture for over three years, eventually giving himself up to the Duc d'Aumale on December 22nd, 1847. He resided in France until 1852, when Napoleon III released and pensioned him. He then lived in various cities of the Near East, revisiting France for the Exposition of 1867, when the Emperor received him with all honour. He eventually died at Damascus in May 1883, aged seventy-six.

It is remarkable that a great proportion of the French officers who subsequently gained distinction in the Crimea, in the struggle with Austria, and even in the *débâcle* of 1870, won their spurs on North African battlefields. Of these, one of the most distinguished was Pélissier, afterwards Marshal and Duke of Malakoff. Although his record was dimmed by his barbarous "smoking out"

* Callwell, *Small Wars*.

of 500 Arabs in the caves of Dahra, he returned to Africa as Governor of Algeria (after a brief term as French Ambassador to England), and died there in 1864. His immediate successor was Marshal Macmahon, who had been created Duke of Magenta for his share in the great victory of that name in 1859. It was during Macmahon's term of office that Napoleon III visited Algeria, utilising the opportunity to issue a conciliatory and flattering proclamation to the Arab population. On the outbreak of war with Prussia it was found necessary to recall to France a large proportion of the troops serving in Algeria, where sporadic disturbances broke out in Constantine and Oran, but were checked by the vigilance of General Durien—the last of the military governors of the colony. As for Macmahon, he survived his surrender at Sedan to become President of the French Republic.

It was not until 1881 that France actually invaded and occupied the neighbouring kingdom of Tunisia, after years of friction and desultory frontier fighting. It became a French Protectorate nominally administered by a native Bey. This annexation proved of enormous importance to France, giving her as it did the practical control of Northern Africa, a splendid coast-line with fine and sheltered harbours, and a much freer hand in the Mediterranean. To-day, with its commercial prosperity and population of over 2,000,000, Tunisia is among the Republic's most successful overseas propositions. Morocco followed suit in 1893,—that is to say, in this year took place a formal "division" of the French and Spanish zones of influence in that country with, on the part of France, a considerable expansion into the Sahara. The same year was, indeed, notably memorable for French enterprise on African soil, for it also witnessed the acquisition of Dahomey as well as of the French Sudan and Upper Volta. Three years subsequently, Madagascar became the property of the Republic.

In an illuminating paper in the CONTEMPORARY REVIEW last year,* Sir Charles Hobhouse paid eloquent tribute to the progress of Morocco under French and Spanish "protection." Revisiting a country with which he first made acquaintance nearly half a century ago, Sir Charles was able to bear witness to conditions of very real and substantial progress. "Coal and manganese," he wrote, "have lately been found in large quantities. Other minerals are known and are being exploited. France is doing a great work of pacification there, but not from altruistic motives. Spain is not doing so badly in imitation of her ally and rival." It may here be re-emphasised that present-day Morocco consists of the French, Spanish, and international zones, and that the powerless but amiable Sultan resides in the French zone. Tetuan

* October, 1929.

is the capital of the section sublet to Spain, that power also possessing the valuable port and harbour of Ceuta on the Mediterranean. The centre of the small international zone is Tangier, where the administration "has made of a stinking and insanitary mediæval fortress a healthy and attractive resort for European residents."

As early as the first half of the seventeenth century Senegal and the Island of Reunion had been occupied: in the case of Senegal, a big expansion and extension has been in progress since 1889. French Guinea and the Ivory Coast were "taken over" in 1843, and the Somali coast in 1864. The French Congo, with its present population of some 3,000,000, dates as such from 1884. Nigeria, which had been gradually absorbed down to 1912, was then recognised as French and its limits defined. Finally, as an outcome of the World War, the ex-German colony of Togoland and a part of the Cameroons have been administered by France since 1919 under mandate from the League of Nations.

It is of supreme interest, I think, that this year's Eucharistic Congress will be held on African soil for the first time. It has taken place once in Asia (at Jerusalem), twice in America, and once in Australia. This year's function is to be known as the Congress of Carthage, and incidentally it will help to commemorate the fifteenth centenary of St. Augustine's death at Hippo (Bona) in A.D. 430. After the French conquest, Pope Gregory XVI re-established the See of Algiers in the historic city occupying the site of Icosium, a bishopric of the second century. Pius IX elevated it to the rank of archbishopric and also created the Sees of Bona and Constantine. Leo XIII in his turn restored the old See of Carthage, and nominated the celebrated Cardinal Lavignerie to be first of the restored line of "Primates of Africa." Lavignerie's "White Fathers" did a wonderful work, and the Cardinal was able to erect his cathedral on the site of old Carthage in the outskirts of Tunis.

Second only to the record set up by Great Britain in India and Egypt has been the success achieved by the French military authorities in the enrolment of native levies for their African armies—Zouaves, Turcos, Senegalese, and the various admirable cavalry formations. As early as the war in the Crimea, native troops were employed on European battlefields, and everywhere with success. The bravery, devotion, and endurance of these colonial soldiers of France throughout the Great War must ever be gratefully borne in mind by the European comrades who were fortunate enough to be associated with them.

PERCY CROSS STANDING.

stamp-collectors using precisely similar methods to those of the great Bank of England and the technical departments of the C.I.D. At the recent Trade Fair of the London Stamp Club held in the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, it was interesting to watch experts testing specimens by this means. One particular instance was a pair of triangular Cape of Good Hope stamps printed together in a square. On the face they were perfect and on the back there was nothing wrong to be seen, yet on examination beneath the rays pale blue strips could be discerned against the cream ground of the stamps. They had been mended with infinite care and cleverness and so perfectly was the work done that the eye could not detect the "patch." Following this, it was amusing to see a well-known collector willingly submit to the rays a valuable specimen from Uruguay which he had just acquired, before completing the purchase. The Philatelic Societies of Britain have made extensive use of this method, and it is stated that the possibility of frauds being accepted as genuine is now reduced to the minimum.

Professor G. R. Kogel of Vienna has adapted the rays to deciphering palimpsests with remarkably successful results and it is claimed that material of much value to historical research which hitherto has been unavailable can now be deciphered. The greatness of Professor Kogel's discovery is that the fluorescence may be photographed, which thus provides a permanent record of writings which were erased hundreds of years ago. When time had rendered a document worthless the parchment was not destroyed but cleaned by chemical or mechanical means and used a second and even a third time. Inevitably some traces of the original tints and dyes have remained in the parchment, and when excited by ultra-violet radiation these fluoresce and are discernible beneath the superimposed and visible text. By means of a special filter this latter can be eliminated if necessary, but the most interesting photograph is obtained by taking the two sets of writing together. In the resulting print the visible text appears as if written in outline type, that is, white letters with a narrow black edge, and underneath may be seen the dark grey lettering of the original script. Imperfections due to variations of the cleaning process are unavoidable, but it is claimed that difficulties in deciphering due to visibility seldom occur.

In industrial applications the detection of damaged goods is a very important development of this work. The textile associations of the West Riding of Yorkshire employ the analytic lamp extensively in examining fabrics for mildew and bacterial damage. The affected strands fluoresce quite distinctly from good ones and enable the expert observer to remove them with facility.

Materials which appear alike in daylight often show remarkable differences on examination beneath the rays, and it has been found that trade interests are safeguarded by examining samples in order to prevent inferior goods being passed as of first quality. Amongst other users, the Crown Agents for the Colonies test imported fabrics similarly, and very satisfactory results are claimed for the measure which is not only clean and simple to use but also involves no damage to the material examined, whilst a greater degree of accuracy is obtained than by other means.

The laboratories of the large tobacco companies are also experimenting with the rays for the purpose of examining the tobaccos as they are imported and detecting bacterial or other damage. If a cigarette is held beneath filtered ultra-violet rays the gleaming white fluorescence of various impurities can be seen even through the paper, and it is hoped that it may be possible to reduce these owing to the more careful examination which the new method allows. At present this development is still in the experimental stage and has not yet been adopted as a practical measure, but it is expected that when present researches are completed several large tobacco factories will instal suitable apparatus.

The purity of agricultural cake is not only of importance to farmers and breeders but indirectly affects consumers, and in consequence the most recent developments of science are being used to ensure the maximum immunity from adulteration. Apart from adulterants, considerable attention is now being paid to the amount of *nux vomica* included in cattle cake. This drug is used as a purgative, but as it contains the poisons strychnine and brucine the amount is carefully graded, and in the examination of samples to find whether the proportion of *nux vomica* is below or above standard ultra-violet rays have proved a most efficient agent, and again the simplicity of operation has made the methods superior to those used previously.

A few years ago the health of silkworms would have been considered a matter of very small importance, but in these days of highly organised medical science even silkworms are subjected to examination by the most recent of scientific methods. To breeders the health of silkworms is of paramount importance, for upon it is dependent the quality and quantity of the silk produced, and it has been found that the ultra-violet rays are the most efficient means of weeding out unhealthy insects. Under the rays the secreting organ of a healthy silkworm fluoresces white while the blood shows yellow, and any variation in the colour shades denotes an unhealthy insect. It is within the realm of possibility that this method may ultimately be applied to the human body.

The ingenious methods which have been devised recently for

the production of imitation precious stones have been developed to an amazing extent. Perfectly legitimate commercial concerns are now making these stones and such a degree of perfection is obtained that even jewel experts have been deceived. It is but a logical development that similar means should be employed to produce stones with intent to defraud, and this risk has become so great that several large jewellery establishments have installed lamps for ultra-violet irradiation, so that in suspected cases a fluorescence test may be made which gives an absolutely infallible answer. Diamonds are readily distinguished by their beautiful blue glow, while imitations are so lifeless and dull that detection is simple. Pearls may be separated according to their origin as well as tested for fraud, and to jewellers who are constantly required to make examination and express considered opinions on the value of gems the analytic lamp is an instrument of great value.

During the war this phenomenon of fluorescence was used extensively for signalling purposes. Since then the method has not been widely applied, but recent research has enabled developments to be made which would be of much value if national emergency should require them. Signalling was accomplished by directing the invisible beam of ultra-violet radiation upon luminescent substances and a filter was used to absorb all the visible light. One of the greatest difficulties was to conserve the ultra-violet energy, and this was arranged by directing the beam with a parabolic mirror and catching it with another one at the required distance away. In the first case the source of the radiation is at the focus of the mirror and in the second case the luminescent substance is at the focus. Various methods, sources, and filters were tried and as a consequence of combined experience such signalling was accomplished. A somewhat similar application was employed in the convoy of ships. A quartz mercury arc enclosed in a very dense cobalt blue glass was hung on one vessel and observers on other ships were equipped with telescopes with fluorescent eyepieces. By noting the position of the fluorescent image it was possible for the ships to be maintained in their correct position without the aid of visible signalling or wireless broadcast.

Geological investigation has received valuable aid by the adaptation of ultra-violet rays to the testing of minerals. In mining technology, oil prospecting, and survey work generally the occurrence and recognition of various minerals is of much importance and this method of testing by fluorescence is being widely used. According to Baskerville not all minerals fluoresce, for while some phosphoresce others are quite unaffected, but nevertheless there are a very large number of minerals which may be examined in this way. Kunzite was discovered with the aid of ultra-violet

radiation, while a crushed mineral may be separated into fluorescent and non-fluorescent portions and this has been applied to testing willemite concentrates and tailings. Willemite is fluorescent but the gangue is not, and if the tailings contain no fluorescent particles, then the concentration process is known to be efficient. The researches of Dr. L. J. Spencer, F.R.S., Keeper of Minerals in the British Museum, have enabled specimens of willemite to be identified according to their origin by the varying fluorescences, and this is a development which may be applied to other substances in the future.

In a large cocoa factory the rays are used for illuminating cocoa for the purpose of distinguishing by means of a microscope the shell and nib tissue. At the moment this is a laboratory experiment only, but it is anticipated that when various technical difficulties have been overcome the method may be used in the production of manufactured cocoa of the highest grades. A carbon arc lamp and a filter are used, and while the tissue of the shell appears brown, that of the nib fluoresces a curious bluish-violet colour. Ultra-violet radiation may be used in this manner owing to fluorescent effects or, in the case of photomicrography, because of the greater resolving power of the microscope for radiation of short wave-length. In this case, of course, only the radiations of greater wave-length than about 3,500 A.U. are effective with a glass optical system. A rather similar method is used in making micro-photography in metallurgy. Difficulties are often experienced in focussing which has to be done by means of a fluorescence screen and must be very exact. The advantage of the method lies in the fact that some of the constituents of steel which look very much alike when photographed by ordinary light absorb ultra-violet light actively, and so appear sharply differentiated when a micrograph is made under this illumination.

Two German scientists, Dr. P. W. Danckwortt and Dr. E. Pfau of the Chemical Institute of the School of Zoology, Hanover, have made extensive investigation into the use of the Hanovia analytic quartz lamp as a means of testing drugs, and it has been proved to be an extraordinarily efficient medium for analytical work. The rays have been used in the testing and identifying of paper, oils and varnishes, in discriminating between natural and artificial tannins, in testing glues, in chemico-dietetic and toxicological work and in chemico-analytical tests. In the investigation of the most important pharmaceutical alkaloids and various drugs, Herren Danckwortt and Pfau claim to have been able to set the capillary-analytical method of tests, which up to the present has been used most extensively, upon an entirely new basis. The great importance of this work will be more fully recognised with the progress

of research, but this in itself is an outstanding achievement which testifies with remarkable clarity to the amazing efficacy of filtered ultra-violet radiation when applied to technical purposes.

The number of firms now using ultra-violet radiation either for laboratory tests or in actual manufacturing processes is ever increasing, while the variety of industries is amazing. The Dunlop Rubber Company test for the adulterant lithopone in rubber, and the well-known firm of Bovril Limited, are similarly equipped, and it must be remembered that the phenomenon of fluorescence is only one of the many properties of ultra-violet radiation. Sterilisation, colour-fading, and food-producing properties are all being used extensively, and there is little doubt that, with the development of this method, science has rendered great assistance to technical industry.

The age of widely-applied ultra-violet radiation has dawned quite recently. It has found mankind in the possession of a great deal of general knowledge pertaining to the effects of radiant energy, but somewhat lacking in specific details, especially those pertaining to the spectrum and spectral distribution of energy, although technical literature contains innumerable references to effects of ultra-violet radiation. If the source of the radiation is fully described and the spectral limits are specified, there is much less doubt than when a result is attributed merely to "ultra-violet energy." Research is concentrating at present on the production of these necessary data and, when they are available, there is little doubt that even greater use will be made of ultra-violet radiation in industrial processes.

LEONARD V. DODDS.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE NAVAL CONFERENCE (*continued*).

7. *The Result.*

ON the evening of April 10th Mr. MacDonald announced in the House of Commons that "this forenoon an agreement was finally reached between the United States, Japan, and Great Britain on naval armaments, including all categories of ships."

In those words was summarised the result of the three-months' conference which had aimed at a Five-Power Treaty, and had achieved a Three-Power Treaty. The length of the Conference had been almost entirely caused by the unwillingness of France to reduce her navy, and to the desire of the other four Powers to induce her to do so. After three months of effort the attempt was abandoned; France stood aloof, and with her, for reasons which will be examined below, Italy also had to stand aloof.

8. *The Last Phase.*

The third month of the London Naval Conference, so far as the record of what took place was concerned, presented few difficulties. So far as Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Stimson, Signor Grandi, Mr. Wakatsuki and others whose wish was to reduce navies were concerned, that period was not only difficult but disheartening. There were those who maintained that France was unjustly blamed; that she was made a scapegoat for a failure subtly attributable to America's hidden purpose of maintaining a strong navy. It is not obvious, however, from the facts how such an hypothesis can be substantiated.

Last month's CONTEMPORARY carried the story of the Conference up to Mr. MacDonald's broadcast statement of March 9th, in which he combined an optimism of tone with the pointed statement that, "We shall not agree to base any treaty which may result from this Conference on entangling military alliances." That statement was understood to imply a British refusal of M. Briand's renewed proposal that the five Powers, before or instead of considering any definite scheme of naval disarmament, should consider a project of mutual military assistance in the event of war. The practical effect of that proposal would have been that the other four Powers would bind themselves to fight on the side of France in all future French wars: a highly agreeable consequence to France if judged by the standards of her post-war philosophy, but hardly relevant to the purpose of a naval disarmament conference.

The cynics are fed, and the constructive men are starved, by the contemplation of what the world's politicians have done in inter-

national affairs since the beginning of the present year. An originally promising conference for naval disarmament was for three months transformed by French diplomacy (inspired by French prosperity) into a controversy about the organisation of future war. Owing to her prosperity France was able to thwart the combined good will of the British Empire, Japan, Italy, and the United States, and to prevent their agreeing on a general treaty for naval disarmament. So confident was the French delegation in its power that on March 11th the French newspapers were suggesting (with a unanimity that could be explained only by the hypothesis of a common source of inspiration) that France would have no objection to the conclusion by the British Empire, Japan, and the United States of a Three-Power Treaty, so long as it was understood that France in such an event would be left free to build as she might choose.

The gossip then prevailing about the feasibility of a Three-Power Treaty, to be concluded in default of a Five-Power Treaty, was explained by the growing general conviction that France would not agree to any naval reduction whatsoever, and that Italy, being adamant on parity with France, was automatically disabled by the French defection.

At the end of the second week in March the good people were so concerned about the threatened break-up of the Conference that propaganda began to shoot from the theory that if only Italy would soften in her claim to parity with France; the Conference might be able to continue its work. It was a stupid propaganda. Its origin no doubt was the premise that France could not be moved, and that therefore Italy should be bullied. There never was any apparent chance of such a tactic achieving its purpose. Italy's case was not only simple and clear; it was reasonable; for Signor Grandi had declared that Italy would reduce her navy to any extent whatever, involving the total abolition of the submarine, provided only that France would reduce her fleet, not by the same absolute extent, but to the same absolute size as that of Italy's. What could be more reasonable? The blackmail levied on Italy in the middle of March—was it not blackmail to suggest that Italy was holding up the Conference because she would not abandon her demand for parity with France?—was as ineffective as it deserved, and was bound, to be.

Meanwhile, the Conference proper continued to function in a sort of automatic listless way, although its output was necessarily meaningless in the absence of any intention on the part of France to sign a treaty for naval reduction. On March 12th the First Committee laboriously debated the alternatives of abolishing or humanising and limiting both the total tonnage and the individual size of submarines, although every member of the committee knew that the French Government had no intention of either abolishing

or limiting its own submarines. On the following day (March 13th) M. Dumesnil, the Minister of Marine, formally presented to Mr. Alexander, the First Lord of the Admiralty, a detailed statement of figures relating to the existing and projected size of the French fleet. Probably his object was to illumine the propaganda above alluded to; for the simple folks had been urging Italy to submit to the conference a statement of Italian naval needs irrespective of parity with France. Signor Grandi refused, for the good and palpable reason that he could not be side-tracked by so puerile a stratagem; and M. Dumesnil therefore submitted a good, full French statement as one who wanted to imply: "See how anxious France is, by contrast with Italy, to help on the good work"—it being France none the less, who, if the truth were told, had deliberately killed that work. It would not be worth the ink it was printed with to quote or even to summarise the document presented by M. Dumesnil on March 13th.

Paris concurrently left us not one day in which to forget that her real concern was not with naval disarmament, but with "security" pacts. On March 14th the French newspapers, again acting in remarkable unison, suggested that as the United States had refused the proposal for a mutual guarantee pact, M. Briand would submit as an alternative that a pact should be signed by the Mediterranean naval Powers, and that such Powers as Spain and Yugoslavia, who were not participating in the Conference, should also be invited to subscribe to the new pact.

The word "pact" is a form of madness in the mental apparatus of nearly all Frenchmen. The Covenant of the League of Nations is to France both in word and in meaning a pact; the Geneva Protocol was an attempted pact; Locarno is a pact; the Kellogg Treaty is not worthy the name of pact because it is nothing more than (as a Frenchman described it) a pious aspiration, and does not prescribe any naval, military, or air sanctions to be applied in case France (for instance) is attacked. It is unfortunate that the post-war neurasthenia of French diplomatic thought should have hit on the peculiarly perverse obsession of military pacts, although it is a commonplace feature of neurasthenia that its victims turn logic upside down. What could be more illogical than the thesis of preventing war by preparing for war? It would be as logical to try and prevent drunkenness by drinking, or to prevent being drowned by drowning oneself. Yet it is seldom profitable to argue with neurasthenic subjects.

Mr. MacDonald did argue with France, week after week. M. Tardieu returned to the Conference on the evening of Saturday, March 15th, and he and M. Briand were invited to luncheon at Chequers on the following day. By that time public patience had nearly exhausted itself, and it was commonly thought that M.

Tardieu must now say yes or no to the question whether France wanted to sign a Five-Power Treaty. So far M. Tardieu and his lieutenant M. Briand (it is only fair to M. Briand to describe his conduct during the London Conference as that of M. Tardieu's lieutenant) had maintained a policy which is not too pointedly described in the crude formula that France would not only refuse to reduce her navy, but would even increase it unless the other Powers combined to give her still another "security" pact, that is another promise to defend France by arms in case she was attacked in the Atlantic or in the Mediterranean.

Mr. Stimson had categorically refused to give such an undertaking. Mr. MacDonald had in effect refused it, because he had publicly stated his unconditional view both that the British Government could not give any further guarantee of the kind wanted, and that such guarantees were a deceptive means to the end wanted.

It was an open secret that Mr. MacDonald was loth to conclude a naval agreement to which France was not a party. It was of practical importance that France should participate in a downward movement of naval armaments, for the clear reason that the British Empire, Japan, and the United States could not, in this imperfect world, go on indefinitely reducing their armaments while France went on increasing hers. The Chequers conversation of March 16th was participated in by Mr. Henderson and by Mr. Alexander in addition to the persons mentioned above. After the conversation M. Tardieu issued a statement to the Press which any child of seventeen would have interpreted as meaning that France had not responded to Mr. MacDonald's plea. He said: "As between French and British we have examined the whole situation together, applying ourselves more particularly to the points of interest to both our countries. . . . We consider that the result to be obtained is important enough to exclude any unwise haste: what we require is not haste but success. I am convinced we shall come to a positive satisfactory result. The common work is going on."

It is probably true that the serious, intelligent, sensitive; and business-like person who takes to politics is an exceptional person; and that M. Tardieu is not one of the exceptions. The unfortunate thing for the general sum of human affairs is that the politician wields great power; that his work affects the well-being and the pocket of vast numbers of people. In the case of the London Naval Conference, the five Powers represented in the work were between them spending £500 a minute on their navies; that is, the taxpayers of those countries were between them working in order to earn that monstrous amount of money for that monstrous waste: £500 a minute, £30,000 an hour, £5,040,000 a week. The sum of £5,000,000 is produced by 1d. in the £ in British income-tax. There are fifty-two weeks in a year. In one year the amount spent

by the five Powers on their navies is tantamount to the whole proceeds of British income-tax.

The politicians of the five Powers met to explore a possible reduction of such expenditure. Four of them were in favour of reduction. The fact that one feels grateful to those four illustrates the primitive condition of diplomatic thought: for it would be as exciting a ground for gratitude in private life that four eminent citizens should be in favour of reducing the practice of murder. One of the five, however, opposed every proposal for naval reduction; and after nearly three months of obstruction, being appealed to *in extremis* by Mr. MacDonald, emerged from the conversation with the pantomimic remark: "What we require is not haste but success."

After the Chequers meeting of March 16th little hope was left that a Five-Power Treaty could be negotiated. It became known on March 18th that M. Tardieu had proposed to Signor Grandi a French willingness to reduce her fleet on condition that the French fleet remained always stronger than that of Italy: a proposal that added nothing new to anything, and need not be further examined. On March 20th, to allay certain rumours which had begun to circulate in the absence of the circulation of anything more solid, Mr. MacDonald stated in the House of Commons that the Conference had not even discussed, nor did it contemplate, any engagement which might involve sanctions or blockade in the Mediterranean that went outside the letter of the League Covenant.

M. Tardieu had gone back to Paris on the day following the Chequers conversation of March 16th, but promised to return for a further conversation on the following Sunday. Nobody was surprised when he did not come back. His refusal to modify his attitude on March 16th could mean only that he had no desire to subscribe to a Five-Power Treaty. Instead of his returning to London, the rest of the French delegation, including M. Briand, returned to Paris, wherein a truer, if more melancholy, comment was made on the general situation. In form the Conference did not abandon the possibility of a Five-Power Treaty, it being still left open to France to return to the Conference; but the only practical object now left to the Conference was the signature of a three-Power treaty, based on the principles of a Japanese-American compromise then engaging the attention of the Tokio Cabinet.

The departure of M. Tardieu lacked even the saving grace of subtlety. Two months earlier, when the Conference opened in the Royal Gallery of the House of Lords, he stated that, "France brings towards the success of the common objective the affirmation both of her good will and of her will to succeed." He left the Conference for two reasons, the first that he demanded naval superiority over Italy, the second that he demanded a military alliance

from everybody else. Neither of his demands could be granted, and neither had any, except a destructive, relevance, to the work of the Conference. The French Press, as is usual, performed the function of Greek chorus, in this case declaring that the evacuation of the French delegation from London marked the decision of the French Government to take no active part in the Conference so long as the existing "group of circumstances" was unchanged.

When the French delegation withdrew from London, public speculation centred on the chance of achieving a Three-Power Treaty. Even in that restricted ground the shadow of France still obtruded. Such a treaty, it was feared, would have to be made contingent on the abstinence of any other naval Power from future increases in her navy: contingent, that is to say, on French naval policy in the future. By that argument, France having been able to prevent the conclusion of a Five-Power Treaty would still virtually have it in her power to kill the Three-Power Treaty now adumbrated as an alternative. On the other hand there were bold spirits who advocated a pacific policy without reference to France, their contention being that if the British Empire, Japan, and the United States decided to base their policy on the assumption of peace and therefore to reduce their navies, their effect would be decisive, and it would not matter if France by contrast adopted a policy of militarist expansion.

On March 24th Signor Grandi suggested to Mr. MacDonald that the Five-Power Conference be adjourned for six months, that Italy and France agree that such adjournment should not prevent the three Powers from negotiating an immediate treaty, and that after six months France and Italy should resume their discussion with a view to enlarging the Three-Power Treaty. At the end of March the position appeared to be that the Conference had entirely suspended its work. No meeting of the plenary conference had been held since February 11th. France had left the Conference, but was trying to come back, not to help in the work of the Conference, but to make a last attempt to snatch a pact for France. M. Briand did indeed return to London in that last week of March, and on Saturday, March 29th, invited *Mr. Henderson* (my italics) to have luncheon with him at Claridge's Hotel. Mr. Henderson went, and the two conversed for two hours after luncheon, declaring at the end of it that the conversations would be resumed.

M. Briand is a clever negotiator, and Mr. Henderson shares with the world in general a susceptibility to M. Briand's personal charm. In what particular direction was that charm now working? Having asked and been refused a new pact in all its military glory, the fertile resource of French diplomacy hit on the clever expedient of suggesting that the French demand for security might after all be met without a pact. Mr. Henderson's ears pricked up, as did those of other men, although he himself had not figured prominently

in the past work of the Conference, and was now on the brink of a difficult Anglo-Egyptian conference. Those hasty spirits who jumped to the conclusion that M. Briand had conceived the somewhat rudimentary stratagem of attempting to seduce Mr. Henderson behind the back of Mr. MacDonald—Mr. Henderson being notoriously less intransigent than his chief to the finesse of French thought—did not understand the methods of French diplomacy. The ends of French diplomacy are normally crude, the methods never. In this case it was a matter of courtesy, of correctitude, on M. Briand's part to consult Mr. Henderson in the first instance, because he wanted to raise no less a project than the satisfaction of France within the framework of the League Covenant. Thereafter Article 16 began to fill the columns of the French Press and the French tactic was gradually made clear.

For a week, the first week of April, the search for a "formula," falling within the letter of the Covenant, was continued. Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Henderson, Sir Robert Vansittart, engaged M. Briand in a renewed attempt to discover an innocuous string of words such as might on the one hand satisfy the French craving for juridical instruments and on the other hand the British postulate that there must be no further military commitment.

The first of April is ordained for the pleasure of a large number of people, who, not finding anything to laugh at for 364 days in the year, are for one day allowed the indulgence of a practical joke so that they may have at any rate one laugh a year. On April 1st, 1930, it was given out in St. James's Palace that a formula had been discovered; that both France and Great Britain were satisfied; in effect, that they had found a form of words which meant one thing to M. Briand and the diametrically opposite thing to Mr. MacDonald. The real joke, however, was the old one, namely, that M. Briand had returned to London to resume his part in a conference begun three months earlier for the ostensible purpose of reducing navies, his instructions nevertheless continuing to be that he must not talk about navies at all, but must try and extract from Great Britain a further commitment (disguised if need be) to fight on the side of France in the event of another French war.

9. *The Dénouement.*

Some alarm began to be expressed about the danger that Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Henderson might fizzle into an unsuspected trap in countenancing an apparently innocent restatement of an existing commitment. Such alarm was a little unnecessary in view of the alert past of both Mr. MacDonald and of Mr. Henderson. Rather it must be accounted to them a virtue that they strained patience to the limit of elasticity before accepting failure. The end of patience was reached in the morning of Thursday, April 10th, and the *dénouement* was rapid. At ten o'clock that morning Mr.

MacDonal met Mr. Stimson; at 10.30 there was a meeting of the American, British, and Japanese delegations; at 11.30 the British met the French delegation; at 1 p.m. Mr. Stimson and Mr. Dwight Morrow visited M. Briand; at 3 Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Henderson met the Italian Ambassador and Signor Rosso, and simultaneously there was a meeting of the American, British, and Japanese naval advisers; at 4 there was a meeting of the British Commonwealth delegation; at 6.30 a meeting of the British, French, and Italian delegations, and at 9.15 Mr. MacDonald announced to the House of Commons the result of so rapid and intensive a climax to the Conference. He said: "With the indulgence of the House, I should like to make a very brief statement—it must be brief under the circumstances—of what has happened at the Naval Conference to-day. I am happy to say that this forenoon an agreement was finally reached between the United States, Japan, and Great Britain on a naval programme, including all categories of ships. The terms of the agreement are now being drafted, but they will follow very closely on the figures mentioned last September and October during the negotiations with the United States, and show substantial reductions. A White Paper will be prepared. From time to time, since the opening of the Conference, various points of disagreement which have held up the progress towards disarmament have been settled, and these, it is hoped, will be brought together in one instrument, and will be signed by the five Powers. The difficulties in the naval requirements of France and Italy have proved to be intricate, and have not, so far, been resolved. At a meeting early this evening between the French, the Italian, and the United Kingdom delegates it was decided that, as such substantial agreement had been come to, it was both unnecessary and undesirable to keep the full body of delegates sitting in London pending a settlement of difficulties which primarily concerned these three delegations only. So we shall propose at the plenary session to be held early next week that the agreement now come to shall be signed, and the Conference adjourned on the understanding that France, Italy, and ourselves shall continue efforts to come to an agreement in unison with that which has been reached between the United States, Japan, and ourselves."

These pages had to be written on April 11th, that is before the White Paper referred to by Mr. MacDonald was published. Subject to correction when the official papers are published, it was commonly understood that the result of the Conference would be embodied in a formally Five-Power Treaty incorporating within it the Three-Power Treaty which constituted the real achievement. Parts I and II of the so-called Five-Power Treaty would record the agreement on technical points, on a battleship "holiday" and on the "humanisation" of the submarine, which all five Powers would sign. The third part, being that relating to the limitation of

cruisers, destroyers, and submarines (the real business of the Conference) would be signed only by the British Empire, Japan, and the United States.

The most important section of Part I was understood to be the agreement to postpone till after 1936 the replacement of the capital ships as laid down by the Washington Treaty. That part included also an agreed statement of the method of assessment, that method being based on a compromise between the "global" and the "category" criteria. Part II formulated the rules for the "humanisation" of the submarine. Part III, the important part, being the Three-Power agreement, prescribed the limit of tonnage to which the three Powers committed themselves, namely approximately the following:

	<i>British Empire</i>		<i>American</i>		<i>Japan</i>	
8-in. Gun Cruisers ...	146,800	...	180,000	...	108,400	
6-in. Gun Cruisers ...	192,200	...	143,500	...	100,450	
Destroyers ...	150,000	...	150,000	...	105,500	
Submarines ...	52,700	...	52,700	...	52,700	
Total ...	541,700		526,000		367,050	

The achievement whereby the three chief naval Powers agreed to limit their output of cruisers, destroyers, and submarines became the more important the more one examined it. Even France, with her surplus wealth and her vast fleet of submarines, will probably not be able to frighten those three Powers into renewed competitive building. One is able to record a definite advance towards world disarmament, and one definite advance is potentially of wider importance than its immediate practical result. Even the immediate result, however, is not inconsiderable. At the Geneva Conference of 1927 those same three Powers badly failed to agree on any limitation whatever. Moreover, in 1927 the three Powers were negotiating on a much larger basis than was agreed on in London. Speaking at Sheffield on April 11th Mr. Alexander recalled these remarkable figures:

"For cruisers, destroyers, and submarines together the total tonnage proposed for the British Empire and the United States in 1927 was 590,000 each plus 25 per cent. over age, a total of 737,500 tons, a figure which was to remain in force till 1936. Now in these categories we are to have a total of 541,700 tons by 1936, a reduction on the Geneva proposals of 195,800 tons. The United States figure now is 526,200, a reduction of 211,300 tons. The small extra American reduction in total tonnage is in recognition of the larger number of heavy 8-in. gun cruisers which the United States may build. The Japanese figure proposed at Geneva for these categories was 481,250; the provisional figure now agreed on is 367,050, a

saving of 114,200 tons. The reduction of the three Powers in these categories as compared with the proposals on which the Conference broke down in 1927 is 521,300 tons."

He estimated the saving to the British Treasury that would result from the 1930 treaty at "between 60 millions and 70 millions sterling" in the period between now and 1936. That amount will represent about 2d. in the £ in income-tax throughout that period.

It would not be sound, however, to ignore the possible indirect effect of France on the pacific purposes of the three Powers. It was common form among the spokesmen of those Powers, and Mr. Alexander made the definite stipulation on April 11th, that the treaty would have to contain a "safeguarding" clause. "For example," said Mr. Alexander, "our reduced destroyer tonnage would be materially affected by an increase of submarine tonnage elsewhere." It remains within the power of France to call a halt in the movement towards disarmament by wildly increasing her submarine fleet. It is one of the remarkable features of our time that French thought after the experience of 1914 to 1918 should in the first place be so ethically muddled as to refuse to take part in a Five-Power impulse towards naval disarmament, and in the second place should constitute a source of uneasiness to those who do take their part in that impulse.

THE CHINESE WINTER.

In the Foreign Affairs section of the January CONTEMPORARY REVIEW a summary was given of what took place in China, and of the calamity produced by the Chinese generals, in 1929. The narrative embraced the events of the whole year up to the middle of December. The situation then was that the year's muddle had apparently grouped itself round three warring groups—the Nationalist forces under Chiang Kai-shek, the "Ironsides" of Chang Fat-Kwai in league with the now openly rebellious Kwangsi forces, and the Kuominchun of Feng Yu-hsiang. The reports that came from China were contradictory, and threw little light on the purpose (if any) of the warring generals. This only appeared probable, that the winter would bring intensified suffering to a population that had been victimised by civil war for eighteen years, and which had been robbed of the chance of peace at last provided by the constitution of the National Government in October 1928.

In the second week of December most of the European and American women and children were removed from Nanking to Shanghai by steamer, and Ichang and Hankow were reported to be empty of foreigners. The National Government was concentrating on the defence of Nanking. The Kuominchun of Feng Yu-hsiang were reported to be advancing through Hupeh, and Chang Fat-Kwai's Ironsides were reported to be within twenty miles of Canton. One had to accept all such reports with reserve, for the

news service of the various camps in China is even more a strategist instrument than it normally is in war. The report, for instance, which was propagated on December 16th that Chang Fat-Kwai had not only lost the battle for Canton, but had incontinently committed suicide as well, was published, as it were, absent-mindedly, and the subsequent reports of Chang Fat-Kwai's activities were published as if there was nothing odd in the transition. It was not regarded as necessary in the interests of continuity to bridge the gap between his suicide and his later history.

What, however, appeared to be confirmed was that he did fail to capture Canton. Indeed, the whole civil war, as if by tacit understanding on all sides, was suddenly suspended, and the Chinese press turned its attention to such other subjects as the freedom of the press, the status of women and the recovery of China's judicial rights. The notion of the freedom of the press became a popular slogan for the last few days of the old year. Chiang Kai-Shek, the head of the National Government, who had had cause for many months to suspect the loyalty of many of his heads of departments, took the opportunity (December 29th) to circularise by telegram every newspaper office in the country urging them to indulge freely in criticism. He even expressed the hope that, as from the beginning of the new year, the newspapers would not spare any of his government departments, whether of foreign affairs, finance, the army, the judiciary. The only reservation he made was that the departments be attacked as departments, and that the names of individual officials be not mentioned. One newspaper, the *I Shih Pao* (January 7th), whether acting under Chiang Kai-Shek's inspiration or from a more spontaneous motive, proceeded to castigate the whole body of officials, from the highest to the lowest, on the particular ground that they oppressed the people and were themselves exempt from the punishment they deserved. The article reached its climax in a plea that officials should be subject, after the manner of common people, to the jurisdiction of the Courts. Chiang Kai-Shek had reason for being satisfied with the *I Shih Pao*, which paper indeed seemed to be going through a phase of general commination. It not only propounded that all officials be submitted to the tender mercies of the magistrates, but in a former issue (December 24th) had roundly cursed those magistrates themselves on the ground that they had secret understandings with the brigand chiefs and connived at their depredations and subsequent escape; that they were completely indifferent to the welfare of the people, and were concerned with nothing but their own personal interests. Not one in a thousand, it declared, recognised any duty to the public. The civil courts moreover were "as bad as the magistrates." The writer was so much in earnest that he proposed no lighter a punishment than death for any magistrate who allowed a bandit to escape.

January was a quiet month so far as the civil war was concerned. On January 7th the Commander-in-Chief of the Chinese Navy was kidnapped by a gang of communists during the progress of an official dinner and carried off with six other guests. The National Government sent a warship to Foochow, the scene of the outrage, after which no further news went abroad. All became quiet on the Yangtse front, and it was even announced officially in Nanking that the two rebellions which had been unfolding north of the Yangtse had both been crushed. Ten days after that announcement, however, namely on January 19th, the news reached Nanking that fighting had broken out afresh on the Tientsin-Pukow railway, and after a further interval of four days it became known that the Kwangsi forces were closing on Wuchow. During the first week of February operations were resumed on the old scale, the Kwangsi forces and the Ironsides launching a formal, but (as is fortunately the rule in Chinese wars) an almost bloodless attack on Canton. On February 14th Yen Hsi-shan caused his familiar diversion by proposing that he and another should quit the country and travel abroad. Throughout 1929 he had concentrated on an attempt to take Feng Yu-hsiang abroad with him, but he did not succeed in organising the trip. It looked as if for 1930 Yen Hsi-shan determined to woo Chiang Kai-shek as his travelling companion. On February 14th at any rate he telegraphed (every Chinese general seems to use the telegram as his normal method of communication with other Chinese generals) to Chiang Kai-shek proposing that they should both resign their military posts and travel abroad. Two days later Chiang Kai-shek telegraphed his answer, which was in the negative, his reason being that an acceptance of Yen's invitation would be tantamount to a dereliction of public duty. Yen at the same time received three more telegrams, despatched by three leading members of the Nanking Government and containing an intimation that Yen's invitation had been improper. Neither he nor Kai-shek, they told him, could resign without permission. Yen, they added, was in effect "fomenting strife."

Recrimination, once indulged in, tends to spread. Three days after telegraphing a refusal of Yen's invitation, Chiang Kai-shek again telegraphed to him, this time upbraiding him for hostility and ordering him to demobilise his forces. At the moment Yen happened to be a loyal colleague of Feng Yu-hsiang and the Kuominchun. He answered, not this time directly by telegram, but indirectly by ordering a general mobilisation of the Shansi armies for immediate action against Chiang; whereupon (February 21st) Chiang sent large detachments of picked troops northwards up the Tientsin-Pukow railway to counter the danger. The fat being now fairly in the fire, the telegraph wires were soon working under considerable pressure. Chiang had annoyed Yen Hsi-shan.

Feng Yu-hsiang, having nothing to gain at that particular time by deserting his colleague, decided to support him. What they did was to send out a circular telegram, signed by themselves and by forty other military leaders, to inform all and sundry that in their opinion the policy of unification by force, so far as it was practised by Chiang Kai-shek, ought to be, and was thereby, condemned. The text of the telegram was published in Peking. Simultaneously an attack by manifesto was launched on the southern front, where Chang Fat-Kwai and the Kwangsi leaders issued to the press a demand for the resignation of Chiang Kai-shek and a concurrent nomination of Yen Hsi-shan as his successor. It followed from that manoeuvre that the Kwangsi generals were disposed to support the Kuominchun against the Kuomintang of Nanking: but in the Chinese civil war it is seldom safe to assume that two and two make four unless the assumption is confirmed by telegram by the parties concerned. The Kwangsi generals (February 26th) duly and formally confirmed their intention thus to support the Kuominchun. There developed immediately a concerted military movement against Nanking from the north and from the south, Feng and Yen moving the Kuominchun through Western Honan, the Kwangsi forces taking the Canton forces by surprise in south-west Kwantung. The Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang, whose third plenary session happened to begin in Nanking on March 1st, on that day decided to send a commission to investigate the activities of Yen Hsi-shan.

Yen, however, soon tires of war. By March 6th he again wanted to go abroad, and correctly asked permission (of Nanking) to do so, this time again reverting to Feng Yu-hsiang as the companion he desired. The permission was refused, and Yen ordered seven divisions to occupy the northern section of the Tientsin-Pukow railway. He was no doubt further consoled by the receipt of several telegrams from leading Kuominchun generals urging him not to persist in his intention of resigning and promising to fight for him to the last man (March 14th). Renewed, no doubt, in spirit thereby, Yen took his place at the head of 130,000 men, and by the side of Feng Yu-hsiang, who had arrived on the Shensi-Honan border, determined personally to direct the operations of the Kuominchun. Oddly enough, the object of that activity was stated to be "to exterminate the traitor (Chiang Kai-shek) and save the nation from extinction": an object which no fewer than fifty-three generals now pledged themselves to encompass.

On March 23rd Yen's agents took over the administration of the Peking-Hankow railway. The following fortnight conformed to the Chinese type in its evolution of the military situation. A certain Nanking general, Shih Yu-san, who had lately deserted from the Kuominchun on the receipt of a handsome "subsidy" from Chiang Kai-shek, but who preferred at any given moment to be fighting

on the winning side, now deserted back again in the Kuominchun in deference to the Kuominchun's success in occupying Chengchow. It is one of the attractive features of Chinese warfare that decisions are reached rather by psychological than by physical means. Sentiment or horse-sense creates an impression that a particular side is winning. All the troops in the neighbourhood cross over to fight on the winning side, and it becomes *ipso facto* the winning side. On April 3rd, the Kuominchun stock had risen so high that Yen Hsi-shan triumphantly, and without being laughed at, announced that he henceforth was to be regarded as the Generalissimo of the Chinese "national forces." He proceeded to give formal assurances to the legations in Peking that he would assure the fullest protection for foreign life and property; and he also appealed to the Powers of the world in general not to give moral or material support to Chiang Kai-shak, against whom, he explained, he contemplated issuing a "punitive mandate" (April 3rd). Nanking however "got its fist in fust" by issuing a punitive mandate against Yen (April 5th).

The *Ta Kung Pao* of Tientsin wrote on March 11th: "China to-day is not a republic; it is a militarist State. Military expenses absorb all the revenue, and the whole control is centred in the hands of the militarists. Why is it that the railways are obstructed, trade held up, crushing taxation not reduced, no construction work put in hand? It is all because the military commanders dominate the situation and because the very life of the State is in the hands of a few militarists."

