



THE UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE

PUBLISHED: FEBRUARY, APRIL, OCTOBER, DECEMBER,
IN MONTREAL.

OCTOBER 1909

	PAGE
Canada and the Monroe Doctrine—Stephen Leacock	351
Shall Canada Have a Navy—C. Frederick Hamilton	375
The Nine Prophets—Andrew Macphail	398
Running Waters—A. Clare Giffen	407
All Men are either Platonists or Aristotelians—Maurice Hutton	408
La Douleur qui Veille—E. B. Greenshields	421
Nova Scotia at Confederation and Now—J. W. Longley	422
Maritime Union—George G. Melvin	436
Sir Thomas Temple, Bart.—G. O. Bent	443
In Love with Easeful Death—Mary E. Fletcher	455
Abt Vogler: Musician—Joseph Gould	456
Virgil's Messianic Eclogue—G. Oswald Smith	467
The Beauty of Cicero's Speech—J. A. Dewe	476
Art and Artifice—Thomas L. Jarrot	483
The Scientific Criterion of Truth and its Relation to Dogma E. W. MacBride	492
The Forge—Mary L. Bradley	508

THE UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE is issued in February, April, October, and December, by a committee for McGill University, Montreal; University of Toronto; and Dalhousie College.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE :—W. PETERSON, M.A., C.M.G., LL.D., Principal; F. P. WALTON, LL.D., Dean, Faculty of Law, McGill University; W. J. ALEXANDER, B.A., Ph.D., Professor of English; PELHAM EDGAR, Ph.D., Professor of French; J. MAVOR, Professor of Political Economy, University of Toronto. ARCHIBALD MACMECHAN B.A., Ph.D., Professor of English, Dalhousie College, Halifax.

Editor: ANDREW MACPHAIL, 216 Peel Street, Montreal.

The purpose of the University Magazine is to express an educated opinion upon questions immediately concerning Canada; and to treat freely in a literary way all matters which have to do with politics, industry, philosophy, science, and art.

The Editorial management is gratuitous, and the proceeds of the publication are applied to the payment of contributors.

All communications, including subscriptions and remittances, should be sent to the Editor. The subscription price is one dollar a year for four numbers, containing about 700 pages. Copies are on sale at all book stores for thirty-five cents each.

CANADA AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

AT THE present moment the whole future of British and colonial relations centres around the question of naval defence. This is particularly the case since it begins to appear that the day may come when the British navy is no longer able to effect single-handed the defence of the entire empire. What has hitherto been mainly an academic question, deliberately excluded from the purview of the party politician because of its lack of bearing upon the material interests of the moment, is rapidly becoming the problem of the hour. A wave of self-interested apprehension, masked under the smug disguise of imperial sympathy, is turning the universal attention of the colonies towards the protection of their coasts and commerce. This is the true interpretation of the naval defence conference of last summer and of the present epidemic of neo-patriotism in the form of deep-sea editorials in the colonial press.

During the coming session of the Canadian parliament the public of the Dominion will be called upon, for the first time in many years, to consider in all seriousness the question of maritime defence and its bearing on the future of this country. The subject is a wide one. It connects itself at first hand with the still unsolved problem of our political relation to the Mother Country. The adoption of any definite national policy in regard to naval defence will present a forward movement in one direction or the other, in the political development of the Canadian people, from which a future retrogression will be increasingly difficult. Any discussion, therefore, which tends to elucidate even a part of the momentous question at issue ought to be of importance at the present juncture. The following article is not intended to

treat of the whole subject of the naval defence of the colonies or even of that of Canada, but merely to contribute to the general enquiry by freeing the controversy of the thick haze of misunderstanding by which certain sides of it are surrounded. The existence of the so-called Monroe doctrine and its supposed bearing upon the international position of Canada has served for many years to perplex a subject already difficult in itself and to postpone beyond its due time the solution of the most important political problem of the day. The imaginary protection which it has afforded to Canada has acted as a soporific to the public mind, and even now the breezy call of the deep-sea editor, yo-ho'ing at the halyards of his new Canadian navy, falls on the ears of a crew but half-awakened from their long sleep.

It is the aim of the present essay, therefore, to show that the protection afforded to Canada under the Monroe doctrine is the purest fiction, and has no warrant in history, in actual fact, or in common sense.

The words "Monroe Doctrine," like many other historic phrases, have been put to a variety of uses and been subject to the most conflicting interpretations. As promulgated by the President from whom it takes its name the doctrine was a declaration of policy and a statement of intention: by a recent American secretary of state, it was declared to be a matter of international law: Prince Bismarck called it an international impertinence: Mr. Olney found in it a theory of United States sovereignty over the American continent: President Pierce saw in it a justification of the invasion of Canada, and a Canadian Minister of Militia, not long since, announced it as the palladium of Canadian liberty. Out of this confusion has sprung up the idea, wide-spread in the minds of Canadian citizens, that the Monroe doctrine is something which protects Canada from outside aggression, and that our national existence is safeguarded by the battleships of the United States navy: this too at a cost of some \$120,000,000 per annum uncomplainingly borne on our behalf by the people of the United States. Such is the belief childishly

harboured by great numbers of people in this Dominion, who are at the same time ignorant as to who Monroe was, whether he is alive or dead, and whether his doctrine is a matter of spiritual belief or a resolution of the Sons of Scotland.

To explode this belief into thin air, nothing else is needed than a candid examination of origin and history of the Monroe doctrine and a proper interpretation of its application in the world politics of to-day. In the explicit and definite form of its promulgation it was a message, addressed by President James Monroe, on December 2nd 1823, in accordance with Presidential usage, to the Congress of the United States, but directed in reality over the heads of the Congressmen, to the assembled monarchs of Europe. It was a noble and spirited declaration of policy of which the citizens of the republic then and now might well be proud. The purport of it was that the United States would not view with indifference any attempt on the part of Europe to subjugate the independent States of America.

It is of course familiar to all students of American history that the beginnings of the Monroe doctrine are to be found long before 1823. Indeed the doctrine is as old as the history of American Independence. The idea that the destinies of America and Europe were separate, and that it was the path of wisdom for the republic to keep itself free from the entanglements of European alliances and European diplomacy, was frequently expressed in the early years of the history of the republic. We find it constantly recurring in the writings and speeches of the leaders of the period. Washington in his Farewell Address to the Nation in 1796 declares: "the great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. Europe," he continues, "has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary

combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities. Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course." Jefferson in writing to Thomas Paine in 1801 adopts the same point of view: "Determined as we are to avoid if possible wasting the energies of our people in war and destruction, we shall avoid implicating ourselves with the powers of Europe, even in support of principles which we mean to pursue. They have so many other interests different from ours, that we must avoid being entangled in them." In Jefferson's extreme old age, four years before Monroe's enunciation of the doctrine we find him writing in still more positive terms of the desirability of separating the political systems of the two continents. "From many conversations with him," he says, referring to a newly appointed minister to Brazil, "I hope he sees and will promote in his new situation, the advantages of a cordial fraternisation among all the American nations, and the importance of their coalescing in an American system of policy totally independent of and unconnected with that of Europe. The day is not distant when we may formally require a meridian of partition through the ocean which separates the two hemispheres on the hither side of which no European gun shall ever be heard, nor an American on the other: and when, during the rage of the eternal wars of Europe, the lion and the lamb, within our regions shall lie down together in peace. . . . The principles of society there and here, then, are radically different, and I hope no American patriot will ever lose sight of the essential policy of interdicting in the seas and territories of both Americas the ferocious and sanguinary contests of Europe."

The immediate cause of the issue of Monroe's message was the prospect of a European fleet being sent to the shores of South America to subdue the revolted colonies of Spain. During the troubles of the Napoleonic war when the Bourbon dynasty had been ousted from Madrid and the peninsula plunged in six years of desperate warfare, the South American colonies of Spain had shaken themselves free from the para-

lyzing group of Spanish oppression. Already in revolt as a result of three centuries of misgovernment and fired by the brilliant example of the North American republic, they had succeeded in making good their independence. With the restoration of the Bourbon Ferdinand the Seventh by the Congress of Vienna (1815), Spain began to cherish the design of again subjugating its magnificent colonial empire of America of which all but Cuba had been lost. To its lost colonies (with the exception of Mexico only) the Spanish Monarchy had never abandoned its formal claim. Left to its own resources the crippled and effete monarchy could not have compassed its object. But it found a timely aid in the allied sovereigns of Europe, now linked together in what was called the Holy Alliance, a mutual insurance league of potentates which now proposed to fill the measure of its unholiness by aiding Spain to extend to America the monarchical despotism which it had sworn to maintain in Europe. It seemed imminent that a new Spanish Armada would unfurl its sails for the reconquest of the western world.

It was at this critical moment of the world's history that the President of the United States intervened: not indeed without diplomatic backing, for he had behind him the moral support of the British Government. The latter, all questions of morality and liberty aside, was ill disposed to see so large a colonial empire and so extensive a field of trade placed again under the restrictions of Spanish control. Canning, the Foreign Secretary, had already (Sept. 1823) proposed to the American Minister that the United States should cooperate with Great Britain in preventing the reconquest of the Spanish colonies. The support of British power was thus assured in advance. Indeed it has often been claimed, though erroneously, as the extracts above amply prove, that the Monroe doctrine proceeded from Canning, and the latter himself declared pretentiously years later, "I called the new world into existence to redress the balance of the old."

A minor dispute with Russia, whose Czar Alexander was the leading figure of the Holy Alliance, gave a further ground

for a definite statement of policy. At this moment the claims of the rival powers upon the Pacific coast of America, as yet unsettled, were indeterminate and conflicting. Russia was mistress of Alaska with an uncertain boundary to the south. The somewhat shadowy claims of Spain to what is now the British Columbian coast had been assigned to Great Britain by the convention of 1790. The United States by virtue of the progressive movement of its expansion westward and by right of exploration also asserted a claim to the Pacific coast between the territory of Mexico and that of Russia. Meantime the Russian government disregarding the rights of all other claimants had declared that its boundary extended southward to the fifty-first parallel (the latitude of the north end of Vancouver Island) and endeavoured to refuse to foreigners the right of entry to its territory. This conflict of titles did not end until the Oregon treaty of 1846, although the Russian boundary was established at the parallel $54^{\circ}.40'$ by a treaty concluded with the United States in 1825. Meantime the outstanding boundary question on the Pacific coast served as a supplement to the larger issue involved in the fate of the Spanish Colonies of Central and South America.

Turning now to the text of Monroe's message of 1823 we find it to enunciate two leading principles of American policy; the one a desire to prevent further European colonization in America, the other a determination to prevent a European conquest of the existing independent States of America. The first appears in the language used in regard to the Russian boundary question: "In the discussions to which this interest has given rise and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents by reason of the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers." The second principle—the denunciation of European conquest—is rehearsed at length in dealing with

the South American States. "The citizens of the United States," writes the President, "cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow men on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defence. With the movements in this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately connected and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. The difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. And to the defence of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it therefore to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any position of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States."

Such was the original declaration of policy known as the Monroe doctrine. The ultimatum produced its effect. The monarchs of the Holy Alliance resigned their piratical project. The independence of the South American States, already recognized by the United States, was presently

awarded a formal recognition by the British Government and later by the European monarchies and by Spain itself.

Nor did the doctrine thus established remain without later applications. There is no need to cite in detail the minor occasions on which it was invoked as a precedent of diplomatic action; the protest against a possible British or Spanish sovereignty over Yucatan (1848), the resolutions of Senator Cass in regard to Cuba (1853), or General Grant's appeal (1870) to the Monroe doctrine as a valid ground for the annexation of San Domingo. But the case of the abortive Austro-French Empire of Mexico (1861-1867) is always quoted as the typical illustration of the operation of the Monroe doctrine. The republic of Mexico, anarchical and unstable in its government, had provoked the intervention of its European creditors by the insecurity of commercial transactions in its territory. Great Britain, Spain, and France decided on armed interference and sent a combined fleet to the harbour of Vera Cruz. The two former powers, having no ulterior motives, presently withdrew when they realized that France was aiming at something further than the legitimate collection of debts. Indeed it presently became clear that the Emperor Napoleon III. was aiming at the establishment of a French empire, or an empire under the control of France, in the place of the Mexican republic. With a prescience which time has verified he foresaw the coming greatness of the United States and its dominance on the American continent if left in undisturbed possession. It seemed to him that the American Republic, with a practical control of the raw produce of the continent and the West Indies, might become a menace to the nations of Europe. It was his policy therefore to establish some power on the North American continent which might offset the increasing predominance of the United States. The same political motives which led him to desire the disruption of the republic by the success of the Southern confederacy, prompted him also in his Mexican designs. For the moment success met his efforts. An expeditionary force of 40,000 trained men under General Bazaine was landed

in Mexico. The republican forces were driven backward into the interior; the capital was seized and occupied, and, with a thin pretence of popular acclamation, an Empire of Mexico was set up with the Archduke Maximilian of Austria at its head and a French army of occupation as its real support. The duration of the empire was brief. The Washington government, engaged in its life and death struggle with the Southern confederacy, protested at first unavailingly. But with the close of the civil war the situation changed. With a million men under arms and with its hopes restored by the conquest of the South, the American government would have asked nothing better than a triumphant expedition to Mexico which might serve as the first step towards removing the bitterness of the civil conflict. The Monroe doctrine was again invoked. An American army was moved to the Rio Grande. The French, served with a peremptory notice to quit, had no choice but to retire. The mushroom monarchy collapsed, and the Emperor met his death at the hands of the victorious republicans.

The later phases of the Monroe doctrine and its relation to the recent expansion of American power which has removed the United States from its previous position of isolation must presently be considered. But before doing this, let us observe exactly in what light the British North American provinces stood to the doctrine as thus enunciated and upheld. A consultation of the text of the presidential message of 1823 shows that it was not intended to have any bearing upon Canada and similar dependencies in one direction or the other. "With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power, we have not interfered and shall not interfere." The policy that was enunciated had reference only to "those governments who have declared their independence and have maintained it." In other words it referred to the already virtually independent states of Central and South America, but left entirely on one side, Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, Cuba, Jamaica, Porto Rico, Honduras, Demarara, Martinique, and the various

other dependencies of European countries in North and South America. Nothing could have been further from the minds of Monroe and his cabinet than to desire that henceforth the United States should guarantee to each of the European sovereigns the maintenance of their American possessions intact against any possible attacks from the others in the event of a European war; that henceforth, in the event of a renewed conflict between France and Great Britain, the Islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe should be immune from British attack, and that neither by conquest nor by cession could any European power dispossess itself of any of its American dependencies in favour of any other. Whatever may have been the later interpretations of American policy or the present intentions of the American government, this idea of a guarantee by the United States of the colonial possessions of the foreign powers did not enter into the considerations of the American cabinet of 1824. It is true that we find something very like this form of policy enunciated later on. President Grant in a message to the senate in 1870 in dealing with the question of San Domingo declared that "the doctrine promulgated by Monroe has long been adhered to by all political parties, and I now deem it proper to assert the equally important principle that hereafter no territory on this continent shall be regarded as a subject of transfer to a European power." But it must be remembered in the first place that Grant was speaking from an interested and not an altruistic point of view, since he proposed to prevent the Dominicans from voluntarily committing themselves to the care of Spain in order to compel them to the higher destiny of annexation to the United States. In the second place the very wording of Grant's statement shows that he at least considered that the "equally important principle" had not been promulgated by President Monroe. This much then seems clear. If by the Monroe doctrine we mean the doctrine as laid down by Monroe conceived as an authoritative text and applied in the light of a fixed interpretation, it had no concern with existing colonies, let us say with Canada,

at all. If it is true that the Monroe doctrine protects Canada, it must be something other than the original policy of the President of 1823.

So far: so good. Let us next enquire on what later occasions the status of the British possessions in America has been brought into conflict with the Monroe doctrine and with American foreign policy, and what measure of comfortable protection may be anticipated from the experience of the past. We begin to realize something of the peculiar elasticity of the phrase Monroe doctrine and how much or little it has to do with Monroe, when we consult the precedent of 1845, and the appeal made to its august authority by President Polk. This was at the time of the Oregon boundary difficulty which has been already mentioned. There is no need for the present to go into the intricacies of the boundary claim and the "fifty-four-forty-or fight" controversy. Both nations had certain claims, more or less tenable, to the territory of the Pacific slope. The United States wanted Oregon. So too did Great Britain.

But while the latter was willing to consider its claim as resting upon ordinary diplomatic grounds, President Polk and his adherents proposed to remove the controversy to a higher ground and to settle it straight off in their own favour by declaring that the Monroe doctrine would not allow Great Britain any further westward expansion: it was not a matter of ordinary claim and counter-claim, resting upon exploration, cession, or settlement, but a matter of the higher destiny of the continent as declared (supposedly) by James Monroe and corroborated by James Polk. "Near a quarter of a century ago," said the latter in his message to congress of December 2nd 1845, "the principle was distinctly announced to the world in the annual message of one of my predecessors that 'the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power.' This principle will apply with greatly increased force should any European power attempt to establish any new colony in North America. In the exist-

ing circumstances of the world, the present is deemed a proper occasion to reiterate and reaffirm the principle avowed by Mr. Monroe, and to state my cordial concurrence in its wisdom and sound policy. The reassertion of this principle especially in reference to North America is, at this day, but the promulgation of a policy which no European power should cherish the disposition to resist. Existing rights of every European nation should be respected, but it is due alike to our safety and our interests that the efficient protection of our laws should be extended over our whole territorial limits, and that it should be distinctly announced to the world as our settled policy, that no future European colony or dominion shall, with our consent, be planted or established on any part of the North American continent."

It is important for Canadian students to appreciate the exact bearing of this pronunciamento. According to Mr. Polk the Monroe doctrine was of such a nature that henceforth there could be no dispute as to the boundary line between the United States and Canada; the boundary was, and must be, whatever the United States said it was. Such a declaration as a matter of brute force, after the manner of the Czar of Muscovy, would be at least intelligible. But uttered as resting on higher ground and as a consequence of American liberty, "which no European power should cherish the disposition to resist," it becomes a piece of hypocrisy.

Nor was Mr. Polk alone. The adherents of his policy in Congress gave him an impetuous support, and were willing to declare, even more plainly than the President, the relations of Canada to the republic under the Monroe doctrine as they saw it. Listen to Mr. Pettit of Indiana, speaking in the House of Representatives on January 14th 1846: "But I assume higher ground. I maintain that it is not just, it never can be just, that a nation on another continent shall extend its possessions on this by contiguity. . . . In the very nature of things it is wrong. Sir, the magnetic wires cannot be extended across the Atlantic ocean: the all pervading influence of electricity is stopped here, and its mysterious voice

is drowned in the noise of the surge that beats our shore. . . . The law which make the ocean a barrier to instantaneous communication between nations—the law of nature which has separated continents by interposing vast abysses, forbids that nations on one continent shall have rights on another by implication, extension, contiguity or by any other invisible, intangible, metaphysical principle whatever. . . . I believe it is our destiny to possess the whole of Oregon: but this destiny does not make it right; it is our destiny because it is right. It is not necessary to name the principle I have attempted to state, nor does it require any course of reasoning to establish it. It is an axiom in political science as applied to this continent and must receive universal assent because it is based upon the law of nature. It is the same principle, in effect, which Mr. Monroe stated when he denied the right of European nations to make further colonies on this continent, and which the President in his late message has again so appropriately and so opportunely asserted in the face of the world.”

The axiom in political science which settles automatically all boundary disputes between Canada and the United States was still further improved upon, during the Oregon debates, by Mr. Sawyer of Ohio, who illuminates the subject with a view of history as novel as it is striking. “England claims Canada,” he said, “but she has no right to it, and I’ll show it before I get through my remarks. I started, Sir, with the position that the Americans have an exclusive right to this island for the purpose of making the experiment of the adaptation of republican principles to the wants and happiness of men. I advanced this doctrine, Sir, that this North American continent, or island as I for some purposes deem it, belongs exclusively to the people of the United States. The principles on which we started were enforced by George Washington, who established the metes and bounds of Americanism, and marked out afresh by Old Hickory and, Sir, by General Scott. We were a colony dependent on Great Britain when we conquered Canada in 1745. This we did before

we were an independent nation, and all the rights which Great Britain now has in Canada were obtained through us. Canada was conquered by our valour and by our means. Therefore I say that Great Britain has no right to Canada and that it belongs to the Americans, who originally conquered it from the French and Indians. . . . But here we have Canada, Nova Scotia, and other British possessions around us which are tares among our wheat. . . . They prevent us from spreading our principles throughout the continent and from fully carrying them out and establishing free institutions. They diffuse monarchical principles amongst us. The seeds of these principles are carried abroad upon the wings of the wind and spread among us these obnoxious weeds. Now I consider that these obnoxious weeds must be eradicated, and that no more of them ought to be propagated through these means on our soil. We must grub them up by the roots lest they affect the whole country."

