



WHAT THE BRITISH EMPIRE MEANS TO THE EMPIRE OF INDIA.

India is an Empire in itself. The King of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the Dominions Beyond the Seas, is also Emperor of India. This is a picture of the Durbar in 1911; the Coronation of King George V. as the Emperor of India. 80,000 spectators assembled on the huge amphitheatre to witness the King receiving the homage and congratulations of the Princes and Rulers of India in the presence of 20,000 troops.

WHAT IS EMPIRE TO JOHN SMITH?

WHAT the Empire means to John Smith in England may be different from what it means to John Brown in Canada or John Jones in Australia, or Hans Schmidt in the Transvaal. But it means essentially the same thing to all of them. What it means to any of them is very largely a question of how it came to mean anything to anybody, how it began, what were the forces that carried the British flag as a permanent institution into remote parts of the world. It is the Empire in evolution as a growth, not an Empire

built according to any Imperialistic programme that interests John Smith. When John Smith or John Brown or John Jones or Hans Schmidt, or even Gundit Singh, join in singing "God Save the King," they mean, also, "God Save the Emperor." And it is the reasons why that are contained in the following Empire article by Sir Charles P. Lucas, K.C.M.G., an extract from the last of a series of five lectures delivered on that subject and published in book form by the Macmillan Company.

By SIR CHARLES P. LUCAS

WHAT real meaning has the Empire for the ordinary Englishman in the United Kingdom, for the proverbial man in the street, for John Smith, who earns his bread with the sweat of his brow, and sometimes cannot earn it at all? What possible use is the Empire to him? Why should he care to know how it came into being? What does it matter to him if it disappears? Is it not little better than an expensive luxury, which the British workman and the British poor could dispense with and be none the worse for the loss, but possibly the better?

The first origin of the British Empire is to be found in the common migratory instinct of mankind, and in this law, whereby nations celebrate their nationhood by looking and going outside and opening up fields for expansion beyond the seas.

The English went over the seas, like other Europeans, either to discover new lands or to discover new routes to new lands which other Europeans had already discovered. What took them across the seas? The first answer is the spirit of enterprise, and especially of sea-going enterprise, which was innate in this mixed race of islanders, and which, as they came to know themselves and the sea which girded their island, to use the mariner's compass and such inventions as were, in their infancy, helping knowledge and seamanship, woke up within them and gathered strength.

DESIRE FOR GAIN.

AS discovery leads to trade, so the spirit of enterprise must necessarily be alloyed with the desire to gain something. If this something is not personal distinction or scientific or religious achievement, it is material gain in one form or another; and the first Englishmen who went over the seas, or most of them, had to the full the acquisitive instinct. In other words, greed came in. All trade can be characterized as greed. The English were human—very human. They inherited privateering blood. They meant their enterprise to be profitable and they made their profit. Adventurous and greedy, as all men are greedy, they took their way on the ocean, having no empire at all so far, but making, so to speak, preliminary surveys and experiments in the direction of future empire.

POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

BUT even at this early stage, the total motive force was very much more than love of adventure and greed of gain. The English, as has been abundantly shown, were not first in the field. Other Powers were beforehand, and one of these Powers, Spain, represented military and religious despotism. What was the result? In going over the seas the English could not satisfy their love of adventure and desire of gain without coming into conflict with Spain; and, at the same time, they could not feel sure of their own political and religious liberty at home as long as Spain was in the ascendant. The most effective method of defence, we are always told, is to take the offensive. No one knew this truth better than the Elizabethan sailors; no one ever preached and practised it more consistently than

Francis Drake. To gratify, on the one hand, the spirit of adventure and the love of gain, and on the other to safeguard the shores of England and the political and religious liberty of Englishmen, was one and the same process. Thus we find a third motive force impelling on the road to Empire, the instinct to defend home and liberty, and this force has been at work in full potency from the days of Queen Elizabeth to the present moment.

The missionary spirit, the evangelical doctrine, the desire to spread the good tidings of the Gospel, did not make itself felt to any great extent, at any rate in the present British Empire, until late in the

eighteenth century, after John Wesley had quickened religious life in England and beyond the seas. From that time missionaries have had much to say to the making of the British Empire.

Emphasis has already been laid upon the work of David Livingstone. Here was a missionary explorer who assuredly had no thought of gain. It is not possible to attribute directly to him any extension of the Empire, but indirectly his intrusion into Central Africa, and his continued denunciation of the horrors of the slave trade in Central Africa, the fruit of his religion, was a most potent force in taking the English onward in tropical Africa. Any honest review of the British Empire must put religion high up in the forefront as one of the determining causes.

DESIRE FOR A NEW HOME.

COLONIZATION—and colonization precedes as well as follows Empire—is not always the outcome of one land and people wishing to dominate other lands and peoples; it is not always to be attributed to the greed of those who wish not only to keep what they now have, but also to add to it beyond the seas. On the contrary, one source of Empire, and a very fruitful source, has been the desire to leave for ever the land which is the mother land, and which, none the less, in consequence of this very wish of some of its citizens to be quit of it, becomes the owner of other lands. This source of Empire is specially interesting because, in some cases at any rate, it is diametrically opposite to the motive of greed. The emigrants desire to better themselves, no doubt, but at least they give up their all when they go out, they do not keep their old homes and belongings and merely add to them. The outgoing citizens may go to virgin soil, so far as white men are concerned—this was the case with the Pilgrim Fathers in New England—or they may go to an already established colony and strengthen that colony.

GROWTH NECESSARY TO NATIONAL SECURITY.

COMING to the eighteenth century and the generations of war with France, when so much of the Empire was acquired by force and conquest, when national greed was apparently so greatly in evidence, we shall find that the instinct of defence was at least as powerful a motive force as lust of conquest. The decline of Spain left the field to the nations which had been the common enemies of Spain, and of those nations eventually to England and France. We have already put the question, Why should England have competed with France at all? Why were not the English content to keep their island and their liberties secure, instead of running neck and neck for a world-wide dominion? By way of further answer, let us ask a counter question. If England had imposed upon herself a self-denying ordinance, if she had refused to take part in competition overseas, if she had confined herself as far as possible to her own shores and left France to pursue her career of Empire unchecked, could she have kept her own hearth and home secure? Could she have ensured the liberties of future generations of Englishmen? What does independence mean in the literal sense of the word? It means not being



KING AND EMPEROR.

George the Fifth, King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.