THE TWO PACTS.

The committee of eleven persons, presided over by Signor Scialoja, who were asked by the League Council in January to propose amendments to the Covenant, met in Geneva from February 25th to March 5th. The British member of the committee was Lord Cecil. They were asked to propose amendments which might bring the Covenant into harmony with the Paris ("Kellogg") Pact.

The report they drew up and the proposals they made are important, their purpose being to prohibit resort to war under the Covenant as absolutely as it is prohibited under the Paris Pact. The relevant clause of the Paris Pact reads thus: "*Article I.* The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

"*Article II.* The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

The amendments to the Covenant proposed by the committee are the following:

PRESENT TEXT.

Preamble.

In order to promote international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war.

Article 12, Paragraph 1.

The Members of the League agree that, if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or judicial settlement or to inquiry by the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the judicial decision or the report by the Council.

Article 13, Paragraph 4.

The Members of the League agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award or decision that may be rendered, and that they will not resort to war against a Member of the League which complies therewith. In the event of any failure to carry out such an award or decision, the Council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.

(The amended phrases are in italics.)

Preamble.

In order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security by *accepting the obligation* not to resort to war.

Article 12, Paragraph 1.

The Members of the League agree that, if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will *only employ pacific means for its settlement.*

If the disagreement continues, the dispute shall be submitted either to arbitration or judicial settlement, or to inquiry by the Council. The Members of the League agree that they will in no case resort to war for the solution of their dispute.

Article 13, Paragraph 4.

The Members of the League agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award or decision that may be rendered, and that they will not *take any action* against any Member of the League which complies therewith.

In the event of any failure to carry out such award or decision the Council shall propose what *measures of all kinds should be taken to give effect thereto; the votes of the representatives of the parties shall not be counted.*

Article 15, Paragraph 6.

If a report by the Council is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League agree that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report.

Article 15, Paragraph 7.

If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the representatives 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.

Article 15, Paragraph 6.

If the report by the Council is unanimously agreed to by the members of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League agree that they will *comply with the recommendations of the report. If the Council's recommendation is not carried out, the Council shall propose suitable measures to give it effect.*

Article 15, Paragraph 7.

If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, *it shall examine the procedure best suited to meet the case and recommend it to the parties.*

Article 15, Paragraph 7bis.
(New paragraph.)

At any stage of the examination, the Council may, either at the request of one of the parties or on its own initiative, ask the Permanent Court of International Justice for an advisory opinion on points of law relating to the dispute. Such application shall not require a unanimous vote by the Council.

In an introductory explanation the Committee observes: "The League Covenant, under some of its articles, reserves the right to go to war, and it is essential to eliminate this right wherever it appears." It is "the right to go to war" that is the enemy of all diplomatic progress. The Covenant of 1919 hampered it; the Locarno Treaty of 1925 abolished it in a particular territory; the Paris Pact of 1928 abolished it generally; and now it is likely that the general abolition will be incorporated in the Covenant. That way progress lies.

April 11th, 1930.

GEORGE GLASGOW.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
I. REVIEWS	661
THE DISSOLUTION OF THE HABSBURG EMPIRE; MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHING; SOME CONTEMPORARY POETS; J. B. BURY; SCRAPS OF PAPER; A NATIONAL SCRIPT FOR INDIA.	
2. SHORTER REVIEWS: "Britain and the Baltic"; "The Colonial Service"; "Poems by Nicholas Nekrassov"; "Report of the Eighteenth Annual Conference of Educational Associations"	677
3. NOTICES OF BOOKS: "A Miscellany"; "Parliament and the British Empire"	680

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE HABSBURG EMPIRE.*

The first instalment of Joseph Baernreither's *Fragments of a Political Diary* fulfils the expectations of those who held the author to be the most intelligent statesman of the closing years of the Dual Monarchy. A sympathetic biographical sketch by his friend and editor, Professor Joseph Redlich, introduces us to the Civil Servant, Deputy, Minister of Commerce, and Member of the Upper House; but the present volume is mainly concerned with foreign affairs during the last six years of peace. The first part, entitled "Jugoslav Policy," is an illuminating contribution to the history of a problem which Baernreither was one of the few Austrians to study on the spot. Revisiting Bosnia early in 1908, after sixteen years, he was distressed to find how completely the attempt to Austrianise the province had failed, how imperfect was the boasted material improvement, and how rapid the growth of Pan-Serb propaganda. The juristic anomaly of "occupation" had prevented the grant of a Constitution, but annexation, he declared, was inevitable. Annexation, however, without reform was useless; for though the Austrian Serbs had not yet embraced the Pan-Serb faith, they would require very careful handling if their

* (1) *Fragments of a Political Diary*, by Joseph M. Baernreither. Edited and Introduced by Joseph Redlich. Macmillan. 16s. 1930.

(2) *The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy*, by Oscar Jaszi. University of Chicago Press. Chicago. 3 dollars. 1929.

loyalty was to be maintained. Aehrenthal called the author of the pamphlet *Bosnische Eindrücke*, a thought-reader, for he was about to proclaim the incorporation of Bosnia in the Habsburg dominions.

In the momentous interview at Buchlau between Aehrenthal and Izvolsky Baernreither believes that neither played a straight game. Friends and foes alike of the annexation realised that it was a turning-point, and even the old Emperor seemed excited when he read the King's Speech in the Delegations at Budapest. It was an anxious winter, but peace was preserved. "One must have lived through these days to realise the feeling of relief and hopeful anticipation which the clever diplomatic solution of the conflict inspired. Aehrenthal seemed destined to lead us out of the lethargy and shallows of our policy." Diplomacy, however, had only prepared the way for the statesman whom Baernreither summoned to "win Bosnia"; but no statesman answered his call. To win Bosnia it was necessary to win Serbia; but the Central Powers coveted the support of Turkey. Aehrenthal ignored the approaches of Milovanovich, the Serbian Foreign Minister, which the author reported to him at the end of 1909; and the tragic blunders exposed in the Friedjung trial widened the gulf which began to yawn in 1908.

The second part of the volume, entitled "Before the War," covers the period from the Balkan Wars to the early summer of 1914, and, like the first, is mainly concerned with the problem of the nationalities. The victories of Serbia over the Turk aroused not only the enthusiasm of the Bosnian Serbs but hopes of Yugoslav union. In the new situation created by the partition of European Turkey the statesmen of the Dual Monarchy had two courses open to them—to trample on Serbia or, as Milovanovich desired, to make friends. Aehrenthal and Berchtold did neither. Baernreither urged a Zollverein with the enlarged Balkan States, and supported the demand for access to a neutralised harbour; but even the Balkan wars failed to open the eyes of Tisza, Wekerle, and other Magyar leaders to the significance of the Yugoslav problem. The Ballplatz was little wiser, for Berchtold repulsed the offers of Pasitch which Masaryk brought from Belgrade in December 1912, and which Baernreither strongly supported. Berchtold, like his master, had no wish for war, but he lacked the courage to pay the price of peace. Roumania, meanwhile, was edging away from Austria owing to the maltreatment of Transylvania by Budapest, which the Ballplatz was unable to prevent. And all the while Conrad was pressing for war, speaking gaily even of the reconquest of the "Quadrilateral" from Italy, which Baernreither found in 1913 "modern," prosperous, and self-reliant. The war party, ignorant of the growing strength of its prospective enemies, became so violent

that Frau Schratt was commissioned to warn Francis Joseph. Francis Ferdinand desired the restoration of the Dreikaiserbund, but for personal and other reasons he had no great following. The real ruler of the Dual Monarchy was Tisza, who had learned nothing and forgotten nothing. It was in vain that William II urged greater consideration for the Roumanians at Budapest and for the Serbs at Vienna. It was equally in vain that Baernreither, who understood the needs of the Monarchy better than anyone else, raised his warning voice in the Delegations, for he was never recalled to office after middle age. We close this fascinating work—a political testament in the form of a diary—with the vision of an Empire drifting hopelessly to its doom for lack of statesmen who understood the signs of the times within and beyond its frontiers, and possessed the courage to change the course of the ship before it dashed itself to pieces on the rocks.

Professor Oscar Jaszi's massive volume, *The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy*, tends to confirm the opinion that the old Austria was doomed. The author, formerly Professor at Budapest and Minister of Nationalities in Karolyi's short-lived Ministry of 1918-19, and now Professor of Political Science in Oberlin College, has mastered the vast literature of his subject, including the Hungarian books which few of us can read, and his pages are occasionally enriched by personal memories. Like Baernreither he scented dangers threatening the Empire, and "tried to convince my compatriots that without deep organic reforms the whole edifice would collapse." The far-sighted publicist now surveys the ruins in a spirit of lofty impartiality. Even before the war, he tells us, he had grown away from the old local patriotisms of Europe, and to-day he feels equal sympathy for all the suffering peoples of the Danube basin. He writes throughout with regret but without bitterness. The policy of the rulers of Austria has received the condemnation of events, but he fully realises that they were confronted by an exceptionally difficult task. "If the Austro-Hungarian state experiment had been really successful, the Habsburg Monarchy would have solved on its territory the most fundamental problem of present Europe, which is also the problem of the League of Nations. How is it possible to unite national individualities of very divergent ideals and traditions in such a way that each of them can continue its own particular life while at the same time limiting its national sovereignty enough to make a peaceful and effective international co-operation possible?"

The dissolution of the Austrian Empire, like the coming of the French Revolution, was foretold by many prophets, and the causes of its weakness are set forth by Professor Jaszi in great detail under the heads of the historical atmosphere, the centripetal forces, the

centrifugal forces, and the dangers of *irredenta*. The analysis of the dynasty, the army, the aristocracy, the bureaucracy, the Church and other elements reminds the reader of Mr. Wickham Steed's masterly volume written nearly twenty years ago; but the two books differ in many important respects. The Hungarian scholar deals more fully than the Englishman with economic factors and with the Hungarian half of the Empire, while making no extended reference to foreign policy. In his closing pages he reminds us of the melancholy fact that the dangers which confront the new states are precisely the same as those which threatened the Habsburg Empire—over-centralisation and artificial assimilation. He speaks sadly of "the wild and brutal atmosphere of hatred and revenge which is still the dominating current of Eastern Europe." Future wars, he is convinced, can only be averted by revision of frontiers, cultural autonomy, administrative decentralisation, and economic interdependence. This thoughtful work is not only a valuable study of a vanished empire but a solemn warning against the errors by which it perished.

G. P. GOOCH.

* * *

MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHING.*

Mr. Cloudesley Brereton has done well in putting his ripe experience on the subject of modern language teaching in book form. He has done much to stimulate such teaching in England and has witnessed the whole of the strange modern history of the teaching of French and German in this country. He is able in retrospect to go even behind the beginnings of the Direct Method and back into the days when the best schools regarded French as a dead language, while foreign teachers made confusion worse confounded. There is this in common between the schools of those days and the most advanced schools of our own time, that everything seemed and seems to depend upon the teacher. Fifty years ago there were, though they were rare, foreign teachers in English schools who, were scholars, were able to maintain discipline and, through sheer force of personality, made many of their pupils into passable French and German scholars. These men practised all the best aspects of the Direct Method, men like Herr Osiander of the Blackheath Proprietary School. To-day

in both secondary and central schools, we in London have been gradually able to secure fully equipped teachers by demanding that the teaching of the subject should be confined to really competent persons. In the secondary schools the provision has

* *Modern Language Teaching in Day and Evening Schools with special reference to London*, by Cloudesley Brereton. University of London Press. 7s. 6d. net.

been easier, owing to the increasing number of qualified persons turned out by the Universities. As the Assistant Masters' Memorandum states, Modern Languages are nowhere to-day regarded as a soft option in the Universities. In the central schools the problem has been practically solved by the central school teacher increasing his or her initial qualifications by attending academic classes at the French Institute, with the result that a large number of central teachers either possess or are on the way to possess the French *licence ès lettres*.

Mr. Brereton, however, considers that the Board of Education has never, in spite of certain concessions such as the granting of a third year abroad for students in Training Colleges, "sufficiently tackled the handicap under which the intending modern-language teacher suffers in this country." The system of exchange of teachers and the opening of the new British Institute in Paris, however, offer new opportunities. Mr. Brereton considers that it is necessary, if we are not to remain an isolated or insulated country, for effective French and German to be taught. He thinks that it would be well for the modern-language teacher in our schools to be able to teach both French and German. "With French and German, for instance, one can practically go all over Europe. Moreover, I feel as a good European that it is our duty to do all we can to prepare for the Europe of to-morrow." This is an excellent goal for the teacher and, indeed, for all, but the difficulty is the actual teaching. Mr. Brereton dwells on the personality of the teacher, and, indeed, with the co-ordination of methods in schools the capacity to teach has become not less but more important. The aim of the Direct Method is fundamentally to make the language taught a living thing, whether the pupils have the gift of tongues or have not.

A child, however non-linguistically inclined, would, in the native environment, learn the language because his food and his comfort depend upon that knowledge. How can you substitute for a native environment some method which will have the same effect? The Direct Method certainly, but the direct influence of the teacher is quite as important. Mr. Brereton adds to this learning by heart of very substantial vocabularies. In its native land a child does not learn actively any vocabularies. He picks up, with extraordinary rapidity, the words he needs to know. The American passive vocabulary is more likely to have a chance with an English student, since it consists only of 1,195 words, and even in the *Bourgeois Gentilhomme* there are only 51 uncommon words per thousand that are not in the passive list. Mr. Brereton admits that the French make no fetish of a knowledge of vocabulary as such "and actually allow candidates to bring in their own *lexique* to the examination, a practice advocated by the Assistant Masters' Association." Mr.

Brereton; in a piece of unseen, places in order of merit knowledge of construction, idiomatic rendering and vocabulary last, but he expects the candidate to know by sight, so to speak, some 5,000 words.

What are the results of a course of four or five years given to an average pupil after the age of eleven years by a first-rate teacher? Suppose that they all pass the school certificate examination with credit, what then are the results? Can such candidates if transported to France or Germany make themselves understood and can they themselves understand with reasonable facility what is said to them? That ought to be the great goal of any system of teaching, but the non-linguistic child is the difficulty, not the child who is non-linguistic as a result of physical or mental defects, but the child who is a clever child but is apparently quite incapable of acquiring a foreign tongue. The real misfits can be isolated in "slow traffic" classes, but what about the clever child who is apparently totally incapable of treating a modern tongue as a reality? If this child were in a French or German family totally cut from English speech we know that his high intellectuality would operate, but in England he deliberately closes his mind to foreign tongues. Mr. Brereton must have come across many of these cases. The courses, however, that are discussed in this able book should, in theory at any rate, meet all cases; the first two years are dealt with in great detail and an able teacher should gain practical knowledge from every page. But what perhaps might astonish a visitant from Mars is the fact that French is begun so late. In Wales the children are from the first bi-lingual and they have two native tongues. Is there no possibility of adopting this method in English schools with respect to at least one foreign language?

However, from the premiss that pupils are to be taught a language when all the early linguistic freshness—which is ready to take any language as a means of communication; English boys speak Tamil and other Indian languages fluently at the age of six—is gone, then it probably is not possible to improve on Mr. Brereton's system. Those boys who have linguistic talent will gain by correctness of method and by phonetic precision while some children who could at the best be expected to treat modern languages as dead tongues will acquire some conversational powers. Moreover, the whole field is covered. Advanced courses are carefully considered, the relationship of examinations to language teaching is carefully analysed and the uses of wireless and other mechanical appliances are effectively presented. The teaching of foreign languages is becoming alive in England, but the hope that the English will become a bi-lingual people is somewhat remote. Yet, in any event, children and

young persons who have a definite objective in acquiring another modern tongue should have no difficulty in doing so. For instance, Spanish has become a necessity for English commerce and it is possible to obtain trained instruction in it in some public schools.

* * *

SOME CONTEMPORARY POETS.*

Mr. Charles Williams in this sparkling series of essays introduces the general reader to seventeen contemporary poets and one—Mr. Thomas Hardy—who has recently ceased to be contemporary. The professed object of the book is to be a companion to various anthologies published by the Oxford University Press, but it is, in fact, much more than this, though the author disclaims criticism and only claims that his essays are utilitarian. He defines criticism as an art which attempts, in another medium, "to create experiences as full and satisfying as those of the work it is discussing . . . real criticism aims always at its own absolute being." Whether this is a sound definition of criticism is impossible to tell. It sounds like "Private Judgment" as defined by Newman and not like the Criticism of Arnold which beckons us towards a promised land, but is of a lower rank than Creative power. The point is of importance in an estimate of Mr. Williams' essays, since he speaks of the "present affluent state of verse," and certainly beckons us to an alleged promised land. Mr. Williams' definition of criticism claims the unity of creative and critical work, and perhaps it is as well that he deals with the lower criticism—the objective and not the subjective—since he passes in review a phase of contemporary life rather than a phase of absolute art.

Mr. Williams thinks that Mr. Thomas Hardy "has assisted to enlarge the possibilities of English verse" and asserts that "his reputation is assured of permanence, for by him rather than by any other poet the romantic Muse has achieved, without losing her own character, a triumph of classical art." Mr. Williams is himself a poet of no mean standing—it would have been pleasant if he had been bold enough to give a utilitarian introduction to himself such as Mr. Shaw could have given—and his opinion is worthy of close attention. Mr. Hardy had been in the public eye for a long time and he was a famous contemporary, but some critics do not like his work and would not hesitate to state, at any rate in private, that his writings will not last a century.

Mr. Williams pays a graceful tribute to the Poet-Laureate. He says that only two of our Poets-Laureate have been greater than

* *Poetry at Present*, by Charles Williams, Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d. net.

Mr. Robert Bridges, Dryden and Wordsworth, and quotes anonymous authority for the statement that he is "our greatest lyric poet since Shelley." Mr. Williams should abandon these "good judges." Everyone is devoted to Mr. Bridges, the poet's poet, but exaggeration of that type would be as painful to the Poet-Laureate as the following statement that Shelley was "peculiarly impatient of intellectual study." Shelley died young, but both in prose and verse he showed the highest capacity for intellectual study. Mr. Bridges is an eclectic poet, gathering thought, structure, and form from many sources, and his work has the immortality which is derived from the essential study of Beauty. It is not necessary to prophesy his ultimate immortality in printed form. What he has done for his contemporaries in instilling the love of Beauty into daily life is an immortality in itself.

Mr. Williams takes next on his list a by no means prolific poet, the Latin scholar Mr. A. E. Housman, a poet whose every line tells and whose hearty pessimism has, as R. L. Stevenson's has, the sadness of music rather than the sadness of life. Mr. Rudyard Kipling comes in for criticism:

Our verse had needed Mr. Kipling and yet he is not a distinguished poet; or alternatively we had not needed him and yet he is. The populace know him, and so (sometimes in spite of themselves) do the intelligentsia. It is not enough to say that he sometimes writes badly—all poets do that—except Mr. Housman. . . . But Mr. Kipling seems to be writing best when he is writing worst, which is why he leaves us in confusion, and why the *bourgeoisie* of verse cannot deal with him. He cannot be forgotten and yet he cannot be endured.

Who are the intelligentsia? Is there a select circle of modern precious ones who (like some Parisian *arbitre élégant* of ladies' clothing) tell the populace (the only people who matter), and even "the *bourgeoisie* of verse," what is good verse and what is bad? Mr. Williams writes as if there were some secret but objective standard that "the intelligentsia" (like a French cook if a French dress-maker be ruled out) apply. Yet probably the best of the essays in this book is the one on Mr. Kipling. The author feels that he can deal frankly, perhaps more frankly than when he is dealing with lesser folk, with that great writer, and gives him the praise that cannot be withheld from him as well as the technical adverse criticism that he deserves. For Mr. Kipling is not a patient poet and he is like Shakespeare in this, that he does not blot lines that ought to be blotted.

Mr. Williams calls Mr. G. K. Chesterton "one of the finest poets of our time" with justice. He has indeed the poet's gift and

uses it with effect in any noble cause in which he may be involved. He is a poet who teems with faith and faithfulness. The same may be said of Mr. John Masefield, a true poet who loves beauty, reality, and romance. Mr. Williams discusses the poetry of Mr. W. B. Yeats, Mr. Walter de la Mare, Mr. W. H. Davies, Mr. Ralph Hodgson, Mr. Wilfred Gibson, Mr. Lascelles Abercrombie—a poet the twenty-first century may hear something about. Mr. Williams discovers for us Mr. T. S. Eliot—an American poet who treats chiefly, it seems, of Hell—writes encouragingly about Miss Sitwell and her brothers, and sympathetically about the scholarly work of Mr. Robert Graves and the pastorals of Mr. Edmund Blunden. These essays show not only the achievements but the possibilities of current English verse, but they do not seem to show the existence of anyone who will be among "the one or two immortal lights," anyone indeed who reaches Matthew Arnold's own superb standard.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

J. B. BURY.*

Dr. Temperley has done true service to students of history in his introduction to these ten essays by the late Professor Bury by presenting the evolution of that eminent historian's historical conceptions. "The first five pieces offer for the first time within the limits of one volume a systematic survey of Bury's views on the general aims of history." Bury desired, first of all, to release history from rhetoric—an impossible task since, for good or ill, rhetoric must always affect not only the later exposition of facts, but the actual trend of events—then from "political and ethical incumbrances" since they hamper the judicial mind, and from all assumption of final horizons in history. Dr. Temperley points out that in 1909 Bury had reached the position that "the doctrine of historical relativity applies no less to his [the historian's] own judgments than to other facts." He was true to this doctrine.

New facts might be discovered and new judgments delivered at any time, and he was himself the living illustration of the process. Between 1889 and 1923 he entirely remodelled his conceptions of the development of the later Roman Empire in the light of new materials and fresh interpretations. His judgments also altered with time. Thus a view of history that is purely unitary is shown in the first three essays here given, all written before 1909. By 1924 he certainly had begun to favour a pluralistic interpretation. Again in 1904 he quoted Tacitus and Treitschke as useful examples of prejudice, but

* *Selected Essays of J. B. Bury*, edited by Harold Temperley. Cambridge: at the University Press. 12s. 6d. net.

his letter of 1926 asserts that freedom from bias in history is not possible nor even desirable. For prejudices alone "engage the interest of the world" (pp. 70-1). He had thus reached a position the exact opposite of the Greek "who would have said that the judgment of a wise man at any time might be final or absolutely valid." In his view a historian's judgment was of permanent interest only as an illustration of his epoch, and finality and impartiality were mistaken ideals.

No doubt this final sentence is sufficiently convincing, but what becomes of the idea of history as a science "no less and no more"? Prejudice in written words is one form of rhetoric; impartiality is the very root of judgment. The scientist and the lawyer are seeking facts in order to form respectively conclusions or judgments, and they throughout the search are subject to law, fundamental laws, let us say, such as the laws (or assumptions) of Newton and Einstein, of Mendel, and of laws that govern human personality such as the Law of Nature. There can be no question of bias or prejudice with the scientist or the lawyer who is perfectly true to himself and to the laws which he recognises as fundamental. Moreover, if these turn out not to be absolutely fundamental he makes, as a matter of course, the necessary adjustments. But apparently that was not the case with Bury's final views as to the task of the historian though, as Dr. Temperley points out, "evolution, in Bury's view, was the final determining influence in establishing the unity of history, in making it into a science, and in relating it to other sciences." Is the historian subject to no overriding or fundamental law? Progress or even evolution is a fact but not a law, though it may be, and probably is, the product of a fundamental law, a law governing the creation of groups and evolution of groups, a law by which the historian is so bound that if recorded facts disobey the law he must assume that the facts are erroneously recorded.

Bury, apparently, was not prepared to face the implications involved in the definition of history as a science. He declares that history "deals only with the development of man in societies," but does not formulate the fundamental laws that govern groups and the possible relationship of such laws to an extra-temporal Power. He indeed expressly says that "a historian may be a theist; but, so far as his work is concerned, this particular belief is otiose." Yet while dismissing the *deus ex machina* he introduces into history the doctrine or theory of "contingency" or pure chance which may be as contrary to scientific conclusions as the idea of an extra-mundane force determining the true lines of human progress but providing at the same time the free choice of good and evil. Dr. Temperley says of Bury's doctrine of contingency in its application to the fall of the Western Empire that "it is thus that the

true historian delicately poises his conclusion." No one doubts that Bury was a true, indeed a great, historian with a marvellous control of his authorities and a passionate desire to be rid of all paraphernalia that hampered the search for truth, of all the mists that human frailty and the casualties of time have placed between man and truth. But the question is, Can Bury's outlook be co-ordinated with history as a pure science? Bury was an acute critic of philosophies of history. He says:

I have pointed out the common error into which philosophies of history have fallen, through not perceiving that in order to lay bare the spiritual process which history represents, we must go to history itself without any *à priori* assumptions or predetermined systems. All that philosophy can do is to assure us that historical experience is a disclosure of the inner nature of spiritual reality. This disclosure is furnished by history and history alone. It follows that it is the historian and not the philosopher who must discover the diamond net; or the philosopher must become an historian if he would do so. But not only is it necessary to abandon unreservedly the Procrustean principle; the method of approach must also be changed. This is the point to which it has been my particular object to lead up. The interpreter of the movement of history must proceed backward, not forward; he must start from the modern period.

That is a purely scientific position; but it is inconsistent with Bury's latest position when he himself drew up a new philosophy of history of which contingency and not law seems to be the moving force. In the brilliant Introduction to the fourth volume of the *Cambridge Mediæval History*, published in 1923, we see the new philosophy at work. Bury writes:

If the chief interest in history lies in observing such changes, watching new problems shape themselves and the attempts of rulers or peoples to solve them, and seeing how the characters of individuals and the accidents which befall them determine the course of events, the story of the Eastern Empire is at least as interesting as that of any mediæval State, or perhaps more interesting because its people were more civilised and intellectual than other Europeans and had a longer political experience behind them.

More than twenty years earlier Bury, writing in the *Quarterly Review* (1900), advances no such doctrine as is involved in the words italicised above in regard to the fall of the Eastern Empire. Inevitable causation based upon the fiscal errors of the Emperor Justinian II brought the Empire to its first decline. Bury's earlier position seems entirely consistent with the proposition that history is a science and it seems, moreover, that the proposal to work backward from modern times when material is plentiful to earlier and less well-documented times is merely a question of scientific

method that may or may not be convenient. Other historians may prefer to begin with the group (ancient or modern) and to show that it originated with the idea of securing for its members a maximum of protection from environment, and that both within the group and within the inter-relations of multitudinous groups political stability of conduct is the goal since it gives a maximum protection against environment. Both methods are scientific, but in working backwards there is always the danger of missing the root of things through the very mass of documents available.

The thorough grounding in history that Von Savigny insisted upon in 1814 as the only means of understanding the procession of law seems to involve a belief which is something more than that limited idea of progress which is admitted by Bury. In 1909 in the interesting essay entitled *Darwinism and History* he declares that progress "involves a judgment of value," and concludes his paper thus :

One may venture to say that no historical change or transformation will be fully understood until it is explained how social environment acted on the individual components of the society (both immediately and by heredity), and how the individuals reacted upon their environment. The problem is psychical, but it is analogous to the main problem of the biologist.

Bury dismissed the theistic idea in this paper : "with a *deus ex machina* who can be brought on the stage to solve difficulties scientific treatment is a farce." But is this true of Design involving a God who does not interfere but plans and gives men the free will and the reasonableness to carry out the plan? Five years after Bury's lecture Lord Balfour took up the theme in his Gifford Lectures. He shows that Design "is demanded by all that we deem most valuable in life : by beauty, by morals, by scientific truth : and that is design far deeper in purpose, far richer in significance, than any which could be inferred from the most ingenious and elaborate adjustments displayed by organic life." In the study of history it would seem more satisfactory to adopt the argument from Design than "a conception of history as a genetic process" or a "contingency" theory of events "which need never have happened," since the argument from Design admits the reign of law while the genetic process is a soulless conception, and the contingency theory recalls Macbeth's conception of history :

To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
To the last syllable of recorded time;
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle !

J. E. G. DE M.

SCRAPS OF PAPER.*

Mr. A. P. Nicholson's book *Scraps of Paper* is a really serious criticism of the Political Department of the Government of India. The "Scraps of Paper" are the treaties made with the Indian Princes long ago. After the Mutiny the Political Department was set up to take over from the East India Company all dealings with the Indian States, and a body of "political practice" grew up which Mr. Nicholson shows to be very far removed from the provisions of the original treaties. The Harcourt Butler Committee (Indian States Committee) which was appointed to make an inquiry into the grievances put forward by the Chamber of Princes, who complained that they could get no redress from the Political Department, in the report which they issued in March 1929, say : "We have formed the highest opinion of the work of the Political Department. It has produced a long series of eminent men whose names are regarded with affectionate esteem throughout the States." On behalf of the Princes Sir Leslie Scott and others were retained to advise on the legal and constitutional aspects of the questions raised. This legal opinion of the position of the States with regard to the Crown, of their sovereignty, of the principles on which the whole dealings of the Government with the Princes are based, is not in many ways acceptable to the Harcourt Butler Commission, who stand by the Political Department. Mr. A. P. Nicholson has had at his disposal the evidence given before this Commission *in camera* which has been collected from the archives of the States throughout India. His opinion of the Political Department may be gauged by his sub-heading of that subject in the Index to his book :

Political Department of the Government of India, an imperious bureaucracy, p.—; their organisation, pp.—; their desire to govern, pp.—; their breach of treaties, pp.—; their invention of doctrines, p.—; their three High Priests, p.—; their "political practice," pp.—; their perversion of history, pp.—.

The story of the "political practice" is briefly that Sir Charles Lewis Tupper "compiled a book of leading cases illustrating our political conduct towards the States. This work on 'practice' which is jealously guarded was issued to the Service confidentially and is still the basis of the Department's policy." The subject has been treated by two high authorities since, but "Sir Lewis Tupper's secret work" is still distributed to political officers for their guidance. "When the Princes asked to see a copy of Tupper's book so that they might instruct their Counsel, Sir Leslie Scott,

* *Scraps of Paper, India's Broken Treaties, Her Princes, and the Problem*, by A. P. Nicholson ("A. P. N."). Ernest Benn. 219.

years, and it shows that the idea of the uses of a national script was in the mind of this great Emperor.

To-day in India there is a welter of scripts, and many of these such as the Devanagri, Zend, Arabic, and Gurmukhi would, inevitably, remain in use since they are "venerated by millions of people as the vehicle of their sacred literature." But, as Mr. Latifi points out, the genius of a language does not lie in the script. Indeed in some parts of Africa widely spoken tongues have no native script at all and now are beginning to have a Roman script. The Hindustani language, the *lingua franca* of India, is found in the three scripts—Devanagri, Arabic, and Roman. Mr. Latifi says that there are "three serious candidates for the position of the national Indian alphabet—the Arabic (as modified for Hindustani), the Devanagri, and the Roman," all derived from a Phœnician origin. Arabic is the most widely spread vernacular alphabet in India and has famous literary implications. It is difficult to read, but it can be written, in its cursive form, faster than Roman or the Devanagri script and in its *naskh* form "is somewhat less difficult to print than Devanagri." But the drawbacks are great and in 1875 the Persian Ambassador declared in London that "it was his profound conviction that one of the principal causes of the backwardness of the Persian people as compared with the Europeans was the Arabic script. . . . With such a system of writing regeneration was impossible." Quite recently Roman characters have replaced Arabic as the national script of Turkey. In December 1928 the Aga Khan declared, in the course of his presidential address to the All-Indian Muslim Conference, that both the Persian and Urdu scripts "present serious difficulties in the primary stages of education, and it is a matter for deliberation how far we can improve and simplify or change our script." The objection to the Devanagri script is its terrible complications. "In the representation in written characters of thirty spoken sounds, the Devanagri script employs no fewer than 280 difficult and often highly complicated symbols." Mr. Latifi proposes an alphabet based on the Roman arranged in accordance with the almost perfect Sanskrit system of speech sounds. To some extent the proposal has been adopted, since the handbook on *Educational Training in the Indian Army* provides that "Roman Urdu is the common language and script in the Indian army, and will be taught in all units."

Mr. Latifi proposes for the consideration of the Indian Government the appointment of a small but strong committee "to devise, with suitable technical help, a scientific script based on the Roman to take the place of the existing clumsy one." He points out that in British West Africa a reformed Roman script is now employed

officially, and is found easy by the West African negro. Mr. Latifi gives various technical suggestions as to the reformed Roman script for India and these should be carefully studied by experts. But the general principle is the important matter at the moment, and when once the Government of India have appointed a technical committee the basis will have been laid of one of the greatest economic and social reforms that can take place in India, since it is not only a matter that affects the army and commerce, but one that means the uplifting of the whole of the Indian peoples. At present illiteracy is one of the great troubles of India. With a simple and universal script education will have an opportunity that it has not had since the time of the Emperor Aśoka.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Mr. Polson Newman's *Britain and the Baltic** is a valuable addition to our knowledge of the problems of North-eastern Europe. Readers of his earlier books will expect a careful analysis of the situation and calm judgments on disputed issues, and they will not be disappointed. He is never carried away by enthusiasm nor does he attempt to send cold shivers down our spine. He finds very much to praise in the efforts of the new States during the first decade of peace, and he is continually reminding us of the immense difficulties which confronted them. He speaks with special warmth of Finland, and detects a good deal of similarity between Finnish and British mentality. Estonia, we are told, has exceeded the most optimistic expectations. Latvia suffered in the war more than any other region of the old Russian Empire, but the worst is now over. The picture of Lithuania, on the other hand, is painted in darker colours, partly because of the poverty and illiteracy of the country, and partly owing to the bitter dispute with Poland about Vilna, which diverts money and attention from domestic reforms to military contingencies. The second half of the volume is devoted to Poland, whose position between an unfriendly Germany and an unfriendly Russia suggests danger in years to come; for if these two Great Powers were to combine, as they have combined before, the Poles would be in a very tight place. Happily, since this book was written, Germany and Poland have drawn a little closer to one another; yet the situation is still one of unstable equilibrium. The chapter on the new Polish Republic tells a fairly encouraging story of progress, in which the financial reforms of Grabski are singled out for special praise. Poland has plenty of internal difficulties such as the working of the new Constitution and the racial minorities; but her gravest dangers are without. Major Polson Newman rightly describes the Corridor as a problem of the first magnitude in European politics, and the greatest danger spot of Europe to-day. Though the communication arrangements between East Prussia and the rest of Germany are described as working fairly well, the severance of a large German province from the Fatherland is as fiercely

* Methuen. 10s. 6d.

on the vital issues submitted to the Harcourt Butler Committee, their request was refused by the India Office." To form a judgment in the case the Harcourt Butler Report should be read along with this book. The legal opinion will be found in an appendix to both.

Mr. Nicholson goes on to recount a series of brief histories of outstanding cases of hardship. His first, our dealings with Sind, is perhaps the furthest removed in point of date. Kashmir follows and then a number of others leading up to a chapter on "Arms and Defence" which deals largely with the "Hyderabad Contingent" and with the acquisition of the Nizam's province of Berar. Considering that the Nizam demanded a commission to inquire into his whole case as recently as 1926, which was refused by Lord Reading, it will be seen that, impossible as it is to revise decisions made and acted upon so long ago, the whole situation needs to be put on a settled basis.

One naturally turns to the chapter on the Salt Monopoly. "The taxation of salt is part of the history of India and we were fortunate to inherit from the native rulers this stable source of revenue sanctioned by custom." Tracing the gradual assumption of complete control by the Government of India Mr. Nicholson describes the impoverishment of certain native States as their salt works were suppressed in order to establish the Government monopoly of production. He gives chapter and verse for various dealings of the Political Agents with the States, particularly maritime States, concerned, most of the negotiations being required to be kept "absolutely confidential," for fear the States should consult together and work up resistance to the "pressure." The isolation of the States from one another has been strictly preserved, and in many ways by alterations of words and phrases and titles the positions and dignities of the native rulers have been reduced in importance in the eyes of the world.

This book, of course, does not deal with the shortcomings and delinquencies of the Princes, its purpose is to show the necessity for the establishment of a proper legal status and practice, and the adjustment of present grievances. Mr. Nicholson quotes the mottoes at the top of the stair in the India Office: "Truth, Justice, Wisdom, Faith, Charity, Prudence, Honour, Courage . . . qualities which in turn have often been shown by Englishmen who have served India," and goes on to say: "But the word Friendship is not there, and the spirit of Friendship has been lacking in our interpretation of treaties with the Indian States." Nevertheless a new spirit is abroad, and the Chamber of Princes is now at work. In the words of the Harcourt Butler Report, "The States have been taken into open conference. The policy of secrecy has

been abandoned. For the old process of decision without discussion has been substituted the new process of decision after open conference and consultation."

E. M. B.

* * *

A NATIONAL SCRIPT FOR INDIA.*

Mr. A. Latifi of the Indian Civil Service, the author of *The Industrial Punjab*, a work which was very warmly received both in India and in England by the leading economists, has recently published an important essay on the subject of a National Script for India. Sir Leslie Wilson writing out of his great knowledge of Indian affairs entirely approves of the proposal. The Indian army authorities are, in fact, using a national script of a sort. Sir Leslie writes:

Much opposition to the adoption of any script appears to come from the idea that this would mean an interference in the use of religious teachings. Mr. Latifi has no such idea, and it is as well that this important fact should be made clear. A national script need not, and would not in any way, militate against the continued use of scripts in which, from time immemorial, religions of all sects have been taught in the historic language of the community concerned; but for practical purposes, Mr. Latifi proposes a script which will enable those in India who are separated at the present time by the fact that they cannot understand the language of each other to come closer together in business and in social life, and the advancement of India in general. I strongly commend this paper of Mr. Latifi as a definite proposition offering clear suggestions towards such a desirable end.

Mr. Latifi does not deal with the early history of Indian scripts, but reference should be made to the ideas on the subject of the great Buddhist Emperor Açoka who reigned in the third century before our era. He apparently used one script for his whole vast empire. D. F. W. Thomas in the *Cambridge History of India*, alluding to his practice of having his missives or edicts engraved on prominent rocks and pillars, says that:

he issued no fewer than sixteen missives, of which fourteen are found engraved, in one corpus, in places as far distant as the extremities of his empire, at Girnar in Kathiawar, at Mansehra and Shahbazgarhi in the Punjab, and twelve of the same with two others at Dhauli and Jaugada in Orissa. In these records, which seem to have been engraved in his fourteenth year, Açoka gives an account of the administrative and other measures which he had adopted.

This procedure seems to indicate a standard of literacy which has not been overtaken after the lapse of more than two thousand

* *A National Script for India*: A Paper read in May 1929 before the East India Association, London, by A. Latifi, with a Foreword by the Right Hon. Sir Leslie Wilson.

resented to-day as when the operation was performed. The author states dispassionately the German complaint and the Polish reply; leaves the reader to strike the balance; and ends by quoting Foch's ominous prophecy: "There lies the root of the next war." If another cataclysm is to be averted, it must be by the co-operation of Great Britain, France, and Germany for which the closing chapter of this thoughtful volume pleads.

* * *

Sir Anton Bertram, who has had considerable judicial experience in the Colonial Service, has published the useful course of lectures that he delivered in 1928-9 on the Colonial Service at the London School of Economics.* He deals with the general lines of the administrative machinery of the Crown Colonies, the Protectorates, and the Mandated Territories in its practical working. The object of the lectures and the book is to give the student "a summary idea of what British government means in these various countries to those who conduct it and to those to whom it is applied." Round the thirty-six units which the Colonial Office controls, units that are entirely separate in all senses from each other, "has clustered an active and manifold growth of customs, laws, regulations, and institutions." Some of the units are vast territories, others are small, but all call for the "application of great principles" in the art of Government. There are five geographical groups: the West Indies and the Atlantic from "the vexed Bermoothes" to the Falkland Islands; the Mediterranean and the Near East; the Far East; the Pacific Islands; and British Tropical Africa. Sir Anton Bertram gives the student a general geographical review and passes on to deal with the constitutional status of the Governor, the Colonial Secretary (who is in daily touch with the Governor), the departments and departmental officers, the district officer, the problems of direct and indirect rule, the organisation of law and justice, the law courts, the growth of colonial legislatures, the status of protectorates and mandated territories. Sir Anton discusses, but not very decisively, the knotty question of the status of persons domiciled in a Mandated Territory. He says that "if one looks at the substance of the thing, it appears to be that the rights of sovereignty are in fact exercised by the Mandatory Powers but on behalf of the League of Nations and as trustees for the well-being and development of the people of the country." This seems to assume that the League of Nations is a Sovereign Power. The League, whatever else it is, is not a Sovereign Power. Sir Anton assumes that the meaning of the term "Mandatory" is to be ascertained by reference to Article 1984 of the French Civil Code. He gives as a reason for this statement that the French text of the Covenant is authoritative, and "that the French word 'Mandat' must presumably be interpreted according to French ideas." But the English text of the treaty is also authoritative and there is an English word "Mandate" derived direct from the Latin which President Wilson presumably meant when he introduced the term. It is rather surprising to read that "under the Covenant the Mandatory Power in effect holds a Power of Attorney from the League of Nations." If this is so, what is the position of the United States of America

* *The Colonial Service*, by Sir Anton Bertram. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d. net.

which is not a member of the League and yet has rights under the Treaty of Versailles in the transferred colonies? The Council of the League has refused to give a decision, and in the circumstances Sovereignty *de facto* by the Mandatory Powers is indicated until such Sovereignty is challenged.

* * *

The work of many of the great Russian prose writers has been familiar to English readers for many years, but partly owing to the difficulty of translating poetry, the great Russian poets are less well-known, and are, in fact, little more than names to most non-Russian speaking English people. In the case of Nicholas Alexeievitch Nekrassov who died in 1877 and is regarded by Russians as one of their very greatest poets, both his name and work were unknown in England, except to students of Russian, until Mrs. J. M. Soskice translated and published in the "World's Classics" Series, *Who can be happy in Russia?* She has now translated and brought out in the same series a collection of *Poems by Nicholas Nekrassov*,* which includes one of his most famous works, "Russian Women"; in it he describes the terrible journeys, contrasted with their up-bringing, of Princess Troubetzkoy and Princess Volkhonsky, who after their husbands had been sent to the Siberian mines, decided to give up their Russian homes and follow them to Siberia. Nekrassov has an amazing power of description, making his characters, the scenery, and even the dead cold of Siberia, alive and tangible. Unlike many Russian prose writers, he can show the happy as well as the sad side of peasant life, as for instance in the poem "Peasant Children," where the little village children play merrily; and in "Uncle Jake," who sells his wares in kindly fashion. Nekrassov is essentially a writer of detail; nothing is too small to escape his notice, and it is this gift coupled with a descriptive sense which makes his work particularly interesting to people who do not know Russia.

* * *

The Report of the Eighteenth Annual Conference of Educational Associations held at University College London last January† opens with a foreword by Miss Henrietta Busk, the honorary treasurer of the Conference, who notes that the Teachers' Guild of Great Britain and Ireland, the pioneer of conferences in education, has been dissolved, its work having been accomplished. The President this year is Professor Winifred Cullis, Professor of Physiology in the University of London, the first woman president. Her address on "the Lure of Investigation" published in this volume was broadcast all over the country. Over forty subjects were discussed by the various educational associations, covering practically the whole range of technical educational thought. The joint conference was on "History as a Training for Citizenship" and three illuminating essays were contributed by Miss E. C. Lodge, the Principal of Westfield College (who dwells on the educational value of the historical method); Dr. G. P. Gooch (who finds in the study and teaching of history a source of priceless moral stimulus and discipline); and Professor A. F.

* "World Classics" Series. Oxford University Press. 2s. net.

† Published for the Conference Committee, 29, Gordon Square, W.C.1. 4s. 6d. post free.