So much for the Monroe doctrine as interpreted in 1846. The debates of Congress as reported in the "Congressional Globe" of that year make but sorry reading for any Canadian enamoured of the theory that the Monroe doctrine acts as a form of protection to Canada.

On one other historic occasion has the disputed boundary line of a British dependency in America been made the subject of a declaratory application of the Monroe doctrine. This was in the case of British Guiana in 1895. It is unnecessary here to enter into the question whether the disputed territory belonged of right to Venezuela or to British Guiana. Probably, as in all boundary questions, there was right and wrong on both sides. But what is of interest, is to notice the rather startling form given to the Monroe doctrine by Mr. Olney, the Secretary of State in Mr. Cleveland's cabinet. The high ground of Mr. James Polk and Mr. Pettit of Indiana is here abandoned for a still loftier elevation. "No European power or combination of powers," wrote the Secretary in a letter to the American Minister in London for presentation to Lord Salis-

bury (July 20th 1895), "shall forcibly deprive an American state of the right and power of self government. . . . Distance and three thousand miles of intervening ocean make any permanent political union between an European and an American state unnatural and inexpedient. . . . To-day the United States is practically sovereign in this continent and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition." Such was Mr. Olney's interpretation of the Monroe doctrine, an interpretation which President Cleveland fortified by proclaiming in a message to Congress that the doctrine was no longer a mere declaration of policy but had become a matter of international law: "Since in international councils every nation is entitled to the rights belonging to it, if the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine is something we may justly claim, it has its place in the code of international law."

It is a disputed point whether the body of rules known as international law is entitled to its name. In the lack of a compelling power behind its regulations it seems probable that they will be followed or not merely according to the relative fighting power of the two parties to an international dispute. But in so far as international law is of any account, the Cleveland-Olney version of the Monroe doctrine would certainly reduce the Dominion of Canada to the most impotent simulacrum of nationality that it is possible to conceive. Here we have three propositions: first, the Monroe doctrine is international law; second, the Monroe doctrine declares that the United States is sovereign in America; third, it also declares that a permanent political connexion between Great Britain and Canada is unnatural and inexpedient. The propositions followed to their logical conclusion mean that Canada is a vassal state of the American republic, whose present connexion with the British Empire cannot permanently be tolerated.

From Mr. Olney's statement of the case let us turn to the view presented in rejoinder by Lord Salisbury, the British Foreign Secretary of the day:

“ The contentions set forth by Mr. Olney in this part of this despatch are represented by him as being an application of the political maxims which are well known in American discussion under the name of the Monroe doctrine. As far as I am aware, this doctrine has never been before advanced on behalf of the United States in any written communication addressed to the government of another nation; but it has been generally adopted and assumed as true by many eminent writers and politicians in the United States. . . . But during the period that has elapsed since the message of President Monroe was delivered in 1823 the doctrine has undergone a very notable development, and the aspect which it now presents in the hands of Mr. Olney differs widely from its character when it first issued from the pen of its author. The two propositions which in effect President Monroe laid down were, first, that America was no longer to be looked upon as a field for European colonization; and, secondly, that Europe must not attempt to extend its political system to America, or to control the political condition of any of the American communities who had recently declared their independence. . . . The disputed frontier of Venezuela has nothing to do with any of the questions dealt with by President Monroe. It is not a question of the imposition upon the communities of South America of any system of government devised in Europe. It is simply the determination of the frontier of a British possession which belonged to the throne of England long before the Republic of Venezuela came into existence. . . . In the remarks which I have made I have argued on the theory that the Monroe doctrine in itself is sound. I must not, however, be understood as expressing any acceptance of it on the part of Her Majesty's government. . . . International law is founded on the general consent of nations; and no statesman however eminent, and no nation however powerful are competent to insert into the code of international law a novel principle, which has never been recognized before and which has not since been accepted by the government of any other country. . . . The

danger which such an admission would involve is sufficiently exhibited both by the strange development which the doctrine has received at Mr. Olney's hands and the arguments by which it is supported. . . . In defence of it he says, 'that distance and 3,000 miles of intervening ocean make any permanent political union between a European and an American State unnatural and inexpedient, will hardly be denied.' The necessary meaning of these words is that the Union between Great Britain and Canada; between Great Britain and Jamaica and Trinidad; between Great Britain and British Honduras or British Guiana are 'inexpedient and unnatural.' Her Majesty's Government are prepared emphatically to deny it on behalf of both the British and American people who are subject to her Crown."

But let us now pass to what is really the most important aspect of the whole matter. Conceding for the sake of argument all that a Canadian, anxious for peace at any price under the shadow of the republic, might have said in the past about the protection of Canada by the United States, let us see how the question stands under the actual circumstances of to-day. Here we must no longer think in terms of the America of Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe; isolated from Europe and from Asia, they were able to contrast the effulgence of republican liberty with the gloom of European tyranny and were anxious to separate the children of republican light from the children of monarchical darkness. The times have changed. Democratic liberty is now shared by the people of both continents. It is an open question whether, in practice, the monarchical or the republican is the better form. The moral basis of the original doctrine has been removed. The doctrine of the present, whatever it is, rests only upon expediency and policy. And this policy has shifted its ground. The United States has lost its isolation, and in its diplomacy, its commerce, and its territorial interests is intimately connected with the states of Europe. From a system of European powers we have passed to a public polity controlled by a group of world powers.

This was a change which was already being prepared years before Mr. Olney and Lord Salisbury discussed the Venezuelan question. The change from a republic to a republican empire was one that must of necessity come with the completion of the internal development of the United States. But it required the sudden shock of the Spanish war of 1898 to precipitate the full effect of the change that had been long preparing. The echo of American guns in the harbours of Santiago and Manilla awoke in the hearts of the people of the republic the sense of new ambitions and a new part to be played in the destiny of the world. Not that the Americans have not always been a people of soaring national ambition, eager just as the British or any other of the so-called great peoples of history have been eager, for material wealth and territorial gain. The spiritual modesty of the Puritan did not prevent his downcast glance from falling with oblique approval on the glittering Spanish dollar of the rum and sugar trade. The Virginian of early days dreamed of empire and foreign conquest and hoped to find the Khan of Tartary at the head waters of the Chickahominy. It was therefore no lack of hereditary ambition, no natural humility, that led the statesmen of the new republic to repudiate all interest in the affairs of Europe. Ambition and empire lay nearer to their hand. The conquest of the unknown west of America and its development formed for one hundred years the goal of national aspiration. Within our own time the last phases of this conquest have been completed. The wars of the Apaches and the Sioux are done. Ocean is joined to ocean. The metropolis of the Pacific coast rivals the mother cities of the east. The prairie, robbed of its romance, choruses the autumn jubilation over the corn crop. With the settlement of the west and the consolidation of its industrial civilization, it was inevitable that American enterprise should seek a wider field than that offered within the four corners of the republic. The lateral expansion of American trade called urgently for a like expansion of political power.

In such a situation the shock of the Spanish-American war shattered the thin screen behind which the republic still maintained a mimic isolation. The sequel is a matter of common knowledge: Cuba wrested from Spain to be made a protectorate on probation with a standing possibility of something more; Puerto Rico annexed; the Philippines purchased; Hawaii incorporated by special invitation: Samoa, Wake Island and other stepping stones of an oriental trade of the future turned into "possessions" of the United States, a thing undreamed of in the earlier covenant. Jeffersonian democracy struggled awkwardly to fit its phrases to the new situation. It vaunted the independence of the Cuban republic. It gave it a real president, a box of senators, voting machines, and all the paraphernalia of political freedom. Then with sincere emotion it tied to the tail of the Cuban lion the tin-can of the Platt amendment, and converted the republic into what the brute honesty of the tyrannizing Briton calls a protectorate. The Philippine Islands became a Crown colony of the Washington government; to be presently made, like Puerto Rico, a colony of the second grade with a government partially elective and similar in outline to that of Barbados or Jamaica or Samoa. The United States governs through the officers of its navy, keeping its eyes shut and forgetting the inconvenient equality of all men.

It is not here meant to imply that these new American governments are bad. On the contrary they are, from all accounts, singularly forceful and efficient and go far by their very efficiency to disprove some of the grosser fallacies of the Jeffersonian declaration of independence. Moreover in their form of administration they pay to the outer empire of Britain the compliment of an imitation long held to be the sincerest flattery. But the point under discussion here is not the equity or efficiency of the American imperial governments, but the altered position thus accepted by the United States in the general sphere of world politics. It has become an Asiatic power with new lines of interest radiating in all directions across the Pacific; a naval power and now the

predominant partner in the West Indies, the former battleground of the maritime nations of Europe; a commercial power whose colossal and highly organized industries at home look to its new possessions as bases for the conquest of the export trade. Monroe's creed of America for the Americans has been altered to mean America for the Americans and as much else of the world's surface as can be obtained at a profitable figure. This is a simple "doctrine" long known and practiced by the princes of Europe. It removes the moral bias from the original gospel of Monroe and should therefore allow the American republic to enter the comity of the great powers on a footing of complete good fellowship.

Meantime the new international status of the United States has been accepted with alacrity by the dominant political party of the country. The old-fashioned groaning of a few people in the rural parts has been of no avail. Over their little light has been rudely clapped the bushel of commercial interest. There has been a willingness, too, to pay the cost. For a maritime empire a navy is a first necessity, and for this Congress is voting yearly some million dollars and will go on voting until the navies of Europe are overtopped by the navy of the American republic. Diplomatically America has entered into the counsels of the powers. Peace and war in Manchuria are settled in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and the appearance of American delegates at Algeciras shows that the republic is willing to aid the Princes in their protection of the Sultan of Morocco. The situation is one that is perfectly understood. In the possible struggle for China or the partition of Siam the United States will have to be reckoned with as one of the participant powers. The only person who fails to grasp the situation is the Canadian patriot-politician sitting upon a snow pile and meandering about the protection afforded him by President Monroe.

Consider now a moment what would be the consequences, under present conditions of international politics, of the supposed axiom that Canada is protected by the United States. It could only mean that no matter what European

power or combination might be at war with Great Britain, no matter how the United States might otherwise be disposed towards that power, no matter what part Canada might be taking in the contest, as an active ally, as a field of recruitment, as a granary of food supply—that the United States would declare to the European power that Canadian territory, Canadian ships, and Canadian commerce were outside of the legitimate field of belligerent attack. The thing is absolute nonsense. Let us suppose an actual case. Even the Liberal First Lord of the Admiralty has recently made the supposition on the floor of the Commons that Great Britain was at war with Germany, although avowedly he did it only “for arithmetical purposes.” It is not therefore the mark of an unbalanced jingoism to make such a hypothesis apart from its arithmetical uses. If Germany should go to war with England to-morrow we should find ourselves,—in law, in fact, and in our own hearts,—belligerents; our ships at sea and our commerce would be liable to capture as those of a belligerent power; our coasts would be liable to invasion, our seaports to a naval bombardment. In the dangers and fortunes of war, the British Empire is and must be one. The German adversary would insist upon the right to strike a blow wherever it might find a point vulnerable to attack. And what more natural? For whatever might be said or done officially at Ottawa, whether our government adopted a policy of active co-operation or of declared neutrality, we should be as much belligerents in fact as the people of the British Isles. Nothing could prevent our young men, from the spirit of adventure and from a higher motive, enlisting by thousands in the war: nothing could prevent us from acting as one of the chief bases of food supply for the British Isles, during the struggle. Under the rules of naval warfare adopted in 1908, the food supply of a fighting nation, in so far as it is destined for the combatants, becomes contraband of war. It is an easy inference that in the case of a nation like Great Britain, which must import food or starve, each and any part of the incoming grain or produce would be regarded as contraband of war by any adversary that could arrest its passage at sea. Is

it not also at least possible that Germany in fighting England might find that under our present defenceless condition the despatch of a minor cruiser to cripple the Canadian trade and to bombard the unprotected ports of Canada, might, relatively to its size, be one of the promising exploits of the war.

And here it is presumed the United States would intervene, that the Washington government would say to the German Empire: "Canada is neutral territory: it is lawful for the British belligerent to seize as an act of war your German dependency of South West Africa, to hold Kaiser Wilhelm's land in New Guinea, or to attack the German base in the Pacific Kiao-chau; but Germany must not in return seek to cripple the Canadian trade or seize the sea-ports of Nova Scotia without contravening the sacred rights of Canada secured by the Monroe doctrine and insulting the sovereignty of the United States." Such a statement carries with it the proof of its own absurdity. The United States could only say this at the price of itself participating in the war, of declaring itself an active ally of Great Britain in the struggle against Germany. That it would do this on each and every occasion that might arise passes the bounds of the conceivable. The United States, like every other country, has its own interests to preserve, its own international affinities and obligations to regard, its own welfare to pursue. In a war between Britain and Germany, it might side with one or with the other, or, more probably, preserve a strict neutrality between the two. To suppose that it would, at all risks to itself, take under its protection the most valuable external possession of one of the belligerents, a country of 7,000,000 people, thousands of whose citizens were combatants in the contest, is to suppose it guilty of a form of philanthropic lunacy not readily creditable to the American people.

Before we can imagine the United States intervening to keep the hands of Germany off the British dominions in America, we must measure in all candour the extent of American sympathy with the combatants on either side. The American republic is by no means made up of British people

and the descendants of British stock. It contains among others some 12,000,000 of German birth, to whom, though the imperial government is little loved, Germany itself remains as the vaterland of their affection; add to these the alien millions who have never known us, and the millions who have gone from our midst with hatred in their hearts and, in their opinion, the wrongs of centuries to avenge, and we may measure the extent to which the colonists of the British empire may rely upon the forcible intervention of America.

Nor, let it be remarked, have the official leaders of the American republic ever expressed their willingness to embark upon such a policy. Monroe certainly did not, nor has the doctrine of American protection of the Dominion of Canada ever been voiced except by representatives of the Canadian people themselves. Indeed we can find utterance of exactly contrary opinions in the official papers of the Washington government. No men were readier to invoke the recollection of Monroe's message than President Grant and Mr. Secretary Fish in the San Domingo affair of 1870; Mr. Fish was even willing to claim that the Monroe doctrine prohibited the transfer of American territory from one European power to another. But even he was not willing to aver that the United States was willing to prohibit the belligerent operations of a regular combatant in war. "This policy," he wrote in his Report to the President of July 14th 1870, "does not contemplate forcible intervention in any legitimate contest." It may perhaps be granted that in the event of a German, Japanese, or Russian conquest of Canada in arms, when the time came for a definite treaty, the United States would consider itself entitled to be consulted in regard to a possible cession of Canada, just as France would consider itself entitled to be consulted in regard to a possible cession of Belgium. Such comfort as is to be found in this, Canadians are certainly entitled to cherish. But this is intervention after the fact, dictated not by the welfare of Canada as such but by the national interests of the United States.

The long and short of it is this. The Monroe doctrine is merely an expression of policy, of what the United States at certain periods in the past thought it in their own best interests to do. In the future it will be the same,—merely an expression of what the government of Washington, having in view the advantages and disadvantages that might accrue to its own people, decide to do in a particular situation. It was invoked against the presence of the French in Mexico, not because French occupation of the country was unjust or oppressive to its inhabitants but because it was dangerous to the United States. It was not invoked, officially, against the American occupation of the Philippines, because the commercial interest and the export trade of the republic was benefited by the occupation. So, too, it will be always. Under present circumstances the whole thing has become a mere diplomatic figment, a polite name for the fact that the United States, like all other Christian countries, is prepared to use brute force in what it thinks its own interest even in regard to territory not under its immediate sovereignty. The Sultan of Turkey exercised, while he could, a similar Monroe doctrine over the Upper Mediterranean.

But in its bearing upon our national future in Canada, perhaps when all is said and done, the main reason for casting aside the worn out fiction of the protection of Monroe lies in another direction. The acceptance of such a protection, even if offered, would be unworthy of a people as lofty in their own estimation as the people of this Dominion. There is no need to elaborate the point. The nations of history have grown to greatness by sacrifice and self-reliance. There is no other path. We cannot accept unpaid the sheltering protection of another state. The future lies elsewhere. Upon the North American continent, there are not one but two great powers. Side by side with the democratic republic of the United States stands the democratic empire of the British people. Not all the fiats of an American Secretary of State can annihilate its sovereignty.

STEPHEN LEACOCK

SHALL CANADA HAVE A NAVY

CANADIAN policy is based upon three root-ideas: (1) We wish to remain in the British Empire. (2) We wish to remain independent of the United States and to build Canada up as a second great power on the North American continent. (3) We wish to keep, possibly to increase, our autonomy as regards Great Britain. That is, we wish to do our own national business, to develop in our own way.

At the moment the third of these is the most visible, because for some time little has occurred to direct our attention to the others. Its possession of the uppermost layer of our thoughts is taking the form of a noticeable growth of national consciousness—sometimes self-consciousness—and this new national consciousness shows itself as a desire for national recognition. This temper can and should be made the basis of an appeal to Canada to provide the armed force, on sea as on land, which in the present imperfect condition of the world is the foundation of national status. When, however, we survey the whole field, we are likely to doubt whether this desire for autonomy really is the strongest of our three root-ideas. It is my conviction that a serious crisis would reveal a passionate resolve to maintain our independence of our neighbours; or an overwhelming national consciousness of the supreme value of British connexion; according to the form which the crisis might assume. Apart from this, Canada lives in a world which is steadily growing smaller; in that world she has international relations which are of great importance to her; and these relations are governed by the fact that she is in the British Empire. In short, it is in the light of our British connexion that we must approach our problem.

Foreign powers care little about our growing sentiment of nationhood, which is an aspiration so far principally of interest to ourselves; they are forced to take into serious consideration the fact that we fly the British flag and are subjects of King Edward VII.

We are in the British Empire. What world-business is the British Empire about in which we may be involved?—The striking fact about world-politics is that, so far as the future can be read, we are destined to have only three or four Great Powers. These are to be the British Empire, the United States, Germany, and perhaps Japan or whatever Far Eastern empire she may found. It is to be observed that the British Empire ranks third among these in the matter of effective population; the United States have 87,000,000, Germany 63,000,000, the British Empire 57,000,000 (white men), and Japan 49,000,000. If we consider merely the United Kingdom, which furnishes the whole of the immediately effective armed force of the Empire, the British Empire comes last with 45,000,000.

The grouping of these four world-powers is complex. The British Empire and the United States are on friendly terms. The British Empire and Germany are on bad terms. The British Empire and Japan are friendly and indeed at present are united by a positive alliance, but are without any guarantee as to future friendship. The United States and Japan are dangerously near being on bad terms, though earnest efforts are being made by the two Governments to avert a clash. The relations between the United States and Germany and between Germany and Japan have not taken definite form.

The governing factor of the present international situation, so far as both Great and Greater Britain are concerned, is the grave possibility of an Anglo-German war. The majority of Englishmen of influence now believe that a war with Germany is inevitable; the British nation as a whole is coming to that idea, though with intense distaste, reluctance, and regret. The British apprehension is that Germany intends to smash the British Empire and by so doing, (1) gain

immediate profit, by means of an indemnity, seizure of colonial possessions, increase of trade, etc., (2) acquire the overlordship of the world.

The specific reason which is driving the majority of responsible people in Great Britain to this conclusion is the fact that Germany, already the greatest military power in the world, and having no interests on the ocean which demand overpowering naval strength, is building a great fleet; moreover, she avows her intention of creating a navy which will equal, i.e., beat the British navy;¹ and this in face of a long-standing and explicit warning that Great Britain regards any challenge of her command of the seas as a menace. The process has been electrically sudden. When Sir Wilfrid Laurier became Prime Minister of Canada, the German battle-fleet consisted of four small, badly-constructed, thoroughly inferior ships; the British navy consisted of from twenty to twenty-five battleships, enormously superior ship for ship to those of the Germans. To-day Germany (1) has eighteen fairly good battleships of the pre-Dreadnought type, (2) is building *Dreadnoughts* so rapidly as to make it a subject for controversy whether she or Great Britain will be in the lead in 1912 or thereabouts.

It follows that Great Britain is arranging all her diplomatic or international plans with this fact in view. She expects a very big world-storm to burst one of these days.

The plans which Great Britain is pursuing in accordance

1 "Germany must have a fleet of such strength that a war against the mightiest sea-power would involve risks threatening the supremacy of that power. For this purpose it is not absolutely necessary that the German fleet should be as strong as that of the greatest sea-power, because generally the greatest sea-power will not be in a position to concentrate all its forces against us." From the preamble of the German Navy Bill of 1900.

