

of incidents which led to the occupation reflects credit on British statesmanship. It is possible to arraign the shortsightedness of those who pledged themselves to a short stay of a few years. But the whole-hearted attempts made to relieve the country of all responsibility in Egypt acquit British statesmen of the sinister motives ascribed to them by the Parisian press up to the agreement of the eighth of April last year.

A reference to South Africa, however brief, seems advisable. Here, unfortunately, is a *prima-facie* case of oppression by a stronger power of the weak. And this excites a sentimental bias in favour of the losing side. A unanimous opinion therefore has not yet been reached in spite of all that has been written on the subject. But there is a tolerable consensus of opinion that the case for Britain is good. A stronger line might be taken than is usually met with. It is affirmed by no less an authority than Hegel that "civilized nations may treat as barbarians the peoples who are behind them in the essential elements of the state. Thus, the rights of mere herdsmen, hunters and tillers of the soil are inferior and their independence merely formal." These words outline a position which Boer partisans would find difficult to controvert.

The Boer war leads naturally to the movement inspired by the late colonial Secretary. His critics are many, but one type is hard to understand. There are professing admirers of imperial brotherly love who yet apparently object to provide machinery by which the family of nations in the Empire may carry out its common purposes. However mistaken in its methods, a movement which tries to

supply an organ for a sentiment admittedly good cannot be wholly bad. Surely it is legitimate to press for the rescue of this disembodied spirit, to strive to provide the Imperial idea with hands and feet. There is nothing immoral in such a course and as little in the belief that even such gross instruments as tariffs may be made an engine of mutual service within the Empire.

Yet another factor in the problem must be reckoned with. British Imperialism is not only the variety in the field and must not be judged as if it were unique. The expansion of the United States, the world politics of Germany, the ambition of Russia, the colonial policy of France are vital elements in the question, not extraneous matter at all. The declaration of President Roosevelt in 1898 sounds the keynote of the first. "I have scant sympathy with that mock humanitarianism . . . which would prevent the great, free, liberty and order-loving races of the earth doing their duty in the world's waste places, because there must needs be some rough surgery at the outset. . . . I hold that throughout the world every man who strives to be both efficient and moral . . . should realize that it is for the interests of mankind to have the higher supplant the lower life." Cuba and the Philippines, Hawaii and Porto Rico bear testimony to the aliveness and potency of Roosevelt's doctrine. Republican and Democrat are solid on this issue. Even the unsavoury affair of Panama received from the Democrats only a modified condemnation. The Republicans "violated a statute of the United States as well as plain treaty obligations, international usages, and