Pollard (who discusses the nature of true citizenship), followed by an interesting discussion in which an experienced inspector of schools, Dr. C. F. Strong, declared that children in elementary schools are interested in modern history. The conference attended a special Sunday afternoon service at Westminster Abbey, when the preacher, Canon Woodward, considered the relations which should exist between religious and secular education. The report is a fascinating volume of educational thought and has been very carefully edited by the secretary of the conference, Miss M. A. Challen.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Dr. A. C. Bradley, formerly Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford, has compiled an attractive volume which he has aptly entitled "A Miscellany."* It is in fact a collection of thirteen articles on various and diverse literary topics. There is an interesting article on the Reaction against Tennyson followed by an illuminating account of the virtues of Jane Austen. "There are two distinct strains in Jane Austen. She is a moralist and a humorist." By means of a short analysis of each of her novels, Dr. Bradley confirms this judgment and gives a clear insight into the mind of the great novelist. There are several chapters on the plays of Shakespeare including *Coriolanus*, and Feste the Jester in *Twelfth Night*. This little volume will be very useful to the students of English literature. But to obtain a true appreciation of Dr. Bradley's arguments it is necessary to have read a great deal of the works discussed. At all events this book, on the other hand, urges one to know more of some outstanding figures in English literature.

* * *

During the last few years there has appeared a flood of literature dealing with the constitutional position of the British Empire. The Imperial Conference of 1926 finally confirmed the principle of dominion self-government and converted the Empire into an institution outside the traditions of history. It was natural, therefore, that books should be written expounding the significance of the new position, both in internal mechanism and in external relations. "Parliament and the British Empire,"† by Robert L. Schuyler, is a book of this type, and yet different. The author is Professor of History in Columbia University, and considers his subject from a strictly historical standpoint. "The legal right of the British Parliament to legislate on any subject for any or all parts of the British Empire is now universally recognised, but this has not always been the case. From time to time controversies have arisen within the Empire in which this right has been vehemently denied." Professor Schuyler considers some of these Imperial crises, and finishes his work with a chapter on the present position. He has endeavoured to build up an historical background to emphasise the character of the modern British Commonwealth of Nations. Such a contribution to the question of Imperial growth and constitutionalism must be welcome. Some of the conclusions may be controversial, but they do at least add something to the study of the subject.

* Macmillan. 10s. 6d. net.

† Humphrey Milford. 18s. 6d. net.

MR. PHILIP SNOWDEN'S SECOND BUDGET.

AMONG the epithets bestowed by the newspaper press and in the debates of the House of Commons on Mr. Snowden's second Budget, I noted "humdrum," "simple," "austere," "puritanical," "ferocious," "punitive," and "vindictive." It has its virtues; but they are not attractive, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer need not be surprised if his second Budget is contrasted unfavourably with his first, that of 1924, which was described as "Gladstonian" and so won the highest praise that can be conferred on a financial statement. It is indeed difficult to recognise the faintest family resemblance between Mr. Snowden's two offsprings. His first relieved the poor without imposing any burdens on the rich. His second imposes heavy burdens on the rich without reducing the taxes that fall upon the budgets of the poor. The reason for so wide a difference is not far to seek. Mr. Snowden's first Budget was, comparatively speaking, an economic Budget. His estimated expenditure then, on the old basis, was 790 millions. In the Budget which he unfolded on April 14th of this year, the estimated expenditure on the same basis—i.e. including the Post Office and other self-balancing items—was, according to my calculation, 884 millions, though the *Economist*, I observe, puts it lower, at 865 millions.*

It is true that, of this addition of over 90 millions to the national expenditure between the years 1924 and 1930, Mr. Churchill is responsible for 70, including the cost of his precious Derating Scheme; and although the 20 millions or thereabouts, which the Labour Government has added in its first year of office, is above the Churchillian annual average, yet it must be remembered that Mr. Baldwin's late Administration went into office pledged to public economy; for was it not written in the King's speech at the opening of Parliament in December 1924: "The present heavy burdens on the taxpayer are a hindrance to the revival of enterprise and employment. Economy in every sphere is imperative, if we are to regain our industrial and commercial prosperity." Nor can we forget that Mr. Churchill in the first year of his Chancellorship informed the House of Commons that he saw his way to reduce the public expenditure at the rate of 10 millions a year.

No such charge can be brought against the Labour Government. Economy does not figure in its programme. Indeed many Labour candidates got into Parliament largely by promising that immense

* Probably the *Economist* leaves out four minor self-balancing items stated at over 13 millions by Mr. Snowden on April 17th, 1930.

sums of public money, drawn from the pockets of the rich, should be distributed among the poorest of the electors. Consequently, while those who still believe in the old virtues of public economy are entitled to complain bitterly of Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Churchill for having failed to redeem their pledges, they have no right to be surprised or disappointed that the new Labour Government, even in a year of bad trade and unemployment, should be adding 20 millions to the estimates, of which some 14 arise from additional grants to the unemployment insurance fund and 5 from additional contributions to widows, orphans, and old age pensions. The one substantial saving for which Labour can claim credit is a reduction of over 4 millions on the Navy, against which must be set an addition of over $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions to the cost of the Air Force, and an equally mischievous one of $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions to the beet sugar subsidy.*

Those who listened to his financial statement on April 14th, or to Mr. Snowden's broadcast talk on the Budget from his study at 11 Downing Street on the following evening, will have appreciated its simplicity and straightforwardness. I doubt if there has been in our time a Budget so easy to understand; and its intelligibility lost nothing in the exposition. After deducting the self-balancing items, Mr. Snowden had to provide for an estimated expenditure (on the new basis) of 782 millions, including 355 millions for the service of interest and sinking fund on the national debt. On the revenue side, which includes not only the yield of direct and indirect taxation but also the profits of the Post Office and receipts from reparations and war debts, Mr. Snowden could anticipate a revenue of only 740 millions, leaving a gap of 42 millions to be filled somehow or other. In addition, there was a deficit on the previous year's Budget of $14\frac{1}{2}$ millions, towards which he assigns 5 millions in the current year. On the other hand there was a fund left by Mr. Churchill of about 20 millions, to meet the initial cost of the Derating Scheme. From this Mr. Snowden is taking 16 millions, leaving 4 millions to help next year's Budget. The net result of these operations reduced the gap to be filled from 42 millions to 31 millions; but the complete abolition of the betting duty and a few small concessions on stamps and motor licenses cost half a million, so that the total sum to be found by increased taxation was $31\frac{1}{2}$ millions. Unfortunately, owing to the Derating Scheme and other increasing liabilities, next year's deficit will be larger than this year's. Consequently Mr. Snowden so arranged his new taxes that their yield next year will be considerably larger than this year.

* A folly which this year will cost $5\frac{1}{4}$ millions. Its effect is to induce British farmers to grow, at the taxpayers' expense, an unprofitable and uneconomic crop of sugar beet instead of a profitable crop of turnips or mangold-wurzels.

The new taxation is as follows. First of all, there is a small increase of three shillings a barrel on beer, which is to raise $2\frac{3}{4}$ millions without increasing the price or reducing the strength of beer—an almost miraculous result! Then comes the raising of the standard rate of income-tax by sixpence, from four shillings to four shillings and sixpence, which, after some new abatements on smaller incomes, is expected to yield 21 millions this year. Added to this is a graduated increase in the surtax on larger incomes of upwards of £2,000 a year. This is to yield $7\frac{1}{2}$ millions. Lastly a further graduation of death duties on estates of over £120,000 is estimated to yield 3 millions. These increases of taxation should produce over 34 millions of additional revenue this year, leaving a margin or surplus of just over 2 millions, and 47 millions of additional revenue next year. The Chancellor also announced a Valuation Bill to provide the basis for a new tax on land values; but this is not part of the Budget scheme.

In his broadcast talk Mr. Snowden reminded us of his declaration a year ago, before the election, that "Labour's taxation policy is to raise revenue mainly by income tax and surtax, by death duties, and by the taxing of land values." He has also committed himself more than once to the policy of paying our way by raising taxation to cover expenditure, in contrast with the methods pursued by Mr. Churchill throughout his Chancellorship.*

So much for the framework of the Budget. They used to talk of the sweet simplicity of three per cent. The simplicity of this Budget is not sweet but bitter for those who have to pay the piper; but our criticisms should be directed mainly against the policy which has made taxation inevitable, rather than against the taxation itself. It is the increase in the national expenditure rather than the corresponding increase in taxation that demands attention. An inclination to extravagance, an apparent indifference to the luxurious and wasteful outlay of the spending departments, has been the vice of Parliament ever since the War. Six years ago, when the Budget fell below 800 millions, it looked as if the economists were beginning to get the upper hand; but since then the mischief has grown and spread in spite of a substantial fall in prices, which should have assisted a frugal Chancellor, and in spite of a severe depression of trade which should have warned Parliament that the strain of taxation was telling upon industry and enterprise. I do not lay the blame for this year's great addition to the estimates mainly on the Chancellor of the Exchequer; for I have no doubt that he has done his best to put a check on the spending instincts of his colleagues and

* Under Mr. Churchill's Derating Scheme a charge of about 30 millions a year was laid on the Exchequer, and the only new taxation to meet it was the tax on petrol, which yields a paltry 15 millions a year.

followers. Towards the close of his financial statement he said :

In facing the inevitable increase of taxation I have been guided by two principles. As long as I hold this position I am determined, however burdensome it may be, that the country shall pay its way by honest methods. I will not leave my successor to meet my bills. In imposing additional taxation I have done so by placing the burden on the shoulders best able to bear the weight. I have imposed no direct burden on industry*; neither have I taken from the poorest of the land any part of their inadequate means. The additional taxation will fall upon a class to whom it will mean no deprivation of the necessities of life nor even of the reasonable luxuries and amenities. I am asking only that the favoured section of the community shall contribute to the needs of the State in proportion to the benefits the State has conferred upon them.

But after thus giving expression to his well-known views on taxation Mr. Snowden went on to say :

On the other hand I realise the imperative need of the strictest national economy in the present state of trade and industry, not only to provide employment and comfort for our people, but because primarily it is only from trade and commerce that the national revenue can be derived.

In the course of the Budget debates, Sir E. Hilton Young reminded the Chancellor of the Exchequer of what he said a few weeks before, when he was broadcasting to the United States. Here are a few sentences describing the situation of Great Britain :

Our people are the most heavily taxed in the world. The average amount of national and local taxation works out at about £100 per family. We have an income-tax of four shillings in the pound, a super-tax running up to six shillings in the pound, and in addition duties on estates passing at death ranging as high as 40 per cent.

With such a burden as this upon our shoulders, with all the destruction, and the waste, and the sacrifice, and the disorganisation of industry and society that it implies, is it any wonder that we have severe industrial depression?

One may regret that in this message to the American nation Mr. Snowden did not find time to repeat his statement during the last general election about the unfair treatment which Great Britain has received in the matter of war debts. It is true that Mr. Baldwin is to blame for not having secured a most-favoured-nation clause and for not safeguarding his country against a rise in the value of gold and against the exclusion by a prohibitive tariff of the goods in which our war debts ought to be paid. But at the same time, it is to be remembered, we were assured by the

* Meaning no doubt that income-tax falls on the profits after they have been made, whereas customs duties hamper trade and raise prices.

Washington Treasury officials and by the Debt Commissioners that they were giving us "rock-bottom" terms and that Congress would not permit better terms to be given to any other of the debtors. It would seem therefore that the time has come when the United States might well be reminded of an injustice which grows heavier and more oppressive every year, as prices fall and tariffs rise.

When we come to the means adopted by Mr. Snowden for bridging the gap between his expenditure and his revenue, we are of course immediately struck by the fact that practically the whole of the new taxation is direct and that it falls on quite a small class—about half a million in all. There is no real answer to the objection that the representatives of an extravagant democracy ought not to visit their extravagance upon a small fraction of the people; for there ought to be some popular check upon expenditure if a democracy is to escape ruin, and perhaps the only way to bring an effective body of criticism to bear is to make new expenditure felt by the masses as well as the classes. On the other hand Mr. Churchill, it must be admitted, consistently drew his new expenditure from the sinking fund, or from consumers. While he lowered income-tax and super-tax he increased the death duties and imposed literally hundreds of indirect duties, which raised the cost of living and transport and production, and at the same time put money into the pockets of favoured manufacturers. Even now Mr. Churchill, though he still calls himself a Free Trader, states that, if he had had to raise money this year, he would have preferred to raise it by duties on foreign manufactured articles, which duties, of course, would have been paid mainly by the middle and working classes. Here is what he said in the House of Commons on April 15th :

As everyone knows, I do not accept the Protectionist hypothesis; but I am bound to say that, confronted with such a need of raising £12,000,000 or £15,000,000 more, I believe it could have been done with far less injury or discouragement to the productive energies of the people at this time if it had been raised by an import duty on foreign manufactured articles, either of a finished or a semi-finished character. I observe that Holland, which professes and practises a Free Trade policy, has a general revenue tariff of 3 per cent. *ad valorem* on all manufactured imported goods, but even if in this country you applied it only to finished or nearly finished goods, a very substantial yield could be gained by the Exchequer without any discouragement but rather, on the contrary, with encouragement to the general trade of the country.

If this is not protectionist doctrine, I should like to know where protectionist doctrine may be found.

The excuse, then, for Mr. Snowden is that he has only restored

the sixpence which Mr. Churchill removed from the income-tax, and that so far most income-tax payers are no worse off than in 1923 and 1924. He can claim that, thanks to abatements, only half a million of income and super-tax payers will suffer from his Budget, and that only large properties will be taxed more severely than they were under his Death Duty scheme. But most of the Death Duty money will be capital withdrawn from industry, and the half million well-to-do and rich are certainly very hard hit. For the sake of illustration let us take from the White Paper issued with the financial statement a few examples of the effect of the Budget on single persons whose incomes are derived from investments:

An income of £2,500, instead of paying £469, will have to pay £525. An income of £5,000, instead of paying £1,181 will have to pay £1,369. An income of £10,000, instead of paying £3,081 will pay £3,569. An income of £50,000, instead of paying £22,206 a year to the Exchequer, will have to pay £25,694, which is over ten shillings and threepence in the pound. Under the Death Duties scheme the largest fortunes, instead of paying 40 per cent., will pay 50 per cent.

In his second series of British Budgets (1913-20), Sir Bernard Mallet remarks that there must be a limit to the amount of taxation which a country like Great Britain, dependent for its very existence on foreign trade, can support; and he is disposed to think that this limit has nearly been reached. Nevertheless, he continues, "there is every indication that the growth of public expenditure will continue to out-run the natural growth of the revenue, and that increasing resort will be had to the direct taxation of accumulated wealth to satisfy the lavish demands of the modern state. Such a process cannot long continue unless wealth is continually replenished, and the industrial and productive capacity of the nation can be made at least to keep pace with the growth of expenditure."* In face of the recent decline of trade and extension of unemployment, especially in the staple industries, which are dependent on exports for their prosperity, it is difficult to believe that Mr. Churchill's additions to indirect taxation, chiefly in the form of protective duties, have not caused a setback, or accentuated the depression. It is equally difficult to believe that the recent addition to doles, or unemployment benefits or social services, at the expense of incomes and estates can increase the national prosperity. If taxpayers' money deters the unemployed from seeking employment, it will be of doubtful benefit even to them; and in any case the withdrawal of 30 or 40

* *British Budgets* (Second Series), by Sir Bernard Mallet, K.C.B., and C. O. George. Macmillan & Co. 1929.

more millions from private capital and income must reduce the annual amount of savings which are invested and reinvested in home trade.* These savings, or surplus profits, are all-important if our industries are to be kept up-to-date and our mines, our factories, our docks, and our shipyards are to be equipped with the latest machinery and appliances. Sir Bernard Mallet, like many other publicists, seems to have abandoned "all real hope of economy in public expenditure." That is to say he anticipates a continuance of progressive taxation until, through the discouragement of commercial and industrial enterprise or through the withdrawal of capital, the revenue, instead of expanding as taxation rises, begins to contract and decline. Australia should serve as a warning to those who inspire the financial principles of British Socialism. One of its ablest theorists, Mr. G. D. H. Cole, has published quite recently a book called *The Next Ten Years in British Social and Economic Policy*, in the seventeenth chapter of which, dealing with the Labour Budget, he admits very frankly the difficulty of the problem we have just been considering:

Of all the ministers in the next Labour Government, it is obvious that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will have by far the most difficult task. Other departments spend money; he has to provide for raising it. And no matter how excellent are the uses to which the tax revenue of the country is put, no one enjoys paying taxes. Moreover, as we have seen, it is not easy under the present economic system to tax the luxury expenditure of the rich without at the same time affecting their willingness to provide out of "saving" the new capital which is urgently needed for the work of national development. The rich spender hides behind the rich saver, and defies the efforts of the tax-gatherer to sequester his unproductive surplus. His power to do this can be counteracted if the right measures are taken; but the need to counteract them makes the problem harder and more complicated than many Socialists admit.†

It is just possible that the Labour Party may gradually come round to the Liberal or Radical point of view to which, indeed, Mr. Snowden has often given expression. This view recognises that public economy is essential if the public credit is to be maintained and the national prosperity restored. It regards peace and retrenchment as indispensable conditions of reform. Public economy does not necessarily mean ruthless all-round retrenchment; but it does mean the avoidance of public waste and of all expenditure at the present time which is neither necessary nor productive. Liberals and Radicals are in general agreement with

* I would suggest that the revenue from the Death Duties ought not to exceed the Sinking Fund.

† *The Next Ten Years in British Social and Economic Policy*, by G. D. H. Cole. Macmillan & Co. 1930.

Mr. Snowden's doctrine that direct and graduated taxation is the cheapest and fairest method of raising the bulk of the revenue, and that protective customs duties are the most unfair and ineffective method of all. They are unfair and ineffective for three reasons. In the first place, their yield to the revenue is much less than their burden upon the people, and the higher the rates of duty, i.e. the greater the protection, the less is the revenue. Indeed, at a point which is reached in many cases by the United States tariff, a customs duty becomes practically prohibitive and the revenue dwindles to nothing. Secondly, customs duties, though a form of indirect taxation, are a direct tax on trade. They interfere with imports, and consequently they often raise the price of the article taxed by far more than the duty. Thus the tax on an imported Ford motor vehicle is 33 per cent.; but the price of a Ford car in London is about double its price in New York. Thirdly, these protective customs duties are most unjust and unfair because they are not graduated in accordance with capacity to pay, but fall quite unequally upon consumers. This injustice is aggravated by the fact that in most cases a protective duty increases the profits of an individual or a group of individuals. Thus the profits of a few manufacturers are increased by the safeguarding duty on buttons; but the duty is paid by all persons who wear buttons, and the loss is spread over the tailoring and dressmaking trades.

A feeling that Mr. Snowden has been a stalwart champion of the cause accounts for the disappointment which Free Traders and practically all Liberals feel with his second Budget. They recall the fact that in 1924, in his first Budget, Mr. Snowden, besides repealing or reducing the Corporations Profits Tax and a number of taxes on food, repealed the McKenna duties on motor cars, pianos, clocks, watches, etc. Since then we have had five Budgets from Mr. Churchill. He not only restored the McKenna duties, but added to them protective customs duties on commercial motor vehicles and on motor tyres. He also introduced a series of protective duties under the so-called safeguarding procedure, as well as duties on silk, artificial silk, and several other articles. He increased the key industries duties, which include optical glass and many foreign chemicals and drugs. Consequently Mr. Snowden's task, in order to restore the Free Trade system, was far heavier in 1930 than in 1924. Free Traders did not expect him, under the circumstances, and with so large a prospective deficit, to abolish at once those protective duties, like the silk duty and, in a less degree, the motor vehicle duties, which yield a considerable revenue; but they did expect with a great deal of confidence that a number of protective duties which yield a small

revenue, yet impose a serious burden on consumers, would be promptly repealed, and that, in some cases, the customs revenue would be fortified by an excise duty which would remove the protective incidence of the tax besides adding to the revenue.

When pressed, before the Budget, to relieve the anxieties of the protected interests, especially the silk and motor car manufacturers, Mr. Snowden stoutly refused to be drawn; and of course he was right to preserve the traditional secret of a budget. But his Free Trade friends felt sure that he would fulfil their hopes and be loyal to his principles when the day came for him to lay his axe to the roots of the Protectionist tree. Some protective duties would be repealed, others reduced, others countervailed by excise. But on Budget day all Mr. Snowden's courage in action and outspokenness in speech seemed to evaporate when he came to the protective tariff. Like Agag, he stepped—and talked—delicately, and, even when he came to the safeguarding duties, merely promised that when and as they expired they would not be reimposed. If, then, the Labour Government remain in office for another year, the four safeguarding duties on lace, cutlery, gloves, and gas mantles will not have been renewed; and if they remain in office until May 1st of next year, the very mischievous customs duties on wrapping and packing paper will also disappear from the tariff.

What Mr. Snowden had to say about the McKenna duties and the silk duties was that they bring in altogether a revenue of nearly 10 millions a year, and he regretted that the financial position which he had inherited would not permit him to repeal those duties in the present Budget. This is an apology, or an excuse, which will not pass muster; for everyone knows that a number of protective duties could have been repealed and others reduced without any substantial loss to the revenue. Mr. Snowden did indeed go on to say that the Free Trade pledges of the Government, given soon after it took office last year "still stand," and that they still intend, if they remain in office long enough, "to remove all existing food duties." He also intimated his hope that next year he will be able to submit to the House of Commons a much more cheerful and encouraging statement. Not that he could speak of the future with certainty or give any binding assurance. "But at least I can say this: So far as I can see, the steps which I have proposed for balancing this year's Budget will be sufficient to ensure, in the absence of unforeseeable calamities or a heavy increase of our expenditure, that no further increases of taxation will need to be imposed next year."

I wish I could endorse these hopeful views. If I do not, it is not because I am suspicious of Mr. Snowden. On the contrary I

believe that he will do his utmost to fulfil his predictions and to carry out his intentions. I am sure also that he hates waste, and that even if he is driven into excessive and imprudent expenditure he will employ all the powers of the Treasury to keep it within bounds. If he cannot wield the axe, I am confident that he will use the pruning hook. But in spite of his high character and abilities, in spite of his tenacity of purpose, and the outspoken candour which won him an international reputation at the Hague, in spite of all the sterling Yorkshire qualities, which as a fellow-Yorkshireman I admire, I must confess that I am distrustful about the future of expenditure and not too certain about the longevity of the Labour Government. There is no time like the present. An opportunity has been missed. If he had done a good stroke for Free Trade, he would have rejoiced and heartened his friends and given a much-needed impulse to our foreign trade. He would also have executed the Free Trade mandate conferred upon this Parliament by a great majority of the electors last year.

FRANCIS W. HIRST.

PRESIDENT HOOVER'S CRITICAL YEAR.

THE Hoover Administration has now been in office for fifteen months, and a provisional judgment will be passed upon it by the electorate in November. Five months is a short interval, but it is long enough in these days of swiftly moving events for many important things to befall. It is possible that by the time the President has to face the results of the mid-term congressional elections his position, especially in relation to the Houses of Congress, may be different from what it is to-day. Possible, but we may agree not very likely, and we may be sure that Mr. Hoover, as Chief Executive and what Woodrow Wilson used to call "legislative leader," will continue to provide intensely interesting material for all students of democratic institutions. Before the American people knew him in the White House they took for granted that they had in Mr. Hoover a President who would start a fresh tradition, both of leadership and of administrative method. And undoubtedly the chief thing to be said about him now, at the end of a first year of continuous difficulty between himself and Congress, is that he has falsified a surprising number of the predictions that were made concerning him, by friends and foes alike.

A President, to begin with, makes an impression upon his fellow countrymen by his smaller actions, his daily habit of life; while people at a distance form an estimate of him first of all from his spoken words upon important occasions. We have had so far, of course, only one annual message to Congress, and that must presumably be taken as indicative of Mr. Hoover's manner of reviewing conditions and stating purposes. The Message of December 1929 was in the nature of a departmental review of the year, with brief incidental references to specific policies. Thus it contained only two short paragraphs on naval affairs, these being imbedded in a very long statement which, having taken the clerk two hours to drone through before Congress, was probably not read by one American citizen in a thousand. When writing about administrative matters Mr. Hoover, it must be admitted, falls into a manner that is heavy and altogether unrelieved. When dealing with other subjects he can at times achieve a form of utterance which makes a notable contrast to the style of his immediate predecessor and of himself in his purely official character. We may see this by turning from the Message of December to the speech delivered on Armistice Day, which contained at least two passages that aroused the attention of Britain and the world. The first had to do with the United States and naval disarmament; the second contained a highly characteristic suggestion as to the immunity

of food ships in wartime—the President's one personal contribution so far to the problem. It may be well to say a word upon both these statements before coming to the important question of Mr. Hoover's relation to the London Conference.

For many years, and born of a poignant personal experience (Mr. Hoover said) I have held that food ships should be made free of any interference in times of war. I would place all vessels laden solely with food supplies on the same footing as hospital ships. The time has come when we should remove starvation of women and children from the weapons of warfare.

The speech containing this aspiration was hailed as a great State document; and, indeed, it is much superior in expression to any other utterance of the President's with which I am acquainted. I was travelling in America at the time of its delivery and was greatly struck by the almost unanimous approval with which it was greeted throughout the country. One of the things most commonly said about the United States is that it is a land without definite public opinion upon an international question, but, at any rate, the response to Mr. Hoover's declaration showed that the American people can hold, and give expression to, a strong common sentiment. So far as one could judge at the time, the popular approval was nation-wide, and, as we should expect, there was heard in it a tone of religious fervour. True, it was largely unreflecting. The President's statement had a noble sound. It was most appropriate to the man who had created Belgian relief and commanded the immense remedial measures in Central Europe after 1918. That, for the American Press and for a great number of associations, was sufficient. The grim reality was for the most part ignored—the fact, namely, that in modern warfare the distinction between combatant and non-combatant is obliterated: the starvation of women and children is as inevitable as the destruction of men behind the lines. The President's reference to naval reduction in the same speech was much nearer to actuality, and also somewhat surprising in its emphasis:

We will reduce our naval strength in proportion to any other. . . . It only remains for the others to say how low they will go. It cannot be too low for us.

These words were spoken five weeks before the publication of the French Memorandum, and rather more than two months before the meeting of the London Conference furnished Mr. Hoover with his first great opportunity of showing the character and force of his international leadership.

During 1929 his decisions and actions in relation to naval disarmament had been of the finest. His administration was formed

at the end of the most distressing chapter in Anglo-American relations since the war. The memories of the Geneva failure were still fresh and the American public was resentful because of the Anglo-French conversations of 1928. When Mr. Coolidge went out of office there seemed little or no chance of an early resumption of naval negotiations, but President Hoover declined to accept the apparent logic of a bad situation. He reopened the question without delay, provided General Dawes with instructions for the "yardstick" speech, and thereby cleared the way for Mr. MacDonald's visit to America and the provisional agreement arrived at in the Rapidan camp. So far the evidence of Mr. Hoover's positive intentions seemed to be conclusive. Neither the American nor the British public could be blamed for drawing the inference that the President had taken a stand which would involve on his own part close and definite co-operation with the American delegation in London. That, however, as we now know, is not Mr. Hoover's way. Having appointed and dispatched Mr. Stimson and his colleagues, the President withdrew into the background and there remained during the three discouraging months of the Conference. At a critical point of the struggle, after the delivery of the memorial signed by 1,200 American liberals and internationalists urging clear action from Washington for the saving of the great objective of the Conference, Mr. Hoover made it known that he must regard any such enterprise as this as an unfriendly act. The American cause at the Conference had been committed to the delegation: the duty of all American citizens was to leave them alone. Nor, it became evident, was the President himself to do anything in the way of guiding or stiffening the delegation. There was the celebrated incident of Mr. Stimson's ambiguous statement of March 21st as to the intentions of the United States in the crucial matter of the consultative pact, as a minimum offer in reply to France's demand for guarantees in the Mediterranean. We may doubtless assume that Mr. Hoover would himself have been prepared to go as far as was necessary in agreeing to consultation should the peace of Europe be endangered. But he was not ready to take the risk of instructing Mr. Stimson. As President, that is to say, he was compelled to be against any kind of consultative pact, against any commitment towards the implementing of the Kellogg Treaty. He could only support the delegation in such fashion as to insure the acceptance by the Senate of whatever naval treaty they might take home. And who shall blame him? The tragedy of Woodrow Wilson could not be disregarded. Mr. Hoover knew enough of the temper of the Senate to know that the acceptance of anything that could be made to look like entanglement in Europe would mean

the instant restoration in Washington of the multiple alliance of the isolationists, with the powerful voice of Senator Borah reinforcing the malignant tones of the Hearst papers and the *Chicago Tribune*. Wanting a naval treaty and no further delay, Mr. Hoover could not do otherwise; and he had evidently overlooked one significant warning. The French Memorandum had plainly indicated a situation which threatened disaster for the Rapidan understanding about cruisers. Mr. MacDonald could not draw back; but Mr. Hoover might well have felt that it was probably of little use to go on with the plans for the Conference if what the United States cared about was a Five-Power naval treaty. But the curious fact was that the American group acted from the start as though the French Memorandum had never been submitted or drawn up. One cannot help wondering whether any member of the delegation—with the exception of Mr. Morrow, who neglects nothing—had studied the document before the crisis precipitated by M. Tardieu. Certainly Mr. Hoover could not plead ignorance of this great obstacle. It was annotated and underlined in December by those American journals which continue, against many kinds of discouragement, to keep the question of disarmament going, not as an affair of Kellogg sentiment but as a problem of hard thinking and practical adjustment.

The Naval Treaty, needless to say, is a grim disappointment for the President, as for that vast public in the United States which, ever since the Washington Conference, has been mobilised in support of naval disarmament. It is not possible to see how this disappointment could have been avoided, considering all the circumstances. After the failure in 1927 we heard on all hands the cry that there should be no more conferences on naval disarmament until the Governments had hammered out an agreement as to policy, aims, and methods. Geneva was understood to have been a warning; there were to be no more half-preparations before conference. But Mr. MacDonald's triumphal visit to Washington changed all that, and we had the spectacle of the Five Powers gathering in London amid conditions which threatened difficulty for the Labour Government and the defeat of Mr. Hoover upon the point which is for him the central issue of the naval question. "In setting up this conference," he said on November 11th, "we have already agreed with Great Britain that there shall be a parity in naval strength between us." Parity, of course, must mean a large building programme for the United States. Mr. Hoover was perfectly aware of this: under the terms of the Rapidan agreement it was as plain as could be. And yet the President went on to say, "I am in hopes that there will be a serious reduction in navies as a relief to the economic burdens of all peoples."

Here, then, is the upshot for Mr. Hoover and the American public. The American Press in general took the view that Mr. Stimson went to London to get parity, which was already a matter of course. The President wanted limitation and reduction, but knew that, even if the French came in with goodwill, a Treaty of London would mean a large building programme for the United States, a programme which would seem almost satisfactory to the Navy Department. Nevertheless the Senate Committee hearings, held in public, have brought out a great deal of opposition, the admirals making play with technical arguments about guns, which during the Conference had not interested the British public. The irony of the situation is that while the enemies of the Treaty on our side denounce it on the ground that it involves the surrender of the essential British position, the American big-navy party asserts that British superiority remains intact. Mr. Hoover (unlike Mr. MacDonald) cannot expect to gain kudos out of the Conference, but the treaty should not be in any serious danger. The Senate is anxious to get it out of the way before the midsummer adjournment. The fight must come next winter over the navy appropriations. They will be very large, and the President—who believed earnestly in disarmament, and is outraged by the financial and industrial waste of warship building—will be torn by a conflict between personal conviction and a supposed party interest. There is to be no competitive building between Britain and America. But there will be rivalry, on an equal basis, in efficiency and invention, and a resolution on the part of America to challenge any British ruling in maritime policy. Washington in 1922 began what London in 1930 completes, the abdication by Britain of her old command of the seas. It is foolish to go on repeating that the British estimate of security and naval need is unrelated to the American claims and building programme. There are many who would insist that the first interest of Britain, especially under a Labour Government, was so to modify her naval claims and programme as to lessen or remove the American motive for building a great cruiser fleet in order to attain parity. How could that be done? Surely, by one means, and by one alone: the decision by a British Prime Minister to fix a maximum of cruiser strength so far below the Admiralty's minimum that the American President could act upon his November declaration: "It cannot be too low for us." Mr. MacDonald said in New York that he was ready to take a risk for peace. In the matter of sea-power, and in relation to America now, the only risk that would count for anything is a large cut in cruisers. And a Labour Prime Minister in a minority position plainly cannot take it.

The Anglo-American field has been dominated for the past

twelve months by naval affairs and the London Conference. But these have not been by any means the major concern of President Hoover. His anxieties are near at hand, and they have come upon him as the result of a series of events and complications going beyond anything that Mr. Coolidge had to cope with. Mr. Hoover was elected upon the Prosperity issue. In 1928 Prosperity was Americanism, and orthodoxy was the belief that prosperity, as described in Mr. Hoover's campaign speeches, was identified with the rule of the Republican Party. The boom period, as a matter of fact, was due to end, according to the best available calculations, before the Hoover Administration came in. The crash was delayed until the autumn of 1929, and its immediate effects were being felt through the country just as the President was being made to realise that the situation in Washington was becoming unmanageable. The political tangle of Mr. Hoover's first year is, by common consent, unparalleled. Any attempt to make a tolerable summary of it would require many pages. I will try to condense the more important facts into a few pages.

First comes the Tariff Bill. Mr. Hoover was committed to relief for the Western farmers, and he made, in the campaign, the mistake of promising a special session of Congress for the purpose of passing a Farm Relief Bill. The special session of 1929 was the opportunity for which the manufacturing interests were looking. Their money, in huge quantities, had gone into the Republican Party Fund, and they were determined to get full value for it, in tariff terms. Hence the Farm Bill was put out of the way in order that the forces of protection might be concentrated for the passing of a Tariff Bill embodying schedules which made those of the Fordney Act seem almost like scientific moderation. When it left the House the Bill was a monster. It provoked the Press to derision, and it created in the Senate a new coalition of Democrats and Progressive Republicans who, setting to work on the measure, brought it, as many observers surmised, into something resembling the Bill that the President had envisaged: Mr. Hoover having asked for moderate tariff revision to accompany farm relief. This was the situation at the end of last year, when the outlook for the Tariff underwent a transformation by reason of the presence in the Senate of an agent of Big Business, now recognised in America as a marvellous specimen of his order. Mr. Joseph Grundy is Lobbyist-in-Chief to the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, and he sits in the United States Senate by virtue of an emergency nomination made in peculiar circumstances. His State had chosen William Vare, a notorious political boss, who was accused of having bought his election on a scale deemed to be scandalous even in Pennsylvania, where political corruption has

long been established upon the highest levels. The Senate refused to allow Mr. Vare to take his seat, and the selection of an interim substitute falling upon the Governor, that functionary acted with a fine sense of fitness. The business of his State is big business. Who, then, so appropriate for the senatorship as Mr. Grundy, whose tariff doctrine falls within the statement that the protective wall should be high enough to keep out of America every article that is or could be made in Pennsylvania? To Mr. Grundy fell the task of undoing the work of the Progressive bloc. A second campaign was organised. The schedules were revised once more upwards; and at the time of writing the Bill is passing through its final stage at the end of a year of intrigue, strife, and confusion, worse than anything known in Congress for half a century. The Tariff has made havoc of Mr. Hoover's first year, so far as Congress is concerned. It has put him through an ordeal as legislative leader which he is clearly unable to meet; and it has imposed upon him a severe test for the presidential veto.

Along with the Tariff there is to be considered the enormous difficulty of Prohibition and law enforcement, which Mr. Hoover made the leading issue of his term by the simple device of giving it the central place in his inaugural address. The single passage of that address upon which the public fastened was the one in which the new President announced his intention of framing a commission to investigate the admittedly appalling facts of crime and law-evasion. The President's Commission, with Mr. G. W. Wickersham as chairman, was understood to proceed upon the wide terms of reference contained in the inaugural and not otherwise defined. But the Press and public made it plain that they were not interested in general lawlessness and did not choose to regard Mr. Wickersham and his colleagues as concerned with the crime wave as a social and legal problem. What they were interested in was Prohibition; they thought of the Commission with reference to the Dry Law and to that alone. And they were encouraged to do so by the Senate, which in January entered upon the first official inquiry into Prohibition undertaken since the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment and the passage of the Volstead Act. The storm broke with the greatest fury. Wets and Drys had each a sensational innings before the Senate Committee, and the metropolitan papers gave, and have continued to give, inordinate space to the controversy. The testimony of the opposing witnesses was soon over, but the public interest has been kept up by the reports of another Senate committee which is inquiring into the gigantic business of lobbying and special propaganda. This body has poured out a stream of facts which add not a little to the marvels of the record; but no one can say that the unlimited exposures

make any material difference to Prohibition as a national system or problem. The federal amendment cannot be repealed or modified, at any rate within any term of years that we can forecast. But the gathering tempest in the country is a matter of great moment to the President and the Republican Party. Having taken his stand upon law observance, Mr. Hoover is compelled to act with some show of vigour. It is even arguable that he is in favour of an attempt to enforce the law to the limit of the existing machinery. And in the meantime he is urging upon Congress certain steps towards efficiency, especially the simplification of procedure in the federal courts and the transfer of the Prohibition division from the Treasury, which has had it for ten years, to the Department of Justice. In many States this year Prohibition will be a prominent election issue, and no one would deny that to the American people as a whole it far transcends all others in interest. The subject is ubiquitous and inexhaustible and it is an immeasurable bore.

Mr. Hoover can expect no help with respect to Prohibition from Congress, nor will its members grapple with the general problem of lawlessness. The Tariff Bill cannot get through without some definite bargaining with the President, for he has served notice that there are some points upon which he will not surrender. Between the White House and the Capitol, indeed, there would appear to be, not only an absence of co-operation, but a positive antagonism which must, if maintained, be a grave matter for Mr. Hoover, who cannot be other than a serious and conscientious Chief Executive. Such hostility is bad enough when it has to do with legislative measures alone; it becomes peculiarly irritating when personal matters come in. This has lately happened in connection with the Federal appointments, not a few of which, it is contended, have displayed a lack of judgment or sensitiveness on the part of Mr. Hoover. Those who have regarded him as above all else a scientific administrator were puzzled by several of his selections for the diplomatic service, which the Senate did not challenge. It did debate his two appointments to the bench of the Supreme Court, confirming the eminent Mr. C. E. Hughes as Chief Justice, but rejecting a judge from North Carolina, after an angry contest which disclosed a growing anxiety concerning the character of America's most important institution. More easily than any occupant of the White House since Wilson, Mr. Hoover could have afforded to resist the pressure of politicians and industrial magnates in the matter of patronage. In certain departments he has done so, and done brilliantly. In others he has made mistakes which have already begun to damage him.

I come now to that aspect of the Administration upon

which, at the end of 1929, the attention of all America was concentrated, namely, the highly characteristic measures adopted by the President after the October crash on the Stock Exchange. As Secretary of Commerce for seven years, and the master of a new technique, Mr. Hoover gained a knowledge of American industry and trade greater than that of any Cabinet Member known to this generation. It was understood that he was particularly interested in the phenomena of trade cycles, and the public could take for granted that, in the event of financial and commercial disaster, he would be prepared for immediate action. He was. Every department of the Federal Government was brought into play; the official experts were called together; several hundreds of the country's "key men" were summoned to Washington. The public authorities, the railroad executives, the great contractors and what not announced decisions that implied a huge expenditure upon constructive undertakings, while the President was given assurances that the large employers would refrain from attempts to turn the crisis to their own advantage by reducing wages. This policy was demonstrably right. Mr. Hoover acted in harmony with his own philosophy and record, and there could be no doubt about the impression made upon the country. It was good for America that, in the presence of a financial calamity more stupendous than any in the annals of Wall Street, the Presidency should be held by a man such as Herbert Hoover. Everything at the time depended upon the decisions of the Executive and the consequent state of the public mind. But when one has said that, one has said almost all. A few months later, when the events of the winter were reviewed, and the facts of business depression were everywhere in evidence, the President's policy, which had been given resounding publicity, seemed to be lacking in concrete result. It was being attacked as a course of the treatment identified with one American religion. "It testifies," wrote the veteran John Dewey:

"... to the import of the crowd psychology of suggestion and credulity in American life. Christian Science rules American thought in business affairs; if we can be led to think that certain things do not exist, they perforce have not happened."

It has been recognised, since his political advent, that Mr. Hoover could not be a President in the regular succession. He was without experience in the world of average politicians, and his mastery of the machine was of very recent date. There was a special welcome for this new President, for educated America, shocked and humiliated by the grossness and unreality of party politics, was beginning to realise that government is the most special and difficult

of crafts, which might conceivably yield its secrets to an engineer-executive who, in the eyes of the whole world, had accomplished one of the great administrative tasks of the modern age. The attitude of the American public to-day amounts to a very interesting comment upon that earlier expectation. Mr. Hoover finds himself in daily conflict with the most difficult of all legislative systems. He contemplates a stricken field upon which lie the grotesque results of struggle over a tariff which, having provoked protests from a score of foreign governments, is foredoomed as a measure of policy, whether the President should veto it or not. Moreover, Mr. Hoover enters upon the crucial stage of his administration at a time when the myth of general and continuous prosperity is being exploded with shattering thoroughness. For a half-year or so after the avalanche of last October the conspiracy of optimism was maintained by the Press and the business associations, Mr. Hoover himself contributing to it by predicting a speedy return of prosperity conditions. That elaborate pretence is now abandoned, and as the mid-term elections approach the facts of unemployment and industrial distress will be pushed into the foreground in every industrial constituency. The Republican Party cannot escape severe punishment: that is taken for granted. But those among Mr. Hoover's admirers who have understood the special view of the Presidency with which he is identified would argue that the disrepute of the political machine, by means of which he rose to power, should not involve the defeat or frustration of a President known to be abhorred by all the masters of that machine. That may be true; but manifestly it can only be proved true by the Engineer-President's assertion of a power of national leadership not hitherto revealed.

S. K. RATCLIFFE.

GANDHI AND TOLSTÓY.

THE following letter to Gandhi, written by Tolstóy shortly before his death, plainly states the principles of non-Resistance and non-Co-operation—which are identical. It amounts to a moral indictment of the basis on which all Governments rest. The idea was no invention of Tolstóy's or Gandhi's, it is one which has been widely held in many countries and many ages and always reappears when people find the law a hindrance to the performance of what they consider their duty. Tolstóy took it first from the Gospel text: "Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also." Gandhi took it from Tolstóy, from the Gospels, and from the Bhagavad Gita. They both assume that the use of physical force to restrain our fellow men always indicates ill-will and is immoral. That is a very doubtful proposition, which I have discussed and I hope refuted in my *Life of Tolstóy*, so I need not argue it here. If it be admitted, we are logically compelled to proceed to the condemnation of army, police, legal proceedings, the punishment of criminals, and all government relying on these things. The chandelier is perfect—only the way it is screwed into the ceiling is doubtful.

In different forms and to different degrees this principle has reappeared over and over again. It was part of the Albigensian heresy in Southern France in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which was suppressed by Simon de Montfort's Crusade. Many thousand Albigensians were killed, their territory was laid waste, and the Inquisition succeeded in stamping out the sect, but the idea survived and reappeared elsewhere. To-day we find it operating in Gandhi's movement in India and also among the Dukhobors in Canada, where schools—schools in which a Government which enforced conscription during the war (though the Dukhobors themselves were exempt) seeks to educate and presumably pervert their children—frequently and mysteriously burn down.

It appeared among the Moravian and Hussite reformers of the fifteenth century, as seen in the works of Peter of Chelczic. Strangest of all it actuated William Lloyd Garrison's anti-slavery movement in the United States, when the Constitution of that country blocked his path. In our Western world generally the idea operates feebly and sporadically, but among Russian Christians a spirit of submission, meek endurance of wrongs, readiness to endure martyrdom, and the belief that "God will look after his own," and that suffering will be rewarded somehow, here or hereafter, is a main feature of their religion, and largely explains the

fact that persecution by the Bolsheviks is not often actively resisted, though the persecutors are much less numerous than the persecuted. Among Buddhists and Hindoos similar beliefs operate; though perversely enough the moral condemnation of the "Satanic Government," based as it is on the belief that the use of force is evil, generally leads in practice to acts of violence directed against the Government: a casting out of devils by Beelzebub.

