

political party in Great Britain to repress the national aspirations of the Irish, so far as they were compatible with the interests of the Empire as a whole. The trouble has been to decide whether or not particular measures were or were not open to this criticism. So also in the case of South Africa, the Dutch republics were overthrown, not because they strove for Dutch Afrikanderdom, but because, in the opinion of the majority throughout the Empire—whether that opinion was right or wrong concerns not the argument—their attitude, as guided by Kruger, forbade that position of equality for British subjects in their midst which Great Britain, as the paramount Power in South Africa, claimed to be their due. How loyally and earnestly the British Government has sought to make partnership in the Empire consistent with the legitimate aspirations of Dutch nationalism is shown by the fact that the Dutch General Botha, who commanded the Transvaal forces in the South African War, is now the loyal Prime Minister of the self-governing British South African Union. It is further shown by the fact that the South African Government is doing its part in the work of resisting German pretensions.

We can indeed confidently affirm that wherever European settlement has been possible on a large scale, the British Empire has tolerated, if not encouraged, colonial nationalism. Canadian historians, of Anglo-Saxon origin, have criticized and condemned the policy which encouraged the continuance and persistence of French customs and ideals in an English-speaking world. But whatever our opinion of such criticisms—and one may be allowed to suggest that it is not such an easy matter to uproot a historic past as some high authorities seem to imagine—at least this is clear, that the adoption of such a policy, even in the dark days of the eighteenth century, plainly