"We do not know what adversary we may have to face. We must therefore arm ourselves with a view to meeting the most dangerous conflict possible." Admiral Tirpitz, Secretary of the Navy, in the Reichstag, 1900.

"In our attitude towards England we must keep cool; and until we have a strong fleet, it would be a mistake to let ourselves be drawn into a hostile attitude towards her." Herr Basserman, leader of the National Liberal Party.

The "Hamburg NEUESTE NACHRICHTEN," on the day after the text of the German Navy Bill of 1908 was published, said: "Henceforth the policy of the Imperial Navy is to act strictly on the offensive. The time is seasonable so to augment our fleet as to render it capable of engaging the mightiest navy with a good chance of success."

with this apprehension have two phases which particularly concern us:

(1) It has become of peculiar importance to the United Kingdom to be on good terms with the United States: not merely on good terms in the sense of abstaining from quarrelling, but on good terms in the sense almost of alliance.

(2) It is of considerable, perhaps of great importance to Great Britain to be on good terms with Japan, the other remaining great power of the future.

This, then, is the world in which we are living. The dominating factor in it is the apprehended world-storm. Let us see how this affects Canada.

In the first place, if the Empire fights, we shall be at war with its enemy. If the thunder-cloud breaks, some of the rain will fall on us: perhaps some of the lightning too. If the enemy wins, the Empire will be smashed. If the Empire is smashed, we shall be thrust out of it, we shall have to shift for ourselves, we shall find one of our three root-ideas in ruins, we may in addition be seriously molested. That will be the size of the stake for which we shall find ourselves playing. Apart from this possibility, there is the actual material damage, in losses to be estimated in dollars and cents, which war would inflict upon us.

In the second place, the American and Japanese policies which this state of affairs imposes on Great Britain affect us very closely. Our own state of mind about these countries is not by any means identical with that of Great Britain.

It has to be recorded that Canada does not feel particularly enthusiastic over the policy of taking excessive pains in order to keep on good terms with the United States. We know that it will never do to go to war with that power, on the principle which prevails in County Kerry, that it is not fair for one man to fall upon thirty. But we have no idea whatever that any dispute would lead to fighting; and we are fairly content so long as our neighbours do not actually declare war against us.

This may seem a hard saying; but if we reflect we shall see

that there is very little harm that the United States can do to us short of resorting to actual hostilities. Tariff war has prevailed for over a generation; American commercial legislation is deliberately and minutely framed for the purpose at once of exploiting Canada and of retarding her economic development. Again, with the exception of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, it would be difficult to name one good turn of national importance which the United States has consciously or purposely done us. True, there is a considerable amount of good-nature in our relations with our neighbours: a good-nature partly heedless, partly cynical, partly the result of habit—for commercial warfare has lasted so long that we can scarcely conceive the possibility of normal relations—partly diplomatic, partly mere good business sense, as when we co-operate over the deep waterways and the fisheries of the Great Lakes. If the United States really desired to annoy us, almost the only means they would have short of war would be the abrogation of the bonding privilege, and that possibly would hurt them more than it would us.

We live and breathe in this cynically good-humoured economic warfare with the United States. As a result, we are exceedingly reluctant to see any concession made to a power which never does a good turn to us. Moreover, rightly or wrongly, probably wrongly, we have an idea that much of the apparent unyielding and quarrelsome resolution of American foreign policy is bluff; and this makes us exceedingly impatient of any concessions to the American point of view.

But if Great Britain and the United States are to be fast friends, a certain number of good turns must be done to the Americans, for the arrangement must be profitable to them as well as to Great Britain. So far this necessity has worked out in an unhappy way for Canada; the benefits of the friendship have been enjoyed by the Empire as a whole and more specifically by Great Britain, who supplies the armed strength and so controls the foreign policy of the Empire; the price has been paid by Canada, as the part of the Empire whose interests touch those of the United States. Fortunately, as the United

States get deeper and deeper into world-politics Great Britain's opportunities of helping them will multiply, and concessions by Canada no longer will be the Empire's only method of winning their friendliness. Still, Canada's share in the doing of good turns is bound to remain large as long as this imperative necessity continues.

As to Japan, we have no special reason to cultivate her beyond our general desire to increase our trade, and we may have a dangerous race-question to discuss with her. Our people in British Columbia have all the North American white man's intolerant, and one must almost say insensate, pride of blood and race; the Japanese are proud and quick to take offence; the racial aspect of the difficulty is aggravated by its economic importance, one or two industries already having been appropriated by the new-comers from the Far East. We have every diplomatic reason to treat Japan with consideration, she being mighty where we are feeble; but we have very precious interests to conserve on the Pacific littoral, and in the maintenance of them Japan is our chief—let us say—obstacle, for enemy is not the correct word to apply.

These, then, are the broad conditions under which we play our part in world-politics. Popular instinct has been absolutely correct in feeling that they are exceedingly unsatisfactory. Our three root-ideas are made to conflict. We are in the Empire and the most noticeable result is that we are perpetually playing the Empire's game by making concessions to please our big neighbours. But these concessions conflict with our second root-idea by perpetually exhibiting us in the light of an inferior dependency, whose lot on this continent is to yield every point in every dispute. And this is deeply wounding to the increasing national pride which is a result of the working of our third root-idea.

And yet the Empire has good reason for asking this sacrifice of us. There is danger of fighting; our contribution to the common safety seems to be yielding, not doing any fighting ourselves. We do not play the game by adding to the armed force of the Empire, so we are expected to play the

game by making concessions. That is what the situation resolves itself into when we look at it steadily.

How profoundly distasteful the situation is ! Canadians have chafed under it for years. Apart from the humiliations which it from time to time entails, there are two particularly disagreeable and dangerous features in this method of playing the game. We never can be quite sure wherein we profit. Nominally these concessions are for the good of the Empire as a whole; possibly—nay probably—this is the case; but we are prone to think that they really are for the sole benefit of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom is understood to pay us for our playing of the game, for making concessions, by furnishing the whole armed force of the Empire. But as she also controls the policy of the Empire we are never quite sure just how big is the boon in return for which we are to play the game. And secondly, we have little or no control over the policy of the Empire which renders these concessions necessary. Having a partial voice in the actual negotiations, which we sometimes obtain, is ineffective when the policy behind our side of the negotiations has been decided without our having been consulted. The upshot is bound to be distrust, jealousies, bickerings, which need only to be prolonged enough to endanger the strength of our affection for British connexion.

The essence of the situation is that we are of very little use to Great Britain in the specific sense of being able to render armed aid in case of war, and so she is compelled to resort to other means of strengthening her military position. We must ever remember that Great Britain, for the first time since 1805, is threatened with a serious maritime war. To a land war we might contribute a few thousand volunteer troops whose value would vary with the field of operations; to Great Britain's naval strength under present conditions we add nothing—we are in fact a deduction from it owing to the defencelessness of our coasts. Under the circumstances, the friendship, even the benevolent neutrality, of the United States is worth more than the good-will of Canada.

But on the other hand if we develop a fairly strong armed force of our own we shall at once acquire some value to Great Britain in a military sense and so acquire some share in the policy of the Empire. If when the maritime war came Canada were to have, let us say, a dozen or a score of useful warships; if she could contribute to a great land war, say, 50,000 second-line troops¹; her hearty sympathy and aid would weigh heavily even against the precious boon of friendly neutrality on the part of the United States; and we may be sure that British statesmen, (1) would take no important step in international politics without finding out what we thought about it, and weighing our opinion very carefully; (2) would regard our actual aid as weighing heavily against American good-will. There need be no trouble as to the machinery for giving us a share in the Imperial councils; the desire of Imperial statesmen to know our mind would soon lead to means being devised.

The business of making concessions to the Americans would then change in several respects. The need for concessions would decrease; as the Empire grew stronger its need for conciliating the Americans would lessen, Canadian strength taking its place as an asset. American demands might conceivably slacken as Canada improved in ability to hold her own. And thirdly, even if concessions were necessary, we should know that our public men had been consulted, and the need would not irritate us so much.

Thus, we in Canada would find our root-ideas harmonized, would have our British connexion strengthened by our new weight in Imperial councils, would find our American neighbours increasingly agreeable, and would attain the national status which comes with national strength and with national strength alone. Meanwhile, the Empire would be benefited. Its chances in any war would be improved, and to that extent the likelihood of war would decrease. As its chances increased

¹ By second-line troops I mean troops which would arrive on the scene after the opening battles of the war had occurred and when the need of reinforcements was making itself felt. Considerations of distance, training, and organization seem to impose this rôle upon contingents from Greater Britain.

it would be freed from the need of cultivating the friendship of the United States and Japan. That is, cultivating in a specific sense, as distinguished from the desire to live on good and neighbourly terms with all other people, which is the peculiar pacific glory of the British Empire.

To sum up the more general part of my argument: if Canada were to develop an appreciable armed strength, she would at once benefit the Empire, confer a boon on the United Kingdom, make her position in the Empire more influential, enable her to live on somewhat less unequal terms with the United States, increase her own self-respect, and win the respect of others. The peculiar danger of the Empire just now being a maritime war, naval strength assumes particular importance. Consequently, if we were to set up a Canadian naval force of some sort we should be acting in harmony with the profoundest tendencies of our development.

Powerful, immediate, and material motives point in the same direction. Definite naval dangers threaten us in the present state of international politics.

The whole structure of our commerce is founded on our Atlantic trade. Speaking broadly, Canada's principal business is to sell things to Great Britain. Of course we have other lines of trade, but that use of the British market is the keystone of our commerce. We may amplify this general summary of our business: the United States refuse to buy from us whenever they can help it; Great Britain purchases our staples. We have a home market and an active internal trade; we have hopes in the Orient, promises as to France and Germany, and possibilities as to the West Indies; but everything rests upon the steady out-go of our staple products to Great Britain. Interrupt that access to the British market, and our whole system will fall in ruins. We have had previous experiences of that sort. Prior to 1846 our commerce was based on the preference given us in the British market; Great Britain adopted Free Trade, and we suffered disaster. From 1854 to 1866 our commercial system was built on a basis of

selling our goods to the United States; the United States clapped on a prohibitive tariff; Canada was ruined, and it was years before her trade readjusted itself to the new conditions. We do not wish to repeat the experience. But if our trade with Great Britain is interrupted, repeat it we shall.

Let us look at the figures. In the year ending 31 March, 1908, our export trade in home produce stood as follows:—

To Great Britain	\$126,000,000
“ the rest of the Empire	13,000,000
“ the United States	90,000,000
“ other foreign countries	17,000,000
	<hr/>
Total	\$246,000,000

In other words:—

Trade overseas	\$156,000,000
Trade by land	90,000,000

Thus over 63 per cent of our trade is maritime. If we were to include the proportion of our trade with the United States which is done by Atlantic and Pacific coasting vessels, it is evident that fully two-thirds of our trade with the outside world is ocean-borne.

An incidental consideration is that there is a possibility, not much debated at present, but still a possibility, that we may form some arrangement with the British West Indies, which would give us a considerable interest in those islands. We might assume some loose form of hegemony of British America; we might establish close trade relations with the British Islands; the project even has been mooted of our incorporating them in our confederation. Any such development would mean so much more need for us to keep the Atlantic ocean open to our ships.

We next must note that the conformation of our Atlantic coast-line is so peculiar that if an enemy's ships could reach it, and if no local defence were provided, it would be easy so to beset it as to deny us egress to the ocean. We could be absolutely blockaded with very little effort. Our ships enter the Atlantic at four points; through Belle Isle, a long strait,

in one place some 15 or 20 miles wide; through Cabot Strait, some 70 miles wide; from the port of Halifax; and through the mouth of the Bay of Fundy, some 40 miles wide. If British warships happened to be absent, four hostile cruisers, one at each of these points, could choke up our whole trade across the Atlantic. We should lose our British market. In addition some local but annoying damage could be done by scaring seaport towns, raiding the fisheries, etc. It is unnecessary to dwell on the panic, loss of trade and money, and national rage and humiliation which such an interruption of our trade would work. Even a brief actual stoppage might, in conjunction with the consequent uncertainty and panic, mean the loss of an entire season's trade; and that would mean hard times.

That is our immediate local risk. If we take a wider view, it at once becomes evident that our whole commercial system depends on the British market being kept open. If any enemy could obtain command of the sea, and blockade Great Britain, our commercial ruin would accompany the political downfall of the United Kingdom and the smashing of the Empire; our search for a new international status would be made in poverty. If an enemy could interfere with the passage of our foodships to Great Britain, he would at once hurt her and damage us. Great Britain seriously apprehends a war with Germany, and we may be sure that if an energetic power like Germany engages in a naval war with the British Empire she will use this weapon; and we may further be assured that an attack on the food trade from a power so intelligent, so determined, so ruthless and ingenious, will be formidable.¹ Let that war break out and the attack upon us will come. We may conjecture indeed, that her most vigorous attacks will be made upon that portion of the food trade which has its origin in Canada. That trade is on

¹ Since this passage was written the London Conference] has given countenance to the idea of "volunteer cruisers," *i.e.*, privateers, and has made it clear that a ship may leave her home port under the merchant flag and on the high seas mount guns and hoist a war flag. Lord Charles Beresford has given us to understand that German tramp steamers carry guns in their holds, and are ready to be converted into commerce-destroyers on the receipt of a cable message.

the Atlantic, the only ocean to which she has access; by intercepting Canadian ships she would hurt the Empire at both ends of the voyage; and there would be no difficulty about neutral ships or neutral goods.

In this connexion it is fair to remark that in one respect Canadian and British interests diverge. British statesmen and sailors in considering the problem of food-supply have one great advantage; their possible sources of supply are remarkably varied.¹ Canada, the United States, the Argentine, Russia, India, Australia, New Zealand—all are possible bases from which wheat and cattle may be shipped to Great Britain. From the insular British point of view it is of secondary interest whether the food comes from some part of the Empire or from a foreign land. British statesmen might even deliberately prefer to draw their supplies from a powerful neutral, like the United States, whom the enemy would be reluctant to annoy, and who would be given a monetary interest in British success. On the other hand, Canada's whole interest lies in getting her food-stuffs to England, and nowhere else. For England the problem is complex; for us it is unpleasantly simple.

We thus are confronted with the practical danger of a German attack upon our trade with Great Britain, and it behoves us to consider if we can guard against it.

Four non-fighting expedients have been or may be suggested:—We might declare ourselves neutral. We might ship through American ports and under the American flag. The Monroe doctrine might protect us. Private property at sea may be exempted from capture.

As for the first, we intend to stay in the British Empire, not to run away at the first sound of blows, to set up as a separate nation, weak, undefended, and universally despised as a coward. As for the second, the Americans have not

¹ "It will be seen from this table that in the case of any interference with our supplies from any given source we might expect that a considerable share of the grain now sent from other producing countries to destinations other than the United Kingdom would be diverted to this country." Report of the Royal Commission on Supply of Food and Raw Materials in Time of War, Cd. 2643, p. 8.

vessels enough to carry their own goods; there might be a difficulty about inducing an enemy to recognize transfers which would be colourable pretexts to evade his purpose; and for us to use American ports would ruin Montreal, Halifax, and St. John. The Monroe doctrine is designed to protect territory from invasion, not ships from capture; for the Americans to forbid Germans to capture British ships on the high seas would be to declare war. As for the fourth proposal, the discussion of it [at the last Hague Conference was discouraging, and in any event the enemy probably would evade any such arrangement by declaring food contraband. Precedents for this exist.¹

In short, our Atlantic trade and our Atlantic coast must be protected by fighting any enemy who may attack them. The traditional Canadian opinion is that in any case the Royal Navy will protect coast and trade so efficiently and so much as a matter of course as to give to any measures of our own the character of works of supererogation. But will the Royal Navy be able to do this? Or will it be disposed to make special exertions or sacrifice other objects to this end?

The rapid development of the German fleet has forced the British navy to concentrate in British waters. In five years the force in commission in those waters has increased from 20 armoured ships to 41; while the number of armoured ships outside of British waters has fallen from 22 to 17. The withdrawal of cruisers from foreign stations has been even more marked; in unarmoured ships, the type which apparently will be used in commerce protection, the drop is from 45 to 27. Further, the resources of the Admiralty in unarmoured cruisers suited for commerce protection have been greatly diminished by its action in discarding a great number of vessels of middle size and moderate speed. In 1903 the Royal Navy had 164 protected cruisers, torpedo gunboats, and scouts built or building; in 1908 the number of these craft had fallen to 86. That is not all; the only cruisers which are being built are small vessels of very high speed and slight fighting power,

¹ It has been done by Russia in 1904-5; and by France in her war with China, 1885.

purely for use with fleets and not for patrolling purposes. The Admiralty, which formerly provided vessels specially designed for patrolling the commerce routes, seems now to be laying its plans for a war which will involve a determined struggle for the mastery of the sea with an enemy's fleet in the North Sea, and to be building ships to serve in fleets, not for patrol or commerce protection purposes.¹

The German coast is difficult of approach and would prove awkward to blockade. A possible development would be a use by the German fleet of the shoals and other obstacles of its side of the North Sea so as to drag the war out to tedious length and to force the British fleet to remain concentrated and on the alert for weeks or months. The more prolonged the concentration the greater would be the demand for cruisers to act with the fleet as scouts, messengers, inshore blockade vessels, and in a dozen other capacities. These demands could not be met by the thirty-odd swift cruisers which are specially suited for fleet work, and the Admiral in command in the North Sea would be forced to draw on the forty-odd cruisers of moderate speed and the ten or eleven torpedo gunboats which also are borne on the Navy List.

Now the German navy, in addition to rather over a dozen very swift cruisers for work with the fleet, possesses about 25 cruising ships which are slower than the standard—about 22 knots—now required for this sort of work; and it is remarkable that they have coal-endurance far superior to that of British cruisers of corresponding speed and force. The German navy presents this curious characteristic, that its battleships have small and its smaller cruisers large coal capacity.²

¹ Since this passage was written the Admiralty has begun to lay down cruisers of the *Bristol* type, which seem designed for commerce protection work.

² That is, its pre-Dreadnought battleships. Germany's new vessels of the all-big-gun type have large coal capacity.

The list is as follows:

SECOND CLASS CRUISERS—UNDER 21 KNOTS.

	AGE	DIS- PLACE- MENT. Tons	ARMAMENT	SPEED Knots	Coal cap. Ton
Kaiserin Augusta	1896	5956	12-5.9"; 8-3.4"	19	850
Freya	1898	5569	2-8.2"; 8-6"; 10-3.4"; 10-1.4"	19.5	825
Hansa	1899	5791	2-8.2"; 8-6"; 10-3.4"; 10-1.4"	19.5	825
Hertha	1899	5569	" " " "	19.5	825
Victoria Louise	1898	5569	" " " "	19.5	825
Vineta	1898	5791	" " " "	19.5	825

(British cruisers of similar tonnage and speed and lighter armament carry from 500 to 600 tons of coal.)

THIRD CLASS CRUISERS—15 TO 20 KNOTS.

Irene	1888	4224	4-5.9"; 8-4.1"; 6-1.9"	19.8	750
Prinzess Wilhelm	1888	4224	" " "	18.7	750

(British cruisers of similar tonnage and speed carry 400 tons of coal.)

Gefion	1894	3705	10-4.1"; 6-2.1"	19	780
Gazelle	1898	2603	10-4.1"; 14-1.4"	18	560
Niobe	1901	2603	" "	20	560
Nymphe	1901	2618	" "	19.5	560
Hela	1896	2004	4-3.4"; 6-1.9"	20	500

(British cruisers comparable to these carry 400 tons of coal.)

Condor	1892	1614	8-4.1"	16.5	300
Cormoran	1893	1614	"	16	300
Seeadler	1892	1614	"	16	300
Geier	1896	1597	"	16.2	300
Bussard	1890	1555	"	16.5	300
Falke	1892	1555	"	15.5	300

(The British cruiser Barham, 1830 tons, 18.6 knots speed, carries 140 tons of coal.)

CRUISERS AND GUNBOATS—UNDER 15 KNOTS.

Schwalbe	1887	1102	8-4.1"	13.5	264
Sperber	1889	1102	"	13.5	264
Eber	1904	977	8-3.4"; 6-1.4"	13	240
Luchs	1900	962	" "	13.5	240
Panther	1902	962	" "	13.5	240
Tiger	1900	962	" "	13.5	240
Iltis	1896	881	" "	13.5	165
Jaguar	1899	900	" "	13.5	165

(British vessels of similar tonnage and greater speed carry 100 tons of coal.)

Under these circumstances, might not the Germans, while playing to keep the British fleet concentrated in the North Sea, detach a few of these older, slower, less valuable cruisers to worry the food trade upon which Great Britain depends for her daily bread and Canada depends for her solvency? The noteworthy circumstances of the high coal endurance of all of these cruisers strongly points to some such design. They evidently are meant to take long voyages—say across the Atlantic.