The extent of the moral and intellectual apathy with which this pregnant and pervasive doctrine is treated among ourselves is shown by the following curious incident. When the Oxford University Press published Tolstóy's *What I Believe*, it addressed letters to a number of the most eminent Church of England and dissenting preachers, pointing out that the book contains the germ of a theory subsequently elaborated by Tolstóy, which, if true, is fatal to the authority of Church or State, and asking whether the ministers addressed would not think it well to meet his arguments. The replies received—with the exception of one from Principal Garvie, who had dealt ably with the matter in a published address to his students—fell into two groups. The majority said, in effect, that the doctrine was so absurd as not to be worth answering, for no reasonable Englishman would consider it for ten minutes; while the minority said that the teaching, based on the words of Christ himself, contained a fundamental truth—and could therefore not be refuted. These replies reminded one of Tolstóy's comment on Dean Farrar, who in a magazine article had said that Tolstóy's non-resistance theory was, of course, unsound, but that consideration of space did not permit of his refuting it. Tolstóy's comment was "The Christian world has been waiting for nineteen hundred years to know why it should not follow Christ's instructions. Dean Farrar knows why, but says he has no time to tell us. What a pity!"

The service Tolstóy rendered—though I think he chose the wrong side of the argument—was that he put the non-resistance doctrine so clearly, logically and trenchantly, that what had previously been cloudy and confused became now so concrete that we can examine and refute it. As Bacon remarked: "Truth comes out of error more easily than out of confusion." It is a pity our spiritual pastors and masters are so dumb on this great moral problem. To deal adequately with it might tax their intellectual resources, but its neglect has, and will have, to be heavily paid for, in prisons, police, and soldiers. To meet ideas with truncheons and bullets may temporarily succeed and the struggle be deferred, but until the ideas are convincingly answered and the answers become generally understood, they will crop up again at other times and places.

This is what Tolstóy wrote to Gandhi, who was then in the Transvaal, where he was just bringing his non-resistance protest against the treatment of Indians in South Africa to a successful conclusion.

Kocheti,

September 7th, 1910.

"I have received your journal *Indian Opinion*, and was glad to see what it says about the Passive Resisters. I immediately wished to let you know what thoughts its perusal has aroused in me.

"The longer I live—and especially now that I clearly feel the nearness of death—the more strongly am I moved to express what I feel intensely, and what, in my opinion, is of immense importance, namely, what is known as 'Passive Resistance,' the abstention from all use of force in resisting government. That abstention is ultimately nothing but a following of the doctrine of love unperverted by false interpretations. Love, the striving of human souls towards union, and the relations with one another that result from it, is the highest and only law of life as everyone feels and knows in the depth of his heart (and as is most clearly seen in the case of children): man knows this as long as he is not ensnared by the net of worldly lies. That law was proclaimed by all the sages of the world—Indian as well as Chinese, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman. Most clearly of all, I think, it was proclaimed by Christ, who said precisely that in this is 'the law and the prophets.' But more than that, foreseeing the distortion that this teaching frequently encounters from all sides, He pointed out the danger of the perversion of it natural to people absorbed in worldly interests, namely the belief that they have a right to protect those interests by force, meeting violence by violence and taking back things that have been seized, and so on and so on. He knew, as every sensible man must know, that any use of force is incompatible with love as the highest law of life, and that as soon as violence is considered permissible, if but in a single case, this law is thereby denied. The whole of our Christian civilisation which is externally so brilliant, has grown up on that strange and obvious misunderstanding and contradiction, sometimes conscious, but for the most part unconscious. In reality, however, when defence by means of power was permitted, the law of love no longer prevailed or could prevail—and when once the law of love was no longer respected, there remained no law but that of the strongest. So Christendom lived for nineteen hundred years. In all ages mankind in general has allowed force to be the governing principle of its social order. The distinction between the Christian and all other nations consisted only in this, that in Christendom the

law of love had been announced more clearly and definitely than in any other religion and was solemnly acknowledged, but for all that the employment of force was considered permissible, and people based their life on the use of violence; so that the life of the Christian nations exhibits a gross contradiction between the law they profess and the law that moulds their existence: a contradiction between the love which should prescribe the law of our intercourse, and the employment of violence, which is accepted under various forms, as in the case of Government, law-courts, and armies—all regarded as necessary and respected. This contradiction became sharper with the development of the spiritual life of Christianity and has latterly reached its greatest tension.

"The crux now is that one of the two must prevail; either we must admit that we do not recognise any religious teaching at all, and allow ourselves to be guided in our course of life only by the power of the strongest, or we must demand that all compulsory collection of taxes, all our judicial and police institutions, and above all our military forces, should be abandoned.

"This spring, at a religious examination at a girls' institute in Moscow, the girls were questioned—first by the teacher of religion and then by the Bishop, who was also present—on the Ten Commandments, and especially on the Sixth Commandment. When the Commandment had been correctly quoted, the Bishop sometimes asked: 'Is killing always and in all cases forbidden by the law of God?' And the unfortunate girls, misdirected by the teacher in advance, had to reply and did reply: 'Not always, for in war and at executions it is permissible.' When, however, this additional question—whether in such cases it was still sinful to kill a man—was put to one of these unfortunate creatures (this is not an invention, but actually happened, and was told me by an eye-witness) the girl went red, and firmly and vehemently replied: 'It still is!' And despite all the Bishop's customary sophistries, she held unhesitatingly to it—that in the Old Testament already to kill was forbidden under all circumstances, and that Christ not only forbade us to kill, but forbade us to do any injury to our neighbour. Despite his dignity and verbal dexterity the Bishop became silent and victory remained with the girl.

"Yes, we may write in our newspapers about our conquest of the air, the improvements of our diplomatic procedure, various associations, discoveries of all sorts, unions of all sorts, so-called works of art, and we may evade this girl's reply, but we cannot ignore it—for every Christian feels it however obscurely he perceives it. Socialism, Communism, Anarchism, the Salvation Army, the increase of crime, unemployment, the increasingly insensate arrogance of the rich and misery of the poor, the fearful increase in the

number of suicides—are all indications of this inner contradiction, which must and will be solved, and naturally solved so that the law of love shall be recognised and all employment of violence abandoned. Therefore your activity in the Transvaal—the other end of the world from here—occupies a central place in our interests, and is the most important activity the world can at present take part in, and in which not Christendom alone but all the peoples of the earth will participate.

"I think you will be pleased to hear that among us also in Russia a similar movement attracts adherents, for refusals of military service increase year by year. However small may be the number of those with you who renounce all resistance by force, and however small among us the number of those who refuse military service, both these and those may say: God is on our side, and He is stronger than man.

"In the conscience of Christendom, even when Christianity is taught only in such distorted form as among us and accompanied by an assurance of the necessity of armies trained for slaughter to the greatest extent, lies such a glaring contradiction that sooner or later, and probably very soon, it must become apparent in all its nakedness; and that will either cancel the Christian religion—a cancellation not desired even in the interest of the State-authority—or it will sweep away the military and all allied State-institutions, things which are not less necessary to the State. This contradiction is encountered by all Governments, by your British as well as our Russian, and therefore your movement is recognised by Government as an attempt at independence, and will be energetically suppressed, like every other activity inimical to the State, as we have experienced in Russia and as is indicated by the headings of your journal. The Government knows where its greatest danger lies, and in this regard it now does not merely watch its interest vigilantly, but actually fights for its life or death.

"With special regard,

"LEO TOLSTOY."

AYLMER MAUDE.

DR. SCHOBER: AUSTRIAN POLICE PRESIDENT AND DIPLOMAT.

WITHIN the past nine months the star of Austria has emerged from the long eclipse behind Geneva. Austrian influence has again been felt in Rome and Berlin and Paris. The man who personifies this altered destiny is Johann Schober, the President of the State Police, the Federal Chancellor, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs. Less than a year ago he was anathematised by many as "The Bloodhound" and "The Workman-Slayer." To-day he is "The Man of Order."

It was Johann Schober who, as Chancellor, presented the plight of Austria to the economists who had assembled at Genoa in April 1922 to reconsider the work of their diplomatic colleagues at Versailles and St. Germain. He pleaded that not only was Austria left unable to pay reparations, but also she must perish unless immediate loans were granted her. He won real assurances of sympathy from his hearers, but they could not alone set turning the mechanism of salvation. Schober resigned, having succeeded in drafting an accord with Czechoslovakia only. "By the Treaty of Lana," he has said to me, "Austria resumed normal international relationships: I was the first to open the door in the wall which surrounded us." But Lana was not enough. Austria was bankrupt. Isolated by the centrifugal forces which had been released by defeat, she remained a small Teutonic island in Central Europe, nationally pure, an uneconomic monstrosity. Her assets were all in pawn to the Reparations Commission. It was for her salvation that the League of Nations took over her finances and impinged upon her sovereignty.

Few statesmen have ever been given a second chance. History affords but rare instances when a Chancellor returning to office after eight years hits upon problems nearly identical with those of his earlier administration and finally solves them through a policy unaltered. In 1921-2 revolution and civil war were threatened by the Communists; in 1929-30 revolution and civil war were threatened by the conservative *Heimwehr*. The uncertainty of a lasting truce was reflected in economics. In spite of the salutary work of the League in reorganising the currency, once the pilot from Geneva had been dropped, there commenced a flight from the schilling which paralleled for a few days of terror the earlier flight from the krone. Foreign money, foreign confidence, and foreign alliance held aloof. The Reparations issue was just as unsettled when Schober took office in the disastrous fall of 1929 as it had been eight years before. He embarked upon the same programme: he held in all attempts at violence, while he removed

DR. SCHOBER: AUSTRIAN POLICE PRESIDENT. 707

the essential causes of discontent by constitutional reforms, and he thus could approach Austria's neighbours with the assurance that Austria had set her house in order and was ready to discuss terms. That his diplomacy has been successful in 1930 where it was not successful in 1922 can only be explained by the fact that post-war hysteria has now been exploded, and post-war budgets have been brought back to normal. The Schober of 1930 has changed little from the Schober of 1922.

Schober is before all else the police officer. His career has determined the emphasis which he places upon the necessity for order in a modern industrial State, and it is a happy coincidence that the foreign investor, the bourgeois tradesman, and the diplomat accord with him. Through his insistence first upon tranquillity he finds all possibilities open. Fortunately for Austria he can step beyond the *Polizeiamt*. He has made himself economist and diplomat. But every vital decision finds him viewing the case from the Police President's angle; he demands security, routine, and confidence.

The Austrian Chancellor is a self-made man. The son of a modest official, he worked his way through Vienna University and entered the Police Department of the State. He must have made a most satisfactory impression upon his superiors, for during six years he appears in Marienbad as the attaché commissioned to protect and render agreeable King Edward VII's visits. Perhaps, to this first contact with England and with royalty the future Chancellor owes his mastery of the English tongue and his real *flair* for statesmanship. Being in no wise a politician, having no political alliances within Austria, and holding no elected office in the *Nationalrat*, the Police President retired from the scene of government as soon as he resigned his Chancellorship in 1922. But he continued and multiplied his international relations in his organisation of the First International Congress of Police after the war, in his establishment of the International Criminal Police Commission, which holds a permanent control over the activities of associated guardians of the peace, and in his professional visits to America and England to further these enterprises.

It was from his activities as police officer that he has in every case come into public notice. He had just been named head of the entire police force of the State, in 1918, when the war ended; and his police remained the only Government arm when Austria was disarmed and the disorganised troops of the empire rolled back across the land. Then it was that the *Heimwehr* was first organised, simply as a peasants' corps to protect the home. Schober and his men kept order both in the city and in the provinces.

A man-sized head had been placed upon the body of a dwarf:

Vienna, an imperial city, had become the capital of a mere province. Thousands of workmen lost their jobs. Simultaneously the same starvation which assailed Germany reached Austria. It was like a war plague. Budapest went Bolshevik. Munich went Bolshevik. Communistic agitators swooped down upon Vienna from both West and East. The mob stormed Parliament on a "Green Thursday," seizing upon the great building standing exposed upon the open flank of the Ring as an ideal target. Either through terror or connivance the ordinary city police gave way before the storm, but the State police, arriving in the nick of time, held the broad stairways and fired volleys over the heads of the attackers. As the two forces met, shots were exchanged, fired point-blank. Before nightfall the only crucial battle for Communism in Austria had been won by the forces of order. "When I had repulsed this attempt of Bolshevism," Chancellor Schober told me recently, "the populace was most thankful to the police and to me. It was the beginning of the confidence which I have since enjoyed. As a consequence in 1920 and in 1921 I was twice named Federal Chancellor."

A similar *melee* between Schober's men and the mob led directly to the conflict about the Police President's name throughout 1927 and 1928, and paved the way for his return to office when the *Heimwehr* threat necessitated a strong hold upon the reins. He has given me his own version of this affair, the famous "July Revolution" which was dramatised throughout Europe. "It all came about as the aftermath of a political demonstration in a little village in the Burgenland. A man who was threatened by a crowd of radicals lost his head, ran into his house, seized his gun and fired out of the window. He killed one grown person and a little boy. He was tried in Vienna; and the jury, which was made up mostly of working-men, gave as its verdict, 'No murder, but an excess of self-defence.' Articles in the radical Press made this verdict seem a class injustice. Radicals all over the land were roused." Schober himself, at police headquarters, heard that the *Schutzbund*, or local troop organised by the Socialists to set at defiance the *Heimwehr*, was forming in marching order throughout the working-men's suburbs. Simultaneously, in the heart of the city, a vindictive mob of no particular political complexion succeeded in breaking through the guard at the Palace of Justice, ransacked the archives, beat several policemen to death, and, pouring oil over all the legal documents that they could collect together, fired the building. Within fifty minutes a general strike had been declared and had paralysed all Austria.

Every revolution has its symbol! In France it was the Bastille. In Austria the mob wished to make it the Palace of Justice. "Over

this mob," continued the Chancellor in telling his story, "the Social Democrats themselves, the Socialists, had no power. They had the courage to appeal to the most dangerous rioters to cease, but without success. The palace was burning, and when firemen came the people refused to make them passage-way. It was necessary for the police to fire. As a result there were great attacks made upon me, but the 'Revolution' was over the next day."

Schober's police had killed some eighty-seven persons. The others who were only wounded filled the hospitals as in a war. Schober was accused of the most ruthless sacrifice of lives, yet he had, as he insists, "preserved order." It remained for the good people of Vienna to come round to his point of view. For two years they were aghast at his demonstration. Even so recently as six months ago I could write of the situation in Austria with perfect truth, "If anything jeopardises Schober's political position it is his unpopularity. He is a man trusted yet feared. He has played the Mussolini in a land which does not relish the strong arm." To-day this is no longer true. Already the persons who called in the strong man with the feeling that they were doing so as a last resort have been entirely won over by the peaceful régime which he has inaugurated. Alarums and excursions have ceased. It dawns upon them that Schober is as slow to use exaggerated force as he is swift to upset attempts at revolution. What has completely reconciled them to the government of a man who will not leave his post of Police President even while he carries on the duties of Chancellor is his success in going beyond the causes of disorder and striking at the roots. He set about constitutionally to obtain the reforms which hot-heads demanded through force of arms. He centralised the power of the State, depriving Vienna of its federal status to make it an administrated township, investing the President with supreme command of the army and the power to issue ordinances, and abolishing communal police organisations in places where his own federal police exist, thus freeing the State troops from either competition or political influence both in the provinces and in Vienna. This series of Reform Bills dissolved the prime reasons for the *Heimwehr's* discontent. When he later pushed through legislation directed against the methods of terrorisation by which members of one party kept out all opposing partisans from factories which they could command, forming a sort of political "closed shop," he removed the last element of immediate danger in the political situation.

Economically the continued failures of established houses and the growing unemployment menaced all efforts at tranquillisation. Schober called an economic conference of leaders from every in-

dustry, and won their promise of collaboration in a constructive policy. When the *Boden Credit Anstalt*, one of the oldest banks in the country, crashed, he was ready to meet the crisis by calling upon Rothschild interests to take over the bankrupt's assets. Rothschild had gone on a hunting trip in Lower Austria, no one knew exactly where. As Police President Schober had men whose business it was to find people. As Chancellor he sent Rothschild an urgent message. As Minister of the Treasury—for at the moment he was holding four posts in the Cabinet—he spent the day working with competent authorities over possible methods of combination which he might propose to the banker when he arrived. At eight o'clock on Sunday evening, with only twelve hours of grace before the announcement of disaster must get abroad, Rothschild had not yet been heard from, yet the Chancellor—always intent upon the preservation of order—was holding an interview with a Vienna editor to frame some report of the financial situation which might bring a calming note into the morning Press. Two hours later the Chancellor had moved over from his offices in the Treasury to take up his post at police headquarters, and it was here that he received all the bank presidents of Vienna, whom he called in conference to meet with him and Rothschild. By midnight Rothschild had arrived and agreed to take over the threatened *Boden Credit Anstalt* without calling in the immobilised industrial loans of that institution. Thus the many firms who owed money to the failing bank might continue to do business without themselves being forced into bankruptcy. Shareholders were to receive shares in Rothschild's bank, the capital of which was to be raised thirty millions. Depositors were to lose nothing: if a run came when the banks opened, gold could be brought from Switzerland by plane. In exchange for his aid, Rothschild was to receive the privilege of floating a part of the next State loan—and perhaps a monopoly. By assuming the responsibility for the merger and its recompense, Schober had again saved Austria.

But the need of foreign capital had once more been emphasised. It was necessary now to enlist the moneyed Powers of the world in an attempt to restore Austrian industry. For this Schober saw plainly that far more was necessary than a simple statement that order reigned in the land. It was necessary to relieve business of the crushing possibility of reparation payments yet to come. It was necessary to free commerce from its tariff walls. In a word, it was necessary for Austria to re-enter the concert of nations, to restore her shattered diplomatic prestige, and to become, as far as she was able, a power.

The diplomatic situation of Austria only six months ago was lamentable. Italy had been estranged by the affair of South

Tyrol, where German minorities were suffering under attempts to shift their culture and allegiance rather brutally. Hungary had been estranged over the affair of the Burgenland, which had been given Austria as a sort of sop for South Tyrol, and thrown down, as it were, between the two central fragments of the old Hapsburg empire like an apple of discord. Were it not for the Burgenland some reconciliation might have been effected years before, but that lay in the way, just as Meran lay between Italy and Austria to the South. Germany, sympathetic in all questions of nationality, was not yet ready to give aid, nor had Germany agreed to any trade treaty so far drafted. France stood aloof, dreading the *Anschluss*. Great Britain hesitated to invest in a country where the reactionaries on the farms and the radicals in the towns daily proclaimed each other's destruction. Only after he had secured the passage of his Reform Bills did Schober find the moment opportune to turn toward foreign affairs. He could then immediately reassure investors that there would be no civil war in Austria. He went to The Hague, and the same diplomats who gave its final shape to the Young Plan at last gave him what he had started out to get in 1921, their Governments' acknowledgment of Austria's inability to pay reparations. Now loans could be launched, freed assets could be mortgaged. The long-cherished project to obtain 725,000,000 Austrian schillings (£21,000,000) for productive purposes might be carried forward. It remained to win the final political authorisations from the signatory Powers, and this was a purely diplomatic matter.

Schober has in four months won no slight reputation as a diplomat. Austria is so placed that her position holds the key not only to the Balkans, but also to Central Europe. Her Chancellor has fallen heir to the traditional Hapsburg policy of playing off one great rival against another. He returned from The Hague to visit Rome, and for the first time since 1914 the possibilities of Italo-Austrian cordiality were hinted at. An actual accord was reached which has already borne fruit. The Germans in South Tyrol are experiencing an easier, gentler method of Italianisation. At the same time Austria is pushing forward the construction of certain roads round Jugo-Slavia which Italy deems essential, and which might in certain conditions serve a variety of purposes.

Schober only returned from Rome to post off again to Berlin, there, in the midst of speeches to his "Dear German Brothers," to sign the trade treaty which Curtius had waiting for him. The economic *Anschluss*, viewed by so many as inevitable, had at least found partial expression. By affixing his signature Schober not only guaranteed a surer future to Austrian enterprise, but also assured himself and his régime of the parliamentary support of

Austria's third party, the *Grossdeutsche*. Austria's first party, the Christian Socialists, he had already secured by his conversations with the Ultramontanes in Rome. Thus he was able to go to Paris with the majority of his country solidly behind him, while, with the pacts of Rome and Berlin in his baggage, he held two strings for his bow in all diplomatic conversations. The short visit was a triumph, culminating in full French accord in the flotation of the desired loan and in Briand's Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour to match Mussolini's recent gift of the Grand Cordon of the Crown of Italy. Before leaving Paris for London, where the final authorisation for the loan was readily obtained, Schober delivered himself of one phrase which in its absolute simplicity at the same time conceals such a multitude of enigmatic and utterly fortuitous connotations as to render it his first great diplomatic *mot*. "Austria and Germany," he said, "are one nation but two States." The enemies of the *Anschluss* see in this perfectly objective and undebatable statement too great an admission of unity, while the supporters of the Greater Germany find in it too calm an acceptance of political division. It is the perfect expression of Schober's willingness to continue the *status quo* so long as Austria can live—and if Austria can live—as now constituted.

"The Austrian Republic as it exists to-day was at its origins unready to function as an independent State," the Chancellor has told me. "It had been cut out of a self-supporting whole. There had been no need under the Empire to dig for coal, because coal came from Czechoslovakia. Now we have dug for coal and found coal. We have harnessed our immense resources in water power and electrified the railroads and the mines. We can export power. From extensive, leisurely agriculture we have turned to intensive cultivation. Our potato crop is now two hundred per cent. more than it was. Our sugar beets are yielding four hundred per cent. more. We produce more cheese than Switzerland. Austria is a business proposition. I stand for the security of foreign money within our borders. My duty—may I not say, 'my job!'—is to provide this fundamental condition of security."

Back of Schober the diplomat and statesman stands Schober the Police President. It is to the maintenance of order, the first condition for a healthy industry and the first pledge in foreign commerce, that he returns.

WILLIAM LEON SMYSER.

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT AND FREE TRADE.

THE eleventh triennial Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance met at Ghent in September 1924. It was held in part of a large hall in which a great exhibition of the Co-operative products of many nations had been on view during the summer. Compared to the contemporary show at Wembley indeed, the exhibition would appear modest enough. Nevertheless, to the present writer at least, the Co-operative Exhibition was much more interesting and significant. In itself and compared with most shows of the kind, it was a very fine exhibition. The visitor passed from the section devoted to one nation to that of another, and on and on from that to others through a long and interesting series, each one filled with a variety of goods, modern, tasteful, and abundant. A truly wonderful witness to the constructive power of democracy, painfully during three generations accumulating the capital and business experience necessary to the production of such a display!

There was one exhibit, however, which appeared in striking contrast with the surrounding splendours. Naturally the powerful British Movement had one of the largest and best sections in the hall. Yet the part of it which probably aroused most interest among the visitors was the plainest, least attractive thing to look at in the whole exhibition. This was a large model of the original shop of the Rochdale Pioneers—of the twenty-eight weavers who clubbed together to open shop in a tiny cottage, in the narrow windows of which were displayed samples of sugar, tea, etc. M. Charles Gide, the "Père Gide" of French Co-operation, remarks on the fact that no economist of the day, not even the sympathetic Mill, made any reference at the time to this new Movement. Verily the kingdom of Co-operation "came not with observation"!

To-day the International Co-operative Alliance heads a mighty movement, and includes societies in all the important countries of the Western world, societies with a combined membership of over 50 million persons. As often, indeed generally, only one member of a family, the father or mother, belongs directly to the Society, it is probable that about 200 million people are at least partially fed and clothed by goods bought at "the Stores."

Now this great organisation quietly gathering strength below the battles of Capital and Labour, Liberal, Tory, and Socialist, growing even during the Great War, and expanding more rapidly than ever since that catastrophe—in the last seven years one London Society alone has increased its membership from 100,000 to 350,000—has brought into existence a new force, a thing which is

certain to have, sooner or later, its political as well as its economic influence. I do not refer to the movement among British Co-operators to enter directly into politics as a Co-operative Party, though the Party has already a representative in the Cabinet; I mean that, for the first time in history, the consumer as such has a powerful organisation of his or her own. Tariffs grow under pressure from groups of producers, each one "scrambling at the shearers' feast," seeking tariff favours for his own trade, and the consumer has had no organisation to stand up for him. If British trade unionism has stood very true to Free Trade, this is at least partly due to the fact that our exports of manufactured goods and the trades which make them are so very much greater than our imports of the same class that the number of men who might conceivably find employment under a tariff is insignificant compared to those who stand to lose by it. The greatest unions would lose; only minor ones could gain as producers; all would suffer equally as consumers. Nevertheless, the Protectionist can often appeal to the trade union of producers, to its particular interest. With the same men organised as a Co-operative Society of Consumers, he can do nothing; their obvious interest is identical with that of the nation, social, not particular.

It is not wonderful then that, when the third International Free Trade Congress, held at Amsterdam in 1921, founded a Permanent International Committee to Promote Universal Free Trade as a federation of National Free Trade Organisations, with the officers of the Cobden Club as its Executive Committee, almost at the same time as the first post-war Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance was meeting at Basle, the Alliance should commit the Co-operative Movement to Free Trade. M. Albert Thomas was invited to read a paper on the "Policy of International Co-operation," and to move a resolution defining it. The resolution, as drafted, met with prompt opposition. The Austrian delegates refused to vote on it, recognising that the representatives of a small nation could do nothing to prevent the issue of such a resolution, but determined to have no responsibility for it. They soon found, however, that the Congress was of the same mind as themselves. M. Thomas' resolution was referred back for reconsideration. After stating that "in many cases the system of Free Trade has helped the consumer by reducing the cost of living," the resolution as drafted went on to say, "it (the Congress) does not demand the abolition of customs duties or of commercial treaties. It is aware that the same practical system, whatever it may be, produces quite different results, according to the spirit which inspires it." Next day M. Thomas brought back his resolution with the objectionable sentences deleted, when it was adopted by a large majority.

I believe that the Co-operators everywhere are eager for Free Trade with the exception of those of France. With French Co-operators, too, the difficulty is more one of words than substance. Obviously it is impossible for any man or organisation to be against *both* Free Trade and protective customs taxes, which are the meanings of the words "Free Trade" and "Protection" as understood in this country. When Joseph Chamberlain proposed a 2s. a quarter import duty on foreign wheat it was possible to approve, to oppose, or to be indifferent to his policy; but to say you were both for and against such a duty was merely nonsense—though I have heard men say that very thing. The French Co-operators, however, appear to have attached to "Free Trade" a positive, not merely a negative idea; they include in the term a more or less definite approval of competitive private trading. As Co-operation is obviously an attempt to promote a new non-capitalistic method of exchange, national and international "Free Trade," thus extended in meaning, is incompatible with Co-operation itself. But Co-operators eagerly desire to extend the International Exchange of Co-operative products—quite apart from their wish as consumers to buy as cheaply as possible themselves. To that end they are developing their international organisations, the International Co-operative Alliance, the International Wholesale Society, and the International Women's Guild. The International Wholesale Society at least cannot develop as it ought to do so long as the world is divided into tariff-hedged sections separating the National Societies one from another as at present. There is a deep-seated patriotism among many Co-operators, a feeling of loyalty to the Movement and to its founders, the Rochdale Pioneers. Up to the boundaries of many nations, elaborate organisations have been built up, which would have delighted the Pioneers. Co-operators are proud of their yet incomplete success; they cannot long tolerate barriers that prevent the development of International Co-operative exchange.

Yet it is clearly impossible to favour Co-operators by freeing their products, and theirs alone, from the exactions of the Customs House Officer. At Birmingham I was told a story much to the point: A friend asked a Co-operator for a match, and saw that the box from which it came bore the legend "made in Finland" on it. "You should not buy foreign matches," he said, "and put our people out of work." The reply was effective: "We buy Finnish matches and send British-made bicycles to pay for them." Co-operative exchanges teach men economics! It is clear though that the Finnish matches would be charged with the match-tax duty and probably the bicycles with a duty on reaching Finland, just as if they were sent by private traders; the only difference would be

that the Co-operators of both countries would realise exactly what was happening—an exchange of goods for goods. The private trader would only be told this by an economist, whom he would not believe! If the International Co-operative Wholesale Society is ever to realise internationally the ideal of the Rochdale Pioneers, protective tariffs must first disappear.

I noted above the fact that the International Committee to promote Universal Free Trade was founded at the same time as the Basle Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance dealt with M. Thomas' resolution. The Congresses of the Alliance are held every three years, and it was in 1924 that the next one took place at Ghent. Meantime the International Free Trade Movement had got into working order. Important International Conferences had been held at Budapest and Frankfurt in 1922, under the Committee; and the leading nations of Europe and the United States had Free Trade organisations, most of them newly founded since the war, affiliated to the Committee. Like other great democratic bodies, the Alliance invites kindred organisations to send accredited "fraternal delegates" to visit and give short speeches at their Conferences. That the Alliance recognised in the International Committee a body definitely at one in principle with itself was shown when the Committee received an invitation to be thus represented at Ghent. At this, and again at the Stockholm Congress in August 1927 the Committee was represented, the Secretary of the Cobden Club attending at Ghent and Sir George Paish at Stockholm in this capacity.

At Stockholm a further advance was made in associating the Alliance definitely with the Free Trade Cause. The Alliance had been well represented on the economic conference convened by the League of Nations at Geneva, the famous report of which had been issued shortly before the Stockholm Congress. The report of the Central Committee of the Alliance contained a resolution thanking the League of Nations for accepting the Alliance Delegation and commending in general terms the report of the International Economic Conference. The paragraphs which concern us were read as follows:

"The Congress further expresses its agreement in principle with the resolutions of the Conference so far as they are in accord with the long-established policy of International Co-operation, especially those relating to the removal of customs barriers and the reversal of the present system of tariffs; the relation of Agricultural and Consumers' Co-operative Societies, and the establishment of commercial treaties.

The Congress declares that the time has come—the Stabilisation of the Currency being now largely accomplished—to put an end to the numerous irritating obstacles created since the war by the tariff systems, which are always prejudicial to the

consumers of every country, and declares that it is in the interdependence of the nations and not in the nationalism of every-one for himself that a fruitful and durable peace may be found."

The encouragement given to the International Free Trade Committee by the Alliance led to a modification in the work the Cobden Club was doing among British Co-operators. The relations between the Club and the Co-operative Movement have always been most friendly. The Club never took part in elections, nor undertook any activity that could be interpreted as political; but at the outset of the "tariff reform" controversy, it succeeded in holding a number of Industrial Conferences on the tariff question which were largely attended, among others, by Co-operators. Another series confined to Co-operative Societies alone has been held during the last few years in order to appeal directly to consumers as *consumers*, and at these resolutions had been proposed and carried with virtual unanimity protesting against the Government's policy of "safeguarding," the McKenna Duties, etc.

The discovery, however, as a fact and not merely as a probability, that foreign Co-operators had proved immune to the Protectionist influences around them, and were virtually at one with their British comrades on the question of Free Trade, seemed to open a new opportunity. The famous "Bankers' Manifesto" for the removal of trade barriers, the resolutions of the International Chamber of Commerce and, above all, the League of Nations Economic Conference, showed clearly enough that thinking men in business and political circles desired a new economic policy for tariff-ridden Europe. Such pronouncements were, however, not enough. For any great reform to succeed public opinion, including that of the masses, must be aroused, the masses who do not hear or who easily forget what Capitalists and Economists do and say. Cobden's strength lay in his popular appeal; the Anti-Corn Law League was an appeal to democracy, though as yet democracy had no votes. When, however, after his success at home, Cobden spoke to foreigners, it was impossible for him to reach the people in the same intimate way. The area to be covered was too wide, even if the language difficulty had not been insuperable. Now it is vital—the whole question of success or failure for the growing Free Trade feeling among Continental statesmen and business men probably depends on it—that, by some means or other, the common people of Europe should be reached as effectively by the International Free Trade Movement as were the British working classes in the eighteen forties by the Anti-Corn Law League.

How is this to be done? It is a problem of great difficulty and perhaps other methods may supplement that of the International Committee; but I am convinced that the British, and through it the

Continental Co-operative Movement, afford the best means of reaching the masses of Europe. On realising the opportunity thus opened, the nature of the appeal to British Co-operators was modified. Instead of dealing only with the fiscal misdeeds of Mr. Baldwin's Government, the speeches and resolutions at the Conference from June 1928 were directed not only to the question of home affairs, but to an appeal to foreign Co-operators to take active measures to oppose their own tariffs; while, instead of convening them by the Cobden Club only, further Conferences of Co-operators were held jointly by the Club and the International Committee to promote Universal Free Trade. Prominent leaders of Co-operation itself, whose names would carry influence throughout the Movement everywhere, consented to address the Conferences. Five were held between June 1928 and the general election at which resolutions were drafted on the lines of that passed at the Newcastle Conference held in 1928, which was addressed by Mr. H. J. May, Secretary to the International Co-operative Alliance, and read as follows:

"This Conference, representing the Co-operative societies of Newcastle and district, protests against the Protectionist policy of the present Government as injurious to the trade of the country, as tending to increase the cost of living, and especially as encouraging the Protectionists of other countries to ignore the findings of the League of Nations Economic Conference of Geneva last year, which declares that 'the time had come to put an end to the increase of tariffs and move in the opposite direction'; it is convinced that the ideals of the Rochdale Pioneers so generally successful within the boundaries of many nations, cannot be fully realised so long as the present network of tariffs renders impossible the free exchange of commodities between the different nations, and it therefore calls upon co-operators of this and other countries to agitate for the reduction and ultimate extinction of the tariff barriers now enforced here and abroad."

They were carried unanimously and with very marked enthusiasm.

Freedom of Trade, an advantage to all, is a necessity of growth to the Co-operative Movement. It is continually confronted and its development hindered by the present monstrous system of nation-confining tariffs. Up to the borders of each State the Movement progresses, silent, peaceful yet essentially revolutionary, a peaceful revolution. Its natural development is towards internationalism, and having in many nations developed from small retail grocery shops to general stores for trade after trade; having federated in National Wholesale Societies; having come to own factories, ships and mines, formed its own banks and run its own building societies, it is out for further conquest. It cannot be content to stop where it is, it cannot long tolerate the artificial barriers that cramp its

international development, the impulse of a growing thing to expand is too strong for that.

The true nature of Protective Tariffs, too, is easier seen by Co-operators than by those who buy their goods from private traders. As I finish this article, I learn that the British Co-operative Wholesale Society has been opening up exchanges with the Co-operators of Argentina, and the Societies of the latter country have been reckoning up the added cost to themselves of the duties on the things they buy from their comrades in this. The result has startled them. The story I have at second hand from *Le Co-opérateur Suisse*, which comments:

"The lack of union among consumers prevents them from taking account of the fiscal burden, for it is the merchants who pay the duty and after increase still further the prices charged. But where consumers have a co-operative organisation and desire to import from abroad, by their own agent, the goods they need they begin to understand the burden and the importance of such duties. That is what the Argentine Co-operative Societies have found out."

Free Traders anxious to defend our policy of free imports here and to help the movement now growing abroad for lower tariffs should welcome the aid of the International Co-operative Movement.

BROUGHAM VILLIERS.

A CATHOLIC VIEW OF TOLERATION.

A CERTAIN recrudescence of suspicion among Protestants as to the capacity of Catholics for religious toleration coincided oddly in the concluding months of last year with the beatification in Rome of no less than one hundred and thirty-six Englishmen and women who at the hands of the English Reformers between the years 1541 and 1680 suffered death, sometimes with horrible accompaniments, for their religious convictions. Here was one of those lambent ironies which so often attract the eye of the philosophic historian. Here was one party to the unhappy division of the Christian world into opposing camps celebrating its martyrs while the other was cultivating its apprehensions. Here was the memory of bygone persecutions working at one and the same time to produce in the former tears as little deserving the epithet of idle as the fears of the latter seemed, at least to some of us, to deserve it much.

Who among us is entirely sufficient for these things? Humour, no doubt, if it could get full play, might quickly deliver the anxious from alarms that are of all our present fears perhaps the least alarming; for the notion of the kindly Catholic Episcopate of this country trampling rough-shod upon the beliefs of their countrymen is as well calculated to astonish and amuse as the comoritant idea of their miraculous levitation into the saddle of secular government. But what chance has Humour ever had among the spiritual children of those grave and reverend persons of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who first perceived the Pope protruding a cloven hoof and the Church that has its seat upon the Seven Hills masquerading in a robe of scarlet? With such as these suspicion must be scotched by something heavier than a joke and prejudice will be throttled only in the coils of an argument. Faced by the disastrous consequences of the failure of professing Christians to retain or recover the corporate unity so solemnly commended to them by Christ—consequences exemplified at every turn of the history of persecution—many indeed of the best of us will seek to avoid every crossing of swords, preferring to let challenges go unanswered and controversy slide rather than to give any fresh occasion for the time-honoured gibe about the love of Christians towards each other. Yet, even though we shun the intellectual duel as but a little less inconsistent with Christian charity than the corporal, we may still find it desirable to maintain something—if the simile be not too profane—in the nature of inter-ecclesiastical sports and pastimes if only because these afford us occasion to take stock of certain hares and red-herrings, to check their pedigrees and maybe somewhat to refine their breeding.

The charge of persecution is, perhaps, the best runner amongst all our national hares, the most highly-scented member of all our store of red-herrings; and its pre-eminence is due not a little to the fact that there are few things men dislike so much in others as persecution, or notice so little in themselves. The defect of a quality, the mark often enough of a consuming passion for truth or justice that has flamed into zeal but not yet into love, intolerance ought itself to be regarded most tolerantly. For we come upon traces of it even in the most unexpected places—in the University of Cambridge, for example, where in spite of old tradition and new enlightenment, in spite of the conviction that truth is great and must of its own force prevail against error, at any rate in homes of sound learning and finished education, in spite, too, of the contiguity of Dr. G. G. Coulton, an industrious champion of tolerance though not apparently very active in this actual connection, certain of the authorities were moved during the Great War to deprive Mr. Bertrand Russell of his post for no better reason than that his opinions on contemporary politics differed widely from their own.

This little incident, trivial as it may now appear, serves, like the simultaneous "insensate persecution"—to use Dr. Gilbert Murray's term for it—of the Quakers and their kindred for entertaining a religious conviction with political consequences, as a useful reminder of the fact that patriots are by no means exempt from the same kind of zeal which sometimes overflows in churchmen. The high fires of persecution have, in fact, been lit in many cities besides Rome, as well in other ages as in that acclaimed "of faith," and by other hands also than those of Popes. Socrates suffered in Athens and Stephen at Jerusalem. It was at Constance and, as Creighton points out, in order to satisfy "the need felt by a revolutionary party for some opportunity of defining the limits of its revolutionary zeal,"* or, in other words, to advertise the orthodoxy of the advocates of the conciliar as against the papal theory of the Church, that Hus was burnt. St. Joan met her fate in Rouen; Forest and Fisher, More and Bradford in London; Servetus in Geneva; Patrick Hamilton at St. Andrews; Cranmer and Latimer beside the walls of Oxford. Alone perhaps (if we except the apostolic founders of the Church itself) among those whose sufferings for opinion are held in world-wide memory, Bruno, with his, from every point of view, incredibly stupid ascription to Christ of the character of a magician, is associated with Rome.

The roughest list of names and places is in truth enough to remind us that in this phenomenon of persecution we are dealing with nothing peculiar in Catholicism but something common to

* *History of the Papacy*, II, p. 33.

man—something embedded in man's nature or conditions. Innocent prophets of human progress would indeed have us believe that the world forsook the desire to constrain religious conviction about the time of the Revolution in France. The *dossier* of Persecution to be found in the files of Clio tells a different tale. With French Deist and French Atheist alike this familiar of mankind has notoriously found a home. Unless the records strangely err, it has had shelter in the secret chambers of Masonry, and the indiscriminate expulsion of the religious orders from France in the beginning of the twentieth century discovered its strength in circles free from all suspicion of Clericalism. A few years later it was to be seen running beside the advancing armies of Orthodox Russia as they passed into Ruthenia, and, when they failed, it was gratefully received into the habitations of Soviet labour. It ranges, if not from China to Peru, at least from China to Mexico. Now rampant, now couchant, it dwells perennially amongst the children of men.

In tolerant England, where we have felt indeed its teeth, but hardly the full weight of its paw, its caresses have been, perhaps, more equally distributed between Catholic and Protestant than is often supposed. If we go by numbers, Mary's three or four hundred victims are not fully compensated by the deaths of the two hundred and fifty-two persons whose claims to beatification were lately considered in Rome. But the tale can at least be made up in Ireland where at Drogheda some thousand or more citizens, as we now know through his chaplain's indiscretions and in spite of his own precautions,* were massacred in cold blood by Cromwell—that boasted meddler with no man's conscience in whom Dr. S. R. Gardiner would have had us see the model of the modern Englishman.

A less numerical method of inquiry gives a more curious result. The English Reformation was initiated by the execution, just for clinging to religious convictions that his sovereign had once both held and defended, of one who was reckoned in his day by Colet and Erasmus the greatest genius amongst his countrymen, and the English Revolution, which deprived of his crown the first English king to approve toleration,† was closed by the application to Ireland, despite the pledges given in the Treaty of Limerick, of a penal code characterised by Burke in familiar words as "a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance . . . as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment and degradation of a people and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man. Irish loyalty to the English Crown,

* See on this *Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. VII, pp. 354-5.

† As Dr. Temperley shows (*Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. V, pp. 237-8) there is no convincing proof of James's alleged insincerity.

unaffected though it was by the Scottish Rebellions in '15 and '45, wrought no change in the feelings of the English Government, and Catholic Emancipation sprang, when at last it came, not from any Protestant regard for tolerance but from political fear of rebellion. Even so it remained on any exact investigation incomplete. Though penalties became obsolete they were not finally removed from the English Statute Book until a few years after the Pope had removed them from the Code of Canon Law—and only then at the instance of a Catholic M.P.—and, though disabilities have passed for the most part out of memory, they remain still sufficient to prevent Henry V or Henry VII from mounting the throne or Thomas Wolsey or Thomas More from occupying the Woolsack.

In view of these considerations, there is a plain absurdity if not some slight impertinence, in the demand recently addressed to Cardinal Bourne in the columns of *The Times*, for an undertaking that, if Catholics were ever in power, they would abstain from the coercion of their fellow-citizens. Where all have acted alike, not from one but from all, if pledges are needed, should pledges be required. And before hypothetical cases are discussed, all actual disabilities ought surely to be removed. But, apart from any question of equity, the demand displays a singular shortness of thought; and the Cardinal showed characteristic wisdom in leaving it unanswered. A clergyman who sought to pledge unborn generations to a policy of unconditional toleration would be carrying ecclesiastical domination to a point at which the most ardent of clericals might take alarm; and those who demand such a pledge, even though they be dons or divines, must incur the suspicion of being doctrinaires. Wise men will hope that public education may some day advance to the point at which ideas can be allowed the freest passage; but sensible men are aware that every measure of toleration has, in practice, to be conditioned by the safety of society and the State. Where Error—or what we take for such—trades too disastrously upon Ignorance and Innocence, something has to be done for the protection of Truth. A plethora of Bolshevist Sunday-schools must explode all niceties of tolerance. At some point or another what political scientists call "the armed conscience of the community" comes inevitably into play; and to the voice of conscience it is the business of theologians to encourage us to attend.

