

men" by machinery of any kind. Marionettes, if you like, mechanical toys, mannikins; but not men. Use as many metaphors as you will, talk of wax, of fluids, of moulds, you cannot put away the fact that it is the nation that makes the law, and not the law the nation. Feet are not feet because they have been brought up in boots: even clogs should follow the shape not "mould" it: Mr. Wells shares the contrary opinion with the Chinese.

Is it then impossible to change a national constitution—national ideas—national customs—for the better? Certainly we hope not, but the first thing to recognise is that the process must be one of growth from within, not of mechanical pressure from without. And growth implies two things that seem to be alien to Mr. Wells's present mode of thought—time and nutrition. In the growth of nations time is the equivalent of "history," and nutrition corresponds to "sentiment" or the inherited national way of looking at things. In the sermon to which we have just listened, history and sentiment have no place whatever.¹

"This noble realm of England hath been a long season in triumphant flower." Why is it that such words rouse us like a trumpet, while we are only depressed by the barrel-organ of the New Republican? Why, five hundred years after they were spoken, do they still stir the sap in us as the modern prophet cannot do? Surely because they go to the root; they

¹ In saying this we do not forget the passage in which the proposed jury system is recommended as "characteristically Anglo-Saxon," and as already in use in a "precisely parallel application." There is of course no parallel whatever between our present jury and our parliamentary representation. The function of a jury is to decide questions of fact: that of a parliament to deliberate on policy. A jury is chosen by lot to ensure as far as possible that it shall represent the view of neither side: a member is elected that he may represent the view of the stronger side in a given locality. A "precisely parallel application" would give us either a system by which litigants would fight for the privilege of choosing the jury, or one by which a member would be valued in proportion as he shared the views of neither party in his constituency.