Suppose, now, that a detachment of these German vessels were to slip out of the North Sea and attack our food trade; the Admiralty might find itself in a difficult position. Everything would depend on the issue in the North Sea; the North Sea fleet might be in desperate need of cruisers; the Admiralty might harden its heart and decide that the detaching of cruisers to search for these marauders must wait till the command of the sea was obtained.¹

Such a course might be by far the wisest in view of the whole interests of the whole British Empire. But it would leave us in Canada very helpless, if we had not provided a force of our own. Our ships could be seized on the high seas; more than that, as we have seen, so long as we possess no naval force whatever, it would be practicable for the marauders to choke our whole Atlantic trade. To the actual physical stopping power of hostile cruisers picketing our four entrances upon the ocean we must add the panic which their appearance would raise, the exaggeration of their numbers, and the consequent reluctance of shipowners to allow their vessels to put to sea. The panic caused on the American coast in 1898 by rumours concerning a very few Spanish ships which at the time

1 "If you were contemplating some very vital and important operation against the enemy, and you could under certain circumstances say, 'We can afford to risk a lot of these wheat ships being taken, because we know the country has got wheat, and it cannot absolutely starve, and therefore the game is worth the candle,' would that not be a factor?" A. "I think it would be a great factor. I think an admiral on a station, who is protecting a trade route, if he saw a chance of some brilliant success with his fleet, by means of withdrawing the cruisers that are on that route, would withdraw them at once." Report of Royal Commission on the Supply of Food and Raw Material in Time of War, Cd. 2644. Evidence of Sir J. C. Hopkins, Q. 8960, p. 32.

were still in Europe is an interesting precedent. Four insignificant cruisers carrying only 500 or 600 men appearing off our Atlantic coast could paralyze our whole trade with Britain. The paralysis would last until bigger and stronger British cruisers appeared to capture them or chase them away. Even if the Admiralty sent aid promptly, a fortnight or more might elapse before the British ships could come across the Atlantic. And we have seen that circumstances might oblige the Admiralty to delay succour. In such an event our loss would be millions in money, in addition to the humiliation of having our helplessness exposed to the world. It would be a curious spectacle, the whole commercial framework of a nation of seven or eight millions shattered by a few hundred seamen in a few obsolete cruisers.

If we had a Canadian naval force, working in Canadian waters, the enemy would find this exploit much less easy. Even if our force were small, it would disturb the German plans. A warship on a commerce-destroying mission of this sort greatly dislikes fighting other warships. Even if she wins, there is only one small cruiser the less in the hostile navy, whereas her business is to destroy a great many merchant ships, terrify the rest from sailing, and upset the enemy's trade. Again, an enemy's coast, 3,000 miles from home, would be an uncomfortable place if a chance shot hurt the engines or made the vessel leak. Then there are considerations as to ammunition and fuel supply of a technical nature. Thus even a small fighting force would tend to discourage a somewhat stronger commerce-destroying force from coming in its direction. The stronger our defensive force were to grow, the less attractive would the enemy find our coast. Moreover, the peculiar nature of our coast-line, with its series of gateways, would lend itself to defence, if we had a naval force, even as it does to blockade as long as we have none. If we keep those gateways strongly enough to warn raiders off, the St. Lawrence, 600 miles from Quebec to Cabot Strait, is safe; and so is the Bay of Fundy. From Quebec to Liverpool is 2,600 miles; of this some 600 or 700

miles would be closely guarded, and the rest would be in the ocean, where it is harder to find vessels than in coastal waters where routes converge.

The naval force for such a task might be either a torpedo defence, or a squadron of suitable cruisers, or both. By a torpedo defence I mean, of course, a flotilla of torpedo boats or of destroyers, possibly even of submarines.

The advantages of torpedo defence are that, by reason of its stealth and the shattering effect of a blow that gets home, it is a weapon which is effective against any kind of ship, even the mightiest; that its existence makes the whole coast so infested most unsafe for any hostile fleet, however powerful, and imposes a strain on the nerves of its crews and on the judgement and strength of purpose of its admiral; and that it is a valuable assistance to any friendly fleet which comes its way. If we had three or four divisions of torpedo craft, say one at Belle Isle, one in Cabot Strait, one at Halifax and one at Yarmouth, the very fact of their existence would keep our coastal waters clear of hostile vessels unless they had some particularly good reason for standing inshore; even if they did, it would be necessary for them to approach by daylight, when they could be seen, and to be off before nightfall. The menace of the submarine would be particularly efficacious in keeping the enemy away. Any British fleet having business in our waters would, of course, find in these craft a ready-made and valuable auxiliary. The disadvantage of torpedo craft alone is that they can operate only by night, so that a cruiser really wishing to enter the Gulf or the Bay of Fundy could do so by running through in daylight.

As for cruisers, they could of course be overmatched. If we were known to have a squadron of 1,000-ton vessels armed with 12-pounders, the Germans would be debarred from sending their 900-ton gunboats, but might send their *Condors* or *Falkes* with 4-inch guns; if we had 1,500 ton ships with 4-inch guns, they could dispatch their *Gazelles* or *Irenes*. Of course, they would be progressively disinclined to risk the more expensive vessels on such an enterprise. If a

British fleet were to find it necessary to operate in our waters, a few small and slow cruisers would be a much less valuable reinforcement to it than a division or two of torpedo vessels.

If now we turn to the Pacific, we find that the dominating factor there is the existence of Japan as a most formidable naval power. We have no guarantee that our relations with her always will remain friendly, and there are several dangerous elements in the situation. Apart from the problem of Japanese immigration and the race difficulty which it raises, we must consider the remarkable antagonism between the United States and Japan; should these two powers fight, our position, in view alike of the explosive conditions in British Columbia, and of the temptation to Japanese—or to American—ships to use our harbours under certain possible contingencies, might prove very delicate, and we might be dragged into the conflict. Aside from these dangers peculiar to ourselves, there is the general fact that any one of a hundred accidents or developments with which we have nothing to do might set the British Empire at war with Japan.

Given war with Japan, our position would be extraordinarily difficult and dangerous. Between Germany and Canada lies Great Britain in all the amplitude of her sea-power. So far as Japan is concerned, we lie between her and the United Kingdom. There is this especially formidable circumstance, that the German menace forbids Great Britain sending to the Pacific a fleet large enough to ensure victory over Japan. The Anglo-Japanese treaty will terminate in 1915. By that time Japan will have 20 modern battleships and 20 modern armoured cruisers, and more than half of these will be of the all-big-gun type started by the *Dreadnought* and *Indomitable*. To cope with such a fleet Great Britain would be obliged to send 50 or 60 armoured vessels, many of them *Dreadnoughts*. But by that time Germany will have upwards of 50 armoured vessels, nearly thirty of which will be all-big-gun ships, and Great Britain will be forced to keep some 70 armoured vessels at home to confront this great fleet. Thus to deal with Japan and ensure her safety against Germany, Great

Britain would need, say, 120 to 130 armoured ships; at present she has 87, built and building; so that she would have to build about 40 armoured ships in the next six years—each at a cost of ten million dollars.

We can, without dishonour, count on a certain automatic protection from the United States. That power is certain to maintain a fleet on its Pacific coast, and Japan would know that the Americans, for their own reasons, would be exceedingly touchy about any interference with us. This protection, however, has limitations, and might become a danger; if we were impotent and if Japan in attacking the American littoral were to violate our neutrality by using our coast as a base, we might be embroiled with the United States, whose government might suggest that as we were unable to safeguard our coast ourselves it would undertake the task for us.

The clue to our Pacific policy seems to lie in this contingency. It seems an imperative duty to take steps to make our coast secure against use by a foreign fleet. Only one weapon fits the case—the torpedo. Fortunately, the intricacy of the coast, with its chain of islands masking the true shore, with its maze of sounds and straits, with its thousands of fiords and inlets, lends itself to mosquito warfare. The climatic difficulties of navigation, it is to be observed, are far less serious than on the Atlantic—an important consideration when we are discussing the use of these fragile boxes of machinery. In addition to this very serious duty, there are certain peace-time tasks of patrolling, police, etc., which are needed in the North Pacific and which might properly be undertaken by Canada; these would require ships of the normal cruiser-type.

It remains to discuss, very briefly, the situation on the Great Lakes. It is unnecessary to consider the probability or possibility of war with the United States, beyond recalling that so short a time ago as 1895 a disturbingly large proportion of the American people seemed positively pleased at the prospect of hostilities. Should such a war occur the whole defence of Central Canada would turn on the com-

mand of the Lakes. American command of Lake Superior would mean the instant cutting of the Canadian Pacific; possibly the cutting of the Grand Trunk Pacific as well, for several railway lines will lead from Lake Superior to that road. American command of Lake Huron would render the defence of the Western Peninsula of Ontario almost impossible, for forces could be landed on the shores of the Georgian Bay behind our people's backs. American command of Lake Erie would turn our defence of the Niagara river. American command of Lake Ontario would compromise our defence of the Niagara and would expose our line of communication to interference. On the other hand, British command of the Lakes would mean that from Kingston to Port Arthur—900 miles—invasion could be attempted at only four points, and at these must be on a narrow front and with greatly restricted power of manœuvre, two circumstances which would tell heavily in favour of the defence.

It is necessary to dispel the illusion that Great Britain could send ships of the Royal Navy through the canals on the approach of trouble. Aside from the fact that any such measure might be the signal for instant war, there is the practical fact that, outside of torpedo craft, there are only a dozen vessels in the Royal Navy which could get through the locks on the St. Lawrence; these are torpedo-gunboats, somewhat obsolete craft of from 750 to 1,000 tons displacement and armed with two 4.7-inch guns each. But several of the canals are within sight of American territory across the St. Lawrence river; field guns on American soil could sink the ships in the canals, and for that matter could destroy the locks before the ships came to them; so that this means of strengthening our position in time of strained relations is impossible. A second obstacle is interposed by the narrow waters of the St. Clair and Detroit rivers, which would forbid access to Lake Huron, which is our most dangerous lake.

The building of the Georgian Bay Canal would modify the situation to some extent, as a considerable number of cruisers of the Royal Navy are of dimensions moderate enough

to use the 22-foot waterway and the large locks which are contemplated. But they would be restricted to Lake Huron, the canal and river at Sault Ste. Marie being under gunfire from the American bank. It is further to be noted that the shortage of cruisers already remarked must have an important effect upon this fanciful vision of an incursion into these confined waters of squadrons drawn from a deep-water navy whose ships have been designed, whose plans have been laid, without a thought of any such action.

It would seem that if anything is to be done in the way of preparing for a naval defence of these lakes, it must be done by ourselves. If we had a naval force on the Atlantic, for instance, we might build and maintain in the Gulf of St. Lawrence gun-vessels which, while suitable for coastal work, would fit the locks, and would carry a fairly heavy armament. We also might maintain a number of torpedo boats small enough to be transported by rail.

The next step in the argument would be to proceed to a discussion of the type of naval force which we should provide; but that is beyond the scope of this paper. The question propounded is: Shall Canada have a navy of her own? It seems to me that I have answered it. To put the matter on the lowest plane, our material commercial interests require it. On the Atlantic our trade is distinctly likely to sustain an attack which, if we persist in leaving everything to a Royal Navy which has innumerable other duties which to it are far more important, might easily inflict enormous damage upon us; by taking steps to provide a naval defence of our own we should lessen and perhaps remove that danger. What sort of force? That is a further question; to some extent a question for experts. On the Pacific coast we are confronted with grave problems which may develop into grave dangers; here, too, it is imperative that we provide a coastal defence. On the Great Lakes the military aspect of our problem of maintaining our independence within the British Empire will be lightened by the maintaining of a naval force adapted to the highly peculiar needs of those waters.

Transcending these material arguments is the great and pressing need for self-respect, for discharging some more honourable part in the British Empire than that of buying the friendliness of a powerful neighbour by mortifying concessions. As long as we are a military or naval weakness to the Empire we shall live in the depressing sense that we are a dependency, that our national will is less respected than that of our neighbours; and so our citizenship will be of an inferior grade, and our sense of nationhood will be one of uneasy self-consciousness, with its fretful and feverish side. Let us in Lord Milner's words make of ourselves a new centre of strength, and the sense of being a dependency will vanish, our citizenship will become that of full-paying members of a world-wide Empire. It is on the ocean that dominion and empire rest. A national armed force upon the ocean is our next national development.

C. FREDERICK HAMILTON

THE NINE PROPHETS

A NEW era of prophecy is come upon us. Our old men see visions and our young men dream dreams. Up to the moment of the present writing six trumpets have sounded and three more are preparing themselves to sound. The first voice was heard in the East. It tells that in fifty years the Atlantic Ocean will be working for Prince Edward Island; that the liquor question will be settled; that farming will be a fine art; that fish culture and mind culture will go hand in hand; that the horse shall lie down with the automobile, and a woman or a little child shall drive him safely; that the Island will become a hive of manufacturing industry and retain its present qualifications for an earthly paradise.

The second voice is like unto the first, a strong sound from the "giant of Guysborough," and yet sweet as the song of the herdman of Tekoa, as it tells of grass which never withers and the ample waters which never run dry. In those days the farmer of the West and the manufacturer of the East shall feed together behind the shelter of a protecting wall. The merchant shall be cheered by return cargoes, and the cities of Nova Scotia, the gateway of Canada, will wax great as Nineveh or Tyre.

The words of Lemuel are the prophecy of mineral wealth, when the water-powers of New Brunswick will be something more than pleasure streams for tourists, when the Intercolonial will have several competitors, and a great export business will be done in dairy products and root crops. He predicts a population of a million within a period of forty years, though he does not tell us how that feat will be accomplished, a point upon which we should like to be informed, in view of the fact that the people of his province have only increased by 9987 persons during the past twenty years, that the population of

the principal city has decreased by 614 persons during the past thirty years, and that such increase as there has been is confined almost entirely to those counties in which the French race predominates.

The fifth prophet is conscious that to forecast "the direction in which and the extent to which development and progress go is—although the *locus in quo* is confined to Ontario—practically equivalent to setting forth these things with reference to Canada and to a certain extent with reference to the British Empire;" and "he shudders as he contemplates the utter inability of mere man to grapple with such a problem." That is the voice of Ontario. What need to record further these songs of greatness all pitched to the same key? Are they not written in "Collier's" in the prophecy of the Governors of the nine Provinces?

If a Governor have a vision of his own heart or a dream by night, it is quite proper that he tell his dream. It is also proper that he who hath a true word should speak it faithfully, even if he be "as the ass who forbad the madness of the prophet." For this word of truth the moment is peculiarly opportune since we in Canada are in that stage of development when all men speak well of us, a condition against which woe is especially proclaimed.

Herein are the two main views of prophecy. To the Greeks a prophet foretold events of the future. The Hebrew prophet was a seer, who sees things as they are, and uttered boldly the results of his observations. If one sees things as they are it requires no special gift of divination to foretell what will happen. When one knows what men are it is an easy guess what God will do.

This capacity to perceive the present truth is less common and, it may be added, more useful, even if more dangerous, than the practice of forecasting the future, since all people desire that their prophets shall smooth their tongues, and say, He saith. They say to their seers, See not; and to the prophets Prophecy not unto us right things, Speak unto us smooth things, Prophecy deceits and words which are smoother than

butter. We in Canada are not free from those prophets, of whom Ahab found four hundred in one day, "speaking great swelling words of vanity, sporting themselves with their own deceivings, and with feigned words making merchandise of the people." We could well endure the burden of the Lord—that spirit which comes upon a prophet, illuminating his mind and exciting his will to proclaim that things are as they are and that the consequences of them will be what they will be.

All Hebrew prophecy was political. Had there been newspapers in the reign of Zedekiah, Jeremiah would have been writing editorials urging the people to arm themselves, to go forth boldly into the world, to plunge themselves into the vortex of Chaldean militarism. Public life in Judea was corrupt; although by a curious perversion of thought we have come to regard the Hebrews as righteous, because their prophets occasionally cried out against wickedness; and pastoral, because they proclaimed that successful commerce is accompanied by public corruption and private profligacy. The prophets of smooth things had been proclaiming, Ye shall have peace, No evil shall come upon you. They encouraged the people to rely for defence upon the Egyptians, their neighbours to the South. They preached a kind of primitive Monroe doctrine by which the army of Pharaoh would come to their relief. Any one who has a Bible in his hand will find out that it befell quite otherwise and that, when the critical moment arrived, Pharaoh had business of his own to attend to. Those who were happy as they were declared that the prophet sought not the peace of the people but the hurt. They smote him and put him in prison. His advice was not taken, but the city was. In this there is a nice lesson in Imperialism for us, upon which one might enlarge if he were engaged in the labour of making a sermon, delivering a homily, or writing a tract.

We are not now so badly in need of this lesson in self-defence as we were two years ago. In 1908 a Commission was created to enquire into the operation of the Civil Service, and by a curious interpretation of the terms of reference the Commissioners undertook to investigate the military adminis-

tration of the Militia, notwithstanding the difficulty under which they laboured of being without expert assistance and knowing nothing whatever of the intricate technical question upon which they went out of their way to deliver judgement. They reported that the expenditure had "gone up by leaps and bounds" from three and a half million dollars in 1904 to six and a half million dollars for the fiscal year ending March 31st 1909; but they omitted to mention the explanation of the obvious fact; namely, that during that period the burden of maintaining the garrisons at Esquimalt and Halifax had been removed from the Imperial Exchequer and assumed by Canada; that 11,000 more men and 2,500 more horses were trained in 1908 than in 1904; that the pay of the permanent force had been increased; that the Corps of Engineers had been expanded; that the Medical Service had been organized; that an Army Service Corps had been developed which was competent to supply troops either in camp or field; that the Corps of Clerks and Guides had been added to the force, and much money spent upon rifle associations and companies of cadets, in the re-armament of both the infantry and artillery forces, and in the creation of a reserve store of ammunition.

During the time which has elapsed an event happened which was apparently so small that its significance escaped notice. In the re-arrangement of the Imperial forces the post of Quartermaster General in India fell vacant. The acceptance of this office is commonly understood to imply promotion to the place of Commander-in-Chief, the rank which was then held by General Lord Kitchener. It was offered to the Brigadier-General and Chief of the General Staff of the Canadian Force and was declined. The reason was that that officer had undertaken a work which was yet unfinished. To-day it is finished and the results may be summarized under the following heads.

1. Appointments to the Permanent Corps are now made only after the passing of a qualified literary examination, similar to that in force in the British Service for the

Regular Army, supplemented by a military examination, closely approximated to that in force for entrance to the British Army. A certificate of graduation from the Kingston Military College exempts from both examinations; the matriculation examination for any recognized University in Canada exempts from the literary qualifying examination.

2. Every officer in the Permanent Force, before being promoted to or confirmed in his rank, has to pass the examination for that rank laid down for officers of the British Regular Army. There are but two or three exceptions to this rule, in the case of very senior officers who are approaching the age for retirement, and who understand that they will not receive any further promotion.

3. The main difference between the Militia force as it existed six years ago, and as it exists to-day, is, that the "departments" such as the Army Service Corps, which feeds and transports an army in the field, the Medical Corps, which looks after its health and cares for the wounded, the Ordnance Stores Corps, which provides arms, clothing, equipment, ammunition, and munitions of war generally, and the staff which forms the controlling and business management of an army, can hardly be said to have existed in 1902, but have now been created and trained in their several duties. Without these subsidiary services, an army could hardly take the field and certainly could not maintain itself when there; and the Militia previously was, therefore, little more than a number of individual bodies of armed men. Without a staff to direct its movements, it would be completely disorganized and unable to execute the simplest manœuvres. The whole policy of the Militia Council, since its inception in 1904, has been so to organize the forces of the Dominion that they should really be available for use in defence of the country.

4. Considerable criticism has been directed at the increase of the staff of the Militia. But, when it is remembered that the staff is the controlling portion of the Militia body, and that it is essential for war, and further, that the

increase in staff for the Militia has been approximately proportionate to the increase in the strength of the Militia itself, the force of the criticism largely disappears. When it is further remembered that, in the event of an attack on this country, thousands of men would flock to the colours for its defence, so that the strength of the Militia would be, at least, doubled, it will be seen how suicidal it would be to restrict the numbers of the staff. A Staff Officer can be no more improvised at short notice than can the management of a large business concern. The staff of the Militia is only slightly in excess of the proportion to the peace strength of the Militia which the British regular staff bears to the peace strength of the Regular Army. On the other hand, if we take the strengths of the two forces on a war footing, the proportion of Staff Officers in the Canadian force is very much smaller than the proportion of Staff Officers in the British force.