Just here we pass to a new stage in the argument and from comparison to contrast. For the obvious similarity between Catholic and Protestant in regard to the use of constraint was attended by a vital dissimilarity of motive; and this dissimilarity is all to the Catholic advantage. Acton was the very last man to favour his own Church, but it is Acton who points out, in some pages which ought to be much better known than they are, that, whereas the

Protestant persecuted religious opinion primarily because he disliked it as erroneous, the Catholic persecuted it primarily because he regarded it as subversive of society. The classic example of Protestant intolerance is thus precisely the case of Servetus, a visitor about to quit Geneva and no manner of peril to the government. "It is on this account," as Acton observes, "that the *tu quoque*, or retaliatory argument, is inadmissible between Catholics and Protestants. Catholic intolerance is handed down from an age when unity subsisted and when its preservation, being essential for that of society, became a necessity of state as well as a result of circumstances. Protestant intolerance, on the contrary, was the peculiar fruit of a dogmatic system in contradiction with the facts and principles on which the intolerance actually existing among Catholics was founded. . . . The only instance in which the Protestant theory was adopted by Catholics is the revocation of the Edict of Nantes."*

Contrary, then, to much that we are accustomed to hear, it would appear that the Catholic, if he is intolerant at all, is intolerant for reason of State and, as it were, only by accident, whereas the Protestant, if he believes with the early Reformers that "the defence of religion" is "not only the duty of the civil power but the object of its institution,"† is committed to intolerance by the very fact of his citizenship.

The "open Bible" did in fact nothing to ease the problem of doctrinal disagreement. The conception of "a perfect society," to which intolerance in Catholics has before now been attributed, is as certainly present in the pages of the Old Testament as in any Catholic treatise; and the picture there displayed of a theocracy claiming exclusive possession of divine truth and guarding its faith and morals by the sharpest sanctions made the deepest impression upon the eye of Protestantism as it came in time to search the Scriptures for the strong foundations of a national commonwealth. The State became the engine, not of civic freedom of thought, but of an academic rectitude of opinion.

An argument which aimed first at showing that there was little to choose in outward appearance between Catholic and non-Catholic intolerance and then at distinguishing an underlying difference in principle between them, reaches its final conclusion if it be able to prove a correspondence between the Catholic doctrine of toleration and that common sense which it is the boast of Catholic philosophy to exemplify. An allegory and an analogy have dominated the mind of Christendom in this particular connection; and it is not without significance that the allegory precedes

* Acton: *History of Freedom and other Essays*, p. 169.
† *Ibid.*, p. 158.

the analogy. The parable of the wheat and the tares governed the thought of the earlier doctors of the Church, and, even whilst the Roman Empire with its own inherited tradition of persecution remained, a tolerance, incomplete if we will, yet still advanced and firmly opposed to bloodshed, distinguishes the opinions of Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom and Martin of Tours. Catholic and Non-Catholic carried on their controversies in council; and after the fall of the Empire in the West until the end of the tenth century heresy appears to have known no penalties except those which belong to the spiritual order or pertain to the discipline of the religious life.*

Thus for five centuries with ancient law at a discount and the pressure of Imperial Rome removed, the Church reverted quite naturally to a policy as tolerant as that of its primitive era. It was the emergence of Christian civilisation from the Dark Ages, its re-formation as a coherent international society and the presence of enemies both within and without, that brought the horrors we now deplore. As the shadow of Islam began to fall more darkly upon Christendom, and as the subversive character of the doctrine of the Cathari became more apparent, the analogy of the forger of false money displaced the old merciful allegory of the wheat and the tares and took hold of the mind of Aquinas. The currency of false ideas seemed to the Angelic Doctor no less pernicious than the currency of spurious coin; and even now it is not so easy, without laying oneself open to the charge of gross materialism, to make play against his dialectic. The force of his argument comes home to us, indeed, more easily if we adopt a more familiar simile. The importance of maintaining a united front where a society is battling for its life cannot, as we ourselves have reason to know, be effectively challenged; and, if one happens to be engaged in mortal conflict with the fanatical energy inspired by another religion, one can hardly be blamed for attempting to protect the rational stability of one's own. Of the competence of the Cathari to reform the existing conditions in Church and State it is easy to form an opinion by reflecting that they regarded marriage as a vice and even carried their opposition to it to the point of refusing to eat all food that had been sexually conceived. Such ideas, to say nothing of the practical license to which by reaction they led, cannot be reconciled with the requirements of a healthy community; and the most brilliant and intellectually receptive of the mediæval emperors and the most statesmanlike of the mediæval popes were significantly agreed to suppress them. The edicts of the one discover a new harshness, and the canons of the other a new interest in penal

* Havet: *L'Hérésie et le Bras Seculier*, p. 66.

legislation; and no one, perhaps, will gladly undertake to defend either the severities themselves or the moral duty of inflicting them imposed upon the civil power. The recommendation of force is, however, always a thing distinct from the form that force is at the time in the habit of assuming, and the recurring use of the phrase *animadversio debita*—the punishment due—gives us the right measure of the Church's responsibility in the matter. For the rest, those who have appreciated the full significance of Milman's conclusion that "it is impossible to conceive what had been the confusion, the lawlessness, the chaotic state of the Middle Ages without the mediæval papacy,"* will deal cautiously with the sterner side of papal policy.

Yet, even amidst the entanglements of international politics, the Church had not been left without at least one immensely imposing witness of her own more excellent way. There is no greater figure in the century which stands between the Papacy of Gregory VII and that of Innocent III than that of St. Bernard; and St. Bernard has declared in words upon which no modern can improve that "Faith should be persuaded and not imposed" and that "heretics should be captured by arguments and not by arms."† Such quotations alone, are, indeed, enough to refute the suggestion of a polemical mediævalist‡ that Cardinal Bourne was committed by "the whole tradition" of his Church to a policy of intolerance. Is St. Bernard, then, one might ask, outside the Catholic tradition, or is he only outside the province of Dr. Coulton's studies or recollection? For the passage has a singular importance, showing as it does that at the very height of the temporal power of the Papacy the methods of propagating Christianity appeared distinct from those of preserving civilisation.

The disruption of Christendom which was averted in the thirteenth century was effected in the sixteenth, and Catholics must take their share of blame for the atrocities of blood, burning and massacre that attended it. But, when all has been said that can fairly be said on these familiar lines, the fact remains that a vast political revolution was in progress behind all the controversies of faith and that those who were borne now this way and now that in the fray could no more have been expected to see beyond the devastating passage of the wars of religion and the destruction of the catholic civilisation they had known to the new national civilisation—such as it was—that eventually emerged, than the adherents of the *Ancien Régime* could figure to themselves the advent of a

* *Latin Christianity*, I, p. 430.

† "Fides suadenda est, non imponenda" (Serm. in Cantica LXVI); "Capian-
tur, non armis, sed argumentis" (*Ibid.*, LXIV).

‡ See *The Times*, October 31st, 1929. A letter entitled "Roman Catholics and Education," by Dr. G. G. Coulton.

sane democracy. Historic equity will condemn the attempt of Conservatism to save by force what the wisest humanists of Europe—More in England, Erasmus in the Empire, Montaigne in France—would have kept intact if they could—as little as it will condemn its actual exploits with rack and faggot much. And if the Platonic Socrates were here he might, no doubt, confront us with troublesome questions as to the precise nature of the improvement in the methods of an international organ which relies in the last resort upon the slow torture of a blockade, with its obvious want of discrimination between the guilty and the innocent and its fiercer incidence upon the weaker and more helpless members of the community, and those of one which worked by interdict, crusade or inquisition. But let that pass.

Whilst in the Old World the thought of Catholic Christendom lay dying, in the New Catholic enterprise was affording one of the most striking proofs imaginable of an instinctive tolerance. Whilst Quakers were still being hanged by the Pilgrim Fathers in New England and Puritans and Catholics alike were being persecuted by Anglicans in Virginia, Lord Baltimore in Catholic Maryland had advanced beyond mere toleration and was granting equal political rights to all believers in the Trinity. The Continent in which he led the way towards that honourable regard for honest conviction which we owe to one another not less than we owe uncompromising fidelity to truth, as we see it, to God and ourselves, was, however, not yet worthy of him; and the effect of the downfall of James II in England was to destroy religious liberty in Maryland. So little do real events sometimes correspond with popular assumptions!

Studied thus by the light of history, certain apparent differences in the Catholic attitude towards toleration may without much difficulty be reconciled and understood. Those who, like Cardinal Lépicier, look to the past and are sensible of the immense services rendered by the Church to Society in the Middle Age, will tend to assert her native and inherent right—however much more wisely honoured in the disuse than in the employment—as a community independent of human authority, to prescribe and require the infliction even of temporal penalties upon evil-doers. Those on the other hand who look to the future will, like Cardinal Soglia in a work approved by Gregory XVI and Pius IX,* commend the view that it is more consonant with the gentleness of the Church's character to limit her coercive authority to moral constraint. Those again, who prefer practical considerations to constitutional discussions will reflect that common sense indicates that every society must be presumed to possess such rights of coercion as are required by the work it has to perform; that the Church organised under

* For the reference see Vacandard's *L'Inquisition*, p. 304.

the Papacy was, as we have seen, the dominant factor in the safety and evolution of mediæval civilisation; that some measure of secular coercion was as necessary to the performance of its secular duties at that time as some measure of spiritual coercion is necessary to the maintenance within it of an intelligible unity of thought and purpose at all times; and, for the rest, that to recommend the civil government to make use of force is within the privileges of the meanest citizen and to make use of it on his own initiative not beyond the possibilities of his private duty. The terrors supposed to be latent in the condemnation in the Syllabus of the proposition '*Ecclesia vis inferendæ potestatem non habet*' will, indeed, seem hardly intelligible to those who have chanced to notice that neither the character nor the extent of the 'force' referred to is defined or to reflect that, upon a renunciation without reserve by the Church of the use of force at the date of the Syllabus, the States of the Church would have appeared, on any strict interpretation, to be placed in no little danger of going without police or defence.

Let that be, however, as it may, for the essential thing is to lift the whole controversy from the region of doctrinaire polemics to that of statesmanlike discussion. Any repudiation of coercion in principle violates that leading canon of statesmanship which insists that no administrative problem should be considered outside its setting in time and place. But it is worth while to notice that it is equally discountenanced by all we can learn of the attitude of Christ Himself towards the use of force. Once and once only, yet significantly once, does the Prince of Peace resort to physical coercion. In the account of the expulsion of the money-changers from the temple the Catholic can point to a temporal penalty inflicted upon sacrilege and the critic must admit the presence of an example which brings secular sanctions within the compass of Christianity.

There is, then, the best reason and the best authority for refusing to allow problems whether educational or otherwise, into which the issue of coercion enters, to be treated on academic instead of practical lines. The Church is not bound except by the desire of unity, the obligation of truth and the law of love; and the citation of the disciplinary canons of the Lateran Council in the thirteenth century brings us no nearer to an understanding of Vatican policy in the twentieth than a study of the English monarchy under King John to a comprehension of its significance under King George. The mind of Rome, however, lies open for such as care to read it and in two outstanding events of our time the anxious Protestant may find comfort. There is in the first place the appearance of the new code of Canon Law which abrogates all penalties of which no mention is made, and thus, whilst not repudiating the

past, recognises beyond all doubt its passing. A grave reminder embodied in its pages to the effect that ecclesiastics are pastors and not smiters, and their weapons benevolence rather than severity, exhortation rather than commination, charity rather than force, says all the rest.

To these implications of the new code must be added those of new conditions. The constitution by the Pact of the Lateran of a new state of the Church so small as to preclude all thought of defence and so unarmed as to make ridiculous the idea of hostilities; the pledge given to Italy by the Holy See that it will take no part in international politics or congresses except only by request as an arbiter; the confiding of the more onerous police-duties in the Vatican City to the Italian Government—all these things show that same wish to avoid any direct responsibility for measures of coercion which is believed to be likewise a leading factor in the tacit decision of the Papacy neither to seek nor to accept any formal association with the League of Nations. That the Church shrinks from force and bloodshed was never more true than it is to-day; nor was any Pope more profoundly pacific than the present one.

In these circumstances a certain responsibility must rest upon those who, in a world distracted with suspicion, yet seeking to be at one, mistake a stand for unity for a standard of oppression, gather miscellaneous evidence of indifferent value in proof of a Popish plot against human freedom, and embarrass generous aims by dark surmises.

Humanity moves, indeed, towards its appointed end through a tangled and mysterious forest which we can people, if we choose, with ogres, and where the middle path of virtue is really flanked on either hand by steep inclines and deep morasses. It is easy to slip from toleration in the strict sense of the term either into the persecution of others or into an indifference towards their welfare less horrible certainly, yet not perhaps less heartless. As the English Catholic Cyclopædia justly observes "true tolerance" is "one of the most difficult, yet most beautiful and delicate of human virtues"; and we must expect in every camp and company to meet enthusiasts who cause Talleyrand's classic phrase to rise to our lips—"surtout pas trop de zèle." In churchmanship, as in statesmanship, patience is, indeed, not far from being the greatest virtue. But we can, if we will, make the safety of our civilisation by shaking hands across the gulfs that we cannot in conscience bridge; and we may, if we please, discover in the joke which Spurgeon played upon his co-religionists by observing "The Baptists have never persecuted," and then, after the remark had been duly punctuated by applause, adding, "because they have never had the

chance," just such a touch of humour as makes the whole world kin and kindly. The paradox we have to face is, after all, though in varying degrees, the same for all believers in revealed religion. Christianity is exclusive and will brook no rival; and yet Christianity cannot be satisfied unless we honour all men and do all men good.

ALGERNON CECIL.

IRELAND IN 1930.

THE current of events in Ireland during the past twelve months has been singularly tranquil. In the six counties Lord Craigavon's Ministry still rules with little change in policy or personnel, as it has ruled ever since the Belfast Parliament was inaugurated by His Majesty nine years ago; in the Free State Mr. Cosgrave still presents a gay and gallant front to an opposition all but equal to the forces on which his ministry relies. I cannot imagine a Government Whip in the House of Commons cheerfully undertaking to carry on with a paper majority of half a dozen, of which several members were not even technically under his orders. Yet this is the miracle which Mr. Duggan, last survivor in our political life of those who signed the Treaty in December 1921, performs on each day of the Dáil's sittings. Not even actual defeat, such as occurred shortly before the Easter recess, can shake the just confidence of the Government in its ability to live out its full term of office.

I must not repeat here what I said last year of the proved advantages, as of the admitted inconveniences, of our system of Proportional Representation. But I may, perhaps, add this further proof of its efficacy to prevent violent changes, that when the defeat just mentioned took place no one was greatly disquieted. The Dáil re-assembled the following week cheerfully certain of Mr. Cosgrave's re-election; nor did even distance lend such enchantment as to induce Mr. de Valera to hasten his departure from the United States. Directly, no doubt, this indifference towards what looked on the surface like a considerable crisis, was due to that peculiarity in our Constitution by which the Chief of the Executive is elected by the Dáil itself, and to the consequent consideration that, since no one supposed the defeat to be due to any loss of confidence in the Ministry, the result of a direct vote on this issue was a foregone conclusion. No doubt, too, there is another possible explanation: that the country looked forward without dismay to finding itself with a Republican Government in office, an explanation naturally favoured by Fianna Fáil's shadow Cabinet. I believe, on the contrary, that had such a thing been regarded as probable public feeling would have shown itself in a very different fashion. In truth, every one knew perfectly well that, dissolution or no dissolution, Fianna Fáil had no prospect whatever of gaining a working majority for itself or of being placed and kept in office by others. Proportional Representation guarantees us the existence of Labour and Independent Deputies in sufficient strength to make them, in combination and even separately, factors of primary importance; and, as long as the policy of

Fianna Fáil remains as nebulous as it has been these past three years, neither Labour nor Independent votes will be thrown into that scale. It is one thing to display your independence and your desire for better social conditions by voting for an increase in the Old Age Pension vote; it is quite another to hazard the Treaty and all that hangs upon it; and yet another, and still more serious, to place the Government of your country in the hands of men who are more than suspect of being themselves controlled by organisations hostile to the Constitution.

It is true that all the available evidence goes to show that the extremists have steadily dwindled in numbers and influence. Documents seized by the police, and published in reply to Parliamentary challenge, make it clear that as long ago as December 1927 the membership of that secret parliament which claims to wield the legislative powers of the Republic, had been reduced, in the words of their President, "from the original number of 128 to just 20, which was the original number to form a quorum." It further appears that, although this body "as it was constituted as the Government of the Republic, has descended and is now deposited with powers in those who may be termed the Faithful Surviving members of the Second Dáil" to the exclusion, of course, of those, including Mr. de Valera himself, whom the Irish electors chose to represent them at the last general election, the Faithful Ones, distracted by "bickerings between members of different Republican organisations," found themselves unable to agree upon any definite line of action whatever. And, if the semi-legalists of the "Second Dáil" are few, it is quite likely that the true believers in force and nothing but force are not much more numerous. But these are undoubtedly still banded together in organisations, only kept from dangerous activity by the strong hand of the present Government. Has Mr. de Valera definitely broken with them? or is he still trying, like those he left in 1927, "to see what he can do between those who believe altogether in physical force and those who believe in a certain amount of civil action"? No one knows. For weeks together he behaves just like any chief of a Parliamentary Opposition; and then quite suddenly he will begin to talk about "another battle of Clontarf" in which the British and their agents in this country, to wit the supporters of the Treaty, are cast for the part of the vanquished Danes, or he will declare that the title of the Dáil in which he sits is defective because it excludes men who refuse to take the oath required by the Constitution, and will hint that the true will of the People is to be found embodied in some other, unnamed, organisation.

I have dealt with this matter at some length because continued

doubt as to the real aims of Fianna Fáil policy is the kernel of the situation in the Free State. We know that Mr. de Valera's party stands for higher tariffs, for yet more gaelicisation. We know that he proposes to repudiate the financial agreements made with Great Britain, to retain in the Irish Exchequer the Land Purchase annuities, to abolish the Senate and office of Governor-General, and in some way, not yet revealed, to oblige the north-eastern counties to submit to the authority of an Irish Republic. All this is bad enough for those (and I am convinced they constitute a large majority) who think we have had trouble enough in our time without going out to look for more. Much worse in the eyes of all who care for orderly progress and the rule of law is the menace implied in Mr. de Valera's insistence that somewhere outside the Constitution is to be found expressed the true will of the people of Ireland and in some body of men not subject to the Civil government is the right to make that will prevail. Until that threat is withdrawn we shall not be quite without anxiety for the future of our country.

Meanwhile, as I have said, we make steady if unsensational progress towards better things. Recent harvests have been good, if prices are low; and the farmer who is wise enough to feed unsaleable crops to his cattle is not without reward. The Shannon Scheme is all but complete; and although some of the exaggerated hopes are unlikely to be fulfilled, those especially which pictured our scattered farmhouses equipped with electric light and power, there is the certainty that even our small towns will take full advantage of the supply of current now available. Bank deposits and the sales of National Savings Certificates are again on the increase; and everything points to a coming time of modest prosperity.

As for Mr. Blythe's latest Budget, it should surely dispose at last of that curious delusion still entertained by some people on both sides of the Channel, that the Free State will be driven by financial stress to solicit the favour of a new Legislative Union with Great Britain. It is true that items of abnormal expenditure, legacies of the passing of the old régime and of the civil war, still have to be reckoned with; but year by year we get nearer to normal conditions and a perfectly balanced Budget. Expenditure under all heads, save education, has shown a steady decline during the past eight years, while of late receipts have tended to expand. Our Budget has been called humdrum—a term rather of praise than reproach. A 3s. income-tax and a national debt equal to less than one year's revenue at existing rates of taxation are things which some of our neighbours may not improbably envy us. And if some of our own emigrés, or if some not of our household, should decide that Mr. Blythe's whips are to be preferred to Mr. Snow-

den's scorpions, I can assure them that, notwithstanding anxieties already mentioned, their act of faith is not likely to lead them into trouble. One can say of the political, as Mr. Blythe said of the financial, outlook, "Every indication points to the conclusion that, although the improvement in the country's health is gradual, it is unbroken." Irish people are drinking less and (there is some reason to believe) are thinking more. Old prejudices slowly die; and old quarrels are forgotten. Within the last few days the Vice-President of the Council took occasion to pay a generous tribute to the work of the old Parliamentary Party; while the loyalty of former Unionists, in and out of the Dáil, to a régime with some of whose symbols their sympathy must needs be imperfect, is widely recognised. It is pleasant also to notice that the Committee which recently examined the grievances of the Irish soldiers of the Great War found nothing to show that these men had suffered from any ill will either on the part of the Government or of their neighbours. Such grievances as were established, unemployment and difficulty in procuring houses at sufficiently low rents, are common to the general body of unskilled labour. Sectarian troubles are happily unknown in the Free State, though the discreditable efforts of one or two *soi-disant* "Catholic" papers to muddy the waters not long ago evoked well-deserved rebuke from a distinguished Jesuit. In this respect, at any rate, the Free State presents an agreeable contrast to the six counties, where the quarrel over provided and non-provided schools has once more broken out, and where in this and other respects the Catholic minority appears to suffer under galling disabilities.

Probably the worst thing that can be said of the present Free State Ministry is that it has done less than one could wish to keep social services on a level with those of our neighbours. In dealing with unavoidable unemployment it has relied mainly upon occasional relief schemes to supplement a reformed Poor Law, under which outdoor relief (now known as Home Assistance) is given somewhat more generously than in the past. Unemployment Benefit exists, but not the "dole." We have not followed Great Britain in making provision for widows' pensions or in lowering the age at which old age pensions can be claimed. Similarly housing legislation has so far failed to touch our city slums, although the fall in building costs and interest may before long make it possible for municipalities to deal with this most grievous of social evils without laying an excessive burden on either rate-or taxpayer. I am myself inclined to the opinion that in these matters the Government has, if anything, been over-cautious. Nevertheless, a Ministry that steadily refuses to do the easy and

immediately popular thing is a sufficiently rare phenomenon to command respect. Rightly or wrongly, Mr. Cosgrave and his colleagues have steadily refused to increase the load of taxation, considering that the first need of the country is to build its economic life on a sure foundation and that in the improvement of agriculture and in the gradual growth of urban industry lies the sole permanent cure for unemployment and the miseries it brings.

A word or two on matters of another kind must be added to this hasty summary. Everyone who cares at all for literature in these islands mourns the passing of the *Irish Statesman* and the silencing, at least for a time, of A. E.'s voice, never raised but in wise judgment. One hopes, without much assurance, that he and his paper may presently find worthy successors. Meantime, we are left without one single weekly review in which life and literature are reflected from an Irish angle; while the sudden death of Mr. James Good has almost simultaneously deprived us of the best brain given in recent years to Irish journalism.

It is more agreeable to record that Irish drama still shows signs of active life both in Belfast and in Dublin. In the latter city the "Abbey" has now a friendly rival in the newly established Gate Theatre, which not only affords playgoers an opportunity of seeing the plays of many foreign authors hitherto unknown to us, but has also discovered a fresh crop of native playwrights.

For a last word I turn to a matter of more general interest. When in 1926 the Imperial Conference accepted Lord Balfour's formula describing the United Kingdom and the Dominions as "autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations," there were many here, as in Great Britain, who believed these to be empty words. Since then we have had the report of the Conference on the operation of Dominion Legislation. Passing over the recommendations relating to Merchant Shipping, as at present of relatively small interest to the Free State, it is now agreed (provisionally upon the concurrence of the next Dominion Conference itself):

1. "That the power of disallowance can no longer be exercised in relation to Dominion legislation"—the Irish Free State Constitution making anyhow no provision for the exercise of such power.

2. That reservation must in the Dominions "be regarded as a statutory and not as prerogative power," which "if exercised at all, can only be exercised in accordance with the constitutional practice in the Dominion"; that the United Kingdom Government "will not advise H.M. the King to give

the Governor-General any instructions to reserve Bills presented to him for assent"; that advice "will not be tendered to His Majesty by H.M. Government in the United Kingdom against the views of the Government of the Dominion concerned"; and finally, that no obstacle will be placed in the way of any Dominion that desires so to amend its constitution as to abolish altogether the power of reservation, discretionary or compulsory.

3. "That the Parliament of a Dominion has full power to make laws having extra-territorial operation."

4. That the Colonial Laws Validity Act shall cease to apply to any laws made by the Parliament of a Dominion, and that "no law hereafter made by the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall extend to any Dominion otherwise than at the request of that Dominion."

5. "That any alteration in the Law touching the succession to the Throne or the Royal style and Titles shall hereafter require the assent as well of the Parliaments of all the Dominions as of the Parliament of the United Kingdom."

Lastly, in those matters in which uniformity throughout the Commonwealth is desirable on the ground of common concern or practical convenience, this end, hitherto secured through Acts of the Imperial Parliament of general application, is henceforward to be sought "by means of concurrent or reciprocal action based upon agreement."

It is not easy to see how the principle of co-equality could in practice be pushed much further. One can understand an Englishman asking what is left of the Empire of his fathers. What is really incomprehensible is that Irishmen should continue to complain of restraints on freedom which have ceased to exist either in practice or theory. It is acknowledged that during the eight years of the Free State's existence neither Westminster nor Downing Street has ever attempted to interfere in our affairs; it is plain that no such interference can henceforth be attempted without infringing the rights of the entire Commonwealth. To one inquiring what good things now denied a Republic would bring us, answer was made: "We should have that for which the martyrs died." The question was, perhaps, as simple as the reply, since to speak of work-a-day things to those who think in terms of mystical religion is to set oneself down a fool. One can but keep silence, and make sure that the fire extinguisher is handy, should occasion arise.

HUGH A. LAW.

EVANGELICAL CATHOLICITY:

THE approach of the Lambeth Conference is turning the minds of men in all the Churches once more to the subject of Reunion, in the hope that some noteworthy results may be gained from the *Appeal to all Christian People* issued ten years ago and that a fresh advance may be made towards the attainment of its ideal. Fresh appeals are being made; renewed warnings are being given. The ten years that have elapsed have not been unfruitful. The leading Presbyterian Churches of Scotland have become united; British Methodism is on the point of being united. The United Church of Canada—embracing Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Methodists—is now in working order. Fruitful discussions have taken place, not only between Anglicans and Evangelical Free Churchmen in this country, but between all the Churches, save that of Rome, at Lausanne. In particular, the Lambeth Conference will be called upon to pass its judgment on the South Indian Scheme of Union. It need only be added that the world events and movements of the past ten years have combined to emphasise the urgency of the problem.

In these circumstances, it is natural that ecclesiastical statesmen should cast about to discover a practical scheme, embodying both a working Constitution, founded upon primitive and fixed principles, and also the most hopeful way of its gradual realisation. There are many, however, who think that, while all such attempts are useful, not only for their practical results but even more for the spirit of mutual understanding and of co-operation that is fostered by them, it is still more important to reach a common point of view, by means of which all practical efforts may be guided. It may, therefore, be useful to attempt to show, from the standpoint of so-called Evangelical Christianity, how complex is the situation with which we have to deal, what factors are involved in it, and what are the vital influences that despite "our unhappy divisions" are making for true Catholicity. Due regard to all these conditions would set Faith and Order in their proper relations to one another, and would deliver all concerned from taking such static views of Church organisation as would hamper the living energies of the Divine and Catholic Spirit of Christ.

1. The most important consideration to be borne in mind is that the Church of Christ is by its very nature a highly complex institution. It depends upon the co-existence and inter-activity of three essential factors. These are the fact of Christ, the response of Faith in Him, and the Fellowship of the faithful with Him and with one another in Him. This community of Fact, Faith, and Fellowship is the spiritual Reality, which, high above

all organisation, holds Christians together alike in their united and local Communion and also universally. That they are so held together, despite manifold differences, is shown by the fact that, in a large measure, they hold the same theology, sing the same hymns, and interpret human life from the same point of view. Christian Thought, Worship, and Activity, by their very nature, leave sectarian differences beneath them and behind. Organisation, in varying degrees, supports, trains, and directs this common life, but does not create it. Its source is in Christ Himself.

The spiritual and creative Headship of Christ explains the unity and interactivity of Fact, Faith, and Fellowship which constitutes His Church. "*Ubi Christus ibi Ecclesia.*" The Fact of Christ may be set forth, in detailed fullness, in Creeds, the Faith may find expression in Sacraments and rites of worship, and Fellowship may be organised in visible Communion. Yet, on these levels, they tend to fall apart and to sink below their true significance. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." The Real Presence of Christ vivifies the Creeds, transforms the Sacraments and worship, transfigures the Fellowship, and fuses all three into a mystic Whole. Each communion of Christians is conscious of this mystic unity, seeks to foster and to express its sense of it, as the essential truth of its existence. Yet the Church is both Universal and local. By its very nature it is One, yet it gathers together many races, with differing temperaments, traditions, and modes of thought, living in different circumstances, in different ages, under widely different conditions, compelled to confront differing crises. The more Catholic it becomes, the more its component parts vary in all these respects. In ancient times Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Carthage, Rome exemplify this inevitable manifestation of Catholicity in difference. If the Church be a *living* Institution it must recognise and serve itself of these differences, must reconcile and not suppress them.

2. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the Church, as an historic institution, exists everywhere and in every age in the midst of an enviroing world. This environment exerts influences upon it that are, at one and the same time, fostering and moulding, hostile or corrupting, within an outlying mass of ignorance and indifference. This fact is generally acknowledged as a truism, but is imperfectly realised as a truth. Accommodation, whether individual or collective, to accepted, though un-Christian, standards of life is generally recognised as having endangered the Church in every age and is beside the purpose of this article. Other consequences, however, must be taken into account. Some have been intellectual; for example, Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics have been a potent influence, enviroing the thought of the Church.

Some have been political and constitutional. The terms Presbyter, Bishop, Pope, even *Ecclesia*, for example, come to us charged with suggestions of derivation and moulding from the institutional environment of the Church. Ethically and socially some of the regulations of the Church betray, not only assimilation to, but extreme reaction from, enviroing abuses. It is a mistake to treat such Puritan self-defence against abuses as the essential attitude of the Christian Religion.

All this seems dangerous, at first sight, to "the good seed of the Kingdom." Yet, if there be a Divine Providence in regard to seed, it must extend also to soil and climate. Isolation is, on a large scale, impossible. On a large view it must be treated as contrary to the Divine purpose and Sovereignty, and, therefore, undesirable. Our Lord's parables of Seed and Soil, of Leaven and Lump, of Wheat and Tares are sufficient indication that He regarded frank contact with and living interaction between His Church and its environment as not only inevitable, but beneficial. Yet, if this be true, the principle cannot be limited by the past. Christians are not entitled to speak of "Noster Plato," or in effect of "Noster Thomas Aquinas," as entitling them to exclude, and even excommunicate, all subsequent philosophy. Nor are they entitled so to stereotype their borrowings and adaptations of political or social offices from the earliest ages, as to debar themselves from following an exactly similar process in modification of the past, if that method be indicated as beneficial to the Life of the Church, which consists, as has been said, in the Mystic Unity of Fact, Faith, and Fellowship.

3. For it must be borne in mind that the Church, by reason of its nature and its commission, is living and energetic. At the lowest this is the essential condition of its survival in a world like ours; still more to any leadership in thought and life. Most of all is this essential if the Church is to fulfil its Divine Commission to "make disciples of all the nations." Its activity may, here or there, be that of perversity or even of decay. But static it cannot possibly be. Hence no static formula or regulation can possibly be a true reflection of the history of the Church. Attempts have been made to establish the definition of Victor of Lérins, "*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,*" as such a formula of Catholicity. Only intellectual juggling can perform this feat, even in regard to the undivided Church, directly this agreement is pressed beyond the complex simplicity of the Fact, the Faith and the consequent Fellowship, which are original and universal. The Unity of the Church can be found ultimately only in community of spiritual attitude; neither in formulation of beliefs, which has varied, nor in constitution, which has been

by its very nature consequent and subordinate. Hence, even the Roman Church has been constrained to admit the fact of development, of which its own history is a patent example. It has only saved the doctrine of its immutability by the vain endeavour to represent its development as self-enclosed and as the economic unfolding of an original and secret deposit, the explanation of which is, at once, profounder and more obvious than its authoritative doctrine admits.

4. The mystic unity of Fact, Faith, and Fellowship which constitutes the Church must needs be interpreted on the intellectual and organised on the practical side. It must create a Theology, establishing it both as a coherent system and offering it as a philosophy that is not merely consistent with but explanatory of Reality as a whole. The Church must also organise its Life, so as to provide for its expression in worship, for its unfolding and perpetuation as truth, for its propagation throughout the world.

Yet the very fact of its Catholicity involves that in carrying out both its intellectual and its practical tasks, it must serve itself by the frankest and fullest intercourse and exchange with the life of mankind. While true and because true to its Mystic Life, it must interpret its meaning by the help of the universal human thought and must promote its fellowship by the help of the universal human organisation, which, if its fundamental Faith be true, have come into being "through and unto" Christ, "in Whom all things hold together." This is obviously true of its most influential thinkers. Where would Augustine have been as a systematic thinker without Plato, Thomas Aquinas without Aristotle, Calvin without the Stoics? In these outstanding examples an universal necessity becomes apparent. The same necessity extends, as has already been suggested, to ecclesiastical organisation. Nor can this twofold relationship be restricted to the achievements of the past. It must needs exist in the present and throughout the future.

This continuous interpretation and organisation is not creative of the fundamental reality of Fact, Faith, and Fellowship, the secret of which lies deeper than Creeds and Constitutions. Interpretation and organisation, while essential, are, at the best, but instrumental and therefore secondary. They must be tested continually according to their adequacy to exhibit the Fact, express the Faith, and promote the Fellowship, the threefold existence of which is of the *esse*, the vigour and proportion of which are of the *bene esse* of the Church.

5. It follows from these positions that it is inevitable that the Church should manifest its life, in thought and activity, by

means of an unity that is multiform. Within its fellowship countless limited minds must needs be engaged, according to the measure of their power, in interpreting and setting forth a transcendent Reality. Leaders must arise, and even following involves the exercise of choice and loyalty that is more or less intelligent. That the Church is Catholic means that it exists locally in widely different situations and temporally in widely different ages. The crises that have arisen have been of necessity dealt with locally by men and movements of widely differing traditions, mentality, and associations. Even had the Church always lived on its ideal plane, the very fact of its Catholicity must needs have led to a rich diversity—to variations, which are the sign and not the injury of life. How much more must this have been the case by reason of the many lapses of the Church, here and there, and of all the frailties that are characteristic of imperfect, even if well-intentioned men!

It is of the nature of vital variations and still more of movements of reform in human society that they should attract those who are like-minded, bringing them into intimate relations of thought and endeavour. In the course of such inevitable processes fresh types are developed which, even if they involve negative protests, are yet essentially positive, and in so far as they rest upon the threefold foundation of Fact, Faith, and Fellowship bring aspects and interests of Catholic Truth and life to effective recognition, even at the expense of disproportionate emphasis upon them.

The excessive restriction of the Roman Church—the authoritarian regulation, which is the mark of its spiritual Romanisation—has within its own borders suppressed or severely limited these processes of vigorous spiritual life. But at what cost! At the cost of taking its starting-point from the period of its own deepest degradation, of including in its intellectual and practical life much that should have been rejected, and of excluding by its anathemas many influences of thought and activity which have not only enriched the general life while Rome has been impoverished, but have set up excessive and needless antagonism between the Church and human progress. This unhappy issue should give a salutary warning to all those who in other Communion may be tempted to adopt a similar policy, even if in attenuated and feebler forms.

The grave mistake throughout these processes of past history has been that the so-called Catholic and the Protestant Churches have denied their own Catholicity. They have treated one another, at least officially, as outside the Catholic Unity as a whole. In some cases they have well-nigh lost the sense that

there is a Catholic unity or, at the most, have treated it as a "pattern laid up in heaven." The only way of Christian Reunion is to treat all those who in St. Paul's phrase "hold the Head" as being, by reason of that decisive fact, within the Unity of the Catholic Church.

6. It follows from all this that the Universal Church under human conditions must needs pass through three successive phases, Homogeneity, Differentiation, and Synthetic gathering together into an Unity which is completed and enriched, not in spite, but by means of the differentiation which has gone before. The proviso "under human conditions" will be objected to by Roman Catholics and perhaps by some others. It is the point of the Roman Catholic doctrine that the Church as One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, must needs have been supernaturally preserved from such human conditions as involve the differentiation that has taken place. A survey of the historic facts and of the resultant situation shows how ill-founded is the claim and at what tragic cost it is maintained. Apart, however, from such considerations, the dogma appears to be out of harmony with the whole principle of the Incarnation and with the methods of the Divine Spirit. Excessive emphasis, moreover, upon a Divinely guaranteed immunity of the Church from the risks of human conditions carries with it an exaggerated depreciation of these conditions, and insufficient recognition of the meaning of St. Paul's declaration that all things "hold together" in and for Christ.

Rigidity is the foe of expanding life. The Catholicity of the Church is to be found, not in imposed organisation, but in unity of origin and unity of end, in the immanent unity of experience and meaning, which organises the process from unity of origin to unity of end. Herein is to be found the very essence of Catholicity, the secret of the means by which differentiation is bound together in a spiritual evolution, which will eventually gather together the several contributions of the differentiated parts into the comprehensive fulfilment of perfected Catholic Unity. This process seems to be indicated in the great saying of St. Paul, "Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown Man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. iv, 13). The mystical union of Fact, Faith, and Fellowship, which constitutes the Catholic Church, rests upon and is informed by Christ Central, Christ Redemptive and Spiritual, Christ Sovereign over the whole of human life.

The vision of all this is becoming steadily clearer to increasing numbers of people in all Christian Communion. As the vision

becomes clearer, the sense of practical calling becomes ever more urgent and constraining. Despite all our differences, there is a fundamental and general unity of faith in the facts of the Gospel, in their interpretation, whether formally credal or not, and in the common consciousness of fellowship with Christ and of access to God through Him. The difficulty lies in giving full effect to that fellowship with one another, the Catholicity of which is immanent, within the more limited fellowships that bind together the several communions. Men have erroneously treated the peculiar intimacy of faith, when held in complete theoretic and practical agreement, as being the only real and the sufficing fellowship of the Christian Church, or Churches. The spiritual task of the present time is to recognise and give full effect to the immanent Catholicity, which is implicit in the fellowship with Christ, which is the vital experience of every part. Till such full recognition is reached and acted upon all-round schemes of Reunion will be artificial and ineffectual. When it is reached, difficulties which appear at present to be insuperable will be overcome, because they will be reduced to their proper proportions, and will lose their rigidity under the vital, and therefore plastic, influences of a common organising faith.

For those who see the situation in this light the immediate practical consequences are clearly manifest.

I. All the Churches should seek to bring about a reunion in which the emphasis shall be spiritual and the organisation inclusive and elastic. The unity exists, despite all hesitations about, or even denials of, the fact. It has been continuous throughout history, despite the divisions of East and West, of the Reformation, and of the rise of the Evangelical Free Churches. Seeing that the Fact of Christ is one and the response of Faith, however mediated, is common, this primary and truly Catholic reality should be treated as the firm foundation upon which an universal, but not uniform, fellowship should be based, with such comprehensive and plastic organisation as may best secure full enjoyment and expression of it.

II. As the indispensable condition of this endeavour, mutual recognition and appreciation on the part of all the Churches must become universal and habitual. It is often declared that inter-communion must be the final act of consummated reunion, and that to sanction it "before we are all agreed" would be hypocritical. But what disagreement, if it exist, can be more than the "small dust of the balance" in comparison of the highest, deepest, and largest agreement in the mystic reality of Fact, Faith, and Fellowship which are constitutive of the Church?

III. The immediate aim should be to bring about the organic

union of similars, care being taken that such unions should preserve, so far as possible, all that is permanently valuable in the "deposit," *ethos* and freedom of the several uniting bodies.

IV. There should be the utmost possible co-operation between dissimilars, not restricted by the reservation "despite our differences," but inspired by the principle, "because of our agreement."

V. The process towards reunion, in all its parts and in regard to all its concerns, should be dominated and directed by supreme regard to the mystic trinity, which is constitutive of true Catholicity.

J. SCOTT LIDGETT.

• THE CENTENARY OF T. E. BROWN.*

THOMAS EDWARD BROWN was born on May 5th, 1830, at Douglas, where his father, Robert Brown, was incumbent of St. Matthew's Church. His mother was Dorothy Thomson, born in the Isle of Man, but of Scottish extraction. There was thus a mingling in him of Manx and Scottish, Keltic and Saxon, blood. He was the sixth of ten children, and when he was two years old his father was made vicar of Kirk Braddan, near Douglas. Here Brown's early years from 1832 to 1847 were spent, and to them he looks back in the poem *Braddan Vicarage*, wondering

if in that fair isle
Some child is growing now, like me,
When I was child; care-pricked, yet healed the while
With balm of rock and sea.

That healing influence of rock and sea was to be with Brown to the last.

And another dominant element in the racial medley of these formative years was the "dear brave old Scotchman," the manservant John McCullough, the Covenanter who prayed that his Episcopalian "Maister," the Vicar, might stand fast on the rock of sure foundation, to whom Brown paid such a nobly tender and humorous tribute in the verses *Old John*:

Old John, if in the battle of this life
I have not sought your precepts to fulfil;
If ever I have stirred ignoble strife;
If ever struck foul blow, as bent to kill,
Not conquer: by the love you bear me still,
O! intercede that I may be forgiven.
Stern Protestant—not pray to saints? I will
To you in Heaven.

At the age of fifteen Brown entered King William's College, which has played such a great part in the educational and cultural life of the Isle of Man. Among his contemporaries were F. W. Farrar, Thomas Fowler, and J. M. Wilson, who says even of those early days that "wherever Brown was, life was fullest."

In October 1849 he went to Oxford as a Servitor at Christ Church. The Servitor was a relic, soon to be abolished, of eighteenth-century class-distinctions at the University. The position was galling to a proud and sensitive spirit, and it was a bar to his election to a Studentship after he had gained in 1853 a Double First. Oriel made amends by electing him to a Fellowship, but he soon returned to his Island as Vice-Principal of King William's College. In 1857 he married his cousin, Miss Stowell, and his wider responsibilities led him in 1861 to seek a new post in the headmastership of

* From a Lecture delivered before the Royal Society of Literature.
VOL. CXXXVII

And so you constant taught
This earthly Clifton, loved Bartholomew.
Bides yet a Clifton in the chiefest Heaven:
The *avro*-Clifton God has made for us.

Among others not so prominent in Brown's letters and poems were such original thinkers as T. W. Dunn and C. E. Vaughan, scientific pioneers like W. T. Tilden, W. A. Shenstone, and G. H. Wollaston, and the heads of the "military and engineering side," H. S. Hall and F. H. Stevens. With such a staff of "all the talents" and with Brown as chief lieutenant on the Modern Side, the two successive headmasters, Percival and Wilson, made it their aim to combine in Clifton the traditional ideals and studies of the older public schools with the newer subjects that were claiming a place in the curriculum, and with the specialised work necessary for entrance into the services and other professional careers. The same aim, broadly speaking, was being pursued in the other chief scholastic foundations of the mid-nineteenth century, Marlborough, Haileybury, Wellington, Radley, and Rossall. The second half of that century is therefore one of the fateful periods in English education. With the twentieth century arose another problem, the expansion of secondary school education in the day schools.

Of Brown's remarkable powers as a teacher, to which there are many testimonies, I cannot speak at first-hand, as I was on the "Classical Side." Some memories of his humorous and trenchant addresses to the school or the House I have related elsewhere. But there were some memorable Saturday evenings in the House which must be recalled. On these Brown delighted, and somewhat mystified, us by reading out, with all his peculiar force and fire, narrative poems in an unfamiliar dialect. He said nothing about their authorship, and it was only after I had left Clifton that I learnt that the boys of Brown's House had had the privilege of hearing some of the *Fo'c's'le Yarns* from the lips of their creator, and in fact before they had reached the outside world. For though *Betsy Lee* had appeared in 1873, and other poems had been printed in a local newspaper or in semi-private booklets, it was not till 1881 (in which year my life in Brown's House ended) that Brown made a definite approach to the general body of readers by the publication of the first series of *Fo'c's'le Yarns*. In this volume *Betsy Lee* was reprinted, with three other narrative tales in verse, *Christmas Rose*, *Captain Tom* and *Captain Hugh*, and *Tommy Big-Eyes*. A second series followed in 1887, entitled *The Doctor and Other Poems*, and a third in 1889, *The Manx Witch and Other Poems*. In *Fo'c's'le Yarns* we have Brown's most distinctive, though perhaps not his finest, poetic achievement. It was his aim:

To sing a song shall please my countrymen;
To unlock the treasures of the Island heart.

