

divine event towards which the wars of classes, the struggles between princes and subject, religious wars, dynastic wars, all the complex movements of the past are to be interpreted as unconsciously tending.

"I do not doubt that in England and in other countries the decay of authority can be traced through a long period. All organized things decay. Life itself is growth and dissolution. But if this is the whole meaning of it, and the establishment of democratic republics is the aim of human existence, one asks, 'What then?' What is to be done with the liberty when we have got it? Liberty itself must be a means to a further end. What is that end? Life, we are told, will be grander, brighter, and better than ever it was before. But is this true? Does experience, so far, show that the finer features do grow with such exceptional splendour with political liberty? There is a liberty which it is worth while to live and die for—liberty from foreign oppression, liberty from tyrannical rulers who abuse the law which they are established to administer—liberty from that worse oppression which would compel men to profess beliefs which they do not hold. To make such rulers know that they are responsible to a power still higher than themselves is great and heroic, and the stories of such bold deeds are the most elevating chapters in human history.

"But such freedom has nothing but the name in common with the modern theory that every man is his own keeper. Because the captain and officers of a ship have proved unfit for their posts, it does not follow that there shall be no captain or officers, or that the crew shall choose their own."

"Does history show that in proportion as men are left to their own wills, they become happier, truer, braver, simpler, more reverent of

good, more afraid of evil? If it be so, *cadit questio*. The problem of human existence is solved. We have but to abolish the few remaining restraints, and original sin will be extinguished. But the history which is to prove it I believe to be a history of the future, not of the past—a prophecy, not a narrative of fact.

"What is liberty? What used we to mean when we called a man free? The workman became free of his craft when he had learnt under a master all that the master could teach him. Then, and not before, he was set to work on his own account. The artist acquires a free hand when he knows what ought to be done, and eye and hand work together to do it. The musician is not free while his fingers blunder over the notes. To set free an apprentice to go his own way while he is half taught, or not taught at all, is to leave him to his own incapacity. Every art which we learn has to be acquired under instruction and restraint. We do not hear of the right of a carpenter or a mason to go wrong if he pleases. Why in the Art of arts, the art of life, should any other principle hold? What is the use of emancipating a man from control till he has proved that he can control himself? Those who are most impatient of control are those who need it most. I have heard it argued that subordination creates servility, and that to set a man free is to make him worthy of freedom. It is like telling a painter to go his own way and call no man master. It is to expect from liberty the magical change of character which theologians used to expect from faith. Would soldiers or seamen be truer to their salt, if their officers were their servants and received mandates from them as we say our members of Parliament do? Would family life be improved if wives and children owed no obedience to husbands and