

lesson they should teach. At first sight it looks like mere dilettanteism on the part of British statesmanship, and no doubt there was a good deal of that in some quarters, though there were evidently wiser heads there too who prepared for contingencies as far as they could. But it is evident that the men who saw and knew dared not tell the country what they really thought about the situation. And what other explanation is there of this except that the extreme Radical section of the Liberal party succeeded in coercing their wiser leaders into silence or into utterances which practically deceived the country? Scientific treatment of national problems is hardly possible where mere organs of party or class fury have so much influence. In short, the present combination of Liberalism and Radicalism, especially Labour Radicalism, neither gives the moderate Liberal leader the possibility of a free and sound development nor the Radical party the education of a really responsible position. It forces the one into a rather hypocritical attitude and makes reckless irresponsible speakers of the other. Neither side faces the realities before it or is quite clear with itself as to what form progress can take. There is abstract moral attitudinizing on the one hand and unscientific clamour on the other.

Pacifism in general will also have to consider the situation more scientifically. There is a loose kind of pacifism which is vaguely founded on Christian sentiment against war. Germany, one of the most powerful nations in the world, has practically abandoned that point of view, and proclaimed war and conquest as the true path of progress for nations, and it is true also that there are no great nations in the world whose history does not contain at least episodes of military conquest, however they may explain them. Nevertheless, the Christian sentiment against war, when it is reasonably understood, may still be considered as a limiting or regulative ideal of civilization. But there is a class of pacifists who not only overlook the fact that the kingdom of heaven is not yet realized on earth but are equally forgetful of the fact that such kingdom, or such approximation to it as man is capable of creating, has to be established by struggle and conflict—material struggle and conflict—with the lower powers of nature in man; that is the history of human civilization; you cannot sit down and let a supposed divine law work out things for you, while you