The stranger, if he lent a favouring ear, would be welcomed:

Natheless, for mine own people do I sing,
And use the old familiar speech.

This speech is a form of local dialect. I do not know how philologists would label it, but it may be broadly described as a homely type of vernacular English with an admixture of phrases derived from the original Manx tongue of the Island. It is not a speech that appeals to everyone. Thus Professor Saintsbury in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. XIII, ch. vi, assails it as "not a real dialect, but an ugly bastard *patois* or rather jargon of broken-down Celtic and the vulgarest English." And even those who cannot accept so harsh a judgment must admit that Anglo-Manx is not such a natural instrument of the Muses as that Anglo-Irish speech, whose liquid rhythms began, also in the 'eighties, to find their mouthpiece in Mr. W. B. Yeats. But it is the most convincing proof of Brown's genius that from what on other lips might have been a "scrannel pipe" he drew such authentic and such varied harmonies. And all this in one of the simplest of metrical forms, the rhyming couplet with four beats, which is used throughout the three series of *Fo'c's'le Yarns*. With skilful and subtle art, which is hidden under the home-spun diction, Brown continually varies the rhythm of his couplets and prevents it from becoming jog-trot or monotonous. With apparently effortless ease, he can make it completely malleable. It adjusts itself, without jolt or jar, to all purposes—narrative, description, dialogue, reflection, characterisation. That is the hall-mark of the born story-teller in verse from the time of Chaucer downward, and it is a gift that the Muse has too often withheld from her otherwise favoured children.

The *Yarns* are held together by the figure of Tom Baynes, "old salt, old rip, old friend," into whose mouth they are put. Outwardly he was modelled on a Peel sailor, but in essence he is Brown himself, or that part of him which was "the Kelt a good deal hardened and corrupted by the Saxon." These are his words in a letter of November 4th, 1882, to J. R. Mozley, which continues: "That is Tom Baynes, that is myself in fact. I never stopped for a moment to think what Tom Baynes should be like; he simply is I . . . so when I am alone I think and speak to myself always as he does." The events and experiences associated with Tom Baynes in *Betsy Lee* and other of the *Yarns*, are, of course, imaginary, but the "old salt" in his humour, his tenderness, his breadth of sympathy, his justice of outlook on men and things, is a dramatic projection of his creator who was known (as I am told) as Tom Brown in the Island.

Don't we hear the very voice of Brown when Baynes in *Betsy Lee* cries out against the rules and regulations of a "Sailors' Home"?:

A bell for dinner, and a bell for tay,
And a bell to sing, and a bell to pray,
And a bell for this, and a bell for that,
And "wipe your feet upon the mat."
And the rules hung up, and fined if you're late,
And a chap like a bobby shutting the gate—
It is'n rais'nable, it is'n,
They calls it a Home, I calls it a Pris'n.

And near to Tom Baynes stands "Pazon Gale," a brother in spirit, however apart in calling and class. Pazon Gale was drawn mainly from Mr. Corrin, Vicar of Kirk Christ, Rushen, in the south of the Island, whom Brown called "quite the dearest and noblest old man I ever met." But there was blended in the character traits from Brown's father, as Wordsworth's "Happy Warrior" unites features of his sailor brother and of Nelson. He is one of that noble company of the cloth, Chaucer's "povre persoun," Fielding's "Parson Adams," Goldsmith's "Vicar of Wakefield," who are in the world yet are unspotted by it.

Pazon Gale—now I'll give you his size,
He was a simple pazon, and lovin' and wise—
That's what he was, and quiet uncommon,
And never said much to man nor woman;
Only the little he said was meat
For a hungry heart, and soft and sweet.

Around Tom Baynes and Pazon Gale jostle in the various *Yarns* a motley crowd of Manx sailors, miners, and farmers, of doctors and lawyers, mothers and wives, girls of high and low degree, "childer," and such strongly individual figures as the Manx Witch and the hypocritical "local" preacher. With all their differences of detail the chief *Yarns* have the same basic theme of star-crossed love. The rivalries of wooers, the pride and credulity of parents, the machinations of cheats and hypocrites, delay or defeat the union of twin souls. Thus the *Yarns* deal with primitive emotions and elemental things—love and hate, jealousy and fear, broken hearts and shattered lives. Beneath all that is homely and humorous on the surface these tales of Manxland have something of the stark quality of the sagas of the greater island in the Arctic seas. But they always close on notes of forgiveness and reconciliation.

But the Doric flute of the Island was not Brown's only poetic instrument. There have been singers, of whom Burns is the most illustrious, who can make immortal music in their native dialect, but who become flat when they turn to standard England. "Brown was *doctus utriusque linguæ*. His purely English poems show him as

master of an Attic style, lucid, polished, fastidiously exact. I doubt if anyone would have believed, on purely internal evidence, that the writer who had been content with the four-beat couplet for thousands of lines in *Fo'c's'le Yarns* could have shown in the more limited field of his English verse such an astonishing virtuosity of craftsmanship. Brown seems able to do what he likes with words, rhymes, and metre. There are the eight-lined stanzas of *Old John*, with their arresting short double-rhyming line at the close of each stanza; the ten-lined stanzas, with their intricate rhyming scheme, addressed to his godson "Childe Dakyns"; the more fluid structure of the strophes to the "Childe's" father, with the haunting refrain, "three places, Dakyns"; or of the meta-physical musings in *Dartmoor*, and of the sketches and character-studies in *Roman Women*.

To some of these English poems, dealing with early memories, with Manx scenes and characters, or with Clifton friendships and associations I have already referred. Others, like *My Garden*, *The Schooner* and *Opifex* have won their way into the anthologies. There is a group of which *Dartmoor* is representative, inspired by a passionate intellectualism that seals Brown of the tribe of Donne. And it is the exaltation of the true mystic that thrills through the lyrics, unique in their kind, of which the scene is laid in Heaven—*The Prayers*, *The Organist in Heaven*, *Chalse a Killey*, and *Catherine Kinrade*. In his vision of Catherine's forgiveness before the Throne of her episcopal persecutor Brown drew from one of the ugliest episodes in Manx annals inspiration for the greatest of his apocalyptic poems, which enshrines the quintessence of his creed:

A voice: "Be reconciled!"
So to his side the children crept,
And Catherine kissed him, and he wept.
Then said a seraph:—"Lo, he is forgiven."
And for a space again there was no voice in Heaven!

In July 1892 Brown resigned his Clifton mastership, and henceforth made his home in the Island, though he declined the offer of the Archdeaconry. Letter-writing, lecturing, and contributions to reviews occupied most of his time. But it was not unfitting that the last scene came at Clifton, on October 29th, 1897, when he was addressing the boys in the hall of his old House, and had a sudden seizure from which he never recovered consciousness. It was in that hall that I had first heard him speak to the House twenty years before. And now its walls echo to me the words:

Ah, did you once see Shelley plain?
And did he stop and speak to you?

In my years in Brown's House, I saw "Shelley plain." I came, as a schoolboy, into contact with a man of genius. He was not the only poet whom the public schools could claim in the last decades of the nineteenth century. William Johnson Cory, the delicate lyricist of *Ionica* (1858), remained as a master of Eton till 1872. Edward Bowen in 1886 published that volume of Harrow Songs, including *Forty Years On* and *Willow the King*, which have found echoes in hearts far beyond "the Hill"; E. D. A. Morshead at Winchester issued in 1881 his notable translation of the Æschylean trilogy of *The House of Atreus*. And doubtless there were other scholastic devotees of the Muse. But Brown stands above them in a class apart. There are many Victorians whose laurels are by now somewhat faded. But the fame of Thomas Edward Brown, schoolmaster, letter-writer, and poet, was never higher than in this, his centenary year, and will prove, as I believe, imperishable.

FREDERICK S. BOAS.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON LABOUR IN INDIA.

THE Royal Commission on Labour in India, with the Right Hon. J. H. Whitley, ex-Speaker of the House of Commons, as its chairman, was appointed in January 1929 "to inquire into and report on the existing conditions of labour in industrial undertakings and plantations in British India, on the health, efficiency, and standards of living of the workers and on the relations between employers and employed and to make recommendations." The Commission has just returned from its first tour of India and it is well worth considering the nature and the magnitude of the problems which confronted them. Another reason for the necessity of an examination of this kind is to be found in the fact that the recent political developments in India rendered it impossible for the Commission to obtain an adequate hearing, which it eminently deserved.*

Few people realise the actual nature of the labour problems in India. There is a widespread belief that India is primarily and predominantly agricultural and that problems of labour as understood in the West are non-existent. But a close examination of the statistics relating to India would remove this erroneous impression. According to the last industrial census of India (1921) the following facts come to light. In the jute industry India leads the world. In cotton she holds the fifth place. She has a considerable industry in railway and steel products, paper mills, match factories, foundries, dockyards, and others—to mention a few industrial undertakings at random. The same census also indicates that sixteen million people are engaged in various industrial pursuits. Transport employs two million people, while mining comprises a quarter of a million souls. Thus eighteen and a quarter million people make up these three chief divisions of industrial activity in India. Another index to the recent industrial advance in India will be found in the desirable spectacle that during the fiscal year 1927-28 (the latest year for which figures are available) India had exported to foreign countries manufactured articles to the extent of more than sixty million pounds sterling.

Again, India is listed by the International Labour Office as one of the eight principal industrial States of the world, and has a seat on its governing body. Apart from this external recognition of India's industrial importance, there is enough internal evidence to show that industrial and labour problems in India are of a very serious nature and demand careful and delicate handling. During

* On account of the special conditions obtaining in plantations I have left out their problems from the purview of this summary account.

1928-29 the number of industrial strikes totalled 203 as compared with 129 in 1927-28; the number of persons involved was as much as 506,851 as against 131,851 of the previous year; and the total number of working days lost was 31,647,404 which is greater than the total for the preceding five years put together. Of these latter the Bombay textile stoppage alone accounted for 23,347,620 which indicates the extreme concentration of the labour population in a very few localities in the country.

Labour problems in India are not generally understood in the West. In the first place Indian labour is extremely heterogeneous in its composition. People belonging to various castes and creeds, speaking numerous languages and dialects, and emigrating from different and distant parts of the country, are to be found huddled together in the insanitary *chawls* (tenement houses) of Bombay and the primitive *bustees* (employees' settlements) of Calcutta. Problems as wide apart as housing and dietary arrangements on the one hand and industrial and trade union combinations on the other are thus rendered difficult of solution. Differing standards of living—and there is a wide difference between the family budgets of vegetarian and non-vegetarian families as determined by the caste rules—make the establishment of a uniform cost-of-living index almost impossible. This inevitable regimentation of the labour force into watertight compartments at once militates against any provision for industrial amelioration and defies all sympathetic inquiry.

Labour in India is not a steady proposition. The cause of this undesirable feature is to be found in the agricultural situation of the country. Agriculture is not an industry which can be kept humming all the year round. The most enterprising of the teeming millions absorbed by this staple industry of the country (nearly 73 per cent. of the population in all) are always on the look-out for a lucrative opening in the nearest industrial town or city and more or less go on periodical pilgrimages during the slack season of the agricultural year. When once they reach the town in question they not only realise their dreams of making easy money, but fall into the hands of the ubiquitous money-lender, from whose hands perhaps they wanted to escape while still in their native villages. In the majority of cases the industrial labourer goes to the city without his family. Thus his body is usually in the industrial town while his heart is in his country home. These two peculiar characteristics make Indian labour inefficient, unsteady, and unreliable. The new emigrant labourer (and in Bombay more than 84 per cent. of the inhabitants were born outside the city) is drawn into the meshes of the vicious system of recruitment by "jobbers" which reduces him to the rank of a serf.

Disillusioned and lonely he forthwith becomes insubordinate and delinquent. At a very modest estimate there is at least 20 per cent. absenteeism among the industrial workers in India. A greater part of industrial unrest in the country can be easily traced to the undisputed control which "jobbers" have over the workers, the commissions they receive on their wages and the system of fines imposed with a view to stampede the workers into obedience.

Indian labour is extremely illiterate, ignorant and fatalistic in its outlook. These three weaknesses prevent all desire on their part to ameliorate their condition. It is very difficult to convince an illiterate and fatalistic labourer of the advantages to be derived from the fostering of the two sterling qualities of an upward look and thrift. His prejudices, superstitions, and ignorance make him easily inflammable material and the recent labour unrest in the country is greatly due to these characteristics. This does not in any way mean that the lot of the labouring classes is satisfactory. It is certainly not enviable. In the opinion of Lady Chatterjee, a competent authority, Bombay heads the list of the worst industrial cities of the world. Other industrial centres such as Calcutta, Cawnpore, Sholapore, and Madras are equally badly equipped in the matter of industrial welfare. Housing and sanitary arrangements are the urgent needs of labour in India at the present moment. Even a casual glance at Professor A. R. Burnett-Hurst's book *Labour and Housing in Bombay* gives the reader a shocking picture of the unwholesome atmosphere in which the industrial labour of the country is compelled to carry on its existence. Attempts to remedy or mitigate these evils have been made by some enterprising and philanthropic employers, but at the present moment the whole system stands for severe condemnation.

Employers in India have not as yet come to realise that the health and morale of the workers more than pay their way in the long run. Sweated labour was until recently the order of the day, while the *mabap* (patronising) attitude of the employers still prevails. Questions of industrial fatigue, convenient periods of rest in sub-tropical districts, facilities for recreation, schools for the half-timers and juvenile employees, crèches for the children of the women employees, adequate medical facilities in cases of accident, canteens, cloakrooms and bathing facilities, maternity benefits and unemployment insurance, and a host of other desirable adjuncts of a healthy industrial life as provided for in the West are unheard of in India except for single instances of care and vigilance on the part of employers here and there.

One of the most pressing needs of Indian labour is a living wage. Despite the admittedly huge post-war profits of the industrial magnates in India, the question of wages is still unsolved. The

post-war period saw a phenomenal rise in the wages-level, in fact the workers' earnings nearly doubled. But this did not in any way indicate any enhancement of the real wages. Food prices also rose in due, if not equal, proportion, while the pre-war wages-level was certainly iniquitous. Even at the present day nearly 50 per cent. of the industrial strikes in India owe their origin to wages disputes, and this certainly is a feature for regret since it does not allow any room for the consideration of the industrial welfare of the workers which, again, is admittedly very poorly organised. Among the deficiencies in the policy of the employers and the government may be pointed out the want of labour exchanges, truck acts, works committees, workmen's insurance, industrial medical service with a sufficient number of women medical officers, abolition of the system of fines and the suppression of the pernicious practice of "jobber" agency.

The conditions of women and child labour are worse than those of men labourers. Anyone who knows the social system of India and the effects of the climate on feminine and juvenile labour can easily appreciate the difficulties incurred in the activities of these industrial workers. The system of early marriage in India forces the girl worker into premature motherhood, while economic necessity compels her to be a factory-hand almost the whole of her lifetime. Again, climatic conditions and social ideas make for large families, and spinsterhood at will is unheard of in India. Frequent pregnancies among women workers living under unhealthy conditions militate against the efficiency and the longevity of feminine labour. Small wonder that the rates of infant mortality among the labour population in India (1921) were the highest in the world and are still keeping up their record: Poona, 876; Bombay, 667; Calcutta, 330; and Madras, 282, per thousand births. The case of juvenile labour is equally serious and demands the most sympathetic treatment.

In this article only a summary account of the activities of the Government of India in respect of labour conditions and of the growth and future of trade unionism can be offered. In the opinion of the author of the only work on industrial welfare in India,* the Government of India can justly claim the first place among State Governments for their efforts to protect the interests of the labourers. Industrial welfare in the West at the present day is undertaken by employers and voluntary organisations. This does not mean that State action is non-existent. A century of experience and experiments convinced the occidental communities that the closest possible attention paid to the conditions of labour

* P. S. Lokanathan: *Industrial Welfare in India*. (Madras University Publications. 1929.)

is beneficial to industry and the nation alike. In India industrial activity in its modern sense is purely a twentieth-century manifestation. But the Government of India have the benefit of British labour legislation and the experience of British industrial welfare workers at their disposal, and hence the rapid strides in the progress of labour legislation of the country. The Factory Acts of 1881, 1891, 1911, and 1922 followed in quick succession, and in less than fifty years the complexion of industrial activity in India has altered beyond recognition. The Workmen's Compensation Act of 1923, the Trade Union Act of 1926, the Trade Disputes Act of 1929, and the provision for adequate machinery for the functioning of boards of conciliation* at the discretion of the government, are some of the outstanding features of governmental activity in the protection of the rights of labourers and must be pronounced to be highly valuable. Still much remains to be done. It is hoped that the report of the Royal Commission on Labour in India will result in further beneficial legislation on the most desirable lines suited to local needs and indigenous conditions.

A short survey of the growth of the trade union movement in India is of particular value at the present moment. Attention has already been drawn to the serious situation created by labour strikes in India during the past two years. The present political situation also makes trade unionism a topic of first-class importance. Trade unionism in India is entirely a post-war phenomenon. The Madras Labour Union, the first of its kind, was established in 1918. During the days of acute industrial distress in India (1918-20) numerous unions sprang up in various parts of the country. They were mostly unions in name only. In fact they were no more than militant strike committees, brought together to engineer and conduct strikes and dissolved almost immediately after their objects had been achieved. Thus 75 per cent. of the unions established during those years came to early grief.

From the beginning trade unionism assumed a political character. The struggle for political freedom in India found a willing tool in the labour population of the country already chafing under the economic distress engendered by post-war conditions. Even at the present day the executives of the trade unions are controlled either by politicians or lawyers who, in the first instance, constitute themselves into *ad hoc* committees and then endeavour to enlist members of the denominations in which they were specially interested. The main reason for this feature of trade unionism in India will be found in the fact that industrial India is still in its adolescent stage and that Indian labour is illiterate and ignorant

* The Report of the Board of Conciliation on the Dohad Transfer Dispute, the first of its kind in India, reached this country only in March last.

of its rights. But it is hoped that the day when trade unions in India will be manned and directed by the workers themselves will not have to be long awaited.

To the credit of the trade unions in India it must be said that their activities have certainly helped to focus the attention of the public, the employers and the government on the vital issues of industrial welfare and the economic comfort of the labourers. Following in the wake of the Washington Conference of 1919 and the establishment of the International Labour Office at Geneva, the first All-India Trade Union Congress was held side by side with and under the ægis of the Indian National Congress, and has since functioned regularly as the official gathering of the representatives of trade unions in India. The trade unionists were able to secure a representative in the Indian Legislative Assembly, the lower house of the Indian Parliament, as well as one to be included in the workers' group of the Indian delegation to the annual sessions of the International Labour Conference. By persistent propaganda they were able to ventilate the grievances of the labour population in India, and finally to secure legal recognition in the Acts of 1926 and 1929. Just as the Labour Party in this country naturally allied itself with the Liberal Party during the early years of its struggles for political power, the trade union movement in India is at once a handmaid of and is controlled by the Congress Party. No serious objection could be taken to this alliance between these two distinct bodies, since the course of the history of the Labour movements in the West indicates the natural proletarian desire to achieve political power by means of an understanding with the most sympathetic groups in their national parliaments until they attain their political majority. The career of the Socialist and the Independent Labour Parties in this country is an instance in point.

But one significant feature of trade unionism in India must be noted, since the future of the movement and of industrial peace in India depends on it. The Tenth Session of the All-India Trade Union Congress was held at Nagpur during November-December 1929. The credentials of fifty-one unions with a membership of 189,436 were accepted, and fifty unions with a membership of 188,436 were represented. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who subsequently became President of the Indian National Congress, presided over the deliberations of this conference. Extremism was the keynote of the policy of the executive of the All-India Trade Union Congress. They passed resolutions repudiating the Royal Commission on Labour in India as having been appointed by an Imperialistic Government, accepted affiliation to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat and its continuance in respect of the

League against Imperialism, declared that any co-operation with the International Labour Office would be "a distinct betrayal of working-class interests" and finally expressed strong opinions as to the future of the Indian constitution. It may reasonably be said that the executive has openly declared itself in favour of communistic methods and organisation of society. These decisions resulted in a split in the Congress and twenty-four unions with a membership of over a hundred thousand seceded from the Congress and formed themselves into the Indian Trade Unions Federation; they condemned the "pronounced communist tendencies" of the minority group of the Congress which still goes under the original label of the All-India Trade Union Congress. This is a serious blow to genuine trade unionism in India and the welfare of the labour population in general. The future policy of the Trade Union Congress cannot be easily conjectured, but it must be realised that the welfare of the labourers in India will be greatly determined by its activities and influence.

LANKA SUNDARAM.

FRENCH JOURNALISM.

EVERYONE who can write in Paris is a journalist, whatever he may be besides, and as most people can write, there is an astonishing number of journalists. There is no hard and fast line between a journalist and a man of letters, and a journalist is regarded as belonging to a liberal profession. Every journalist has published or has written or is writing plays or novels or other books, and almost every novelist is ready to be a journalist at odd moments. Particularly is he ready to be a critic, and it occurs to nobody to object that there may be anything improper in his filling the double function. Books of poetry are reviewed by poets, and novels by novelists. There are not many dramatic critics who are not either playwrights or actors, and painters do not hesitate to write about the work of other painters. Although Paul Souday, the late literary critic of the *Temps*, wrote nothing but criticism, he was an exception, and one of the most illustrious of his predecessors in his chair was Anatole France. Antoine, the distinguished veteran among theatrical managers, is now a leading critic. So are Lugné-Poe, who is also a manager, and Paul Ginisty, who has been one, while Edmond Sée, Charles Méré, and Nozière are among the many playwrights who are also regular critics.

As Lord Salisbury was glad to think that in the Order of the Garter there was no silly nonsense about merit, so a Paris newspaper editor and his readers have no foolish illusion that criticism can be impartial. What they want is somebody who knows what he is writing about and can express his opinions in a well-written article. What they want, in fact, is a personality. The French newspaper reader wants the personal touch in all that he reads, and consequently a daily paper in Paris is, not only in its criticism but in all its departments, a far more personal thing than a newspaper in London or New York. Everything is signed, including the political leading article, and even including the police-court reports, which are written in a frankly personal way. The political writer is no doubt occasionally inspired by the owner of the paper, but he takes the responsibility of signing—or of resigning.

As for the criticism of books, plays, and pictures, it is not the newspaper which is asked by publishers, authors, and painters to give its opinion, but the critic who is invited in his personal capacity. Review copies are sent direct to the critic, with an affectionate autograph dedication from the author on the title-page. Tickets for the *répétitions générales* of new plays—always two tickets, so that the critic may bring his wife or other companion—are sent to him at his private address. Moreover an author, a painter, or an actor will not fail to send a word of thanks on a

visiting-card to a critic in recognition of a favourable notice. I do not say that there are not papers, and even old-fashioned papers, such as the *Temps*, where some of the articles are always unsigned; but even in the *Temps*, though the leading article never carries a signature, most of the other articles in the paper do, and the *Temps* is an exception.

The personal attitude governs the whole of the production of French newspapers. Indeed, they can hardly be called newspapers in the English sense, for what the Frenchman really asks for is not the news, but comment upon the news. He has no more illusion that news, however baldly stated, can really be impartial than he has a similar illusion about criticism. What interests him are the opinions and ideas to which the news gives rise. Consequently the attempt is hardly ever made in a French paper to state even the barest facts impartially, and comparatively few facts are given at all. In a French paper you will find very little foreign news, not much general news, and no social news—in the sense in which social news is understood to cover the movements and appearance of more or less fashionable people. On the other hand you will find plenty of very intelligent, very ingenious, and often very witty comment on important events which affect the wider life of the community, and trivial events which affect its life in detail. In fact, you will find literature.

I do not say that there are not papers which profess to give the news, the latest news and nothing but the news. They are called *journaux d'information*, and it is they which have the large circulations. But they fill up their pages largely with articles which are nothing but opinions, with literary and art criticism at considerable length and with picturesque descriptive articles in series on subjects quite unconnected with the news of the day, such as convict settlements or herring fisheries. Even these *journaux d'information* are, in a commercial and journalistic sense, only a very timid advance towards the enormous journalistic enterprises of Great Britain and the United States. There are five of them: the *Petit Parisien*, which has a circulation more than half as big again as its next competitor, the *Matin*, the *Journal*, the *Petit Journal*, and the *Echo de Paris*, to which may be added M. Coty's new and already very successful paper the *Ami du Peuple*, and the one picture daily the *Excelsior*. Except that the last-named is under the same ownership as the *Petit Parisien*, all these papers have separate proprietors, and only two of them have their shares quoted on the Bourse. The powerful newspaper-owning groups of Great Britain have no counterpart in France. There is no linking up of provincial and Paris papers. Still less is there any mass production of a number of popular weekly periodicals under one roof. There is no fierce commercial competition between

newspapers. Insurance schemes and football competitions are unknown. There are no fleets of distributing motor-cars to carry the papers to the country. There is one news agency for foreign news, that of Havas, which occupies the same building as the Paris branch of Reuters, but there is none for collecting local news. Very few newspapers have correspondents in foreign capitals, and most of those few are in London, whose foreign news is copied and wired to Paris. No newspaper in Paris has an advertisement revenue to compare with that of an English daily and still less of an American, and it is partly for this reason that very few Paris newspapers are commercially paying concerns. There are two consequences of this. One is that many papers live on subsidies, either from individual politicians or from political groups or from financial interests, and there is an accentuated tendency to produce the kind of *journal d'opinion* which the French reader prefers. The other is that journalists are very badly paid—the minimum whole-time staff rate is under £10 a month—and corruption is not unknown. It is sometimes the journalist who is bribed for a publicity in the editorial columns which an English newspaper would sell as advertisement space. Railway companies ensure journalistic support by giving free tickets; a part of the important secret service funds at the disposal of the Government is believed to find its way into the pockets of the leader writers, while the moral standard of some critics—fortunately the minority—is indicated by the fact that the goodwill of the post of dramatic critic to a certain daily paper was transferred a few years ago for a considerable sum.

Some of the money paid for favourable comment in the editorial columns of the paper does indeed reach the coffers of the journal itself. The financial column is not infrequently farmed out to an advertising agency in return for a weekly payment, and is sometimes entirely handed over to one of those "banks" which are really share-pushing organisations. The Madame Hanau case shows how she was able, not only to run a daily paper herself in order to recommend her concern, but to obtain the control of the financial column of a morning and an evening journal, neither of which announced that it was not itself responsible for its investment advice.

The provincial papers, of which there are well over 200 dailies and 1,500 weeklies, are more financially independent than most of those of Paris, and they have advertisement revenues which make them into valuable properties. They remain, however, *journaux d'opinion* more than newspapers, and especially is this true of the weeklies, which are, not only at elections but at all times, largely devoted to political propaganda. It must be remembered that the newspaper is the main electioneering

instrument, for posters are rare, leaflets rarer still, and canvassing unknown.

It will be seen that there are many reasons for the fact that the French Press, and especially the Paris Press, remains what the Press in other countries has largely ceased to be, a Press of opinion. This special character of the Paris newspaper determines the character of the Paris journalist. He does not only record the political, artistic, and literary life of his time. He does not only comment upon it. He is part of it. He very largely inspires it. The political journalist has been or will be a politician and a Minister. The critic has been, is, or will be a novelist or a playwright. In these circumstances there can hardly be any separation in France between journalism and literature.

Of the seven *journaux d'information* already mentioned only two, the Catholic *Écho de Paris* and the nationalist *Ami du Peuple*, can be said to have any very definite political opinions, although they all express conventional bourgeois proprietary instincts and patriotism. However, there are one or two party organs which have a considerable circulation. Of these *Humanité*, the Communist journal, comes first and is followed by the *Populaire*, the Socialist organ. The *Œuvre*, which is admirably done on its literary side, and the *Quotidien* are both radical journals with a certain circulation, but are virtually controlled by their chief shareholder, Jean Hennessy, the late Minister for Agriculture and head of the brandy firm. *Comœdia*, a theatrical and literary daily, and the *Figaro* (in which the *Gaulois* has been merged) both have readers in artistic and fashionable circles, as have the *Auto* among the patrons of sport, the *Journée Industrielle* among business men and the *Action Française* among royalists.

Among the Paris evening papers, the largest circulation is undoubtedly that of the *Intransigeant*, which was once the mouth-piece of the brilliant and fiery Rochefort, but is now a typical *journal d'information*. It is being approached, however, by the evening edition of the recently-founded *Ami du Peuple*, and another attempt to compete with it is being made by *Paris-Soir*. The influential *Temps*, the semi-official organ of the Quai d'Orsay, has far fewer if more important readers, and the *Journal des Débats*, though it still commands attention, has fewer still. The Conservative *Liberté* and the Socialist *Soir* sell to a limited extent among their political supporters, and *Paris-Midi* has readers among those who want a paper at lunch time—for it must be remembered that no Paris evening paper publishes editions all through the day, and that although the *Intransigeant* and the *Liberté* bring out two—called third and fourth—the *Temps* and the *Journal des Débats* appear with only one, and no evening paper ever thinks of bringing out a special edition, however

important the news. Nor does any evening paper rush its copies all over Paris and the suburbs in the way that is familiar in London. Most of them are content to distribute to newsagents by bicycles and to reach some parts of the town a couple of hours after publication. Though plenty of people bet on races in Paris they are apparently prepared to wait for the results and not to learn even the winner of the Grand Prix until nearly three hours after the race.

In addition to the morning and evening papers which I have mentioned, there are, however, other dailies, some of which are read and quoted by journalists and political supporters, and most of which are subsidised for purely propagandist purposes. They bring the total number of papers published every day in Paris to over fifty. There are also in Paris about 200 political weekly papers and more than that number of weekly financial papers, many of which are little better than bucket-shop circulars. However, not more than thirty of the daily and hardly a dozen of the weekly papers could be obtained at a railway bookstall, and there are not six of the weekly papers whose opinions carry any weight.

A very important feature of newspaper production in France is that one firm holds the monopoly of distribution and another firm the monopoly of both news agency and newspaper advertisement agency. No newspaper can reach the retailer either in Paris or in the provinces, unless the firm of Hachette consents to distribute it and unless it agrees to the terms which the firm of Hachette chooses to impose. Moreover Hachette's, even when they have undertaken the distribution, can enormously encourage the sale of a paper, and also discourage it; but no one has ever dared to try and evade the firm's monopoly until the attempt at present being made by M. Coty, the rich perfumery manufacturer, in the distribution of his *Ami du Peuple*, which has aroused the enmity of the rest of the Press by being priced at 10 centimes instead of the usual 15 or 25. Not a kiosk or a newspaper shop dared to sell it if they did not receive it through Hachette, for they were told that if they did, the supply of all the other papers would be withdrawn, and the *Ami du Peuple* is now retailed by cafés and by vendors who take their stand by the side of the kiosks.

The other great monopoly is that of Havas, which is not only the one agency of any importance for the supply of foreign news, but largely controls the advertisement columns of some of the Paris and most of the provincial newspapers, whose advertisement space it buys up at a fixed rate and farms out. The power which it exercises may be understood, especially as in many cases the advertisements are given in payment for the foreign news service.

PHILIP CARR.

THE COMPANHIA DE MOÇAMBIQUE.

THE southern portion of the Colony of Moçambique (until recently it was officially known as the "Province of Moçambique") includes all the Portuguese East African possessions and embraces the vast tract of territory, some 1,400 miles long, that stretches from just south of Delagoa Bay to the river Rovuma—the southern boundary of the British Mandated Territory of Tanganyika, formerly German East Africa. On the west of Portuguese East Africa lie a portion of the Transvaal, Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia, and the Nyasaland Protectorate, while on the east is the Indian Ocean of which the waters between the mainland and Madagascar are known as the Moçambique Channel.

The Governor-General of the Colony at Lourenço Marques, who is appointed by the Portuguese Government at Lisbon, as the Governor-General of the Union of South Africa is by the Imperial Government, is Governor-General of the entire Colony of Moçambique, but the Territories of Manica and Sofala (Companhia de Moçambique) and Cabo Delgado (Companhia do Nyassa) have a practically independent system of administration, the relationship of the Governor-General to these territories being not unlike that of the High Commissioner for South Africa to the British South Africa Company's administration in Rhodesia prior to 1923.

The government of the Companhia de Moçambique is in some respects not unlike that of the old John Company that formerly governed India. There is a board at Lisbon of which the chairman is known as the Administrator Delegate. The number of directors is, as a rule, eighteen, of which sometimes four are English and four French, with ten Portuguese directors, as, by charter, the number of Portuguese directors must exceed that of foreign directors by not less than two. At the meetings of the board the *Commissario do Governo* or government representative has a right to be present, though he does not vote. The board meets usually weekly at the offices of the company in Lisbon. The four French directors form what is called the Paris Committee, and the four English directors the London Committee. One of these directors is known as the manager of the London or Paris Committee, as the case may be, and is the permanent representative of the company in these capitals. The London and Paris Committees are known as the United Committees, and as a rule meet once monthly in London and Paris alternatively. The present Administrator Delegate is Dr. Augusto Soares, at one time Foreign Minister in Portugal, who was, a number of years ago, *Director do Contencioso* or Legal Adviser at Beira to the Companhia de Moçam-

bique. He is a distinguished lawyer and his many years of previous residence in the Moçambique Company's Territory have made him intimately acquainted with the conditions and requirements of the country.

The Joint General Managers of the Company were lately, Senhores Pedro da Cunha and Paul Planter (now dead), who had been connected with the Moçambique Company for over twenty years. Among the Directors are Admiral Pinto Basto and Senhor Pery de Lind, both former Governors of the Moçambique Company's Territory and the latter of whom worked strenuously during many years to promote the agricultural interests of the Territory with considerable success. The reasons for the existence of so large a number of non-Portuguese directors is the considerable monetary interests held in the company by English and French or Belgian shareholders. As it is obviously impracticable for the United Committees to attend weekly meetings in Lisbon, important matters are referred to them by the Lisbon Board for their views, more especially on questions concerning mining and finance. Moreover, Lisbon keeps in touch with London and Paris not only by correspondence, but by means of visits of the London and Paris managers to Lisbon whenever this appears desirable. The annual report and balance-sheet of the Companhia de Moçambique is published in three languages, viz. in Portuguese, French, and English. The Portuguese directors as a rule know French exceedingly well, as is the case with most well-educated Portuguese, and some have also a very good knowledge of English. The writer has been as a former Director of Mines summoned to a meeting of the board where all the persons present except himself and one of the directors were Portuguese, and yet the whole of the proceedings were conducted in fluent French for the benefit of the director who was not well acquainted with Portuguese, while a *précis* of what was said was made by the Secretary contemporaneously in Portuguese. There are not many, if any, English company boards where a similar linguistic *tour de force* could be successfully accomplished.

The board appoints the governor of the Moçambique Company's territory, subject to the approval of the Portuguese Government, and also the heads of departments such as the Director of Agriculture, the Director of Finance or Treasurer, the Director of Mines or Mining Commissioner, the Director of Posts (Postmaster-General), the Director of Customs, the Legal Adviser, the Captain of the Port, etc. The Governor and all these officials are, with the exception of the Director of Mines, resident at Beira. Since 1914, the local Commandant at Macequece is, I believe, Acting Director of Mines. In addition to the heads of departments the constitution of the company provides for two Inspectors-General, one being the

Inspector-General for Development (*Exploração*) and the other Inspector-General for Finance (*Fazenda*). These two offices are sometimes held by one individual. The two officers possess a sort of right of revision, and a right of criticism of the proposals and actions of the departmental heads whose activities fall within their respective spheres. Should the Governor approve a scheme and the Inspector-General disagree, the Inspector-General can sign under protest, and furnish a report of his reasons which the Governor will forward to the board. The Governor possesses very considerable powers. Under Article 33 of the Bases of the Constitution, he can, in cases of great urgency, temporarily promulgate a local law by decree, which must within a fixed period be approved or otherwise by the board.

The Portuguese general law holds in the Territory of the Company of Moçambique: the *Código Civil*, an adaptation of the French Napoleonic Code, being in force. There are, however, certain specific local laws, such as the mining law, which amplify the general law and may be said perhaps to modify it. The "Pauta," or customs regulations, are also different from those in force in Portugal. New laws are passed by the board in Lisbon, then submitted by the Government Commissary to the Ministry of the Colonies for the approval of the Government, and are usually then published by presidential decree, when they have the force of law.

The law courts in the territory are not dependent on the company. They are on the same footing as the law courts in Portugal, the appointments being made by the Government. There is a *juiz de comarca*, or district judge, with a rather more extended jurisdiction than that of a resident magistrate, whose court is at Beira. The language used in the courts is Portuguese, but practically all lawyers, attorneys, and notaries at Beira have a good acquaintance with English. In the same way, English is understood in all the departmental offices of the Company of Moçambique, and English translations are published of some of the laws, such as the mining law, and the regulations made thereunder, and also the regulations concerning the acquirement and tenure of land. It has been pointed out that the law courts of Moçambique are independent of the Company of Moçambique. The *Conservatorio* or registry of permanent grants of land is in a somewhat similar position. The *Conservador* or Registrar is a Government and not a Company official. The reason for this is obvious. All unalienated land within the territory is vested in the company. The company holds the territory by royal decrees of 1891, 1893, and 1897 respectively, and the charter is for fifty years as from 1891.

Concessions of land within the Territory for agriculture and

stock-raising are, as a rule, subject to the following conditions. A contract of temporary lease is, in the first instance, made for a period of two years which may be extended for another year if absolutely necessary for the completion of works that the concessionaire may be obliged to carry out. The annual rent is two centavos or about 1d. per hectare which is approximately $2\frac{1}{4}$ acres. If on the termination of two or three years as the case may be, the leaseholder wishes to obtain a permanent title to his land, he must pay the *foro* or quit-rent and the *entrada* or entry-into-possession fee—that is really the capital cost or purchase money that will become due on his acquiring a permanent title to the holding. The *foro* or quit-rent is always one centavo (about a halfpenny) per hectare (say $2\frac{1}{4}$ acres) per annum payable in advance. This *foro* or quit-rent is then payable by the Company of Moçambique to the Portuguese Government and is a perpetual charge on the holding, being due even after the expiry of the Moçambique Company's Charter. It is in this sense an advantage to the settler as it may be said to constitute a recognition of his tenure by the Portuguese Government. Thus the registration of all permanent land titles is effected in the *Conservatorio Predial* or Registry of Lands, which is a Government institution.

The *entrada* or entry money, so called owing to its becoming due on the applicant entering into possession of his holding, is a sum fixed on the occasion of the granting of the temporary lease and must be stated in the same. It can never be less than eighty centavos (about three shillings and sevenpence payable on a sterling basis) per hectare or roughly one shilling and eightpence per acre. The purchase money can either be paid in full on the occasion of making application for the permanent title or, alternatively, as to one-tenth on this occasion and the balance in bills of one to nine years, bearing interest at the rate of 6 per cent. All details as to these conditions on which land is granted to individuals are contained in Government Circular No. 24/2801 of November 18th, 1915, obtainable with other information from the office of the Secretary-General to the Company of Moçambique at Beira.

The mining laws and all regulations made thereunder can also be obtained in Portuguese and English from the same official or from the mines office at Macequece. The mining law, especially as to prospecting, pegging, etc., resembles in many respects the Rhodesian mining law. The blocks of claims, however, are bounded by vertical planes extending indefinitely downwards, as in the Transvaal; and there is no following the principal reef "in all its dips, spurs, and angles" outside of the boundaries of claims that has caused such serious and difficult litigation in some cases in Rhodesia. The royalty payable on mining production is on the

gross output on small propositions as in Rhodesia and 10 per cent. of the net profits on large ones, thus sparing the small man the trouble and expense of keeping elaborate books.

There was a *Mining Handbook* published by the Company of Moçambique in 1912 which, although somewhat out of date, gives a very fair summary of the conditions of mining in the company's territory. The reefs around Macequece are similar to those around Umtali which geologically form one field with the Macequece field on the Portuguese side of the border. Though the Macequece mining field has been a good deal wandered over by prospectors, it has not been thoroughly investigated by what one might style professional or scientific prospectors, and the number of gold reefs in the neighbourhood of Macequece show that, like the Penhalonga district, this part of the world, like large portions of Rhodesia, is mineralised through and through and should contain some good small propositions. There is a very successful gold dredging undertaking which has been worked for a number of years in the Revue Valley.

The total area of the territory held by the Moçambique Company under charter, now called the Territory of the Company of Moçambique, and at one time known as the Government of Manica and Sofala, is about 65,000 square miles in extent and has an estimated coast line of some 270 miles. The principal port is Beira. The bar at the entrance to the roadstead is kept dredged and the buoys are illuminated. The shipping entering and leaving the port has increased of late and a considerable amount of merchandise passes through to Rhodesia, especially to Salisbury and Mashonaland. A contract has been signed with a well-known English firm for the construction of deep water quays at the port to be completed in a few years. Lighterage is at present employed for loading and unloading vessels.

Beira is now connected not only with Salisbury and Bulawayo and through the town by rail with the Congo, but it is connected with British Nyasaland by means of the new Trans-Zambesia railway. At present no bridge exists over the Zambesi (except that at the Victoria Falls) but arrangements have been made for constructing one to carry the Trans-Zambesia railway's permanent way. It now takes thirty-six hours from Blantyre to Beira. Beira is the seat of the administration of the Company of Moçambique, and the residence of the Governor, but it is quite a small town. The officials of the Moçambique Company constitute a large proportion of the residents.

Sofala, lower down the coast, was, centuries ago, an Arab port of great importance and there is a fine old gateway still remaining. Near the southern boundary of the company's territory is the

little coasting trade port of Bartolomeo Diaz, opposite the group of islands known as the Bazaruto Isles, where there is some pearl fishing done by the natives. Macequece, the centre of the mining district and about 160 miles from the coast, is the next station to Umtali on the Beira-Salisbury line.

Mealies are the staple production of the territory, and are cultivated all along the line up to the Rhodesian border. Twenty years ago there were barely half a dozen farms visible from the train along this stretch of railway. Now most of the forest has disappeared and practically all the land along the line belonging to the Moçambique Company has been taken up and much for quite a distance back from the rail. The railway, which with the Moçambique Company owns alternate blocks of land of five kilometres square along the line arranged chequerwise, still has, it is said, land to dispose of. Besides the mealies, which thrive wonderfully in the territory, giving a crop some 50 per cent. larger than is obtainable from an equivalent area in Rhodesia, cotton has been put in of late by the farmers in increasing quantities. Along the southern bank of the Zambesi the natives cultivate cotton under the supervision of the company's officials.

Next to mealies, sugar is the most important product of the territory. The Hornung Company have several factories on or near the Zambesi, and have a large output. Fibre is also grown and oranges ought to do well in the neighbourhood of Macequece. The soil in the river valleys is in many places exceedingly rich. In the Revue Valley in the neighbourhood of Macequece, the alluvian loam was eighteen feet deep. Many who took up land for mealie growing twenty years ago have made a great deal of money, and farmers who lived in native-built huts now have brick houses, and own motor cars. The climate of the territory of the Moçambique Company varies considerably according to the altitude. The lands along the coast and of the great coast plain are hot, but the mountainous region in the neighbourhood of Macequece and the chain of mountains separating the territory from Rhodesia possess a climate similar to that of the latter country. The climate in these higher regions is agreeable, and there is but little fever, as is also the case at Beira.

