military service, but that its refusal did not spring from cowardice was abundantly shown when, at the first recognition of the seriousness of the situation, recruiting went up by leaps and bounds. The organization of the self-governing Empire is no doubt unsatisfactory and illogical and can hardly be permanent: though one cannot discuss the style of architecture when the house is on fire. Nevertheless the fact remains that, under this defective system, there has grown up amongst millions of free men a temper of passionate loyalty to the Empire, as representing cherished ideals.

If, then, this war is a conflict of principles, what are the opposing ideals which so closely confront every member of the British partnership? On the one hand there is the ideal of strength, the effective, disciplined organization of a whole people working for a single object. Efficiency in war is the ultimate aim; though to secure this efficiency it is necessary also to secure the proper organization of all other resources, mental, moral and material, which make for such efficiency. It has been the wisdom of Germany to recognize that, without such adjuncts, the sword of militarism might break in the handling. By the extreme upholders of this ideal war is regarded as a good in itself, the ultimate justification of human effort. Others, more moderate, would maintain that war is not an end in itself, but merely an obstacle to be passed, on the road to power. In either case the conclusion is the same. The end justifies the means. Necessity knows no law; and, if paper obligations and the dictates of 'slave-morality' (that is, of Christian ethics) bar the way, we must hack through.

Opposed to this principle and this ideal, what is the principle and ideal for which British Imperialism is contending? (It is unfortunate to be compelled to use the