

has engraved so deeply in people's memories, and which the excitement of the next elections will perhaps fix there still more firmly, cannot be soon forgotten; and even if it does not attain hereafter to the classic dignity of the two names cited above, its place in history is already won. But then what is a Jingo exactly? Is it a man who believes in what Lord Derby calls "gunpowder and glory," whatever this may mean? Is it a man who wants to fight everybody all round, if such a man there be? If we turn to that celebrated refrain which has given currency to the word, and which will be remembered longer than many verses of greater lyrical value, we can find nothing more in it than the expression of a modest firmness and self-reliance. It breathes defiance, not defiance. It affirms that we have no desire for war, but that, should war arise, we have the means to face it. This temperate affirmation is clenched with an oath reprehensible indeed, and by no means refined, but far less objectionable than many other such words that we unfortunately hear even from the Liberal workingman as we walk along the streets. Since there is nothing in the origin of the word, as a political term, which explains the use made of it, and since philology has no key by which to unlock its significance, where are we to turn for an explanation? We shall find a clue in the policy and temper of the men who use it as a term of reproach.

Bearing this in mind, we see that Jingoism comes to pretty much the same thing as another word also used by the same sort of people as a term of reproach—namely, "Imperialism." And this again is a word which can have all sorts of meanings given to it. It may mean a policy which rests on the mere lust of conquest, and which wantonly crushes the free development of other peoples, or a policy which rests on the fact that some nations or races are too young, and some too old, to dispense, without loss to themselves, of the government or guidance or protection of others more fortunately situated. The latter policy may be as wise and beneficent as the former is criminal and destructive. Juggling with words of several meanings is a favourite trick of demagogues. They know that the wits of a popular audience are not sharp enough to detect sleight-of-hand. The believer in the one sort of Imperialism can always be charged with the sins of the other, and the wars which the maintenance of every Empire or State from time to time renders necessary form the peg on which the accusation can be hung. The reproach, however, which may attach to the word Jingo has not deterred many persons from adopting, and even from glorying in it. Such persons are much more numerous than might be supposed, and the Imperial policy which they support is not the result of any explosion of feeling, but has been carefully thought out and adopted after mature deliberation. Their opinions may have the same interest to those who think them most foolish and wicked which the sentiments and reasonings of Nonconformists have to those who uphold the Church of England. Their policy, whatever one may think of it, is a fact and a power, and therefore should neither be ignored nor misrepresented. We heard much a few years ago of the philosophical Radical—he was then a phenomenon to be studied—and if he had now as much influence in the country as the unphilosophical Radical has, we should continue to study him. On the same ground, if on no other, it is worth while to set forth, as best we may, the sentiment and policy of the Jingo, which we take to be no more than the antithesis, in foreign and Imperial matters, of the sentiment and policy of the average Radical.

The Jingo reasons as follows:—"Wisely or not, we have got a world-wide empire. Perhaps it would have been more prudent if, a century or two ago, we had resisted the impulses which led us to cross the oceans. It is true that, had we done so, the United States—that ideal of the anti-Jingo—would never have been founded. It is true that India would probably have been, and would be now, either the prey to chronic anarchy or else under the rule of those to whom the justice and honesty of English administration would seem a foolish and puritanic scrupulosity. It is true that, from the mere fact of over-population, we should long ago have been forced to keep down our numbers by cutting one another's throats. But these and other results of a stay-at-home policy are matters of speculation. The fact is that, whether wickedly, or by a blind chance, or providentially, we are now the owners of an empire to which the only parallel which can be found in history is that of Rome, and which in certain respects is an empire still more wonderful and imposing. This we consider to be an achievement of which we may fairly be proud. We know well what labour and danger and responsibility it involves; but to what end has a race been endowed with the toughness, the activity, the enterprise, and the stability which appear to characterise the English race, if it is to shrink from work which involves labour and danger and responsibility? By no act of our own, but by the working of historical laws, a great part of the human race, especially in Asia, is in such a condition that it must be either a prey to the spoiler or governed and protected by a strong Power. There is no Power on earth except England which possesses the strength and the goodwill needed to rule these nations rightly. We have no longer the choice whether to go there or not; we are there; we are pledged to govern and defend them. Those who deride an Imperial policy in England show about as much sense as those who should recommend an Imperial policy to Belgium or Switzerland. Such a policy is dictated by the situation in which we find ourselves, and by the duty which we owe to those millions who without us would be plunged into suffer-