No description of the Moçambique Company's territory would be complete without making reference to the shooting obtainable there. Before the great war, and it is to be presumed that this is still the case, there was the most excellent big game shooting to be got in the Pungwe River valley and on the flats lying between that river and the Zambesi. Sportsmen of considerable experience have given it as their opinion that the shooting in the Moçambique Company's territory is only second to that of

British East Africa, now Kenya. The Pungwe flats lying along the river Urema about one and a half day's march from Bamboo Creek or half a day's march to the north of the Pungwe, were a well known hunting ground where waterbuck, zebra, and the more ordinary or black wildebeeste could any day be seen in countless hundreds. So little shot over were these regions before the great war, that the writer has stood on one occasion completely surrounded by the herds at a distance of seven to eight hundred yards without the animals taking fright. In the pools of the Urema river are innumerable crocodiles often to be seen sunning themselves upon the banks. In the long grass and thorn and palm bush that border these flats, lions are very numerous and nightly take a heavy toll from the inoffensive grazing animals.

On the Cheringoma hills, to the east of the flats on the sea side of which the Trans-Zambesia Railway now runs, there were formerly great quantities of koodoo to be met with and in the woods of the Gorongoza mountain, on the west side of the flats, impala and hartebeeste were to be found in great numbers. Farther north, near the Vanduzi river, were buffalo, and north of this again that strange-looking and rather rare buck the inyala. As the River Zambesi is approached these valleys running north and south open out into the so-called *tandos* or wide open plains, and not far from the river herds of elephants, mostly tuskless, however, are sometimes to be met. There are many other kinds of four footed game in the territory and many kinds of birds, amongst them egrets and wild swans, yet these hunting grounds, although so conveniently situated for the inhabitants of the Union, are little known to the majority of South Africans.

Before the war a few officers belonging to the regiments of the Imperial Army then stationed in the Transvaal used occasionally to come up here to shoot. Yet the district is very accessible by boat from any South African port to Beira, thence four hours by train to Bamboo Creek, situated only one day's march from the Pungwe and where the actual "safari" begins. Anyone undertaking such a trip could not do better than consult the appendices in Consul-General Maugham's book *Portuguese East Africa*, where all requirements for outfit, provisions, carriers, etc. are accurately enumerated. There is no finer holiday to be had in August, September, or early October than a six weeks' shoot in the Moçambique Company's territory. A fuller description of the big game shooting in the territory of the Moçambique Company by the writer appeared about a year ago in *The Field*.

AUSTIN KING.

CURIOSITY IN WILD ANIMALS.

APPROACHING the animal kingdom from an anatomical point of view scientists of to-day place *homo sapiens* at the head of the primates, along with the monkeys and apes. A mass of irrefutable evidence has long since accustomed people to this fact. The psychological approach, on the other hand, is to-day a subject of much controversy. Everyone admits that between man and animals there is a far greater gap on the mental than on the physical plane. Scientists, indeed, sometimes go so far as to hold that there are two psychologies—human and animal. So long as this division infers that there is a difference only in degree and not in kind, it is perfectly legitimate and may be used with convenience, in the same way that we talk about the psychology of the criminal or the child. When, however, it infers that human and animal psychology are two entirely different things; or when the last-named is approached on the assumption that all animals other than man are governed entirely by instinct, being without feelings or emotions: then, indeed, the fallacy is self-evident. When such an untenable theory as the latter is advanced, it is only natural that the ancient and infallible remedy should be applied. By ascribing everything to "instinct" the simple-minded are deceived, and the theory obtains a foothold, regardless of the fact that the experts themselves are not agreed in their definition of this useful panacea.

Laboratory experiments on animals have often been employed to probe their mental equipment. Usually under such artificial conditions it is impossible to obtain an accurate impression. The most natural method is, of course, to watch the animal in its daily life and in its native haunts. There, it is reasonable to suppose, we may hope to find it using its every faculty in a normal manner. One of the most illuminating of searchlights into the psychology of the wild animal is obtained through a study of its lively curiosity. Even the least observant of us can study this in one aspect, by virtue of the fact that he is of the human species and therefore the object of much curiosity to those wild creatures on whose territory he trespasses. Below are given instances, taken almost at random and from memory, in which a human being has, wittingly or unwittingly, aroused the curiosity of a wild creature. If this note induces anyone to go into the fields and woodlands and there read for himself a few pages in the book of nature, it will have achieved its purpose.

Walking through the fields in the sun, it is a common thing to see a bumble bee swerve in its flight and circle around one, often selecting one's face as an object for special investigation.

One particularly thorough specimen alighted on a woman's hand and would not leave until it had crawled all over her bare arm, returning again and again to points of especial interest. Fully five minutes elapsed before its passionate curiosity was sufficiently appeased for it to fly away. In much the same way bats will fly round one's head in the evening, occasionally venturing so close that the quick flutter of their wings is heard, and a gentle current of air fans one's cheek as they swerve in their flight. From a safer distance birds will indulge their curiosity, often accompanying one along a hedge to the end of their territory. Keeping on the opposite side, a robin or a wren will peer at one through the foliage, flying ahead again as one passes, or just before. This must be a common experience of everyone walking in the country. At a small fishing village I was once befriended by a robin under peculiar circumstances. It followed me for three hundred yards at low tide as I walked round a four hundred foot chalk headland, examining the rock pools. The robin watched me turning up stones and groping about in the water, keeping pace with my slow advance. Hopping or flying from rock to rock, the homely little figure seemed strangely out of place on this bleak sea shore. Waiting until I had finished, it returned with me to the beach. The fact that the bird followed me so far in such strange surroundings was interesting. Usually a creature does not leave its normal feeding-ground to investigate. Perhaps, as has been suggested, the robin is drawn to man by something higher than vulgar curiosity. It often appears that there is a definite friendship between the two.

Though the earth is thickly peopled with creatures of all denominations, it is but rarely that we realise we are trespassing. Sometimes, however, the fact is brought to one's notice. When watching birds, the appearance of some small rodent has often told me that I am standing on what he regards as his very own little corner of the earth's beautiful surface. Once, while standing on the bank of a small river, watching a little grebe diving, I noticed a reddish-brown bank vole (*Evotomys glareolus*) at the foot of an alder some sixteen feet distant, apparently intrigued by my presence. Several holes close to the tree suggested that it was a member of a small isolated colony. As I continued my observations on the bird the little fellow continued his, gradually coming towards me for a closer view. The rough nature of the ground and the thick vegetation effectively concealed the vole's movements, except occasionally when its small russet form streaked across an open space. In this way it came to within six inches of my feet! There, peeping out from some dead leaves, it took stock of me with its bright beady eyes, while its quivering

nose and twitching whiskers worked incessantly to probe the mystery. Then, having apparently decided that I was harmless, the vole returned to its underground dwelling in an almost unprecedented manner. Instead of again using its devious but sheltered run-ways through the undergrowth, it ran in a leisurely manner down the centre of a narrow footpath, only after fifteen feet plunging into the vegetation near its home.

In these few incidents man has in each case been the involuntary cause of arousing curiosity in a wild animal. Mention must now be made of animal curiosity aroused by voluntary means. By acting in a manner which the animal concerned does not associate with the human form, it is often possible to retain its attention for many minutes. Reverting to birds and their habit of following one, the friend who was such an object of interest to the bumble bee once induced a female chaffinch to follow her for some six hundred yards along a hedge leading across two fields and through a coppice. This she achieved by the very simple expedient of saying "Sweet! Sweet!" in as many tones as she could muster, in answer to the bird's constantly reiterated double call-note. The chaffinch's curiosity was most amusing to witness, for when she stopped under a large beech on the outskirts of the wood, the bird perched on the lower branches of the tree, examining with head cocked first on one side and then on the other this strange human being, continuing to challenge her with its inquisitive call. Presently, hunger apparently ousting curiosity, the bird flew away. On another occasion my friend had a very similar experience with a male cuckoo. Answering its loud notes in a spirit of hilarity rather than in an attempt to mimic the bird, she was surprised and amused to discover that it was coming nearer and nearer, until eventually it settled in the upper branches of the tree under which she was sitting. There they "cuckoo'd" at one another turn and turn about, the bird descending lower for a closer view. The cuckoo, being in excellent training, soon won this unequal contest, calling by itself for several minutes before realising that its efforts at having the last word were entirely successful. There being nothing more to interest it, the bird presently flew away.

Unusual movements are often as effective as anything else in catching and retaining the attention of bird or beast. A white handkerchief gently waved to and fro may be successful. In this way I have greatly excited the curiosity of a water vole (*Arvicola amphibius*) in a region where it is by no means easy to approach. The animal was first seen hurrying along the surface of a narrow stream and then disappearing into a hole, at water level in the farther bank. Sitting down opposite the burrow,

- I slowly waved my handkerchief just above the water. In the dim light of the hole two shiny black eyes gradually materialised as the vole returned to the surface to watch. After several moments of indecision it came out into the open and stood staring at me with its rather prominent eyes, full of curiosity at what it saw but could not understand. One's usual impression of this species is of a dark streak swimming rapidly across a stream, while observation with field glasses shows the fur to be a beautiful dark glossy brown. Such was the magnetic influence of my handkerchief that perhaps for a minute I was able to feast my eyes on the vole's compact and lovely little form. At such close range the animal's coat was seen to consist of thick brown fur lavishly interspersed with longer black hairs, the latter outlining the vole with a distinct black halo. Presently, taking to the water, it left me with yet another indelible picture of a few moments in the life of one of our small wild animals.

- As is only to be expected, one can often excite the curiosity of a whole flock or herd of creatures just as easily as that of a single individual. My most amusing experience in this direction was obtained late one September evening, when I held a "Mass Meeting of Rabbits" in Devonshire. The screaming of a pair of lapwing overhead and the peculiar undulating "churring" of a nightjar in the valley below, enhanced rather than broke the blessed silence of the night. I sat down to watch and listen.
- Some time passed before I realised that I was becoming an object of interest to a colony of rabbits, though I did not fully grasp the situation until the familiar thump of warning sounded close behind. A rabbit, as is its invariable custom on discovering some strange motionless object in its territory, was trying to startle me into a movement which would disclose my identity or intentions. As I did not move, the challenge soon rang out from a different direction, this time answered immediately by another. This apparently aroused the whole colony, for thumps began to resound on all sides. It was impossible to estimate the number of rabbits, as each constantly changed its position. During a momentary pause after a particularly imperious thump! thump! I took up the challenge and, striking the bare earth with the palm of my hand in imitation of a rabbit, I sent back a thump which must have given the boldest of the bucks food for thought. After rather a long pause, they began again, I replying fairly frequently. Such a frenzy of excitement I have never seen! Rendered fearless by their burning curiosity they drew closer on all sides, until often I made out their shapes through the darkness, some ten feet distant.

Instead of striking the ground twice in rapid succession with

the hind foot, some of them now signalled thump! thump! thump! and as the foot struck for the third time, the rabbit leapt above the bracken to obtain a clearer view. The darkness was fast closing in, and though they came nearer and nearer, I soon recognised them only as ghostly white patches when in a wild leap or bold scamper the white fur of the tail was revealed. One or two came within four feet, so bold had they become. Though they must long since have realised that I was a man, they seemed to have lost all fear of me, the curiosity I aroused in them now seeming only to add zest to their nightly gambols. The mass meeting threatened to become uproarious! Rabbit after rabbit leaped above the bracken—cotton-tails flashed on every side. It was with regret that I had to adjourn the meeting. As I stood up their play ceased, for I had moved and so broken the spell. Once more I was the dreaded two-legged monster. Before I had moved many paces every rabbit was underground, and silence reigned. The moor seemed suddenly strangely empty.

In children one of the healthiest signs is the possession and exercise of an abundant curiosity. Its possession usually indicates that they are mentally and physically in harmony with their surroundings, and well equipped to put to good account every moment of the day. So with wild animals—the display of a lively curiosity is the surest indication of their well-being. It tells us that, though their daily actions may be more instinct-governed than ours, they are nevertheless as able as we are to live a full mental life—making all due allowance for the great difference in the mental equipment of man and beast. It may even be reasonably argued that the average animal is relatively more mentally active than the average man. For the wild creature lives a natural life in which it has, for its continued existence, to exercise its every faculty, whereas in civilised countries many men are mere automata for a third of the day—and the mental lethargy engendered by these eight hours of soul-killing routine work often imperils the natural functioning of the brain during the remainder of the twenty-four.

G. B. GOOCH.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE SUDAN AND EGYPT.

THE failure of Nahas Pasha to reach agreement with Mr. Henderson lengthens the already long series of failures in Anglo-Egyptian diplomacy. The last failure is the worst because the circumstances of Nahas Pasha's visit seemed to promise a good chance of success. During the past five years there was some justification for believing that so long as the Wafd held sway, but not office, in Cairo, negotiation for an Anglo-Egyptian treaty was a waste of time. When, therefore, at last Nahas Pasha himself not only formed a Government, a Government that commanded both office and power, but came to London to negotiate, fully aware of the policy that would greet him, it seemed reasonable to hope that something would come of it.

The Eastern provinces of British influence, however, are passing through a phase of emotional disturbance. Having been developed by British money and by British skill, and her youth educated at British universities, Egypt is now feeling a certain confidence in herself, which, unleavened by experience or by mature common sense, is expressing itself in a type of exuberance that one associates with unfledged adolescence. The phenomenon is tiresome, but probably not important. The wave of emotion that disturbs Russia, India, and Egypt will probably be bad for trade and finance if the British politicians allow themselves to be excited thereby. So far there seems to be not much danger of such a misfortune.

Egypt having grown up under British guidance has now been offered full independence for herself: but she goes on to demand, in the manner of commonplace extravagant nationalism, that she be allowed to annex the Sudan. That is absurd. It is on the question of the Sudan that the Egyptian politicians are now stultifying themselves.

It is an old question. The Convention of 1899, signed by the Egyptian Minister for Foreign Affairs, has worked well and has developed the Sudan on sound lines. In 1899 it was taken for granted by Egyptian opinion that the Sudan had nothing to do with Egypt. There was no difficulty in allowing British capital and British brains to do what no other agency could have done for the Sudan. In 1920 Lord Milner, writing (August 18th) to Adli Yeghen Pasha, argued the continuity of that position in one sentence: "No change in the political status of Egypt should be allowed to disturb the further development of the Sudan on a system (namely, the provisions of the Convention of 1899) which has been productive of such good results." In 1922, when indepen-

dence was granted to Egypt, the reservation of the *status quo* in the Sudan was made in conformity with the Milner recommendations. In 1924 Zaglul Pasha flew the first Egyptian kite over that particular reserved point. He demanded simply that Great Britain should remove herself from the Sudan, thus to leave free the entry of Egypt into the Sudan. Mr. MacDonald recorded his view of that matter in these words: "Since going there, they (the British people) have contracted heavy moral obligations by the creation of a good system of administration; they cannot allow that to be destroyed; they regard their responsibilities as a trust for the Sudan people; there can be no question of their abandoning the Sudan until their work is done." Zaglul Pasha went home to Cairo to register the first failure in the post-1922 diplomacy of Egypt, for by making the Sudan a cardinal point in his policy, he sacrificed what he could otherwise have obtained for Egypt. In 1927 when Sarwat Pasha came to negotiate with Sir Austen Chamberlain, a provisional agreement was reached by which the Sudan was to be respected by Egypt. Sarwat Pasha, however, commanded only a minority of opinion in the Egyptian Parliament, and on his return to Cairo, his draft treaty was swiftly killed by Nahas Pasha, the leader of the Wafd party, the dominant party. In 1929 Mahmud Pasha in his turn came to London and duly agreed with Mr. Henderson on another draft treaty, still excluding the Sudan from Egyptian interest, but conceding the fullest and most effective independence to Egypt. Nahas Pasha reserved his view of that treaty, and at the election that took place in December 1929 refrained from making the treaty a party issue. The Wafd, as was expected, won the election, and Nahas Pasha was therefore free to adopt the Mahmud draft as his own, if he so desired.

He apparently decided that he did so desire, for he came to London in the last week of March 1930 to renew the negotiation on the basis of the Mahmud draft. The main points of that draft were:

- (1) That the military occupation of Egypt is terminated;
- (2) That an alliance is concluded between the two countries;
- (3) That Great Britain undertakes to support an Egyptian application for membership of the League of Nations;
- (4) That a quasi-Monroe doctrine in diplomacy is adopted by the two countries;
- (5) That Egypt is henceforth responsible for foreign security in Egypt;
- (6) That British forces protect the Suez Canal;
- (7) That capitulations cease;
- (8) That Ambassadors be exchanged;
- (9) That the status of the Sudan remains what it was after the 1899 convention.

The conference duly opened on that basis on March 31st. It ended in another failure on May 9th, when Nahas Pasha left Victoria Station for Cairo without the treaty. The conference had divided itself into two phases. For the first four weeks Nahas Pasha played for time, hoping apparently that Mr. Henderson did not mean what he said about the Sudan. Being then convinced that Mr. Henderson did mean what he said, Nahas consented to resume active negotiations in a way that suggested a decision on his part to accept the treaty. Quite suddenly, he changed his mind, hid for a week behind the deliberately stage-managed comedy of a courier who got lost between Cairo and London, and then emerged to break off the negotiation. The exact story of that fourth abortive conference is reserved for next month's CONTEMPORARY, by when the relevant White Paper will no doubt have been published.

A NEW FACTOR IN INTERNATIONAL FINANCE.

For good, for bad, the Bank for International Settlements is likely to be a big new factor in the delicate and sensitive organism of international finance. No one can foresee what its effect may be; but its effect will be felt in every financial centre throughout the world, especially in London, the world's chief money market. Nor can the work of high finance be circumscribed as a specialist phenomenon hardly concerning the non-expert. Most business men will be affected by what is done in Basle; every taxpayer will sooner or later feel the wind, soft or rough as it may be; the Foreign Offices will find in a greater or in a less degree that their policies will be influenced by the new force in finance.

It is therefore of consequence that the main facts of the new bank's origin, its purpose and its scope, should be understood more generally than by financiers and bankers.

The establishment of the Bank was a cardinal feature of the reparation settlement recommended in 1929 by the "Young" committee, and adopted by the Hague Conference in January 1930. In broad outline its purpose was conceived as a business-like method of collecting and distributing the cash reparations payable by Germany under the new scheme. Its function was to be analogous in the case of those international transactions to the function of a bank in the case of transactions between private individuals. Just as an individual pays his money into a bank, and then, by means of cheques, instructs the bank to pay it out, so in the new reparation scheme Germany will pay cash into the Bank and the Bank will pay it out to her various creditors. Moreover, by the constitution of capital assets for the Bank, the Bank will be able, within

certain limitations, to perform in the case of Germany the same sort of services that a bank performs for its clients, whether private individuals or business firms, by on the one hand arranging credits over short intervals, and on the other hand holding balances on terms of remuneration to Germany should funds accumulate before they are needed.

The committee of fourteen members appointed by the Central Banks of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, Germany, Japan, and the United States explained in their report the motive which led them to recommend the formation of the bank.

"A general plan," they stated, "for a complete and final settlement of the reparations problem, being primarily financial in character, involves the performance of certain banking functions at one or more points in the sequence between the initial payment of the annuities and the final distribution of the funds. A banking institution designed to meet these requirements justifies and makes logical the liquidation of all political controls, and provides instead machinery essentially commercial and financial in character, which carries with it all the support and at the same time all the responsibilities that economic engagements imply. The process of removing the reparations problem from the political to the financial sphere, which was begun in the Dawes Plan, will thus be carried a step further.

"In general terms, the institution will take over such functions of the existing agencies as it may be necessary to continue, and will perform the whole work of external administration, such as the receipt and distribution of payments and the commercialisation of those parts of the annuities which are susceptible of being commercialised. The operations of the institution will be assimilated to ordinary commercial and financial practice. Its organisation will be outside the field of political influences, and its powers and facilities will be sufficiently broad to enable it to deal freely and promptly with the problems involved in the settlement of Germany's obligations. The institution will be equipped with machinery which will provide an elastic element between the payments to be made by Germany and their realisation. In consequence, the creditors will have further assurance that the effects of economic changes on the flow of payments will be minimised, and Germany for her part will have the possibility of assistance during temporarily unfavourable conditions."

The statutes of the Bank, as fixed in January 1930, express its main purposes in two short passages, thus:

"The objects of the Bank are: to promote the co-operation of Central Banks and to provide additional facilities for international financial operations; and to act as trustee or agent in regard to

international financial settlements entrusted to it under agreements with the parties concerned" (Article 3); and

"During the said period the Bank, as trustee or agent for the Governments concerned, shall receive, administer and distribute the annuities paid by Germany under the Plan; shall supervise and assist in the commercialisation and mobilisation of certain portions of the aforesaid annuities; and shall perform such services in connection with the payment of German Reparations and the international settlements connected therewith as may be agreed upon by the Bank with the Governments concerned" (Article 4).

The Board of Directors is composed of the Governors of the Central Banks of the seven countries, of one representative of finance, industry or commerce from each of the seven, of one additional representative of commerce and industry from France and Germany, and of nine other members appointed by the Board. Those nine are appointed in this way. The Governors of Central Banks other than the original seven who contribute to the initial capital of the Bank may each submit four candidates for directorship, two representing finance, and two representing commerce and industry. From those candidates the Board will by a two-thirds vote elect not more than nine members. The total Board, then, consists of twenty-five members.

In so important a body the chief executive positions are a matter of some importance. The President is elected by the Board for a period of three years, being re-eligible thereafter; and the general manager is appointed by the Board on the President's nomination.

It followed almost as a matter of course that the country that made the most out of the war and that therefore is now the richest country in the world, would be given the Presidency of the new Bank. Such is the way of the world. Mr. Gates W. McGarrah, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, was duly elected President at a salary of £10,000 a year, and Mr. Leon Fraser, also of the United States, was made Vice-President at £8,000 a year. The next important post by the same token was likely to go to the country which made most out of the war after the United States, and therefore is the second richest nation in the world. M. Pierre Quesnay, of the Bank of France, was duly appointed Director-General (£6,000 a year).

Great Britain and Germany, who are bracketed as the losers of the Great War, were given as a sort of consolation prize the posts of Vice-Chairmen. Dr. Carl Melchior, a partner in the banking firm of M. M. Warbury & Co., and Sir Charles Addis, a director of the Bank of England, were the two men chosen. Mr. Montague Norman, in virtue of his position as Governor of the Bank of England, is the other English member of the Board. For the rest,

the chief executive appointments were impartially distributed among the nations. Dr. Hülse, a German, was made Deputy-Director-General to M. Quesnay and head of the banking department. An Italian, Signor Pilotti, was made Secretary-General.

It is inevitable that an international Central Bank, although its immediate occasion be the need of organising Germany's reparation payments, will not confine its activities or its importance to that limited field. Indeed Sir Charles Addis, in a recent address he gave to the Institute of Bankers in London, on the subject of the new bank, gave it as his opinion that the collection and distribution of the German annuities would not be the most important of the functions the Bank would fulfil.

"Its chief function," he said, "is to act as a centre of co-operation for Central Banks. That is, perhaps, why the Bank for International Settlements has been occasionally referred to as a Super-Central Bank. As a description that seems to me to involve a misunderstanding of its constitution. No doubt it is extremely difficult, as we found when we tried it at Baden, to define what a Central Bank is. But if its distinguishing marks are, as commonly recognised, the sole right of note issue, the obligation of acting as the fiscal agent of its Government and the custodian of its funds, of regulating by changes in its rate of discount and other means the supply of credit and the volume of internal currency, and of preventing any depreciation of its external value, as measured by the foreign exchanges, by maintaining a reserve of gold sufficient to meet any unexpected drain, then it must be said at once that the Bank for International Settlements answers to none of these tests. It owes allegiance to no single Government, and is forbidden to open a current account for any one of them. It has no right of note issue. It has no currency system of its own to protect, and is not, therefore, obliged to keep a reserve for that purpose. It is a unique creation. There has never been anything like it in the world before. It will be, in fact, what its managers contrive to make of it. We shall have to wait for a complete definition of the Bank for International Settlements until we see how it works. For the present we must content ourselves by saying that in its initial phase the Bank is a co-operative undertaking of the Central Banks of the reparations countries with a limited participation granted to the Central Banks of other countries, in fact, a centre, a rallying point, for Central Banks."

The co-operation of the Central Banks of the world is one of the urgent needs of international finance. Informal attempts at such an achievement have been in progress for several years past, but the result has been small, despite the pious resolutions passed at such international gatherings as the Genoa Conference of 1922.

It is interesting to recall that the Genoa Conference recommended as a matter of policy the convening of precisely such a Conference of Central Banks as has now taken place. In 1922 the project was still-born. There is perhaps some legitimate cause for satisfaction that eight years later the world has made the advance necessary to make practicable a first step towards co-operation in international finance.

The post-war scramble for gold, created by an increasing demand on the part of the Central Banks concurrently with a not comparably increasing supply, and complicated by the political motives of the Bank of France, has done much to impede the restoration of normal financial and diplomatic conditions in the world. The fall in prices of the post-war period and the consequent increase of unemployment have been to some considerable extent attributable to the appreciation in the price of gold caused by the competition for it. The year 1929 illustrated the way in which the rich Central Banks, in this case the Bank of France (made rich by the receipt of the bulk of German reparation payments and the concurrent repudiation by the French Government of its foreign debts), could use the gold scramble for diplomatic ends. The liquid resources held at the disposal of the Bank of France in London enabled that bank at any moment to depress sterling by the simple expedient of changing sterling balance into francs, and thus to lift the franc above gold export point from London at any given moment.

In the autumn of 1929, just after the first Hague Conference, at which Mr. Snowden made his stand against the further attempt to victimise Great Britain, the Bank of France held twice as much gold as the Bank of England, much more than was necessary for the purpose of its currency. Yet the Bank of France, acting, as most commentators now agree, from a diplomatic and vindictive motive against the British Government, persistently drew gold from London in circumstances which caused acute embarrassment to London and directly drove the British bank rate up to 6½ per cent. The French offensive contributed materially to the deficit which Mr. Snowden had to face in April 1930, and which in its turn contributed to the raising of British income-tax. No man with an income over £150 a year can escape the effects of international finance.

How then can the Basle Bank help to combat the mischief caused by those Central Banks which have the power and the inclination to exploit the scramble for gold? Sir Charles Addis in the address referred to above explained this matter in a lucid way. "Obviously," he said, "we must economise in the use of gold. And here the Bank for International Settlements can come to the help of the Central Banks. It can hold balances, as reserves for

their note issue or deposit liabilities, which may be regarded as the equivalent of gold, since it is only in gold currencies that the Bank will deal. It is for that reason that the Bank is not required to hold any gold reserve of its own. It has no currency of its own to protect and its deposits will in fact be covered not by forty or fifty, but by a hundred per cent. or more of liquid assets. The Bank has no power of note issue, and can only redistribute existing credit. It cannot by itself create credit, but it can do so through Central Banks. It may be objected that this may lead to inflation, but, after the powerful dose of deflation from which we are still suffering, there is no need for anyone to be alarmed into a panic if a moderate dose of temporary inflation should be applied by the Board, by way of what the doctors used to call an alternative. We need have no fear that there is any danger of inflation being carried too far in the hands of the Governors of the Central Banks on the Board of the Bank for International Settlements.

"As regards the future, if you care to give wings to your fancy and let it roam, you may like to look forward to a financial Utopia, when the cumbrous and costly physical transfer of gold will no longer be necessary. A debit and credit entry in the books of the Bank will be all that is required. Nor need your imagination stop there. It is at least theoretically possible that a time may come when the elements of freight and insurance having been eliminated the gold points of export and import, between which the rates of exchange oscillate round parity, will tend to draw more closely together until they finally merge in an international unit, not of money but of account; when the dealers in foreign exchange will cry out, like the artificers in the temple at Ephesus, that their craft is in danger of coming to naught, because the Bank for International Settlements is prepared to make transfers of the new international unit to or from any part of the world at par, just as the Federal Reserve Bank transfers the American dollar at par to any part of the United States."

It seems possible that the Basle Bank may do good in one respect. It is an open secret that the simultaneous reduction in the bank rates of London, New York, Paris, and Brussels, that took place in the first week of May 1930 was the result of an agreed policy reached by the Governors of the Central Banks at the first meeting of the International Bank, which took place at Basle the week before (April 22nd and 23rd).

THE REPARATION LOAN.

By a familiar irony the Bank's first business was to make the arrangements for a reparation loan. Germany, ostensibly defeated in the Great War, pays "reparation" to the victors. What she

has paid so far has been borrowed in the ordinary way of business from the United States and from Great Britain, and gone mainly to France. The Dawes Scheme boldly and frankly arranged for a part of Germany's liability to be paid out of the proceeds of a loan. The Young Scheme has gone full circle by arranging for the whole debt to be paid out of the proceeds of a loan, and not content with the full circle, goes on to arrange for an additional loan to be made to Germany simply for her own private benefit. When Russia tries to pay her debts in this way, she is scorned (and quite rightly, especially as she probably would not pay the debt anyhow): but Germany's debt, sanctified by the Great War, is something much more respectable, and the big bankers of the West are prepared in her case to play the farce of lending to Germany the money she is to pay back to themselves. And the real joke is that it does not matter. If the 300,000,000 dollars to be raised by October 1st, 1930, in the form of reparation bonds are in fact raised from the pockets of investors, wheresoever they may be, all is well. All was not well, however, when the arrangements came to be made for the first issue of bonds until the British Treasury experts made a stand against an incidental subtlety, designed for the peculiar damage of Great Britain.

Of the 300,000,000 dollars, 200,000,000 dollars were to represent the "mobilisation" (that is, the loan to Germany) of the annuities payable by Germany under the schedule, and the remaining 100,000,000 dollars were to be simply lent to Germany for her general benefit. It is true that one of the conditions was that Germany should not attempt any other long-term borrowing during the period of the "reparation" loan: but why should she in that case? It was arranged by the bankers that the whole loan should be "offered" (that is, the opportunity of lending it should be offered) before October 1st, 1930, a first instalment being projected for about the end of May. The proceeds of each instalment are to be divided into two parts of one-third and two-thirds respectively, the two-thirds going to the creditor nations (among whom France, by virtue of her being enriched by the war receives the bulk), and the one-third going to Germany. France is in the remarkable position where, having repudiated the bulk of her own debts, she receives the bulk of the reparation payable by Germany.

A first meeting of the bankers was held in Brussels in the last week of April, when the broad arrangements were made for the issue of the first part of the loan. In the following week, the Treasury experts of the several nations met in Paris to settle the technical details. It was from the depths of those technical details that the subtle snare arose to British interests. The question that arose was how much of the loan should be raised in London. It had been

provided in the plan that the British Government would have the right, to be exercised at its own will, to take up 13 per cent. of any international issue made with the approval of the Bank; but each of the signatory Governments reserved the right to fix both the amount, and the conditions of issue, of any reparation bonds to be floated in its market. The British Government was therefore protected against the danger of an excessive issue of bonds in London. None the less, when the Treasury experts met in Paris, a determined attempt was made to induce Great Britain to take more of the bonds than she wanted to take. It mattered much to Great Britain that the amount of reparation loan to be raised in London should be severely limited, for the reason that during the past two years the Bank of France has been able to exert a powerful influence over the sterling exchange, as a result of the huge French holding of sterling balances. Such sterling could, at any moment, be turned into francs, with results such as we witnessed during the 1929 gold drain to France, a drain which is now starting afresh.

Inasmuch as by The Hague agreements of this year no less than 78 per cent. of the proceeds of the first portion of the loan are to go to Paris, the obvious danger was that the French holding of sterling might be still further swollen to the almost certain drain of further gold from London. Fortunately, the British representatives started the conference with the axiom that the British allotment of the bonds should not exceed the British share of the proceeds of the total loan as prescribed by The Hague agreement: and, still more fortunately, the British representatives stuck to their principle and won it. The result is that the effect on the exchanges of the sterling lent in London will be offset by the receipt of sterling due under The Hague plan. The two will neutralise each other, and in this case, at any rate, Great Britain will not be duped.

The arrangement projected at the Paris meeting of experts was that £5,000,000 of the first block of the bonds should be issued in London provided the rest of the issue (£55,000,000) were raised elsewhere; but that if the £55,000,000 could not be raised elsewhere, the British share would be raised to £10,000,000 on the clear understanding, however, that in such an event, the British share of the proceeds would be raised *pari passu*. As this paper was written, it was not certain whether the figure was to be £5,000,000 or £10,000,000, but it was certain, by virtue of the agreement above described, that no part of the amount raised in London would be transferred to France.

Now it has often happened in the history of the past ten years that when the Dupe of the Great War has resisted further attempts at his exploitation, the would-be exploiters have been angry. Wit-

ness August 1929.* Great Britain has come to be taken so much for granted in the rôle of what the French vulgarly but expressively call a *poire*, that it is now claimed almost as a divine right that any and every financial burden resulting from the war shall be shouldered by Great Britain. It is always hard to understand the mentality of masses of people. It is nearly impossible to understand the post-war mentality which unanimously assigns to Great Britain the rôle of Dupe, or the mentality which makes Great Britain meekly accept it. In the present case the highly-placed Frenchmen, whether bankers or politicians (it does not matter which, for their motive was the same), were angry when they found that London had stiffened against any further exploitation. As normally happens in such an event, the politicians inspired the journalists to make a song. A curious thing resulted. M. Jules Sauerwein, of the *Matin*, who, being at Basle, ought to have got his background right, but did not, sent a long and violent dispatch to his paper in Paris. "London wishes," he wrote, "to prevent Basle from growing. England is trying, if not to torpedo the Bank for International Settlements, at least to reduce it, like the French fleet, to a tonnage leaving to Great Britain her former superiority." He picturesquely added that Mr. Montague Norman had arrived at Basle "doped" by Mr. Snowden. His general thesis of what one may call *ad hoc* hatred of Great Britain was not remarkable; it could have been foretold by anyone after the British Treasury experts had refused to give to the Bank of France another lever for damaging sterling. What was remarkable was that in his haste to get his hatred over the telegraph wire, or perhaps because he did not regard the facts as important, M. Sauerwein made a slip. In enumerating the enormities perpetrated by Mr. Snowden, Mr. Montague Norman, and company, he gave as one of the items that the "smallness" of the loan to be floated in London was a result of vindictive sulking on the part of Mr. Norman—sulking because the Bank was situated in Basle and not in London, and because an American had been chosen as President and a Frenchman as Director-General. M. Sauerwein had got hold of the stick given him, but got it at the wrong end. He thereby ruined an otherwise consistent display of bad temper.

THE NAVAL TREATY.

The text was published, as a White Paper, on April 22nd of the "International Treaty for the Limitation and Reduction of Naval Armament" (Cmd. 3556). It follows exactly the lines anticipated in last month's CONTEMPORARY, except that the provisions for the "humanisation" of the submarine were relegated to Part IV of the

* See *The Dupe as Hero*, by Logistes. Jonathan Cape. Chapter XV.

treaty. Parts I and II, then, record the agreement on technical matters and on the battleship "holiday," Part III the agreement to limit cruisers, destroyers, and submarines, Part IV the rules about "humane" submarines. France and Italy are bound only by Parts I, II, and IV, that is to say, they do not engage themselves to limit or to reduce their fleets.

As follows clearly from the narrative given in last month's CONTEMPORARY, the dissociation of France and Italy from the most important provisions of the treaty must be regarded as entirely the result of the French refusal to accept them. So unusual a form of treaty, in which two of the five signatory Powers restrict their signature to a small part of the treaty, naturally produces a confusion in the diplomatic formulæ used. The Preamble to the treaty, for instance, written in the names of France and Italy as well as of the United States, Japan, and Great Britain, contains these three clauses:

"Desiring to prevent the dangers and reduce the burdens inherent in competitive armaments, and

"Desiring to carry forward the work begun by the Washington Naval Conference and to facilitate the progressive realisation of general limitation and reduction of armaments,

"Have resolved to conclude a Treaty for the limitation and reduction of naval armament. . . ."

It is not clear to the plain man how France could subscribe to such a preamble, when in the treaty that follows it she expressly dissociates herself from that part of the treaty which in effect does limit and reduce naval armament.

A passing curiosity in the drafting of the treaty is that although "the French and English texts are both authentic" (Article 26) it is the French, and not the English text, that apparently constitutes the original document. The old question of French as "the diplomatic language" is one that has exercised French patriots since the war to a profound extent, and although the said patriots have had perforce to accept the parity of English with French as the twin diplomatic languages, a subtle and unremitting campaign has been waged from Paris to establish a *nuance* of implied priority. This is a small matter, but it is the small matters that are, as a rule, the most entertaining. In the drafting of the naval treaty, no less delicate a point arose than that of the order of names in the Preamble. It is the rule that the signatories of treaties preamble in alphabetical order. In the English text of the present treaty, the order would therefore run France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, United States; in the French text États-Unis, France, Grande-Bretagne, Italie, Japon (that is, if one concedes that the strictly correct name of France, viz. République Française, should

rank as F not as R in the order). Which order, therefore, should be adopted? Childishness in high diplomacy is as strong a motive as in any other field of human activity, and in this case the result was a foregone conclusion, for by adopting the French order, the United States came first. American influence, therefore, plunged for the French text, which was duly adopted. If the childishness of the world's diplomatists were in all cases as innocuous as in this case, there would be more joy among the nations.

The battleship holiday is prescribed in the following sentence of Part I, Article I:

"The High Contracting Parties agree not to exercise their rights to lay down the keels of capital ship replacement tonnage during the years 1931-36 inclusive as provided in Chapter II, Part 3 of the Treaty for the Limitation of Naval Armament signed between them at Washington on February 6th, 1922, and referred to in the present treaty as the Washington Treaty." Even in this part of the treaty, however, a concession had to be made to the French contention that as she had not before 1931 built all the capital ships to which she was entitled, her signature must not prevent her making up the leeway during the years mentioned. Italy, of course, thereupon claimed the like concession. The resultant reservation reads thus: "France and Italy may, however, build the replacement tonnage which they were entitled to lay down in 1927 and 1929 in accordance with the provisions of the said Treaty."

Part II of the treaty contains a highly technical specification for the exact meaning of the terms used in the provisions for naval limitation and of their application to the various fleets. This part of the treaty led to a curious comment in the House of Lords on May 8th. Lord Bridgeman in criticising the treaty, analysed a potential result of two separate stipulations of the treaty, whereby, he submitted, it might be impossible for Great Britain in practice to build up to the number of cruisers allowed to her in the treaty. He was referring on the one hand to Annex I of Part II of the treaty, which allows pre-armistice cruisers to be replaced after sixteen years, and, on the other hand, to Article 20 of the treaty whereby the amount of replacement in the case of Great Britain is restricted to 91,000 tons between now and December 1936. Lord Bridgeman's point was that owing to the actual position in the case of the British Navy, it would be impossible for the British Admiralty to have at its disposal in 1936 the fifty cruisers allotted to it in the treaty without violating the restriction laid down in Article 20, a restriction made exclusively in the case of Great Britain.

The relevant passages of the treaty run thus:

"... a vessel shall not be replaced before it becomes 'over-

age.' A vessel shall be deemed 'over-age' when the following number of years have elapsed since the date of its completion:—

"(a) For a surface vessel exceeding 3,000 tons (3,048 metric tons), but not exceeding 10,000 tons (10,160 metric tons) standard displacement:

"(i) If laid down before the January 1st, 1920: sixteen years;

"(ii) If laid down after December 31st, 1919: twenty years" (Part II, Annex I, Section I); and

"... Apart from the cruisers under construction on April 1st, 1930, the total replacement tonnage of cruisers to be completed, in the case of the British Commonwealth of Nations, prior to December 31st, 1936, shall not exceed 91,000 tons (92,456 metric tons)" (Part III, Article 20a).

Lord Bridgeman had been criticising the British drop from the seventy cruisers stipulated as the minimum in 1927, and the fifty stipulated in 1930, and then made his revelation in these words:

"Are we even to have our fifty? Sixteen years have been taken as the life of a pre-Armistice cruiser. Under the Article 20 of the treaty we, the only country of the three, are limited in our replacement tonnage to 91,000 tons. That appears to represent 137,000-ton ships, or it may represent 156,000-ton ships, or 185,000-ton ships. That does not give us a chance of getting anything like fifty at the end of 1936. We have many more obsolescent cruisers than any other country, but why are we the only country to be restricted in replacement? We shall only have twenty-four not over sixteen years of age if we do not build at all, and if we build up to the full allowance we shall have thirty-seven, thirty-nine, or forty-two, according to the tonnages I have mentioned. We cannot therefore get near to our fifty which was promised as the minimum essential for peace-time."

Lord Parmoor, answering for the Government later in the debate, dealt with Lord Bridgeman's point somewhat glancingly.

"Lord Bridgeman," he said, "has asked how we can have as many as fifty cruisers of less than sixteen years of age in 1936 when the additional replacement tonnage of cruisers we are permitted to build under Article 20 is limited to 91,000 tons. The answer is that, taking Lord Bridgeman's assumptions, we cannot; but the calculations we have made are not on the sixteen years' basis of life, but on the twenty years' basis. If we take twenty years as the life of the cruiser, then the provision for replacement is satisfactory."

Clearly there will need to be some further explanation of why it is that the British Navy will be able to build the number of ships allowed under the Treaty only by the expedient of adopting a twenty-year life, when the other Powers without exception can

achieve their ratio without exceeding a sixteen-year life? Was it an oversight on the part of the negotiators?

There will be many who will regard the issue as academic rather than important, for the reason that in any event the ships are not going to be used for war; but few will argue that the curious disclosure made by Lord Bridgeman does not merit an explanation on the part of the Government.

Part III of the Treaty is introduced by a sort of preamble within a preamble, to the effect that the United States, Great Britain, and Japan "have agreed as between themselves..." The figures of limitation and reduction agreed on by the three Powers in the categories of cruisers, destroyers, and submarines are the figures given in anticipation of the publication of the treaty in these pages last month.

The rules for the "humanisation" of the submarine are given at the end of the treaty in Part IV. It is better for the funny stuff to be put at the end, if for no other reason than to restore to a good humour those many people who may feel disappointed over certain parts of the treaty, for instance over the non-participation of France and Italy in the all-important Part III of the Treaty. Article 22, short and pleasant, deserves to be quoted for its humour: "The following are accepted as established rules of International Law:

"(1) In their action with regard to merchant ships, submarines must conform to the rules of International Law to which surface vessels are subject.

"(2) In particular, except in the case of persistent refusal to stop on being duly summoned, or of active resistance to visit or search, a warship, whether surface vessel or submarine, may not sink or render incapable of navigation a merchant vessel without having first placed passengers, crew, and ship's papers in a place of safety. For this purpose ship's boats are not regarded as a place of safety unless the safety of the passengers and crew is assured, in the existing sea and weather conditions, by the proximity of land, or the presence of another vessel which is in a position to take them on board.

"The High Contracting Parties invite all other Powers to express their assent to the above rules" (Part IV, Article 22).

No doubt there are people who will feel happier in building their submarines if they have promised to be good in using them. Any man who believes, however, that in the event of war Part IV, Article 22, Paragraph (2) of the International Treaty for the Limitation and Reduction of Naval Armaments will have the slightest effect, is a man who is singularly obstinate in ignoring the plain lesson of all history: the lesson namely that war, resulting from the breakdown of international law, cannot be, and never

is, conducted in conformity with any law whatsoever, except the law of the human jungle. That particular jungle is worse than anything to be found in the north of Siam, for even leopard-cats do not murder their own species by the million for no purpose. Only human beings do that. Although the notion of humanising a submarine, so far as its intrinsic meaning goes, is mostly silly, yet the motive behind it cannot be dismissed as silly. The reason why that motive is distasteful to right-minded people is that it is dishonest. The honest people who want to build submarines (if there be any such) do not pretend that their object is any but the sinking of a maximum number of ships, belligerent, merchant, or passenger, the drowning of as many people as possible, belligerent, merchant, or passenger, and the starving of as many people as possible. It is only the fact that a submarine can do these things more effectively than surface craft that gives it its peculiar terror and value as an offensive instrument of war. There can be no other reason why the decisive French politicians want to build for France the biggest submarine fleet in the world, and why they refused to sign that part of the Naval Limitation Treaty which aims at limiting the number of submarines, destroyers, and cruisers. It is no doubt arguable, however, that the particular prejudice which condemns submarines on the ground that they are dangerous to civilians as well as to soldiers and sailors, is an illogical and absurd prejudice. In the case of war, does it matter whether the people killed are civilian and not belligerent? Some people might even submit that if the million Englishmen killed in the Great War had been chosen from among those who stayed at home rather than from those who were sent to the fighting line, the general quality of British life would be higher to-day than it is.