5. Before 1905, the greater part of the staff duties at the annual camps for training the Militia was performed by officers temporarily employed for the purpose. They were not the same officers from year to year. They had no training in their duties beyond the twelve days in camp, and they consequently were in no sense trained Staff Officers. Under the new system, the Staff Officers for all the camps are officers who are performing the same duties all the year round, and who would perform similar duties with an army in the field. Hence, efficiency of the staff duties at the annual camps has enormously increased, while the number of officers capable of acting as Staff Officers in war has been greatly augmented.

There is one thing more. A beginning has been made in affording to boys the inestimable benefits of that training which Milton commends, namely, "the exact use of their weapon, to guard, and to strike safely with edge or point, practice in all the locks and grips of wrestling wherein Englishmen were wont to excel, as needs may often be in fight to tug, to grapple, and to close." By this means much will be done to counteract the effect of the female teacher and

the public school. Communities abandoned to the public school and the female teacher quickly lose that character which, for good or bad, is well described as manly. No matter how adorable the feminine character is, it is not precisely that which one would hold up for emulation by boys who are afterwards to become men, yet the large proportion of public schools are taught by women who impress upon their pupils the character of women and very immature or celibate women at that. Girls have a certain quickness of apprehension which is of immediate value in the passing of examinations; and boys seeing the immediate advantage of that quality endeavour to mould their minds after the feminine type. Self-reliance, perseverance to the point of doggedness, the contempt of mere smartness, give place to the desire for rapid impressions and instant results. A woman gets what she wants in her own petty way or by crying for it; a boy soon persuades himself that this ready method is efficacious for him also. The drill-sergeant will be a useful corrective.

This Strathcona Trust is a thing of good omen, its object being not only to improve the physical and intellectual capabilities of the children by inculcating habits of alertness, orderliness, and prompt obedience, but also to accustom boys to patriotism and to a realization that the first duty of a free citizen is to be prepared to defend his country; the especial intention of the founder being that, while physical training and elementary drill should be encouraged for all children of both sexes attending public schools, especial importance is to be attached to the teaching of military drill and the use of the rifle to all boys.

A prophet who had an unusual aptitude for cursing might well expend some of his energy upon that perversity of vision which will not allow men to see any good in any act which is not performed by their own party. At a time when a storm of war was impending Canada found itself without quick-firing rifles. The Minister of Militia went to England to secure those useful implements, and found every factory choked with orders for immediate supply. He did the next

best thing, the only thing he could do, and secured a new model, the capital, and appliances for manufacturing it. Because a rifle did not spring into existence by magic equal in all respects to those which the European arsenals had wrought out by years of slow improvement—that was “a scandal” even to men who for thirty years had been deploring the helplessness of infant industries and soliciting charity on that account. And yet with that very weapon in its improved form the Canadians at Bisley during the present year won the Kolapore, the *Daily Graphic*, and Wimbledon Cups; the MacKinnon and Prince of Wales prizes; and the grand Aggregate.

Finally, we have done with talking about spending our last dollar and are actually about to spend the first for the protection of our shores and the commerce which issues from them. In the present number of THE UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE Mr. Hamilton has lifted up his voice warning us what would befall if we lay at the mercy of an enemy of the Empire without a weapon in our hands. The burden of Hebrew prophecy was national defence and righteousness. The prophet who set out four years ago to curse our apathy, our supineness, our insensibility to present obligation and future danger might well end his message to-day with a blessing upon what we have really done; and if he were a man of vision he might reveal the no-distant future day when a Canadian can walk the streets of London without shame as he witnesses the coster-mongers of Whitechapel Road or the peripatetics of the Circus toiling not for his defence but for the maintenance of an Empire in which he too is bearing his part. Also he might justifiably fall into an ecstasy as he dwells upon that enrichment of spirit which will be ours when we are entitled to enter into that heritage which has been growing precious these centuries whilst we have been wandering in the wilderness, a heritage, however, which we did not wholly abandon by the act of crossing the seas.

The other head of prophecy is national righteousness. The prophet of Quebec has not yet spoken. There is yet

hope. It may be that his hand is on his mouth and his mouth in the dust as he contemplates that other revelation which Mr. Justice Cannon has made of the condition of affairs in the municipal government of Montreal—representatives of the people justifying public dishonesty on the grounds of "patriotism." That is the kind of patriotism which is "the last refuge of a scoundrel." Governor Pelletier let us hope will cry aloud and spare not.

ANDREW MACPHAIL

RUNNING WATERS

There were four rivers in Eden old:

(Running waters may never cease)

They fed the apple's mellowing gold,
And the red rose tree in the garden mould,
And the grasses that hid the serpent cold.

(The rivers are restless and know not peace.)

There are four rivers that flow in Hell:

(Running waters may never cease)

They circle the lovers that erst loved well,
And the aimless sinners no man may tell,
And the souls that struggled in vain and fell.

(Here by the rivers may none find peace.)

A. CLARE GIFFEN

ALL MEN ARE EITHER PLATONISTS OR ARISTOTELIANS

IT IS a proverbial fact, poignant also and entertaining yet quite intelligible, that an author is generally the worst judge, interpreter, and expounder of his own work. Virgil fancied himself a philosopher and wanted to burn the *Æneid*. Wordsworth never knew when he was inspired and when he drivelled. Tennyson throws no light, only added darkness, on difficult Tennysonianana. Browning frankly left the oracles in Browningese to the Browning clubs.

It is, therefore, only to be expected that the last interpreter of our Coleridgian *γνώμη* will be Coleridge himself. I have looked for an explanation at any rate in Coleridge and have found less than nothing; nothing would have left me at liberty to say that Coleridge obviously meant what I suppose him to have meant: what I actually found, however, were a few words which seemed to me inept and insignificant. I have forgotten entirely now what these words were—only the impression of their insignificance remains.

Now the worst of this is that it opens the door for the enemy to blaspheme, for the scoffer to rejoice. Accordingly, some of my cherished colleagues—I am told and can well believe it, it is so collegiate—have at once pronounced the distinction a mare's nest, originally intended to form part of those lines which the poet indited "to a young ass." There is no valid distinction, only a distinction without a difference, between Aristotle and Plato; so runs the collegiate criticism.

Nevertheless, because I also am a colleague, I desire for a few moments to attempt to describe the impressions which, as I conjecture, hovered vaguely before Coleridge's mind, when he uttered the famous words. Although, like a true poet, he could seize only the oracle to which he was inspired and not the grounds of it: he could interpret, I

mean, only the divine mind (the conclusions, the large results of thought which seemed to come to him ready-made) and not his own mind: not, that is, the various detailed considerations on which the large results ultimately hung. Coleridge was like the untrained, unscientific judge in the oft-quoted story, who could be depended upon for sound conclusions, but went quite astray, if he attempted to analyse his conclusions into their premises.

What then did Coleridge mean? Not surely that the actual conclusions and creeds of the two men are very unlike; for after all their politics, though different, are not contrary; a conservative democrat and an aristocrat are not antithetically opposed: nor is their religion different in essentials; though Plato never emptied his religion or his God of morality, as Aristotle empties them. Each seems again to have believed in an immortality of an impersonal Oriental and Buddhist character: the dew drop slips into the shining sea. The distinction must rather lie in their methods, their presuppositions, their temperaments.

1. And first and foremost Plato generalizes: Aristotle distinguishes: here is a vital difference of method and of temperament: *ὁ συνοπτικός διαλεκτικός* says Plato, *ὁ δὲ μὴ οὐ*: the philosopher generalizes: he who does not is no philosopher. But with Aristotle the cry is for distinction: let us distinguish: the world cannot distinguish: that is what separates the world from the elect; but also, I may add, in a secondary degree Plato from Aristotle.

Illustrations crowd into the mind and could be multiplied almost indefinitely to prove that Plato overlooks differences, while Aristotle is apt to make distinctions where there is no difference. Plato confounds virtue with art and art with virtue: he identifies the honest man with the man who makes a patent safe: he insists that cooks should have a moral purpose: virtue with knowledge (how often it is rather ignorance, as with the Romans): virtue with virtue, all being alike soluble into knowledge; so that courage is identified with temperance, besides being the same virtue

in man and woman; and temperance conversely is the brave resistance to pleasure: art with artist (art only seeks its patient's good; therefore the artist only seeks his patient's good; the doctor does not practice for a living but for his patient's living): religion with morality: man with God: consciousness with the processes of replenishment and evacuation which produce pleasure and pain (so that pleasure and pain is each called unreal by Plato according to the replenishment or the hunger of the body accompanying them. Plato confounds the human shepherd with the shepherd of sheep: (each practices his art only for the sheep's sake) man with woman: man and woman with pigeons, dogs and horses: and all knowledge with *a priori* mathematics. Rarely, very rarely, is Plato betrayed into an unnecessary and unreal distinction, such as that between the art of pay and the art of healing, the two separate arts which nevertheless every doctor unites. And this, obviously, only because he has previously failed to distinguish between the aim of medicine and the aim of the medical man, and has laid himself open to the charge that he never paid his doctor's bills: he is compelled—to save himself from that injurious imputation—to explain that his doctor *qua* doctor, rendered no bills, but only *qua* tradesman: he paid the tradesman's bill but not the doctor's: a distinction without a difference to a practical tradesman-doctor. In Plato finally, action and contemplation are ever united in the ideal life of his guardians as in his own strenuous and would-be practical essays at statesmanship in Sicily—in unhappy Sicily.

But Aristotle is always refining: virtue is very properly distinguished from art: politics still more shrewdly separated from medicine and the more normal and legitimate arts: the human shepherd from the shepherd of sheep: the good man from the good citizen. (Quaintly enough to our notions; for the good man is the mild, colourless character; the good citizen is the full four-square, all-round efficient man.) One of his best distinctions never out-of-date is the distinction which Plato overlooked in his desperate attempt to ignore

the difference between *meum* and *tuum*, the distinction between *meum* and *nostrum*; another is the distinction ever needing to be re-affirmed in some form or other against Comtists or other modern fanatics, between selfishness and selfishness: between selfishness the vice, the loving of oneself at the expense of others, and the selfishness which is no vice, the simple love of life and self: thus the craving for immortality *e.g.* by interpretation is not selfish: only for immortality at the cost of others: or for honour and a good name at the cost of others: "soit mon nom fletri," a Danton may naturally exclaim, because he adds "si la France soit libre," but no man otherwise need desire to be accursed or annihilated. There is martyrdom and martyrdom: martyrdom for the sake of others and martyrdom for martyrdom's sake, this latter a very selfish unselfishness, because it is at the expense of others, the persecutors; and so on: I am developing Aristotle.

Or again in his chapter on Phaleas, desires are for three things: for daily bread; for champagne and sweetbreads; for the things of the soul, power, knowledge, fame, divine worship: the economist solves only the meanest and the smallest difficulties, when he has successfully provided every man with three square meals a day. The medical man in his own house is a very different being—much less cool and trustworthy an adviser—from the medical man in his patient's house. Government by rule and precedent is a very different thing—weaker alike and stronger—from government by individual will and personal initiative: again monarchy or each other form of Government has various species under the one genus. There are five spurious forms of courage, of varying degrees of spuriousness, besides the true form; and the true form, in spite of Plato, is not the same for a man as for a woman: it is less patient than hers, less enduring, more drastic, and more dramatic. The human creature is carefully distinguished from the brute creation, and also masculine from feminine employments and duties. There are slaves and slaves: slaves who should be free men

and free men who should be slaves; for the Greek is quite distinct from the barbarian, even as he is—at the other end—distinct from the gods. Contemplation befits the latter—the gods—and a few of the diviner men—philosophers: action befits the rest of men: the action again must aim partly at pleasure; but much more at activity for its owner's sake or the State's sake: and the two—the pleasure and the activity of which it is the reflex—can very properly be distinguished; just as also morality can be sharply distinguished from religion; for morality is of the earth, earthy: a means only of keeping the brain clear and wholesome, swept and garnished, that religion may enter in and that by means thereof a man may follow the divine life and may think upon thought.

2. I come next to minor and secondary distinctions between the two men; already more or less implied. Plato represents pure mathematicians: Aristotle the students of the physical and natural sciences. Plato, I mean, represents *a priori* reasoning, and Aristotle experience. Plato thinks that all science, even applied mathematics, even astronomy, can be best studied, after a short introduction in the form of observation, without instruments and without experiments and without observation: instruments and experiments will indeed positively mislead the student, for they will show that the coarse world of matter does not follow very closely the laws and principles of mathematical generalization: that the actual ellipses of the actual planets are imperfect, as imperfect as heard melodies compared with the unheard and ideal; but if the actual ellipses are imperfect, so much the worse for the actual planets; let the mathematician return to the law of the planets, the ideal of the planets, the faith and spirit of the planets, and not be disturbed by their vain and sinful works; which, in the nature of things can never correspond with their ideals, though nearer indeed to *their* ideals than the human creature ever comes to his ideal.

Nay, so wide is Plato's faith in mathematical generalizations that he brings the elementary institutions of human society, the marriage in due season of each new generation of citizens, within the range of astronomical science, and we are treated to abstruse speculations about the nuptial number, or about the 729 times by which the aristocrat is happier than the tyrant. Of course he is more than half joking, but the joking shows how he hankers after mathematical explanations of the problems of politics.

Aristotle has scant faith in these vague general ideals; this universal good or God which informs all things that are good: sometimes he has no faith even in those general propositions which are the conditions of all argument: *e.g.*, he sets before you in one passage (of great moment for apiarists) the moving doubt, "do bees swarm when a warming pan is beaten because they like the noise or because they fear it?"—but the controversial spirit thus aroused does not prevent him from adding cheerfully in the next breath, "after all, perhaps they do not hear it at all." He is quite dispassionate, quite contented even though his experiments are neither as Bacon would say *lucifera* nor *fructifera*: in the same quite cautious matter-of-fact vein he resists co-education and the rights of women, not on principle, not on metaphysics, but with the homely and prosaic argument, "some one must keep house and attend to the larder: who else will do it?"

I mean that Aristotle has great interest in details and in special individual facts; and is not at all concerned to get facts out of which large deductions can be drawn: any fact, even a negative one, is interesting to his strictly scientific and severely sober temperament. One amazing example of this is worth quoting: all philosophy has been full of the thought that it is not truth but the search for truth which repays men; which soothes life and sweetens it until it becomes at least tolerable; but Aristotle makes no such limitations, admits no such hesitation. If the search be pleasant, he says audaciously, it is reasonable to suppose that the goal

is still pleasanter: a prophecy, surely, only true of the collector, of the man of science interested in details and in multitudinous collections of details; who is satisfied to exhaust some science and to complete some collection, though he be as far as ever from broad generalizations and from any large understanding of himself or life; who is satisfied to perfect his collection of certain shells from the seashore, without vain speculations upon sea, or shore, or the wherefore of shells, and shore, and sea.

3. In the third place because Plato reasons *a priori* and Aristotle is an empiricist it follows that Plato is idealist against the realism of Aristotle. An interesting side light on this head is presented by their treatment of the perennial and modern difficulty, the elementary school and its social influences. The idealist—aristocrat though he be—had enough natural sentiment in him to wish to unite all classes, at least in childhood, in common schools; or at any rate in common games: it was the democrat whose caution and whose realism led him jealously to separate the children of the free from contact with slave children and their games, lest one of these little ones should be contaminated; and should contract vulgar and commercial ideas in his games; the idea of trading, for example, I suppose.

This is sometimes made *the* distinction between Plato and Aristotle. So, for example, Professor Munsterberg, in his entertaining book on "American Traits," makes this distinction of idealism or realism the one fundamental distinction between races and individuals. He writes: "the realist is democratic, the idealist aristocratic; the realist is cosmopolitan, the idealist national and imperialistic; the realist seeks his goal in liberty, the idealist in justice. They are the two poles of mankind: the realism of the man the idealism of the woman in every noble household"—or perhaps *vice versa* in some less normal but not less noble households: "and so, in history, in Plato and Aristotle we feel at once the typical expression of the two great tendencies. Plato, says Goethe, fills the world with his ideals, but Aris-

tole works with material already given;" that is, Aristotle, as I understand it, accommodates himself to facts and accepts—because they seem to be the facts of the past—such horrors as infanticide, abortion, and slavery, much more readily than Plato and is much more disposed to conserve ancient wrongs, because they are ancient. Plato is more disposed to dash himself and his hopes to pieces upon the iron walls of fact, in deference to the supremacy of ideals, the supremacy of the inner voice over outer experience. Each exhibits the characteristic weakness of the conservative respectively and of the reformer.

But to return to Professor Munsterberg. If he be right, I ought now to make here a fourth distinction, and dub Plato an Imperialist and Nationalist, and Aristotle a Cosmopolitan or Humanitarian. Perhaps even I might take a poll on the Philippine question, or the future of Canada, to test beyond any cavil the accuracy of the proposition that every man is by nature a Platonist or an Aristotelian; but I think I will let this stand over; for I feel some perplexity. The truth is that in our British politics at least Nationalist and Imperialist are not always synonymous but are sometimes antithetical terms: and besides I have other scruples about this particular distinction, suggestive and racy though it be.

For I sometimes think that Plato—in spite of his sympathy with the eternal feminine—is less nationalistic, less narrowly Hellenic than Aristotle; that Aristotle is more friendly to Greek Imperialism and the Greek conquest of barbarians than was Plato; that Plato in fact was not only "a little Athenian," rather than an Athenian Imperialist, but even was nearer to being "a little Hellene" than was Aristotle. Aristotle indeed, if the Aristotelian scholar Oncken be right, was not Alexander's tutor for nothing.

It is safer at any rate to take some other distinctions which follow more certainly and more obviously from the distinctions already noted. 4. Plato then is revolutionary; Aristotle is conservative. 5. Plato is constructive and

creative; Aristotle is only critical. 6. Plato is, in one sense at least of that much-abused word, practical, while Aristotle is only speculative.

I mean that Plato has a platform; has changes to propose; wide reaching reforms, nay revolutions to champion; hopes and faiths that the end is not yet; that as Hellas has scandalized the barbarians by her naked games, yet has, within her own borders at least, lived down the scandal, so other changes undreamed of yet—such as co-education—will be the household words of later Athenians; for the whole world is in evolution. But Aristotle is practical only in the lower sense that he had no high dreams, no vast changes to propose, nothing to give us on practical matters but a string of *ἀπορίαι*, a string of pros and cons, from which it seems that everything worth discovering is discovered already pretty well; though there are some minor combinations and permutations which might be tried without impropriety. For Aristotle is the practical man without faith in metaphysics and with only that tolerably common sense which, under such circumstances, poets and Platonists have found intolerable: or, *per contra*, to quote Goethe against Coleridge, if it be true that the clever man finds everything wrong in the world and the wise man nothing, Aristotle, measured by Goethe's standard, was the wise Conservative, Plato only the clever Radical.

Plato, says Mr. Benn acutely, had he not been a philosopher would have been a statesman or a soldier: Aristotle would have been a speculative surgeon, or, in these days, a research fellow in some modern science-ridden University. Even Plato's injustice to poetry, to which Aristotle is so just and even generous, is, I think, only the poet's sense of the defects of his own temperament; it is the literary man's confession of the manifold foibles of literature. It is very fortunate under these circumstances that the disinterested and unpoetic observer came to the rescue of Poetry and placed her on her pedestal above history, from which the self-tormenting doubts of poets like Plato are less likely now to

dethrone her. The same thing, by the way, has happened in English literature over again: the best defence of poetry comes from Bacon of all men, one of the most prosaic of Englishmen and the nearest in spirit to the Bacon of Stagirus whom he so undutifully depreciated.

7. Perhaps it also follows that Plato is more human and generous and Aristotle more impersonal and scientific and callous: Plato the natural man and Aristotle the student. Plato—like Schiller in German literature—the man of action—he certainly tried hard to be a man of action—Aristotle, like Goethe, the thinker: the devotee of self-culture. Plato is the missionary, ardent to seek and to save that which is lost, even though it be only common clay, fitted to make but vessels of dishonour: Aristotle is, like his own epicurean gods, careless of the great bulk of mankind. The aristocrat was, as often in this complex world, the practical philanthropist: the theoretic democrat was less intent upon serving common people.

8. It is no contradiction to this to say that Aristotle is anthropocentric, and therefore, in a sense human, where Plato is theological. Aristotle's caution limits him narrowly to earth;

“Know thou thy self: presume not God to scan,
The proper study of mankind is man.”

But Plato is theological, and yet, or and therefore, more humane, if not more human; for theology and the humanities (in spite of a few historical quarrels) must stand or fall together, and rest on the same basis. Plato believes, then, that the end of man is to glorify God and to enjoy Him until he be reunited with Him—with a glorious man-like God, a being with all human righteousness and more than human intelligence.