ings without measure or end. These considerations are decisive, even if conquest, if the getting of an empire, were the wicked thing which you say that it is. But this again we deny. There are just and there are unjust conquests. You Radicals are fond, when talking of Tory landowners, of saying that the soil is a natural monopoly, that man has an absolute right to it, and that those who use it ill may fairly be made to surrender it to those who will use it well. On such grounds you yourselves demand the expulsion of the unspeakable Turk from Europe. It is only when your own country, during a Conservative administration, acts on this principle that it becomes immoral. The United States were founded and have grown through a stronger and more gifted race taking away the soil from an inferior one, and by killing off the occupiers by the sword, and, what is worse, by the brandy-bottle. Our own country became what it is through Teutonic invaders conquering and robbing, as you would call it, a Celtic population, and being in its turn conquered and robbed by Normans. It was thus that the Hebrews, Jingoed in those days to the core, won for themselves the land flowing with milk and honey; it was thus, to go back to a yet remoter time, that the Indo-Germanic race made its way to Europe; it was thus that the Roman Empire, notwithstanding the crimes which too often marked its history, secured for ages comparative order and good government throughout the greater part of the then known world; it was thus that every State now standing in the world has been built up. In denouncing as immoral the instincts that lead men to seek adventure, to brave difficulty and danger, to fight if need be, to conquer, to rule, to be honoured and followed by others, you are only saying that no nation ever became great except by immoral means, for without these instincts no nation ever did become great. Say what you will, you cannot get out of this dilemma. That race must predominate in the world which, after making provision for a vigorous national life at home, has the most surplus population, energy, enterprise, and talent to spare. If you said that we must take care to predominate to the welfare and not to the detriment of others, well and good; but you say that we should not predominate at all. You go about apologizing for the greatness of your country. When in office you made such an impression on foreign statesmen that they ignored you altogether, except on one occasion to make you pay them for allowing, through mere feebleness of will and inability to see how your acts would be regarded abroad, a ship to leave an English port to prey upon their commerce, and on another occasion to obtain the cheap renown of giving you a slap in the face. Your return to office may be the signal for a war vaster and more terrible than any which the world has seen. And for this reason. Half the Continent is only watching for a good opportunity to spring at the throat of the other. It is a matter of certainty that, should a favourable occasion arise, France and Russia will attack Germany. Against this danger the Austro-German alliance has been formed. It is very possible that Italy might be drawn into the conflict; and it is almost certain that the Eastern question would again enter into an acute stage, that the Turkish Empire would be finally broken up, and that the whole South-East of Europe and a great part of Asia would be plunged into anarchy. These are no remote dangers; already one can almost see the writing on the wall. You charge us with being indifferent to human life and human suffering. It is to save life and to prevent suffering that we wish to keep out of office men pledged to the effacement of England. We know what stuff you are made of; we know how you have acted in the past. The belief that a Liberal Administration would be neutral in a European war is a direct encouragement to intending disturbers of the peace. The belief, on the other hand, that, in the case of a war wantonly begun by any European Government, England would take an active part against the aggressors, would do more than anything else to restrain Powers which harbour aggressive intentions, and stay off, and perhaps, through delaying it, to prevent altogether, a catastrophe which no humane and reasonable person can think of without dismay.

"We belong, where the British Empire is concerned, to no party. To maintain it intact and to prevent the seeds of its future dissolution being sown, we would gladly support either party against the other. We think at the present moment that the Conservative party is more likely to do the work than you, who revile us as Jingoed, and; and therefore—reserving our opinion as to the wisdom of particular measures of policy—we at present support the Conservative party. But there is no reason why a Liberal should not be a Jingo also; and whoever should convert the Liberal party to Jingoism would confer as great a benefit on that party as he would on the country at large. We believe we make no mistake in saying that, besides those members of the party who have openly avowed themselves in foreign affairs supporters of the Government rather than of the Opposition, there are in the Liberal ranks not a few disguised Jingoed. It may be that a Liberal Government in office would be forced by circumstances to adopt the policy which it has decried in Opposition. But it is hard to see how this could happen during the lifetime of the two men of most genius and authority in the party. As matters stand, the Jingo, if he happens to be a Liberal and has the courage of his opinions, must on foreign questions act with the Conservatives."

Some such statement as this is what a Jingo would have to make if called on to give a reason for the faith that is in him. There is much in it which the