May 15th, 1930.

GEORGE GLASGOW.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS

	PAGE.
I. REVIEWS	793
THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH NOVEL; MODERN POINTS OF VIEW; SHAKESPEARE'S LEGAL PROBLEMS; THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE; THE ELIZABETHAN HOME; THE CARNEGIE UNITED KINGDOM TRUST.	
2. SHORTER REVIEWS: "Albania"; "Notes on the Ministry of the Church and Christian Reunion"; "Turkey and Syria Reborn"; "The Teaching of English"	809
3. NOTICES OF BOOKS: "A Short History of British Expansion"; "Clemenceau"	812

THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH NOVEL.*

Dr. E. A. Baker, the Director of the School of Librarianship in the University of London, issued the first volume of his spacious work on the History of the English Novel as long ago as 1924 when it was duly noted in these pages. Three volumes have been since added in the last two years dealing respectively with the Elizabethan Age and After, the Later Romances and the Establishment of Realism, and (within the last few weeks) the fourth volume entitled *Intellectual Realism: from Richardson to Sterne*. The current volume—there are more to follow—insists upon the "profound and continuous effect of Fielding's work upon the course of English fiction since his day." Indeed, Dr. Baker regards the period of Richardson, Fielding, Smollett, and Sterne as "the most decisive period in the history of the English novel" and points to the return late in the nineteenth century "to what was profound and valuable in the method of Richardson." He declares that:

The Meredithian procedure, which is based on a sense of the *unité vivante* of the individual, whose character and actions are seized by a dramatic intuition, is, up to a point, identical with Richardson's. Meredith goes on to apply the reflective intelligence, thus achieving that creative technique which is at once intuitive and rational.

* The History of the English Novel (1) *The Age of Romance; from the Beginnings to the Renaissance* (1924). (2) *The Elizabethan Age and After* (1929). (3) *The Later Romances and the Establishment of Realism* (1929). (4) *Intellectual Realism: from Richardson to Sterne* (1930), by Ernest A. Baker. H. F. & G. Witherby. Each volume 16s. net.

One of the chief values of Dr. Baker's work is this comparative study of literary method and procedure. The historian stands apart from the mass of material with which he is dealing and shows, with a skilled touch, processes at work which demonstrate the continuity of the English novel. No doubt in the following volumes he will show that the warm realism of the great eighteenth-century novelists has its hereditary echoes, both in the cold realism of Jane Austen and the tragic almost Euripidean realism touched with romance of George Eliot on the one hand and the warm but romantic realism of the authors of the *Bride of Lammermoor* and *Bleak House* on the other. Mrs. Humphry Ward at her best—and a great best it is—is a continuator, so to speak, of the tradition of George Eliot while, of course, Sir Walter is continuously responsible for the romantic stories that absorbed undergraduates at the end of the nineteenth century. How Dr. Baker will place *The Dolly Dialogues*, the flippant living brilliancy of which recalls the lighter Elizabethan work, remains to be seen.

But this inevitable reference to Elizabethan influence proves the wisdom that Dr. Baker has shown in beginning his work in a learned survey of the origins of creative literature and continuing it through Elizabethan and later times until we come to the novel proper, if that is the correct term. He, by means of his definition of a novel as "the interpretation of human life by means of fictitious narrative in prose," has been able to move from the Arthurian Legend to Welsh Romances; from Chrétien de Troyes in the twelfth century to the *Chansons de Geste* and Malory at the end of the fifteenth century; from the Elizabethan translations out of Italian and Spanish sources to the whole of the congeries of prose fiction including the realistic fiction of rascality beginning with John Awdeley's *Fraternity of Vacabondes* published in 1561; from the Jacobean revival of romance to the intense realism of Defoe and the romantic idealism touched with realism of Bunyan. We seem to find all through these interpretations of human life from Saxon times onwards a twofold force: realism and idealism; in the same way that we find from the first in all serious work the twofold force of the presentation of good and evil. Not that realism is identified with evil and idealism with good. Far from it. But there are twofold literary and twofold moral forces which from century to century are interpreting in their respective ways human life in fictitious narrative.

If we have not a Cervantes we have a Shakespeare, who is not only a playwright but a novelist and a teller of moral tales, and strangely enough, as Dr. Baker points out, Fielding was influenced by both and he is influencing the modern world. Shakespeare himself was almost certainly influenced by Chaucer.

- It is a strange, almost a miraculous, continuity, but all through it there is the continuous conflict of good and evil, the continuous combination of realism and idealism. The greatest of all realists and idealists is to come in this history, Dickens. He, in a sense, combines all the forces that had gone before, and he creates a world of his own with living creatures of his own creation, photographically like the creatures of an actual world, and that world is endowed with a definite moral idealistic purpose, the betterment of the world which it mirrors. Dickens is in the great tradition.

It is unnecessary here and now to go into the special judgments that Dr. Baker makes upon this or that movement, this or that writer. The reader may or may not agree with them though they are all well-based upon real study of the authors. But the chief value of this work is its comparative method, its realisation of not only the continuity of the English author's conception of what man is and what man ought to be, but of the successive and perhaps unconscious influence from age to age of one author upon another. This volume takes the reader to the work of Sterne who may, in a sense, be called a realist, since his work is alive, amazingly alive, but he was only a realist in this sense since, after all, he was a conscious sentimentalist and sometimes a very unpleasant one. Dr. Baker calls him an impressionist because "impressionism is the right if not the only method of presenting himself and the world open to the sentimentalist." It may be so, but Sterne sadly lacks nobility though he touches the feelings perhaps even more than most other English writers. But he touches the feelings and not the depths of man, and his successors have the same fault, even Charles Lamb. Dr. Baker considers that this art is "entirely subjective." That may be doubted, for there is realism in it. But Sterne hardly is in the tradition of the great English novelists. He gave up to precious art what was meant for mankind.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

MODERN POINTS OF VIEW.*

These broadcast addresses, which aroused considerable interest at the time, are prefaced by a summing-up in which Mr. Lowes Dickinson fairly surveys the field. He says that after some two thousand years of Christianity "Religion is no longer a crusted loaf, it is a ferment in the dough, and it would be rash for any

* *Points of View: A Series of Broadcast Addresses*, by G. Lowes Dickinson, Dean Inge, H. G. Wells, J. B. S. Haldane, Sir Oliver Lodge, Sir Walford Davies. With an Introduction and a summing-up by G. Lowes Dickinson and a Supplementary Letter by Sir Oliver Lodge. George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 4s. 6d. net.

man to say what bread may come out of it. We may approve or disapprove these facts, but we cannot deny them. They determine all our present-day attitudes." He declares that all realise now that on questions of "facts" science is the only authority, and says that "the gulf between this attitude and that of mediæval Christianity is profound. It implies the greatest and most pregnant change that has ever happened in the world." But what are "facts"? Are there no realities which are incapable of being, so to speak, weighed and measured? If there are realities outside of the symbols which represent what we call the physical universe are not these "facts"? The philosopher and the theologian declare that there are these realities.

Another point in the able summing-up that may perhaps be criticised is the doctrine that "all property should take the form of payment for work. As things are, of course, a great part of our property does not take this form and therefore notoriously encourages enormous idleness. I think this very undesirable." Of course idleness is very undesirable, but, in fact, the property is *in use* and in the vast mass of cases it represents accumulations from the work which individuals have done and which they would never have done had they not been allowed to accumulate for the use of their children and friends after their death. The true doctrine is responsibility for acquired savings or wealth, and more and more we see that this doctrine of responsibility is operating among the rich. Idleness is becoming rarer and rarer among those who have had the benefit of true education. On one point among others that it is possible heartily to agree with Mr. Dickinson is his belief that "science has put it into our power to achieve, at last, if we have the wisdom and courage, the age-long dream of brotherhood and peace." Indeed we may enlarge Mr. Dickinson's *dictum* and extend it to all these "Points of View" which in a higher unity seem to say that if Science, Philosophy, and Religion will work together the dream of brotherhood and peace must become a reality.

Dean Inge bases his faith in Christianity on the testimony of the heart and conscience of all right-minded people and mysticism or personal religious experience. Mr. H. G. Wells declares that "we are mortal persons responding to the advance of perhaps immortal ideas. We are not ourselves only; we are also part of human experience and thought. . . . I think that Man is immortal, but not men." Mr. J. B. S. Haldane finds "in science and art, and in an attempt to lead a good life, all the religion that I want." Sir Oliver Lodge—a thinker of the first rank—points out that the anthropological point of view must be incomplete and unfinished since the earth some day must perish, but the

- "individual is more permanent than the race . . . it is an outward and visible sign of a permanent entity in the cosmos, something that endures and need not cease to be." Sir Oliver thinks that that fact is part of the essence of Christianity. "Each individual is of permanent and vital significance. . . . This world is temporary; it will cease. But that is not the whole of existence: the permanent realities lie outside all that. . . . The Christian revelation also drives home the permanent and paramount importance of the individual soul. Ignore that and our philosophy is defective." Sir Walford Davies, in declaring his belief in immortality, says, "Can you really burn or otherwise destroy an individual form? In the same way the lilies perish, but the form of the lily, as a creative concept of God and a percept of his appreciative little son called Man, seems to have no perishable quality." All these opinions are well worth reading, but the negative conclusions are saddening, not for the reader, but for those who hold them, since it is so easy to be negative while the world can only progress by positive forces that insist on the infinite value of the individual Man.

* * *

SHAKESPEARE'S LEGAL PROBLEMS.*

- Mr. G. W. Keeton, one of the younger school of learned lawyers, has from a new point of view approached the problem of the soundness of the legal principles that Shakespeare applied in the course of his plays. It is an old controversy and it has no relation to the absurd assertion that Francis Bacon is the author of Shakespeare's plays and of anything else that is outstanding in Elizabethan literature. Indeed if the so-called Baconian theory of authorship were related to the knowledge of law exhibited in the plays it would be in an even worse case than it is, since Bacon could not possibly have made the technical mistakes that Shakespeare makes.

Mr. Keeton does not approach this ludicrous question, but Lord Darling in his laudatory preface dryly remarks that it is "greatly to the credit of an author who has gained the Bacon Scholarship at Gray's Inn that he makes no allusion to those who attribute to the greatest lawyer that learned Society has produced the works generally attributed to England's supreme poet." Mr. Keeton examines not Shakespeare's law as exhibited in numberless passages, obviously written by a layman who moved in legal circles, but the specific legal problems which faced the dramatist in the course of his plays. Sir Sidney Lee in his

* *Shakespeare and his Legal Problems*, by George W. Keeton. With a Foreword by the Right Hon. Lord Darling, P.C. A. and C. Black Ltd. 7s. 6d. net.

refutation of Lord Campbell's idea that the dramatist in his early days had some professional connection with legal practice says quite truly that "the poet's legal knowledge is a mingled skein of accuracy and inaccuracy, and the errors are far too numerous and important to justify on sober inquiry the plea of technical experience." To be a lawyer's clerk in an ordinary case would not be a safeguard against legal error (indeed a little technical knowledge on the law is a fruitful source of litigation), yet a man with Shakespeare's brain would have made an immaculate lawyer's clerk. But the use of legal terminology was a vogue in Shakespeare's time among laymen and, as Sir Sidney points out, Spenser was as great an offender as Shakespeare, while Ben Jonson, Massinger, and Webster (none of them had a legal training) "use legal words and phrases and describe legal processes with all the great dramatist's frequency and facility, and on the whole with fewer blunders." But it is one thing to make technical mistakes in words and quite another to propound erroneous solutions to legal problems arising in the course of dramatic action. Shakespeare had close touch with members of the Inns of Court and would naturally consult them on a vital specific problem.

Now Sir Sidney Lee declares that in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Measure for Measure* there is "a radical unsoundness in Shakespeare's interpretation alike of elementary legal principles and of legal procedure." Mr. Keeton in effect denies this, and since elementary legal principles are after all common sense, and common sense is Shakespeare's strong suit, he denies it with some effect. Lord Darling finds especially interesting and profitable

Mr. Keeton's examination of the cause of Shylock and Antonio, his explanation of the various arguments employed by Portia, and his conjectures concerning the absence of other contentions whose relevance, at first glance, may appear sufficient to have justified their submission to the judgment of the Doge. As it is, the speech of Portia would perhaps more closely resemble the addresses to which juries are privileged to listen did it contain more false points than it does.

Mr. Keeton takes the point that in Shakespeare's day though law and equity were administered in independent courts yet the principle that equity should prevail was taking shape and that a judgment at Common Law would be mitigated in Chancery. The Bond was enforceable at Common Law. "For the leading case of illegality of object in validating a contract under seal, we have to wait for *Collins v. Blantern* in 1766—nearly two centuries later." The Doge is bound by the law, but he sets in motion, in calling for the civilian Bellario from Padua, the Chancery

jurisdiction. Portia appears, and at once applies the equitable remedy and adopts

precisely the attitude of the Court of Chancery at the period. Substitute "estate" for "pound of flesh," and you have a typical Elizabethan suit in Chancery. The creditor is about to take possession of the estate. Very well, says the Court, you may take possession, but you must use the profits you acquire by taking possession in satisfaction of the debt, and you must account strictly for everything that you receive, and everything that you might have received had you been more diligent. In Shylock's case he is to take neither less nor more, nor must he shed one drop of blood—i.e. the estate must not suffer in the slightest degree for the entry into possession of the creditor. In both cases the creditor prefers the safer course, and refrains from entering into possession.

But there is a further point. Shylock has got his judgment and is preparing to put it into effect *on the body of the debtor*. It is one thing to get a judgment at Common Law, but the moment that it is proposed to put it into effect by attempting the life of the debtor then the bond becomes illegal and a criminal attempt. Shakespeare's law is a picture of the conflict then in progress between the English Common Law and the law of the Court of Chancery. "He has skilfully woven the law as he saw it into the material of his plot." In fact Shakespeare must have discussed the problem with some very acute lawyers, and the trial scene is the result.

Various other problems are dealt with in a fashion which shows that Shakespeare had been taking good legal advice before setting the form of his question. A very technical question in the law of bastardy, the case of Falconbridge in *King John*, is correctly solved, and Mr. Keeton says, "surveying the trial as a whole, it is impossible to refrain from expressing the opinion that Shakespeare possessed a sound knowledge of the principles of the law relating to bastardy." But the case in fact was very technical involving a knowledge of Year Book Law, and as it happens was wholly opposed to common sense, though the conclusion was good law at that date. It is, therefore, certain that Shakespeare put the case before his legal friends and wrote up their opinion, but devised a final solution which made equity and not the old feudal law prevail. The Falconbridge case is very important, since the knowledge shown was not that of a lawyer's clerk but of a lawyer with highly technical knowledge, and this is especially clear in the transfer of the land in question from Philip to Robert, which raises a question of feudal law of real complexity. Not even Lord Campbell has suggested that Shakespeare was more than a lawyer's clerk. He was not a member of any Inn of Court

or Chancery, and he must have taken legal advice on this particular knotty question. In the same way he must have had advice in the three cases of appeal followed by trial by battle (*Henry VI*, Act 1, Scene iii; *King Lear*, Act 5, Scene 1, *Richard II*, Act 1, Scene 1). On the other hand the trial scene in the *Winter's Tale* shows no sign of a lawyer's touch. The dramatist "makes criminal procedure completely subservient to dramatic value." It is true that Hermione is regularly indicted for treason under the statute of 1351, but it is indeed "an exceedingly irregular trial" and Mr. Keeton rightly says that the absence of Counsel for the Crown "is a strong reason for demolishing the Baconian heresy. Bacon played a leading part in the trial of his former patron, Essex, for treason. His trained mind could never have produced the dramatic irregularities of this scene." It may be that the *Winter's Tale* was written in 1610-11 in Stratford out of reach of the Gentlemen of the Temple.

Perhaps as valuable a part as any of Mr. Keeton's book are the essays on the constitutional and international law arising out of the historical plays. The essayist asks

Does Shakespeare give us a coherent theory concerning the right of his kings to occupy the throne, and if so, is it the true one? . . . Shakespeare's conception of the right to rule England is fundamentally dynastic. The crown to him descends in the manner of real property, and he has the best claim who can prove priority of descent. All others are usurpers. This is a view which is reflected in all the histories.

Shakespeare was justified in this theory. The alternative view was based on the feudal constitutional scheme of things and no doubt in mediæval times this view determined succession. But in Shakespeare's time the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings was growing to maturity and the dramatist was giving a current as well as a dramatic value in elaborating this theory. The Parliamentary title to the Crown, though its source is in the King in Parliament, as a matter of fact follows in the main the doctrine of real property, though in the constitutional spasm that ended the Stuart rule the Stuarts were shut out. Possibly Mr. Keeton disagrees with this view, but he admits that in Shakespeare's view "Henry VII is at once the nation's choice and the best entitled in right of descent." Sir Robert Filmer's later view was a fact permeating a section of English society in the days when Shakespeare was writing, the derivation of kingship from the structure of the patriarchal family. Mr. Keeton shows how Shakespeare was acquainted with the theory of Divine Right, but that the dramatist does not commit himself to any theory save to the thesis that a good king "is the guardian of his subjects'

welfare, and his life is devoted to their service." Mr. Keeton comments on the fact that Shakespeare does not mention the Great Charter, but at the opening of the seventeenth century it was rather a lawyer's theme than the popular theme which the next half-century was to make it. But Shakespeare does construct a fine ideal for kingship, and it is intimately related to the people though not to Parliament. Indeed the Parliamentary title would have been a piece of prophecy in which Shakespeare of all dramatists would not have indulged since, after all, he was writing in the first place for Court circles. To portray the human side of things, not the political, was Shakespeare's task. Sir Sidney Lee criticises Shakespeare's law in what he says about *Measure for Measure*. Sir Sidney was really concerned to prove that Shakespeare was not a lawyer. But it is interesting to see that Mr. Keeton goes further than that. He does not condemn the law in that great play.

Measure for Measure . . . appears as a study in criminal justice, and an indictment of the meaningless severity of the Elizabethan criminal law. . . . Prisoners should be reformed, if this be possible, and their punishment should not be excessive. Where it is possible, the law should insist that prisoners should redress the harm they have caused. Where it is not, they should be so treated that others will be persuaded from committing similar crimes. That Shakespeare should have enunciated these legal truths at the beginning of the seventeenth century is yet another proof of his unerring range of vision.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE.*

Mr. Dampier-Whetham is to be congratulated on the completion of what must be regarded as his classical work on the history of science and its relation to philosophy and religion. A judicial treatise was, indeed, needed at this time when a new epoch of thought with respect to the physical and biological universe and its relations to the outlook of Man on the subjective themes that we call philosophy and religion, has opened. In world-history there can be little doubt that the opening decades of the twentieth century will be notable—perhaps chiefly notable—for this fact, and at a time when the new education has made all classes of society demand some knowledge, at any rate, of the basic facts of the new epoch of thought, it is gratifying to find that the University Press at Cambridge, the central and ancient home of science, has been able

* *A History of Science and its Relations with Philosophy and Religion*, by William Cecil Dampier Dampier-Whetham. Cambridge: at the University Press. 18s. net.

to issue at a very cheap price this well-printed book of more than five hundred pages.

Mr. Dampier-Whetham has no personal theory of the Universe to urge forward, no theory which is not implicit in his judicial review of the thinking of the last two thousand years and more. He travels from synthesis to synthesis with an austere, judicial mind. He sees the extraordinary fruitfulness of the thought of the earlier Greek physicists such as Aristarchus of Samos and yet can appreciate to the full the epicycles of Hipparchus that satisfied physicists from the time of Ptolemy to Tycho Brahe. He boldly attacks the attitude of Plato to physical problems and frankly says that the teaching of Democritus as to the atom, which was destroyed by Plato and Aristotle, was nearer to the views now held than any other system.

Platonism in its various forms was left to represent Greek thought to later ages, a fact which was one of the reasons why the scientific spirit vanished from the earth for a thousand years. Plato was a great philosopher, but in the history of experimental science he must be counted a disaster.

Yet Mr. Dampier-Whetham does not condemn the scholasticism of St. Thomas Aquinas. It, despite the errors of Aristotle and his master Plato, served a great purpose.

A new and alternative synthesis arose in the scholasticism of St. Thomas Aquinas, who built up a complete, rational scheme of knowledge, in which Christian doctrines were blended with Aristotelian philosophy and science. As the survival of Roman Law kept alive the ideal of order through the time of chaos and through the Middle Ages, so Scholasticism upheld the supremacy of reason, teaching that God and the universe can be apprehended, even partially understood, by the mind of man. In this it prepared the way for science, which has to assume that nature is intelligible. The men of the Renaissance, when they founded modern science, owed this assumption to the Scholastics.

But synthesis has followed synthesis from age to age, and when Newton proclaimed the first great modern physical synthesis he did not claim that the problem of the Universe was solved, since gravitation remains unexplained. Yet lesser minds became materialistic or deterministic, and the nineteenth century saw the great battle between a mechanical and a spiritual outlook and, despite the mighty leap into the unknown that Clerk Maxwell took with his doctrine of undulations, most men of science became more and more materialistic. They, in fact, were not all-round thinkers such as Leonardo da Vinci and the leaders of the Renaissance. Copernicus was an all-round scholar and prepared the way for the telescope of Galileo, though the old thoughts of Ptolemy fasted in

the theory of the Roman Church until "in 1822 the Sun received the formal sanction of the Papacy to become the centre of the planetary system." But Mr. Dampier-Whetham, following Professor Whitehead, rightly declines to make much of the so-called persecution of Galileo. It was a mild reproof and, as Professor Whitehead says, "the way in which the persecution of Galileo has been remembered is a tribute to the quiet commencement of the most intimate change in outlook which the human race had yet encountered." The materialistic scientists of the nineteenth century were as dogmatic as the Thomists of the seventeenth century, and they were as wholly wrong in their synthesis as the mediæval followers of Aristotle. The sceptics of the nineteenth century were in many ways the children of the eighteenth-century sceptics of the type of Voltaire and of David Hume, the type of Macbeth himself.

Voltaire and Hume were great personalities and affected the minds of their contemporaries, but they were painfully ignorant of the subjects upon which they dogmatized, even more ignorant than Auguste Comte who, dying just before the establishment of spectrum analysis, made Positivism risible by the positive declaration that man had reached the limits of his knowledge as to the outer Universe. But even the eighteenth-century materialists should have known better. As Mr. Dampier-Whetham says:

"We shall see how the hard, massy, ultimate particles of Lucretius and Newton have been resolved into complex systems of protons and whirling electrons, non-material, perhaps only to be represented by wave-equations. We shall see too how, in the light of relativity, matter has ceased to be something which persists in time and moves in space, and has become a mere system of inter-related events. In the eighteenth century such possibilities were still hidden in the future; but Locke and Berkeley and Hume had already shown that nature could only be apprehended through the senses. Even with the knowledge then available, materialism, in ultimate analysis, should have failed to satisfy."

Yet Mr. Dampier-Whetham sees the uses of the honest materialism of the nineteenth century, as he sees the uses of other brilliant, successive but erroneous syntheses. Though "materialism cannot even refute Berkeley's idealism, at the opposite pole of thought," though "it cannot survive the destructive analysis of any critical philosophy," yet "it supplied for a time the best uninstructed alternative to uninstructed orthodoxy." The nineteenth century had to go right ahead with classical physics until it reached the point when the philosophy of physics and biology quietly intervened and made perfectly clear that the Universe could only be represented to the human mind by a symbolic system which has an infinity of practical uses, but cannot reveal the purpose of things.

The nineteenth century closed with a synthesis of the material universe which prophesied an ultimate state of equilibrium where change was impossible. Such generalisations were based on limited and imperfect premises, and the theory of biology was subject to the same mechanistic errors. And yet progress was all along the line and the mechanistic theory of things was doing as great a work as earlier provisional theories had done. The doctrine of biological evolution as enunciated by Darwin, his predecessors, and successors, was part of that provisional theory, and the mathematicians and philosophers were playing their part in taking the provisional theory of things into the ultimate stages where it would give way to a new synthesis altogether. Into that new synthesis the author of this very remarkable book leads the way in such a fashion that the reader can see the new horizons, and if he is wise can dream of horizons which he will not see in his mortal span. The end is not yet, but faith has come again into its own and makes possible new hope and new adventures to the unconquerable spirit of man.

J. E. G. DE M.

* * *

THE ELIZABETHAN HOME.*

The limited edition of this most interesting book published in 1925 has been now re-issued in a revised edition. It consists of two dialogues, the first drawn from Conversation Manuals by Claudius Hollyband entitled *The French Schoolmaister*, *The French Littleton*, and *Campo di Fior*, and the second from *The French Garden*, by Peter Erondell, both Huguenots "who taught French for their livelihood in Elizabethan London." Who was Hollyband? He was a Frenchman, Claude de Saintliens (Sancto Vinculo or Holyband), who came to Lewisham—the neighbourhood of the Court at Greenwich—and set up a school where apparently he taught French successfully to the notorious Anthony Munday—it is a Greenwich name—who in 1679 was tramping Europe as a spy. Eventually, probably in 1566, Hollyband moved his school to St. Paul's Churchyard. He based his earlier dialogues on the Latin dialogues of that eminent Spanish teacher, Juan Luis Vives, but later wrote freely in English and gave a vivid picture in dialogue of contemporary English school and home life. Mr. St. Clare Byrne thinks that the picture drawn is unique so far as normal school and home life is concerned, but that is clearly not so, as the picture of child life and school life as drawn by Shakespeare is vivid indeed. Miss Elizabeth Godfrey, in her exquisite volume entitled *English*

* *The Elizabethan Home: Discovered in Two Dialogues*, by Claudius Hollyband and Peter Erondell. Edited by M. St. Clare Byrne. Cobden-Sanderson. 5s. net.

Children in the Olden Time, published by Methuen & Co. in 1907, gives a full picture of Elizabethan child life drawn from Shakespeare.

The late Professor Foster Watson in his invaluable treatise on *Religious Refugees and English Education* (1911) provides a very full account of Claude Hollyband, "the chief of the Huguenot pioneers of schools for teaching French in England." He seems to have come to England before 1565, since apparently an edition of his *French Schoolmaister* was issued in that year and the second edition in 1573. Meantime, in 1566, he published through Vautrollier, a Huguenot refugee, his *French Littleton*, and at that date he was already teaching in St. Paul's Churchyard "by the sign of the Lucrece," so that the beginning of his sojourn in Lewisham must have been much earlier. He appealed to lawyers, as the title of his second book shows, probably in the belief that the Anglo-Norman still spoken in the English Law Courts was really French. He was living in Westminster in 1568, apparently with his French usher, John Henryake, and attended the parish church of St. Margaret's. In 1580 he produced his *Treasure of the French Tongue*, which was the basis of his *Dictionarie French and English*, published in 1593, which Miss Lucy E. Farrer in her work *La Vie et les Œuvres de Claude de Saintliens* (published in Paris in 1908 by Honoré Champion) says was based (as to the French) on Nicot's dictionary of 1573. Hollyband or Holyband thus was a pioneer in the construction of international dictionaries. Apparently the date of his death is unknown, but he was still alive and in England in 1597. Mr. Byrne makes an interesting point about Hollyband's English. "One would like to know whether he originally learnt his English from a Scotsman. Surely not otherwise would he have acquired the habit of persistently referring to his porridge as 'them.'" Nothing is more likely since there were many Scotsmen in France at this period.

Mr. Byrne, however, has another purpose than to trace the early teaching of French by French teachers in London. He is intent on giving a picture of English family life through the eyes of a French pedagogue in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. We see a middle-class family and we hear the schoolboy getting ready for school: "Margerite, geeve me my kosen; dispatche, I pray you: where is my doublet? bryng my garters, and my shooes: give me that shooyng horne." He is nine and a half years old and goes to school in St. Paul's Churchyard where—according to Hollyband—he learns to *speak* Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, High Dutch and Greek, and also learns to cypher. The boy is sped off to school after breakfast and prayers and as he is late, in order to avoid a beating, the father tells him to invite his master

and mistress to dinner on the morrow. That is one picture. Then we have the picture of a father taking his son to Hollyband's school and we learn that the schoolmaster has a wife and children. Hollyband does not only teach French, "unto some he readeth Terence, Virgill, Horace, Tullies offices: unto others, Cato, pueriles, their accidentes, their grammer, according to their capacity: as for me, I learne only Frenche, and to read and writ, and sometimes to cipher." The father does not give his son a good character: "he is somewhat hard of wit, understanding, memorie: he is shamefast, wanton, wicked, liar, stuborne unto father and mother: correct, chasten, amend all these faultes." The Elizabethan parent was harder than the neo-Georgian, but it is difficult to believe such frankness. Yet John Nothingworth is a terror indeed and his companion Nicolas a tell-tale of the worst order. The master (very French) shouts, "Ah, littell fellow, you prattel, brabell, cakell, play the vice. Geve me my roddes: stretch your hand." Dinner was evidently very early, since afternoon school begins at twelve and lasts till five when evening prayers are read. Then there is some evening work.

The meals are described: breakfast, brown bread and butter and fruit; dinner, porridge and a mess of eggs or fish with small beer or watered wine. In place of our tea the children had bread and dried fruits or, in the summer, fresh fruit. The main meal seems to have been supper, when salad and meat, cheese, eggs, and nuts were served. Apparently forks were used and there were strict table manners. If this is a true picture of school life in the reign of Queen Elizabeth the boys did well, but the picture, in fact, errs on the side of pleasantness and good living. Possibly that is also true in the case of the description of the citizen at home, but in fact the citizen described by Hollyband was a very well-to-do man who had been educated at "the Colledge of Winchester." Dinner was at noon and the wife superintended the feast. Apparently a selected child said grace and the children dined at their own round table after reading a passage from the New Testament. The whole picture of the dinner is very vivid. There is (*inter alia*) broth, chickens, and a pasty of venison, blackbirds, larks, woodcocks, partridges, pike, carp, and plenty of fruit, tarts, and cake washed down by much white wine, followed by music. The description of the feast is quite Shakespearean. The singer says: "I should not be a singing man except I could drink well: and for feare we should have the throte dry, we weat the mouth often: and among us singers we have a good recepte for to be never drie." Elizabethan citizenship was a pleasant thing. Erondell's account of a higher social circle is more delicate, but lacks naturally the robust manners that adorned the home of a city magnate.

THE CARNEGIE UNITED KINGDOM TRUST.*

The very important social work done by the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, a body of trustees of whom Lord Elgin is Chairman, makes it desirable to note the phases of the work which the generosity and public spirit of Andrew Carnegie made possible. The help given to social movements is designed to "meet new needs as they arise," pioneer movements of a charitable nature. The Charter limits expenditure exclusively to charitable objects as understood by the law—this is a very wide scope—and if the body which it is proposed to help is a recognised charity there is no difficulty, but bodies cannot be helped by the Trust unless it can be shown that the particular purpose for which the grant is requested is itself charitable in the legal sense. This is a real difficulty since pioneer work must be proved to be eligible. However the forthcoming programme has overcome these difficulties for the time being and includes the continuance until 1931-2 of the Playing Field policy with a further allocation for Children's Play Centres, "a comprehensive development of Library policy based largely on those specific theories of co-ordination which are gradually emerging from the general principles enunciated in recent Reports," an extended policy of rural development, of adult education, and an experiment in public museums. These ventures are all on the same plane of thought, and will dovetail into various aspects of national education. Indeed the Trust has, in several directions, co-operated directly with Government departments in various aspects of essentially educational work.

The Playing Field activities of the Trust which began in 1927-8 have stimulated both local authorities and bodies of trustees. The grants are conditional on local expenditure of considerable sums and yet only in two or three cases out of a total of 260 in the years 1928 and 1929 have the Trust's grants been refused. The interest of the Royal Family in this particular movement must be taken into account in this widespread willingness, but it is noteworthy that "even small villages have gratefully accepted sums as low as £20, and have very gallantly raised the rest by loans or by means of concerts, bazaars, and other methods of collection." The perpetuity of the playing fields is secured by the condition of grants that the land should be held under the provisions of the

* The Carnegie United Kingdom Trust (Incorporated by Royal Charter). Sixteenth Annual Report (for the year ending December 31st, 1929) Approved by the Trustees on Friday, March 7th, 1930. The Secretary, Comely Park House, Dunfermline.

Recreation Grounds Act, 1859, but this is not really necessary since any form of tenure approved by Charity Commissioners can safely be accepted. In the event of the failure of the Trust the Commissioners would make a new scheme. The Trust in 1929 expended £19,113 in this way, eighty-six grants having been made. Two of the difficulties associated with playing fields are inadequate maintenance and lack of supervision. No doubt these matters will be attended to by the authorities responsible for the upkeep of the fields. It is certainly true that "a measure of discipline is essential if playing fields are to perform a really useful service." The fields, it may be suggested, might be put in the charge, in many cases, of a committee of prefects drawn from the local schools. Such a committee would perform a really social service while preserving the amenities necessary for themselves. The success of the Playing Fields Movement has naturally stimulated in a larger region the demand for the play centres for young children initiated by Mrs. Humphry Ward. The Trust in the past year has made sixteen grants for helping on this work, the total being £6,166. This policy is to be continued during the quinquennium 1931-5, and applicants for the grants should know that they are for equipment only, the local authority having provided the ground in perpetuity, and undertaking the maintenance and supervision of the centres. The maximum grant will be £500, preference being given to towns which are also making liberal provision for general playing fields.

The library policy is generous and it has been aided by the greatly increased strength and activity of the newly constituted Library Association. Twenty-one new grants to borough libraries have cost the Trustees £10,475, and the Trustees have decided to make an increased allocation for the next quinquennium. The effect of the grants has been to stimulate the interest of local authorities in the library service "as an educational agency of the first importance," and it is noteworthy that "the proportion of non-fiction issues has increased considerably in practically every library." The work of the central library for students is excellent, while the grants made to boys' clubs and girls' clubs for library purposes amounted to no less than £2,360, a total since the initiation of the movement of £14,670. The effect of this adolescent scheme on continued education will grow with the raising of the school age. This report should be studied closely in all the phases of the activities recorded, not only by those bodies who need help for urban or rural social activities, but by those also who are interested in the history of such movements. The Carnegie Trust covers the widest social range possible and is always on the watch to aid new forms of humanism.

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Albania,* by J. Swire, is an extremely valuable addition to the political literature of the Balkans. A comprehensive work on Albania has long been needed, and the painstaking thoroughness of Mr. Swire is beyond praise. Beginning with a sketch of its history before the Treaty of Berlin, he describes in succeeding chapters the national awakening, the struggle for autonomy, and the acquisition of independence as a result of the Balkan war of 1912-13. The chapter on the brief and troubled reign of Prince William of Wied is the most valuable in the book, for the Prince has frankly discussed its vicissitudes with the author and provided him with a mass of valuable notes. Mr. Swire paints an attractive portrait both of the man and the ruler. "His only fault was his ignorance of diplomacy in its lowest form, which made him incapable of holding his own with the knaves and fools by whom he was surrounded." Faced by the ambitions of Essad and the intrigues of the Powers, destitute alike of money and of soldiers, he was bound to fail, and the experiment was virtually over by the time the world war broke out. Having escaped from Turkey and emerged from the world war without a ruler, Albania naturally became a Republic; but she was only saved by the Powers from her greedy neighbours. Mr. Swire has much that is interesting to tell us of Ahmed Zogu, both as a Minister and a King. The young ruler is described as brave, capable, and patriotic. His seizure of power is justified by the fact that the government of Fan Noli was quite incompetent, and the Treaty of Tirana is approved as the only way of defending the country from the unsleeping ambitions of Belgrade. "The Pact was equivalent to a declaration by Italy that she was prepared no longer to allow Yugo-Slavia, either officially or unofficially, to retard the progress of Albania towards stability and prosperity." He does not share the general opinion that Albania is nothing but a pawn of Italy, for he believes that the backward little country of less than a million inhabitants has now for the first time a chance of developing its resources in peace. The assumption of the royal title by the Dictator is also approved on the ground that a sovereign is likely to be more stable and more independent than a President. The volume ends on an optimistic note. "Thus in the space of fifty years did Albania rise from a mere geographical expression to a kingdom. From a remote region of a ramshackle Empire she has become an independent state with every prospect of prosperity, a stabilised exchange, a reasonable foreign policy, a powerful ally, and a capable sovereign."

* * *

Canon W. J. Brown, the Director of Religious Education in the diocese of Wakefield, has issued *Notes on the Ministry of the Church and Christian Reunion*† in which he sketches the main issues of the questions involved, the aim being to present the facts accurately and impartially and where there is a "difference of opinion within the Church of England, as for instance in regard to Apostolic Succession, the views are stated without comment." Some of the conclusions

* Williams & Norgate. 30s.

† 5, South Parade, Wakefield. Price 6d.

are (1) that Our Lord founded a dynamic society on the basis of discipleship, ministry, and sacraments, in accordance with principles which could be applied as need arose, the Church or society representing the rule of God and exercising authority by commissioned persons; (2) that the organisation of the early Church was rudimentary and adapted to meet immediate needs under the authority of the Apostles and with two types of ministers, Missionary and Local, the former being the more important. The local Churches were presided over by a body of presbyters or presbyter-bishops who were not replaced by a single or monarchical bishop till the end of the second century. At the Reformation the Church of England repudiated the Papacy, but maintained historic continuity with pre-Reformation times and maintained the threefold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons. The non-conforming bodies, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, and Congregationalists, abandoned the threefold ministry at the Reformation or later, and have ministries that "depend for their efficacy upon the inward call, rather than upon ordination. They are perhaps best described as prophetic ministries." The Church of England, however, "does not deny that these 'irregular' ministries have been greatly blessed, and that their rise, in view of past history, was in a measure inevitable." Canon Brown adds that there is a desire both at home and abroad on the part of many nonconformists "to acknowledge the historic episcopate as one of the conditions of reunion." As to the Roman Church he says that until it "changes its mind in regard to the ministry of the Church of England there can be no hope of reunion." The Anglican communion has led the way towards reunion and in the South India Scheme "the historic episcopate is accepted in a constitutional form without intending thereby to imply, or to express a judgment on any theory concerning episcopacy." The scheme is to be considered at the Lambeth Conference this year and the points of view of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon are to be considered. This is a useful and fair-minded little book and worthy of close study at this time.

* * *

Turkey and Syria Reborn,* by Harold Armstrong, is a record of two years of travel in countries already well known to the author from previous visits and military service. The first half of the volume describes Syria under the yoke of the French, in whom he finds very little to praise. The Arabs naturally detest them; but even the Maronites, who at first welcomed their arrival, are now loud in their condemnation. Though Captain Armstrong is no admirer of the French system, he is an equally sharp critic of both Arabs and Turks. He failed to discover the romantic heroes of Lawrence's imagination, and speaks with severity of "the drab uselessness, the brutality, and the incompetence of the Arabs." The Turks are no better, except as warriors, and he roundly condemns "the helpless inefficiency, the cruelties, and the injustices of the Ottoman Empire." The revolution involved in the disappearance of Turkish rule is realistically compared to the turning over of a muck-heap, which only stinks the more for being turned. When he crosses the Syrian frontier and enters Turkey as a Delegate of the Commission

* The Bodley Head. 15s.

of Assessment of Damage, he finds little more to approve; the bravery and energy of the Armenians are recognised, but they are depicted as crafty, unlovable, and greedy. The new Turkey presents the spectacle of a poverty-stricken country, ruled by a superman vainly endeavouring to educate and modernise his primitive subjects. The men at the top, we are told, are full of energy and ideas, but the subordinate officials are as bad as ever, and the peasants are unchanged. "Beyond the primitive facts—to eat, to drink, to sleep, to be warmed by the sun or a fire, to catch lice when they become irritating, to beget and to die—they have no ideas." The prospects are gloomy. The industrious Greeks and Armenians have been expelled or massacred, and the capital required to develop Asia Minor is not to be had. Moreover, Mustapha Kamel, like most Dictators, is a destroyer rather than a builder, "utterly ruthless," suspicious, friendless. "He had torn and rooted the Turks out of the decrepit, putrescent Ottoman Empire, but he had not created them into a living nation. He had destroyed their fundamental loyalties and their religious belief, but given them nothing whatever to replace these." Captain Armstrong has written an extremely interesting and instructive book; but few of his readers will be inspired to visit these ancient lands of heat and cold, of cruelty, vermin, and stinks.

* * *

Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch in his introductory note to Mr. Herbert E. Palmer's volume *The Teaching of English*,* pleads for the union in education of knowledge of the external world, which is to be gained from the study of mathematics and the physical sciences, with the ethical knowledge of man contained in great literature. "The two sides should be trained and wedded into an almost unconscious affection and interplay. . . . This implanted faculty which enables us to tie up our emotional with our intellectual understanding of the World and our place in it, we call imagination." Sir Arthur adds that "something of this God-given faculty resides in every child." Mr. Palmer's book recognises this fact in his guide to English teaching, a guide which incorporates long experience in the teaching of English in England, France, and Germany. Mr. Palmer considers that the basis of such teaching should be literature rather than grammar; that the teaching itself should be thoroughly organised; "nothing should be haphazard or left to chance." The exercise books should be in every case available for the organiser's inspection. The form captain or monitor will have his hands full. Mr. Palmer believes in thoroughness in the lower forms: "eight to ten lessons per week of from 25 to 50 minutes each." He does not believe in examinations except as a necessary evil and can conceive of schools where they are not necessary. Though the teaching is based upon literature, grammar must not be neglected, and should be taught and handled from the very lowest form. "Care also should be taken in the choice of sentences for parsing and analysis." The little student enters at once into the heart of literature, and the teacher should realise from this earnest living book that English on all its sides must interest and charm both the student and the teacher. The essay will bring out the

* John Murray. 3s. net.

success of the teaching. Mr. Palmer suggests dialogue for exercises in the middle forms. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch says that Mr. Palmer's experimental knowledge "reduces much that I have been trying to preach at Cambridge in general principle, in practical and immediate suggestions." That is praise indeed!

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Mr. James A. Williamson's attractive book "A Short History of British Expansion: the Modern Empire and Commonwealth,"* which was written in 1919-21 and published in 1922 has now entered a second edition, and is brought up to 1928 or later in a useful chapter on the British Commonwealth of Nations. "For the Empire as a whole the three principal problems since the war have been those of the constitution, of the promotion of inter-imperial trade, and of migration from the populous mother country to the scantily peopled dominions." Mr. Williamson does not believe that the Empire is "already dissolved within its attenuated husk." That is the view of some foreign observers who "formed the same conclusions before 1914, and their syllogisms shrivelled in the blast of reality." Mr. Williamson declares that modern history is the record of one long contest between freedom and dominance. "The British Commonwealth has steadily and with never a backward glance taken the lead for freedom, and its present position marks the farthest advance achieved along that path. Which of us would have it otherwise?"

* * *

"Clemenceau,"† by Jean Martel, his former secretary, is a record of conversations with the old Tiger during the closing days of his life. We are assured by those who knew him that the man is here authentically revealed, and every reader will enjoy the wit and sparkle of his talk. As in most volumes of table-talk there is a good deal too much of it, for many pages contain mere repetition and commonplace. But the judicious reader who knows how to skip will carry away an extremely vivid impression of one who was beyond doubt a very great figure even if he has no claim to be a great statesman. The colours of the picture, despite the lightning flashes, are sombre enough; for the old man laments not only the ingratitude of his countrymen to himself but the political unwisdom of his successors. The love of France was the passion of his storm-tossed life; but he lacked faith in human nature, and for that reason found himself completely out of touch with the practical idealists in France and elsewhere who are busily constructing a new international order. Clemenceau's tremendous energies could win a war, but with the coming of victory his task was done.

* Macmillan. 15s. net.
† Longmans. 1930. 25s.

69561