9. Plato then has faith, the faith of the theologian and mystic, against Aristotle's Comtism, or agnosticism, or rationalism, or whatever name you give to the euthanasia

which Aristotle sought to procure for the poor, old, struggling patient of the philosophers, theology.

10. Plato has optimism against Aristotle's pessimism.

11. In short the difference between the two men is that which Shelley draws between poetry and science. Poetry, he says, is creative, constructive, imaginative: all good history therefore is poetry: (and all scientific or modern history, I presume it follows, is bad history); science on the other hand is only analytic. So Plato once more is the poet and Aristotle the man of science, who yet admits the superiority of poetry to one science at least, the science of history.

I find the same Shelleyan distinction echoed by Dr. Osler in his "Science and Immortality," page 34, "Aristotle and Plato, Abelard and St. Bernard, Huxley and Newman, represent in different periods the champions of the intellect and of the emotions."

12. And Shelley's distinction suggests one other which has indeed already been drawn in the passage which I quoted from Professor Munsterberg. It was Buckle who distinguished woman from man, as the imaginative, deductive, *a priori* reasoner, feeling her way intuitively, from the man who is inductive, and experimental, and cautious, taking one step at a time.

The distinction may not be altogether happy, for induction like deduction surely may involve imagination in an extreme degree: but as a distinction between intuition and imagination whether inductive or deductive on the one side, *versus* facts and cautious step-by-step ascent or descent, from particulars to general propositions or *vice versa*, it seems to be sound: and if so, Plato's intelligence, in spite of all his distrust of poets and his very modified trust in women, includes the feminine no less than the poetic intelligence, while Aristotle is narrowly masculine in mind.

13. And if I may make my dozen articles into a baker's dozen and into the number of the Apostles, I feel inclined to add that Plato naturally as the poet, as the theologian, as the man of feminine intuition, is much more concerned

to consider "duty", and not happiness (except as the reflex of duty) to be the lawful end and aim of human institutions, and the test of their success; while Aristotle as the secularist or pessimist, as the cautious, sceptical man of science, enthusiastic only for research and reflection, and not at all disposed to admit many applicants into that charmed circle of the elect, Aristotle is much more disposed to welcome anything as so much clear good, if only it increase the pleasures of life for the multitude, none too many even at the best; and it is all-important therefore with him that an institution should make directly for human happiness.

And so, while Plato is continually repudiating with indignation the suggestion that he ought to think more of his guardians' happiness and less of their duties, Aristotle is much concerned about their happiness and is not a missionary and has no ruthless spirit of self-sacrifice. Aristotle is not in the same degree at all a forerunner of Christianity, nor a "παιδαγωγος εις Χριστόν," nor a favourite with Christian churchmen: rather he is—as Antiochus, Cicero's teacher, I think, argued or implied—the precursor of Epicurus and the Epicureans.

This may seem a hard saying in the light of Cardinal Newman's words (in "Idea of a University"): "While the world lasts will Aristotle's doctrine on these matters last, for he is the oracle of nature and of truth. While we are men we cannot help to a great extent being Aristotelians. we are his disciples whether we will or no." And there is a passage of somewhat similar purport, I remember, somewhere in the works of a more masculine-minded and more Aristotelian theologian, Frederick Robertson.

Theologians, like other persons, are scandalized by the recklessness of Plato, by vagaries like his communism of wives and property, and turn therefrom with relief to the sober sense of Aristotle. Nevertheless it remains true that *the* dogma of theology, as well as the loftiest spirit which theology inspires, the *amor theologicus*, is of Plato not of Aristotle. Plato exalted Divine righteousness to an equal-

ity with Divine intelligence; Aristotle founded the agnosticism which makes of righteousness and of all moral impulses, "regulative" virtues; human not divine. In the keen and crucial controversies of the last generation between Dean Mansel and Frederick Maurice to which Mr. Goldwin Smith contributed one of his earliest essays, it was not he only but the natural instinct of all Christians which followed the Cambridge theologian in his Platonism, while all the ecclesiastical dignities of Mansel were not sufficient to Christianize Aristotle. And equally and more obviously the devotion of the missionary—the *amor theologicus*—finds its counterpart in Plato; alike in his theory and in his practice.

MAURICE HUTTON

LA DOULEUR QUI VEILLE

The grief of life is the uncertainty
That lies like mist around the path we trace
As we draw near to the forgetting place
Where mortal vigour ceases suddenly.

Gone is the cheerful, happy world we knew,
Gone are the fields of green, the hills of snow,
The shadowy woods where violets grow,
The friends we loved beneath these skies of blue.

Yet comfort speaks from this vast doubt, and gives
Poor Hope a chance to raise her fluttering wings
Above life's latest overwhelming pain,
The dread that passionless the spirit lives.
No! bind us ever in love's golden chain,
Or dreamless sleep be what the future brings.

E. B. GREENSHIELDS

NOVA SCOTIA AT CONFEDERATION AND NOW

NOVA SCOTIA was the first of the provinces of British North America to obtain parliamentary government. Its legislature was the first which convened under the British Crown outside of Westminster. Small in area and limited in population, it may truly be said that Nova Scotians developed unusual aptitude for government. It produced during its whole history an imposing array of public men who would have adorned any legislative assembly. Richard John Uniacke, S. G. W. Archibald, Jotham Blanchard, James B. Uniacke, Alexander Stewart, and James W. Johnstone are among the shining names of the nineteenth century ante-dating Confederation; but one great character excels all the others, and no name comparable with Joseph Howe appears in the annals of Nova Scotia, or, indeed, of any part of British North America, and whatever genius in purely intellectual matters Nova Scotians have exhibited since Confederation, in the political or literary arena, may fairly be said to have been the inspiration of Howe's life and character. It was he who achieved responsible government in Nova Scotia without the loss of a life, the firing of a shot, or the blot of a riot, and while this is an achievement sufficiently great for a man claiming merely local fame, it expands into Imperial renown when, in his famous letters to Lord John Russell in 1839, is found unfolded in clear and classic English the principles of self-government which the Imperial Government were induced to apply with happy results to the whole growing colonial empire.

In 1864, when Confederation was fairly launched, Dr. Charles Tupper was Premier of the Province, but his accession was recent. Since 1848, when responsible government was finally achieved, Howe and his associates had governed the

country almost steadily until 1863. A hiatus of two years, 1857-59, had occurred in this reign, but this was the result solely of an unfortunate quarrel between Howe and the Roman Catholics. At the general election of 1859 Howe won again by a narrow majority. Johnstone was the Tory leader, both of the government of 1857-59 and afterwards of the opposition between 1860-63, but in 1855 Charles Tupper had "arrived," and after this, while Johnstone remained the titular leader, the genius of the opposition was his young and vigorous lieutenant. Johnstone was a man of commanding ability, of education, culture, and high birth, and one of the most eloquent men the country has produced. He was an accomplished advocate and a man of large and, in a sense, liberal views, but withal scarcely an every-day politician. His tastes were too refined and his ideals too high to fully meet the needs of the rough and tumble of daily political warfare. Tupper supplied the essentials for that function, and while affairs were not upon a large scale in Nova Scotia, it is not going too far to say that a livelier opposition than Dr. Tupper made between 1860 and the general elections of 1863 has rarely been seen. The issues were not many or great, but Tupper kept the whole province in a state of tension every hour. He railed at the policy of government railways, which Howe was carrying along, and finally he came forward with a highly-wrought retrenchment scheme in 1862-63, whereby he proposed to cut down all the salaries, even then too low, and reduce expenses in all quarters so as to make a yearly saving of over seventy thousand dollars. The proposal was preposterous, and to the initiated too specious and obvious for serious consideration, but it appealed to the average farmer and toiler. If it had proposed to save a million, it would have shot over everybody's head harmlessly, but it was just small enough to appeal to the ordinary man. It related to dollars, not millions.

At the general election of 1863, the Conservatives carried all before them. What made the result easier was the

fact that, shortly before the election, Mr. Howe had obtained what he had coveted all his life—an Imperial appointment, British Fishery Commissioner under the Elgin Treaty 1854–66, and the government was left in the hands of Mr. A. G. Archibald, and, while Howe contested a seat as a supporter, the magic of his leadership and personality was wanting. Mr. Johnstone formed his government soon after the elections, but it was not until the ensuing session of 1864 that the new Government had an opportunity of unfolding its policy and vindicating its right to exist. Mr. Johnstone was an old man without fortune and naturally anxious to retire comfortably to the Bench, and Dr. Tupper, anxious to get power absolutely into his own hands, conceived the idea of creating a new Judgeship, which was called, originally, “Chief Justice in Equity,” for Mr. Johnstone, and this measure being carried, Tupper’s reign began.

To all intents and purposes, he reigned during the session of 1864, which was a memorable one. He introduced and carried the Free School Act—one of the boldest and noblest acts ever achieved by a public man, but no opportunist would have ventured on it. It applied a drastic system of taxation for the support of schools. At the same session he secured a grant from the Treasury to resuscitate Dalhousie College and make it a Provincial University, thereby challenging the opposition and ill-will of the several denominational colleges which then, as now, existed. He next came forward with a measure for the construction of a railway from Truro to Pictou as a government work, notwithstanding that “no government railways” had been the Conservative shibboleth for nearly half a generation, and, *horribile dictu!* no signs of retrenchment whatever—on the contrary, more liberal appropriations than had ever before been made. Fortunately for Sir Charles Tupper’s reputation, his famous retrenchment scheme was long ago forgotten. It was too grotesque to live. The end of the session was marked by a resolution favouring a conference of the governments of the

Maritime Provinces to consider Maritime union, which proved to be the first practical step towards Confederation itself.

This was the state of matters politically at the moment when Confederation came up for consideration. The Government at the end of the session had nearly the whole Assembly behind them, the opposition having only 13 seats out of a House of 55, and this opposition was by no means vigorous, Mr. Archibald the leader having given an unstinted support to the Education Bill. It is nevertheless a fact that in the country a strong feeling of hostility to the Government had sprung up. This was proved by two bye-elections held early in 1865, one in Annapolis county to fill the vacancy caused by Mr. Johnstone's retirement, and one in Lunenburg. Both these constituencies had sent supporters of Mr. Johnstone to the legislature in 1863 by large majorities, but both the bye-elections were carried by the opposition candidates by equally emphatic majorities.

The Confederation scheme when first published was undoubtedly received with considerable hostility by the people of Nova Scotia, but just how far this was caused by the terms of the scheme or because regarded as the work of Tupper, who had put the school tax on, must, probably, remain a moot point. The fact that Tupper had secured the support of the two leaders of the Liberal Party, Archibald and McCully, to the Quebec scheme, only added bitterness to the feeling. The wholesale merchants of Halifax, who had had business their own way for some time, were not quite sure how their interests would be affected by having the Custom house taken down between Nova Scotia and the other provinces and let in the unknown, and, therefore, fear-provoking, hazards of competition. Outside of this, there was nothing in the idea of a consolidation of the scattered provinces of British North America to alarm the people of Nova Scotia any more than those of any other province.

Deserted by their leaders, the little band of Liberals in the House, joined by some Conservatives, who were discerning enough to see how popular feeling was running and unheroic

enough to adjust themselves to it, gathered together, selected Mr. Stewart Campbell as a leader, and prepared to resist the Quebec scheme. At heart, a majority in the Assembly was opposed to Confederation on the terms of the Quebec scheme, but when the crucial moment came Tupper had an opportunity to display those qualities of courage, energy, and resource which he has always possessed, but which, in a generation of opportunism, never had a fair chance. Cast amid the stirring scenes of the French revolution, Tupper would have exhibited some of the sublime qualities of a Buonaparte; but it is quite a different thing to pull along on the quiet sea of constitutional government among compeers who were simply "playing the game"—listening to sounds and adjusting conduct and policy to the varying moods of the capricious multitude. Tupper was convinced that Confederation was a good thing, not alone for Nova Scotia and British North America, but for the Empire at large, and he proposed to carry it, and accomplished his purpose by dint of unflagging energy, dauntless courage, and inexhaustible resources. It was this great achievement that increased the bitterness. Nothing disturbs a community so much as to see the impossible achieved. It is quite possible that Tupper could have succeeded in the elections of 1867 if Howe had stayed out of the field, but he had to be absent in England in the autumn and winter of 1866-67, while Howe and his friends were inflaming the public mind, and he found it impossible to stem the tide in the short time before September 1867. Again, Howe might never have been able, even with his matchless and irresistible eloquence, to have secured a great popular verdict, if he had not addressed his anti-confederate arguments to a population smarting under the first school tax. It is difficult even for one actively engaged in the struggle to gauge these questions accurately, but it is fairly safe to affirm that if Tupper had gone to the country on his record, with no Confederation issue, his government would have been defeated on the school tax and non-retrenchment. It may also be safely assumed that with Howe's popular

addresses to great multitudes in every part of the province, Confederation would have gone down on the first battle, even if there had been no other issue. The result was the annihilation of the Confederation party. Tupper himself was the only survivor, and history will never be able to tell fully the powers and resources he invoked to secure his own narrow majority of ninety in Cumberland.

But no one with capacity to think and look forward could believe that the Waterloo of 1867 really meant anything serious. It was a safety valve for popular expression. The authors were temporarily punished, but their work could not be undone. Confederation was right. It was the only means by which a great nation could be created in North America, and every day since July 1st 1867 has vindicated the wisdom and foresight of its founders. A few circumstances suggested danger to Nova Scotia from Confederation. The wholesale merchants would be shorn of their special privileges. That of itself was not entirely a calamity, but until 1866 Nova Scotia had enjoyed the enormous advantages which flowed from the Elgin Treaty. The province was near to Boston, the great metropolis of New England, and trade with New England was easy, natural, and profitable. Almost contemporaneous with Confederation came the termination of the treaty. Trade was instantly disarranged. Commerce with the Upper provinces was unthought of, even after the union. The distances made the matter seem impracticable. Canada was as unknown to Nova Scotia in 1867 as Australia. To substitute an artificial inter-provincial trade for the natural one which then existed with New England was to reverse the order of nature and defy the accepted theories of generations. No one could foresee what vast sums of money and what long years of anxious effort would be required to bring about any considerable degree of domestic intercourse. Nor could any one anticipate the expansion of trade with Great Britain which at that time was not large and almost wholly one-sided. It was a place to buy in, but had not become a considerable market for our products. No Inter-

colonial railway had been built. The early days of Confederation found Nova Scotia hampered in her American trade by oppressive duties and no alternative trading place in sight. Trade with Ontario and Quebec is comparatively limited now. Then, it was regarded as a vague and improbable contingency.

Soon after Confederation, the wooden shipbuilding industry began to decline. Nova Scotia at that time owned more tonnage of shipping *per capita* than any other community in the world. Men were employed in shipyards. Shipbuilders made money in the construction and ship owners accumulated fortunes in the sailing of ships and schooners. These in time began to be crowded out by iron ships and, especially, steamers. The shipyards were no longer hives of industry and fortunes were no longer built up by splendid charters. Howe had always preached the gospel of free trade; a low tariff of 10 or 12 per cent on a few articles was imposed for revenue only. The ideals of the people were centred in wider expansion of trade, of ships traversing the seas and trading in distant ports, of voyages to the Indies, East and West.

In addition to these material incidents, political interests contributed to keep up the hostile feeling. The Provincial Government existed as an anti-Confederate or Repeal administration and relied in no small measure upon the ancient hatred of Canada to retain the support of the electorate.

Yet, despite all these influences, it must be admitted that Nova Scotia threw off its old bitterness and joined in the work of nation building very early and under adverse conditions. The actual death of the Repeal movement may be fixed in August 1873, when the members of the Provincial Government and other leading apostles of repeal welcomed Alexander MacKenzie at a public banquet in Halifax. It was during the recess between the adjourned meeting and immediate prorogation of Parliament, August 13th 1873, and its resumption in October, when the country was intensely excited over the Pacific Scandal. Mr. MacKenzie was the recognized leader of the opposition and seemed likely soon to obtain

power. To have been consistent, the anti-confederate party should have been as indifferent or as hostile to MacKenzie as to Sir John A. Macdonald. He was not in sympathy with their disturbing designs of separation. He was a loyal and ardent friend of Confederation. But the moment seemed opportune for driving Tupper from power, and, to achieve this and get control of the Federal interests in Nova Scotia, it was necessary for them to ally themselves with MacKenzie, and this gave the *coup de grâce* to Repeal. Repeal had a momentary recrudescence in 1886, but that was a pitiful chapter in our history and may be forgotten. As soon as the repealers joined hands with MacKenzie and Blake, the repeal cause had no longer a *locus standi*. Soon Nova Scotia began to take a large and intelligent interest in national questions. Her public men were among the foremost in conceiving large measures of public importance. A majority of Nova Scotia members voted for the admission of British Columbia and for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Notwithstanding that Nova Scotia had been early indoctrinated with the principles of free trade, and her chief natural industries were most likely to be promoted by the freest intercourse with the world, and although the opposition of Nova Scotia and the other Maritime Provinces was the determining factor in inducing Mr. MacKenzie to refrain from any measure of tariff relief in 1876, the fact remains that in 1878 no province in the Dominion voted more emphatically for the National Policy than Nova Scotia. With shipping and fishing its two greatest industries, she yet joined hands with the industrial interests of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, and other manufacturing communities in a policy of building up home industries at the expense of the free roaming of its home-built ships, and for three general elections following, when the existence and stability of the National Policy were at stake, Nova Scotia gave a steady support to the protective policy. Its members stood up session after session and voted scores of millions for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and not a great national issue fraught with

large results to our future history but found Nova Scotians its ardent advocates and the majority of its members voting in its favour.

We have had over forty years of Confederation, and how stand matters now? The population of Nova Scotia has not increased considerably. For many years before, and for several years after, Confederation, there was a steady drain of population to the New England States. A very small sum only is required to reach Boston from any part of Nova Scotia, and to Boston and its vicinity multitudes of its people have gone. Employment could always be obtained, and the rate of wages was higher than our own people could afford to pay. Besides, there is the lure of the city—more to be seen, greater activity, and bustle, perhaps better opportunities for gain. The exodus was not confined to any one class; farmers' sons sought employment on farms near Boston; the girls of all the working classes obtained domestic service in Boston and surrounding towns, and, as well as young men, went into the factories of the manufacturing towns. Graduates of our colleges sought professional life in New England and often distinguished themselves. Our scholars sought employment as teachers and professors in the American colleges. Clergymen accepted calls to New England churches. Even our fishermen have gone in large numbers to man the Gloucester fleet, and our mariners have obtained command of American ships. This was inevitable, and no conditions could have been devised to stay this tide of emigration. It was useless to say our land was better, our fisheries more productive, our conditions generally more promising. The allurements of a great city and the prospects of larger earnings and more varied and interesting environment were too strong to be overcome by patriotic philosophy.

Just as this tide of American emigration was beginning to recede came the opening of the Canadian North West. Cheap and fertile land, new homes, with bright prospects of gain, were potent influences to lure still others to the land of promise, and, although Nova Scotia has, perhaps, suffered

proportionately less than Ontario in this regard, it is a fact that from Winnipeg to Vancouver Nova Scotians are to be found who have left their own province to help build up others in the West.

In the first census after Confederation, 1871, Nova Scotia had 387,800 population. In the last census, 1901, thirty years later, it had increased to 459,574, less than 20 per cent in three decades, when, in a young and growing country, it should have doubled. Manitoba in 1871 had only 18,900; in 1901 this had grown to 225,000, and is now, probably, 350,000. The eastern provinces have had a struggle during the past twenty years to hold their natural increase.

Since 1901, although one hesitates to speak with assurance before the statistics have been compiled, there is ground for belief that much greater progress has been made in Nova Scotia than during any previous decade since Confederation. Large industries have sprung up. Halifax has made considerable growth; Sydney has grown from a village of 2,000 to a city of 15,000. More coal mines have been opened up and a larger output secured. The results of the decade of expansion since 1897 have been felt in all the eastern provinces and especially in Nova Scotia.

The progress in wealth and comfort has been vastly greater than in population. In 1871 Halifax was the only incorporated city. There were no incorporated towns. Now Nova Scotia has two cities, Halifax and Sydney, and thirty incorporated towns. Most of these have a water supply, where there was none thirty-five years ago, and many have gas, electric light, and even electric trams. The banks have gained enormously in capital, rest, and deposits. Exports have increased and the style of living greatly improved; the universities and colleges have more than doubled their endowments and their students. Thirty years ago no such thing as manual training, industrial and domestic science, and nature study was known in our common school system. Now thirty or forty towns have manual training and domestic science regularly taught and nature study and school gardens

are being introduced into many sections. A medical college and law school have been established; science has been introduced as a prominent feature in every college; an agricultural college has been established, and a technical school, most advanced in its character, is in course of construction under the auspices of the Provincial Government.

