its aspirations. As Disraeli said, "Individuals may form communities, but it is institutions alone which can create a state." The king is the |symbol of imperial unity, but he is no more, for in the modern world national institutions must be representative of the people.

We are now on dangerous ground. Nobody knows how the Empire is to develop. It rests unreservedly in the hands of the great democracies which flourish under the Union Jack. No one can dictate to them. But it seems clear that sooner or later, if the Empire is to persist and is to exercise an effective voice in the world's affairs, it must create some common organ of its will. At least that is the growing conviction of the newer school of Imperialists. They do not pretend to dogmatize as to the form the union should take. The conditions are without precedent, and the constitutional bond will probably be without precedent. It will be no simple job. On the one hand British opinion must lose some of its insularity, and accept the proposition that the Empire is as much the concern of the Dominions as it is of the British Isles—it is far nearer that position already than people in the Dominions realize. On the other hand, the Dominions must realize that, if they are to share in the advantages of belonging to the Empire they must share also in the responsibilities that attach to membership. That, too, is a growing conviction oversea.

Imperialism, therefore, is a complex creed. It is no cut-and-dried doctrine of race ascendency, or Downing Street control. It is a policy now vague which can be defined only as the outcome of free discussion and negotiations. But if we are still a long way from a decision, if the points of view of the Dominions and Great Britain have still a long way to move before they can be said to agree, the pressure of events is steadily thrusting Imperialism to the front as the dominant issue before Britain and Canada alike.

Imperialism will fail or succeed according as it can accommodate itself to practical facts and conditions. It