The most promising feature in the material aspects of life in Nova Scotia is the introduction of manufacturing industries. Formerly it was most backward, but now it has, probably, the greatest industrial enterprise in Canada: the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, with a capitalization of about \$35,000,000, which, after many initial difficulties, has now an immense output and earning reasonably good profits. Near it is the Nova Scotia Steel Company, on a smaller scale, but still employing many men and doing a large and profitable business. At Londonderry another large iron industry is in existence, and at New Glasgow and other towns rolling mills are in successful operation and making steel bridges. Amherst has become a hive of manufacturing industries. The Rhodes Curry Company are employing hundreds of men in building cars and all kinds of wood work. Another large company is manufacturing enamelled ware and sending its products over the Dominion. Woollen mills, rolling mills, and a boot and shoe factory are also located in this town. Halifax has its sugar refinery, cotton mills, car works, paint works, and wooden factories in flourishing operation.

It may be that manufacturing industry is to be the solution of the problem for the eastern provinces. It is useless to attempt to compete with Ontario and the West in pure agriculture, though fruit raising and dairying afford openings of great promise. The fisheries are an important industry, but these can only give employment to a part of the population. Mining is growing in extent and importance, but cannot absorb the efforts of all our people, but the possession of unlimited areas of coal, already largely worked, and great iron resources now being developed on a large scale, together with ready access to the markets of the world by water,

point to great possibilities in the way of manufacturing. It would be merely a repetition of the history of the United States. The opening of the West greatly impaired agriculture and other natural industries of the eastern states, and left Massachusetts and other eastern communities the resource of cultivating manufacturing industries in order that it might contrive to live and grow in the face of an expanding west.

Thinkers there are who still believe and avow that the system of protection has reached the limit of its usefulness, if it really had any, and that industrial interests will be better served by returning to a revenue tariff as low as conditions will permit, and thereby check the sinister influence of great corporations. However much wisdom may be embodied in such a policy, truth compels the statement that there is at present no indication of any disposition on the part of the people generally to even modify the protective system, which now has full swing. The only change which the last ten years has brought forth is the obliteration of party division on the subject. Some of the most active promoters of new enterprises are to be found in the ranks of the Liberal party, and those of that faith own and manipulate as much stock in speculative enterprises, more or less dependent upon the tariff, as their Conservative fellow-citizens. The man who sees national danger in this artificial creation of industry has no power to make his voice heard, or, if heard, it is the voice of one crying in the wilderness. No one can fix the date when a reaction will come. In the North-West it would seem that the tendency is toward a lower tariff. All that can be said is that there are at present no signs of such a tendency in Nova Scotia.

One topic is always of interest to Nova Scotians—the Intercolonial Railway. This was one of the lines put forward at Confederation. It had been a dream of Joseph Howe, before the people of Upper and Lower Canada had become interested in it. The existence of a government owned railway running through a large portion of the province is locally a matter of convenience and advantage. The

rates between stations on the lines are in general lower than those in force in Company owned lines. But while there is a disposition on the part of the people of the Upper Provinces to regard the Intercolonial as the special institution of the Maritime Provinces, yet the cold fact is that, viewed in the light of through transportation, the Intercolonial has been of greater benefit to the business men of Ontario and Quebec than to those of the Maritime Provinces. It has proved a cheap and convenient means of pouring the goods of Montreal and Toronto merchants into the maritime cities and towns. The freight eastbound enormously exceeds that westbound. Some Toronto organs are agitating for the Intercolonial to be put in [commission or handed over to one of the transcontinental railway lines. If this end should be achieved, the Upper Province exporters would be the first to feel the pinch if freights were increased.

The popular sentiment in Nova Scotia, so far as I am able to gather it, is hostile to the transference of the Intercolonial to one of the great Railway Companies. Whether this arises from mature reflection, or from preconceived prejudice, I am not able to say. My own conviction is that Halifax would gain, not lose, by such an arrangement. Unquestionably one of the great lines would infuse greater life into eastern transportation than the Government management has been able to do. St. John dates her first recognition as a winter port of shipment from the introduction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This company created a large business for St. John that had never been attempted or dreamed of when the Intercolonial Railway was her only great railway. Either the Canadian Pacific Railway or one of the other transcontinental lines would probably do the same for Halifax if given equal facilities. I know no good reason why the government road should be run at a loss, when better results would almost certainly be attained by a company which would make it pay and greatly multiply business and activity. But it is a delicate question, and regard must always be paid to the popular will.

Mixed up with problems of transportation are fiscal questions. Is foreign trade to be encouraged or repressed? Is our tariff to look to the expansion of the volume of public trade, or is it concerned entirely with interprovincial exchange? Our present methods are purely opportunist, and made to suit the passing hour. Sometimes, perhaps, these problems will be determined after a study of political economy and upon intelligent principle—but who shall say when?

Speaking generally, one may say that after forty years of Confederation all signs of discontent with the Union have passed away. The province is making fair strides in fishing, agriculture, and manufactures. Its shipping industry has, to a large extent, disappeared, and the only hope of a revival is by the creation of a steel shipbuilding industry to which great efforts are being put forth. As broad and national conceptions of our destiny are held among Nova Scotians as in any part of Canada, and an appeal to a wide and lofty national spirit will meet with as generous a response here as in Montreal or Toronto. In proportion to population, Nova Scotia has contributed the largest number of eminent men to the public life of the nation, and at the same time has produced a large quota of the foremost college presidents, editorial writers, and intellectual men of the country. Nova Scotia need not veil its face when meeting its fellow provincials. Intellect is as essential to national strength and power as wheat fields or railways, and it is not in vain that a people strive to maintain a high intellectual standard in the nation.

To sum up, Nova Scotia seeks to be an important unit in the life of a nation in whose growth and destiny all lesser aspirations are merged.

J. W. LONGLEY

MARITIME UNION

IT IS not strange that political communities, when not prosperous, should almost instinctively think of union in some form or other as a remedy. In strictly modern times it has been the panacea for all communal ailments and the number of instances in which it has obviously worked well has given it tremendous vogue. Like every specific, however, it has had its failures; but these are obscured in the glamour of its success and ignored by those to whom its benefits appeal.

It does not require argument to prove that the Maritime Provinces of Canada are not in sound material and commercial health; nor does it need to be stated to those acquainted with their earlier history that this stagnation or atrophy is not the normal or natural condition of these communities. For three-quarters of a century after their establishment as political units no part of North America made steadier or more substantial progress. During the past forty years they constitute the only part of the British Empire tenanted by the white race, except Ireland, that has made no measurable advance in wealth and population. Surely, to the political philosopher and student of human affairs, such a stoppage must demonstrate that it is by artificial, rather than natural, causes that this lamentable condition has been brought about. It is not within the province of this article to elucidate these causes. It is worthy of note, however, that decadence began coincidentally with the federal union with the valley of the St. Lawrence.

The nostrum of legislative union is again beginning to be thought of by the people of the Maritime Provinces, commended to them by shallow "optimists," by the believers in a "new shuffle," and by those who think national prosperity is only a question of square miles and geometrical regularity of outline.

The latter class is well illustrated by a New Brunswick official in a recent issue of a Toronto weekly newspaper, in which he gravely suggests that the Maritime group be extended northward to include the eastern end of Quebec, Ungava, and the greater part of Labrador. Such procedure, he triumphantly exclaims, would solve the problem, for would it not make "Acadia" similar in shape, and measurably so in size to the recently created provinces of the North-West.

By those of saner thought and, presumably, more liberal information, who advocate Maritime union, it is contended that it would go far to accomplish three things for the benefit of the Maritime people: 1. Reduce the cost of Provincial Government; 2. Give the section included a more influential standing at Ottawa; and 3. Enhance the material prosperity of the three provinces. These propositions deserve consideration.

Concerning the first, it would appear, upon its face, well founded. It would certainly seem, other things being equal, that one set of legislative machinery, instead of three, covering an identical territory, would be more economical. But are other things equal? A very little reflection will show that they are not. Should union be accomplished, without the remotest doubt a new capital would have to be selected. This would mean the abandonment of three sets of legislative and governmental buildings and the erection of another, and one far more extensive and vastly more expensive than any of the three given over. This would mean, at once, a considerable increase of the consolidated public debt of the new province, making it, just by that much, greater than the total sum of the three former and several debts. While it is quite possible, at the outset at any rate, that a somewhat smaller staff of civil servants would suffice than is now collectively employed, it is almost certain that the general average of salaries now obtaining would be no longer considered adequate, and that the whole amount so expended would be little, if any-

thing, less than at present. Concerning number, a similar remark would apply, it seems likely, to the elected "local" representatives of the new unit. Without doubt, the size of the united Legislative Assembly would be less than the present aggregate of all three. Here, however, a very great element of uncertainty comes in, for this reduction of representation, short of fixing the site of the new capital, would be the most difficult of all the procedures confronting the new arrangement. Possibly, the number would be diminished by one-third, but there seems almost no doubt that the sum thereby saved by reason of fewer indemnities would at least be equalled by an almost unavoidable increase in the amount of the individual indemnity in consequence of more protracted sessions.

With regard to the general governmental expenses other than strictly legislative, it is difficult to see any opportunity for material retrenchment. None of the services now supported by the individual provinces would be absent under the new regime. The schools, roads, and bridges, the administration of justice, and the other interests which now so clamourously cry for support would not be silent in the new and inclusive organization. The amalgamated revenue would be identical in amount with that enjoyed by the three present provinces, and it would indeed be very probable that the difficulty of deficits and over-expenditures would be as frequent in the larger unit as it has been in the smaller ones.

While the matter of revenue and expenditure is, confessedly, one not amenable to precise and definite foresight, much less uncertainty lurks about the second of the blessings which it is hoped will flow from union, that is the increased influence of the new province at the Federal capital. It is impossible to see from what elements such an increased prestige would arise. It is true there may be several subsidiary causes modifying the Parliamentary influence of a province or section, but the basic one, as latitude underlies climate, is the number of votes that section is able to cast

on a division. To enter into a disquisition to show that union would not increase this number would be to ignore the reader's intelligence, for three and four and five dollars in a man's various pockets make him just as truly the possessor of twelve dollars as if the sum were to be found in one receptacle. Union, of course, would not add to the Maritime representation at Ottawa. On the contrary, it would, almost certainly, slightly reduce it, perhaps by one, possibly by three. At present, no Province can be reduced in the representation accorded it prior to the last preceding census, if it have a fraction of population greater than half the number necessary for the seat in danger, and it will be seen at a glance that, by this rule, it is quite possible for three separate provinces to have, each, one extra member over and above those they are completely entitled to, or, in all, to have three more members than they might possess as one political and provincial integer. With union, at best, but one such extra member would be possible.

Another consideration, perhaps still more important, demands notice. For many years Prince Edward Island possessed a member in the Government or Cabinet, and the whole group held, in all, five such seats. Now neither the population of Prince Edward Island or the combined number in the three provinces entitled them to such an influence, but they were granted the enhanced power simply because of their individuality as provinces. It is absolutely certain that, had they from the first been one province, no one would have even thought of according to it such an extravagant representation on the "front benches" of the ruling party. It is true that of late such governmental influence has been largely curtailed, yet it is quite probable that these provinces are still over-represented in proportion to their population. If such is the case, it will not be denied that it is almost wholly owing to their status as distinct units, as for like reason, in this case statutory, they are heavily over-represented in the Senate. In the latter branch of the Federal Legislature the small provinces have a number

in all about equal to each of the great units of the St. Lawrence region, while containing only one-third to one-half of the population of either. But should they become one province it is scarcely credible that either Quebec or Ontario would consent to remain in a position of mere equality with one so decidedly inferior.

There remains but another point to notice under the heading of "increased influence." It is held that the Maritime member at Ottawa, individually and collectively, would wield more power and influence if coming from a province of respectable size, than is the case with the present arrangement. Attentively considered there seems no good ground for this claim. As at Westminster, so at Ottawa, a man's standing and degree are measured by far other things than the size of the constituency which sends him there, or the importance of the section which he claims as his home. This is so well known, that an example or two will be sufficient, merely to illustrate. The member, to-day, indisputably the second in influence in the Laurier Government, comes from one of those professedly insignificant provinces, and sits for one of the smallest and least progressive counties in it. In fact, the latter is so small that two provincial counties had to be joined to make up a seat for the Dominion. Yet no one thinks of this when listening to him, or reckons, for one moment, that it detracts from his standing. Again, the present leader of the Opposition seems proud to sit for the same small province. A third instance recalls that Sir John Macdonald was not ashamed to represent an obscure, and, at that time, largely "half-breed" constituency in Manitoba, then the very smallest province in population. It is certain the number of votes a minister has behind him in Parliament counts largely in measuring his influence; but it is just as certain that practically no one asks from whence these votes come, whether from a rural or urban community, from one province or several, from a large one or a small one.

The position regarding "material prosperity" is, if possible, even more groundless than either of the other two. Maritime Union could not effect any conceivable or obvious change in the commercial or industrial relationship of the people. Already they have absolute free-trade within themselves and with the other sections of Canada. This, of course, would continue and its freedom could not be added to. It would not, of itself, lead to the establishment of a single manufactory or the settlement of a single farm. Precisely the same conditions prevailing in the industrial and commercial world prior to its consummation would continue afterwards, and beyond the purely political and artificial influences following it, no man could perceive any change entering into his social existence.

There are, moreover, grave and positive objections, not directly material in their nature, that should count strongly against any such disturbance of settled conditions. The first and perhaps the weightiest is that sound and altogether Anglo-Saxon repugnance to novelty in political affairs, unless it can be most clearly shown that it is conducive to increased happiness and prosperity. These Provinces are already time-honoured in their individuality. Many of the most industrious, clear-headed, far-seeing, and moral of the British race have laboured for a century and a half to establish political names and institutions that should be known to the world and respected by it. These names, alone, "Nova Scotia," "New Brunswick," "Prince Edward Island," are in themselves an asset of inexpressible value, produced by honest and indomitable toil and not to be lightly cast away. No one can estimate the value of an honourable and old-established name. There are in the United States differences, both in population and area, far more pronounced, between various states, than any that exist in Canada between the provinces. One such sovereign community contains hardly more than half the population of Prince Edward Island, and another only a little more than half its area, while a third and a fourth contain, respec-

tively, more people and nearly as much habitable soil as are found in the whole Dominion. Yet, as every one knows, a proposition to amalgamate one of these tiny states with one or more of its neighbours would be received with contemptuous scorn. The people of these Provinces are not less tenacious of their historical and political continuity, nor unaware of the value that attaches to them.

But one more point remains. In the event of union, and the sacrifice of the present names, it is almost certain that "Acadia" would be put forward for adoption by the united section. This is a consequence of the activity of a number of idealistic and romantic dreamers over the beauties of the old French rule and nomenclature, and they have persuaded themselves and many of their fellow-countrymen that such a name would be appropriate. To one not both an Anglo-Saxon and a resident of these Provinces it is difficult to make clear the full reason for this objection. When I say that there is, already, a most respectable and moral people called by this name, but of a race, and habits, and language entirely alien to the majority, I give the only explanation possible of this, the final but not least deep-seated or rational objection to the amalgamation of the Maritime Provinces of Canada.

GEORGE G. MELVIN

SIR THOMAS TEMPLE, BART.

THE territory about the Bay of Fundy on Canada's Atlantic seaboard, scene of earliest settlement, had a chequered history as the Acadie of the old French regime and Nova Scotia of the British. Alternating in possession of France and Britain, these barren acres in the wilds of North America served as a convenient make-weight in international settlements. Once conquered by Dutchmen and named New Holland, hindered by internal strife, exposed to depredations of buccaneers, adventurers, poachers, Indians, its early lot was not a happy one nor conducive to substantial progress and prosperity.

The present writing has to do with Cromwell's conquest of Acadie in 1654 and the period of British occupation following. Dated at Whitehall, February 8, 1653 (February 21, 1654, present style), the Protector, just instated, issued a letter of instructions¹ to Major Robert Sedgwick and Captain John Leverett. They were to proceed with a squadron composed of the ships Black Raven, Hope, Church, and Augustine, to Boston, Massachusetts.

Directions were given for a campaign, in conjunction with land-forces of the New England colonies, against the Dutch in New Netherlands (New York), Great Britain and Holland then being at war. This was the primary object of the expedition—"extirpateing the Dutch" in the words of the instructions. But, evidently, it was also intended to "extirpate" the French to the northwards, though Parkman errs in saying that Britain and France were at war at this time. A paragraph in the instructions reads:—"The

¹ Given in Collections Massachusetts Historical Society, Series IV, Vol. 2.

aforementioned service being performed, if tyme permitt and oportunitye be presented, you are to proseed to the gaineing in any other places from the Enemie wch upon advise with a counsell of warr may be judged seizable and conducing to the settlement of the peace and saiftye of the English plantations." Thus Cromwell planned, by one expedition, to rid his New England friends of both their troublesome neighbours and continue the policy of colonial expansion pursued by his royal predecessors.

In the early days of June the British squadron arrived at Boston. But, before the campaign against the Dutch was organized, news came of peace with Holland. Attention was then turned towards Acadie. Boston speculators held large financial claims on Acadie, arising from transactions with the redoubtable Sir Charles de la Tour, who gave mortgage in Boston on all Acadie in order to get aid to resist the Seigneur d'Aunay.

Taking on supplies and reinforcements at Boston, the British vessels sailed for Acadian waters and, in the summer of 1654, took possession of all the French forts and trading posts in Acadie, including Pentagoet (Penobscot, Maine), La Tour's fort at St. John, and Port Royal (Annapolis, N.S.). The only resistance encountered was that attempted by Le Borgne at Port Royal.

Leverett was left as commander of the forts. On in the reign of Charles II. he claimed a large sum still due him for services and disbursements while holding Acadie for the British and petitioned for payment or a grant of the country.

La Tour after the seizure of his fort proceeded to England, doubtless in one of the returning war vessels, as he stated in his petition for redress of 1661 that he was "carried to Cromwell"—probably not much against his will. He appears to have remained in England some two years. The result of his labours there was the issue of the well-known grant or patent,¹ dated August 9, 1656, to La Tour, Colonel

¹ This patent in a French translation may be found in Hazard's Collection of State papers.

Thomas Temple and Colonel William Crowne. The grantees were obliged to raise a large sum of money for Cromwell, who was sorely in need of funds to pay his soldiers, and was endeavouring to carry on government without a Parliament. He further replenished his treasury and avenged wrongs, the year following the conquest of Acadie, by the conquest of Jamaica from the Spanish.

This patent of Acadie and Nova Scotia, which name was now revived, conveyed large privileges and also contained some restrictions. Catholics were to be excluded from the land—Cromwell's response to Richelieu's exclusion of Protestants.

Cromwell must have considered La Tour a good Protestant, which he probably was—while in England. He had lately come from Quebec where he was a good Catholic, in accordance with the prevailing sentiment there. La Tour was not bigoted and possessed much adaptation. Upon his arrival at Quebec on his runaway voyage from Boston in 1646, with the funds furnished him there for trading, in consideration of his "present poor, distressed condition," as the contract reads, La Tour was careful to square himself with the Church. "Jesuit Relations" XLII, 277, year 1647, record: "Mons de la Tour gave 100 livres, which sum was employed in paying for the large ciborium bought this year, with the Cross and four silver candle sticks." A strange diversion of Puritan funds!

La Tour, who was then sixty years of age, immediately transferred his interest in the patent to Temple and Crowne, in consideration of an agreement to give him a certain annual percentage of the products of the country—which he sometimes received. Temple, later on, controlled Crowne's interest.

Dated at Westminster, 17th September, 1656, Cromwell, in a long document, gave Colonel Thomas Temple his commission as Governor of Acadie, with full authority, etc. This is recorded at Suffolk County Registry of Deeds, Boston, where there are many other documents of Acadian interest.

Thomas Temple was thus the first British ruler and grantee of Acadie after the Scottish patent of 1621 to Sir William Alexander, under which the La Tours were grantees in 1629 and 1630. Temple was the first "Governor of Nova Scotia."

Many members of the English and Irish family to which this very early governor appertained have well served their country and generation in various capacities. The roster includes such names as Henry John Temple, the famous Lord Palmerston, and Frederick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury.

The present subject, who was of the Stantonbarry branch of the family, was born at Stowe, County of Bucks, England, in 1614. He was the second son of Sir John Temple, of Biddlesden and Stantonbarry, who was second son of Thomas of Stowe, first baronet, created in 1611, when the order was instituted, died in 1637. Dame Hester Temple, his widow, who died in 1656, the year her grandson received the patent of Acadie, was mother of fourteen children and is said to have had seven hundred persons lineally derived from her before her death.

According to Cokayne's "Complete Baronetage," 1903, Thomas Temple was "admitted to Lincoln's Inn, 21 Feb., 1622 (sic); was a moderate Parliamentarian; Colonel of Horse, 1642; a Sequestration Commissioner for Hunts, 1643."

In 1657, with a considerable retinue, he descended upon America as the new Governor of Nova Scotia—wild land of the beaver and the codfish. He was probably accompanied by Colonel Crowne and also by Captain Thomas Breedon, who appears to have been a wealthy merchant of London and sort of manager and financial over-lord to Temple. La Tour may have returned at the same time. He was at his old fort again at St. John in 1657 and appears to have continued his dealings in Boston up to 1663, about which time he probably died.

Colonel Temple bore with him to America the following order:—To Captain John Leveret, Governour in chief of

our Forts of St. John, Port Royall and Pentacoet in Acadia, commonly called Nova Scotia in America, and to his Lieutenant and other the officers there, or any of them. Oliver Pr. Whereas wee have committed unto our Trusty and wel-beloved Colonell Thomas Temple the charge, custody and government of our Forts of St. John, Port Royall and Pentacoet in Acadia commonly called Nova Scotia in America and the Martiall stores and provisions there being or thereunto belonging;—Our will and pleasure therefore is, That you deliver or cause to bee delivered unto the said Thomas Temple ymediatly upon his arrival there, the full and peaceable possession of the said Forts, and of all the Ordnance, Gunnes, Ammunicon, and martial stores, and other provisions of Victualls, Clothes, Barkes, Boates, Shipps and other thinges whatsoever in the said Forts or any of them, being or of right belonging to this Commonwealth by a true and just Inventory and Appraisement you doe with all convenient speed send unto Us or our Council to the end the same may bee entred of Record, and brought to Accompt in our Exchequer: For which this shalbe a sufficient warrant: Given under our Signet at Whitehall the six and twentyeth day of September 1656.¹

Colonel Temple landed at Boston and there took up his residence. In a letter, dated Sep. 2, 1657, from Thomas Lake, Boston, to John Leverett, London, is the following:—Col. Temple was honourably received ashore by the Governour and Company's soldiers. He hath a noble spirit, answering what you wrote of him in Mr. Brown's letter, to whose house he went at Sudbury. I fear his noble spirit will not suit with Acadie, or at least the profit of Acadie will not maintain his post. Myself and some other friends have spoken seriously to him for a frugal management of the same. He accepts of advice and saith he will by degrees clear himself of the unnecessary charge, which he is at by many servants, that he brought over, who will be as drones

¹ Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc. s. iv., vol. 2.

to eat up all the honey, that others labour for, and that he will have but two at most, to wait upon himself.¹

Colonel Temple at once proceeded to make an agreement with Crowne.² The latter took as his territory the portion of the grant "which lyeth westward from the mouth of the River Damache *alias* Machias," now in the State of Maine. Temple gave a bond for £20,000. Later he leased this portion from Crowne.

From Boston Colonel Temple overlooked the affairs of his principality of Acadie, sending supplies to the forts and trading posts and receiving the products—mainly the skins of the beaver, moose, etc. These were hunted chiefly by the Indians.

In all Acadie there may have been, at this time, a few hundred Europeans. Boston, itself, was little more than a village.

Colonel Temple was a good citizen of Boston, and took part in some of the remarkable proceedings of the Puritan community and in the affairs of the colonies generally. He was actively concerned with the Winthrops in procuring a charter for Connecticut. He appears to have been a public-spirited and progressive man, in advance of the narrowness and prejudices largely prevailing in his time.

He intervened on behalf of the fanatical Quakers, who were hanged on Boston Common by the fanatical Puritans, and endeavoured to save their lives. He offered to "carry them away and provide for them at his own charge." He was not afraid to settle them in Acadie. Cromwell tried to get New-England Puritans to settle in Ireland and also in Jamaica. After he had conquered those parts, he thought of transferring the whole colony. Temple wanted settlers of any description for his Nova Scotia wilderness. He did not succeed, however, in getting the Quakers. It is recorded that "the offer was well received by the magistrates, but rejected by the deputies."

¹ *Ib.* s. iii., vol. 7.

² Suffolk County Registry of Deeds, Boston, lib. iii., p. 108.

For a few years all went well enough with Temple. He fitted up and armed his posts in Nova Scotia, conducted a good trade, kept off French, hostile Indians and poachers generally. The Massachusetts authorities were glad to have Acadie taken from French control, and had sent a letter to Cromwell expressing their gratitude that he was pleased "to give such royal demonstration of his grace and favour." They co-operated with Temple, loaned him ammunition, pending arrival of his supplies from England, and time and again made enactments forbidding trading, fishing, etc., in Nova Scotia waters, which had thus early been a favourite resort for poachers, except upon licence from Temple.

With the restoration and accession of Charles II, in 1660, trouble began. Colonel Temple appears to have used every expedient of a resourceful man to find favour with the new administration and maintain his hold on Nova Scotia. Upon receipt of advice of the new King's accession, he wrote to England endeavouring to get a confirmation of his title to Nova Scotia. He said that the reason of his having been banished to a wilderness was his attachment to the late King. He wrote, "one of whose last commands was that he whispered to Kirke on the scaffold to charge this King to have a care of honest Tom Temple!" But honest Tom Temple had meantime been cared for by Cromwell, and this was to operate seriously against him.

Colonel Temple's zeal for the new King led him to take an active part in the efforts to apprehend two of the regicides who had taken refuge in New England. Temple wrote Secretary of State Morrice regarding them, August 20, 1661, and put in a word for himself. The letter concludes:—I shall not presume, most honoured Sir, to give you any further trouble in this, but only to intreat you to let his Ma'tie know that in all humble duty and reverence I cast myselve at his most sacred feet, humbly acknowledging his great favour in those expressions of his gracious acceptance of my fidelity and obedience, intimated in your letter, for whose service I shall willingly hazard both life and fortune whenever he shall

thinke me worthy that honour. And as to this particular concerning Whaly and Goff (the regicides), as I have hetherto used all the dilligence and industry I am capable of, soe I shall still continue the same untill his Ma'ties commands are effected. And for your owne particular, Noble Sir, I have presumed to beseech this farther favour from you, that you would be pleased to cast your ey upon this enclosed paper to yourselfe, when your leasure may permitt, it relates only to my owne affayres, which I durst not mingle with anything concerns his Ma'tie. Soe most humbly and fervently recommending you to the safe protection of the Almighty, I remayne
 Most honoured Sir, Your most humble and most obedient servant, T. Temple.¹

In the winter of 1661-62 Colonel Temple went to England. During his absence Thomas Breedon acted as Governor of Nova Scotia. He had much trouble with the Mohawk Indians, especially in that portion of Acadie which is now within the State of Maine. They pillaged his storehouses and killed his trading Indians. Breedon was a pronounced Royalist. He went to the Massachusetts Legislature in 1662, and demanded of them, "in the King's name to assist him with 500 soldiers to go against the Mohawks." He treated the Legislature in such a "contemptuous" manner that they fined him £200 and kept him in jail over one night. The fine was later remitted, through Temple's intervention, and, from the Commissioners of the United Colonies, he received permission to enlist volunteers to fight the Mohawks in Acadie.

Temple wrote from England, under date 4th and 5th March, 1662 (in Massachusetts Archives), saying that he had but partially recovered from "somewhat a rough and long passage, in which he was perpetually sick, and no less distressed in mind." Circumstances were such that he "almost yielded to despair" at first, but finally, obtaining fresh courage, he was enabled to continue his labours on

¹ Colls. Mass. Hist. Soc., s. iii., vol. 8.

behalf of the New England colonies as well as for his own interests in Nova Scotia.

He had an audience with the King in which he is said to have explained, among other things, that the "pine-tree" on the colonial money represented the "Royal Oak" which saved the King's life in 1651. Temple was a good courtier but he had to submit to be shorn by the new administration in Britain. Nova Scotia appears to have been granted to one Thomas Elliot, and Temple was compelled to pay Elliot £600 a year.

This arrangement being effected, Temple was created, July 7, 1662, a Baronet of Nova Scotia (or of Scotland). As the order of Baronets was originally instituted ostensibly for the purpose of promoting the settlement of Ulster, so the Scottish Baronets had been instituted to forward the settlement of Nova Scotia. Three days later Temple received a fresh commission as Governor of Nova Scotia.

Returning to New England, Sir Thomas Temple, Knight and Baronet, being of speculative nature, and with his income from Nova Scotia much reduced, engaged in new ventures. In 1664 he purchased "that island or continent of land" known as Noddle's Island, now a part of the city of Boston. Here he had a "mansion-house" and carried on extensive agricultural operations. According to a mortgage security of his possessions in America, given to Breedon in 1665, he had on this island 400 sheep and 60 head of cattle. He agreed to ship £1000 worth of peltries from Nova Scotia to Breedon's agent at Boston each fall and spring.

Beaver skins at this time were the staple commercial asset of Acadie as they were of Canada proper and of New York. The fur was largely used in making hats. Before the discovery of substitutes the real "beaver hat" was a valuable possession and sometimes handed down from father to son.

Sir William Alexander, Earl of Sterling, Lord Alexander of Canada, etc., adopted the beaver for his crest and it has

ever since figured as a Canadian emblem. Sir Thomas Temple was also lessee of Deer Island in Boston harbour, now a seat of reformatory institutions. On Noddle's Island the early Baptists, persecuted by the Puritans, found a meeting-place under liberal Thomas Temple. His own name appears as a member of Increase Mather's church.

Temple managed, nominally or actually, to hold Nova Scotia under Charles II up to 1667. Then came a crushing blow. In July of that year the peace of Breda was signed, and unfortunate Acadie, ever foot-ball for courtiers and politicians, was again handed over to France by Charles II, pensioner of the French monarch. New York, taken from the Dutch, was retained by Britain.

Temple again repaired to England and, in November 1668, laid a petition before the Lords of the Council. He appears to have returned to America without receiving any satisfaction. He did not, however, give up Nova Scotia without a struggle, and attempted by force to expel Le Borgne, the French claimant. He raised difficulties about the uncertain boundaries of Acadie and Nova Scotia and endeavoured to retain a portion of the territory. The New England authorities did what they could to help him. At one time instructions are said to have reached him from England not to surrender the country to the French. Not until 1670 did he finally resign all interest in Acadia. In that year the French representative was given full possession of the various posts.

So Nova Scotia was again blotted off the map and became French Acadie. But, in 1710, what are now known as the Maritime Provinces of Canada became permanently British—49 years before Wolfe and Montcalm fought at Quebec.

Sir Thomas Temple's large expenditures for Nova Scotia and his revenues from it were lost. He proceeded to wind up his Acadian and New England affairs. On November 30, 1670, he gave deed of Noddle's Island and Deer Island to Samuel Shrimpton for £6000. Actual delivery "by

turffe and twigg" was made by his attorney "by reason of indisposition of body." In 1672 he deeded his dwelling-house in Boston to his brother's son, Stephen Temple, in England. In this year he also appears—one of his last recorded acts in New England—as a subscriber of £100 towards a new brick building for Harvard College.

In May 1673 he sailed for England, and in London, March 27, 1674, he died. His remains were interred at Ealing, Middlesex, March 28th. Rev. John Collins, who acted as agent for the Massachusetts colony in England, wrote regarding the death of Sir Thomas Temple (Hutchinson's collection of letters), "whom melancholy and grieffe hath killed by his hard usage from Mr. Elliott . . . I saw neither disease nor paine that would hasten his end, but his spirit broken."

Sir Thomas Temple left a will in New England, in which he made a variety of bequests. To a large number of his friends he left 40 shillings each for a mourning ring, as the custom was, "in testimony of my love unto them." The day of his death he dictated a short last will and testament to his nephew John Nelson. "The debt due from the King he disposed of as followeth if ever paid. To the right Honourable the Countess of Anglesey, one thousand pounds, when his debts are paid the greatest part of the remainder to the Colledge at Cambridge in New England." The inventory of his estate in New England included "one-tenth part interest of a trading house at Kenebeck" (Maine)—all that was left of his extensive domains in Acadie and New England.

Sir Thomas Temple died unmarried and his Nova Scotia baronetcy thus became extinct. His claims against the British Government (he is said to have been promised £16,000) appear to have been prosecuted, but unsuccessfully, by the descendants of his sister, Mary Temple, who married Robert Nelson.

William Crowne, Temple's co-grantee of Acadia, died in New England in 1683, aged 66 years. He was father

of John Crowne, dramatist, and had a son, Henry, of New Hampshire. By the articles of agreement with Temple it appears that he was formerly of St. Martin-in-the-fields, Middlesex, England—now a parish of Central London.

At a later period a member of the Temple family, Capt. Robert Temple (1694-1754), established himself in America and founded a New England line. He landed at Boston in 1717. He established unfortunate Scotch-Irish and German settlements on the Kennebec in Maine. He was lessee of Noddle's Island, the old domain of his kinsman, Thomas, and built a fine mansion there. Included in his bequeathed property were seven negroes, on different estates.

His oldest surviving son, Robert (1728-1782), a member of the Massachusetts government, was a Loyalist. He removed to Ireland, where he died, leaving no male issue. His daughter, Mehetable, married Hans Blackwood, later the third Lord Dufferin, whose son, Price, was father of Frederick Temple Hamilton-Temple-Blackwood, Marquis of Dufferin, Governor-General of Canada.

John Temple (1732-1798), younger brother of the preceding, who married Elizabeth Bowdoin, was the first British Consul-General to the United States. In 1786, upon the death of Sir Richard Temple (7th Bart.), he assumed the Temple baronetcy. He died in New York. According to "Who's Who," 1909, his descendant, the present (12th) Baronet, Sir Grenville Louis John Temple, resides in Canada.

G. O. BENT

IN LOVE WITH EASEFUL DEATH

“In love with easeful death?” Not I,
Too well I love this friendly sky,
The sunrise and the sunset hour,
The winter storm and summer shower,
The hand-clasp and the glad surprise
Of welcome in a good friend’s eyes.

In truth, I have a secret dread
Of lying down among the dead,
The poor, white dead bereft of will,
Who lie so cold, so strangely still,
The while we break our hearts and pray
For one fond word of yesterday.

I’d go as children do, at night,
When they must leave the warmth and light,
With lagging step and looks behind
At toys beloved and faces kind,
Only half sure of God to keep
Strange terrors from them while they sleep.

MARY E. FLETCHER

ABT VOGLER: MUSICIAN

SO MUCH has been written respecting Browning's poem, "Abt Vogler," since its publication many years ago, that it would seem as if any further comment upon this remarkable contribution to our literature must necessarily be a mere reiteration of what has already been said. There is, however, one feature which, in so far as the present writer can learn, has never received special attention in any review of the poem that has as yet appeared, and the following observations are offered in the hope that an examination from an essentially musical stand-point may, even at this late day, reveal artistic qualities which have escaped the attention of readers to whom the literary excellence of the composition is its principal charm.

Before entering upon such an examination, however, it should be remarked that, although not a few of our distinguished poets have been endowed with additional artistic inspirations which have made them famous as painters of fine pictures, yet when we cast about for poets gifted in equal measure with musical susceptibilities and accomplishments, the number is found to be surprisingly small. At first sight and in view of the qualities generally supposed to be common to both arts, the fact appears somewhat strange. A sense of rhythm, of form, of the melodious flow of measure, of the rise and fall of cadence, and of the harmony consequent upon the happy combination of words and periods, naturally exists in a high degree in both the poet and the musician, while the realization of but a few of these qualities, in the same degree, is necessary to the painter; a sense of form and harmony—harmony of colour rather than of sound, however—constituting the principal features of resemblance. Why is it, then,

that there should be fewer poet-musicians than poet-painters, when, apparently, the very reverse of this should be the case?

It is not within the province of this writing to deal so much with the reasons for this fact as with the fact itself; nevertheless, it may not be out of place to notice briefly one or two of them. And the chief one, it may at once be affirmed, is because the two ruling principles of the poet and the musician are the very opposites of one another. In several points, it is true, there is a seeming kinship, but investigation shows that the kinship is more fanciful than real. The poet has to do with things certain and absolutely defined, the musician with things uncertain and absolutely undefined. The poet, by a single word—man, tree, house—instantly awakens in the mind a distinct, definite image; or, by another word—country, heaven, eternity—as quickly excites sentiments and emotions at once distinct and confused. But the musician can speak no single word, nor can he convey any specific, definite idea other than a musical one. He can pourtray grief or joy in a general, undefined way, but in that way only. He cannot express grief in such a manner that we may know beyond doubt the cause or nature of it—whether it arises from the loss of a friend or the loss of a fortune; and any attempt to indicate a specific cause for joy or delight will be equally unsuccessful. He cannot express a conviction or a wish, any more than he can describe a sunset or a rainbow. His speech is elusive and ethereal, the very reverse of the poet's, which is direct and unmistakable.

This vital difference exists for the simple reason that musical ideas are not the ideas of language; they cannot possibly be expressed in language; only in one arbitrary way can they find expression, namely, in musical sounds. They stand by themselves, unique, unlike anything else in the world.

Still one more reason may be presented in this connexion. When we endeavour to fathom music, and to comprehend in their fulness its nature, its mysteries, its immeasurable possibilities, those few elements pertaining to it which are shared

by, or essential to, the poet, assume their proper proportions, and appear, what they really are, merely the first step upward on the long stairway towards the great temple itself. Indeed, they are scarcely this; for music without ideas is not music at all, and no one will venture to claim that a consciousness of rhythm, and form, and the other qualifications possessed by the poet approach even the semblance of a musical idea.

A subject so broad and far-reaching cannot be further pursued at this time. Nor is it necessary that it should be; but the little that has been said may, perhaps, help to emphasize the fact that the union of poet and musician in one personality, as exemplified in Robert Browning's "Abt Vogler" is a remarkable event in the history of art. For, beyond question, in all English literature no other poem can be found disclosing the same clear perception of the true nature of music, so profound an acquaintance with its subtle influences, and so exalted and comprehensive an estimate of its noblest ideals. It may truly be considered the one great poetic exposition of the divine art in our language. Delving deep down below the mere mechanism of recurring cadences and melodic accents, Abt Vogler penetrates to the very origin of the art, surprising us with reflections and revelations at once original and illuminating. He is in turn the fantastic dreamer, the sage, philosopher, and moralist, but more than one or all of these, he is the musician. Underneath the philosophy and the dreams lies music, to him not only the sweet solace and panacea for human suffering, failure, and disappointment; not only the one uncreated art; but

" A flash of the will that can
Existent behind all laws."

He glories in the consciousness that he is a musician, and exultantly exclaims:

" But God has a few of us whom he whispers in the ear;
The others may reason and welcome, 'tis we musicians *know*."

From beginning to end, this enthusiasm pervades the poem.

The strange desire comes to him, that he might build him a "structure brave" from the music he evokes from his organ; commanding the keys to the work, and transforming the sounds into fantastic creatures to do his bidding, even as Solomon before him had done, when he piled him, "a palace straight to pleasure the princess he loved"; calling to his aid,

"Armies of angels that soar, legions of demons that lurk,
Man, reptile, fly."

Acting upon the impulse, he assumes the curious task. Through five long stanzas, these restless creatures of his fancy flit before us,

"Plunge down to hell,
Burrow awhile and build, broad on the roots of things,
Then up again swim into sight, having based me my palace well,
Founded it, fearless of flame, flat on the nether springs—"

their varying movements presented to our view in a flood of imagery so vivid and an action so swift, that we are fairly bewildered by the blaze and the rush.

Vieing with each other; one

"Would mount and march like the excellent minion he was,
Ay, another, and yet another, one crowd but with many a crest,
Raising my rampired walls of gold as transparent as glass,
Eager to do and die, yield each his place to the rest."

With workmen so willing and energetic, the palace soon assumes form:

"For higher still and higher (as a runner tips with fire,
When a great illumination surprises a festal night—
Outlining round and round Rome's dome from space to spire,
Up the pinnacled glory reached, and the pride of my soul was
in sight."

But the task is not yet wholly complete. Nature herself must conceive, and contribute from her store of wonders to the appointments of this unique palace.

"Novel splendors burst forth, grew familiar and dwelt with mine,
Not a point nor peak but found and fixed its wandering star;
Meteor-moons, balls of blaze; and they did not pale nor pine,
For earth had attained to heaven, there was no more near nor far."

Thus furnished, it needed but to people the extraordinary structure, and with a boldness of imagination that startles us, "Presences plain in the place," or "fresh from the Protoplast," are

"Lured now to begin and live, in a house to their liking at last,"
and even the wonderful Dead

"Were back once more to breathe in an old world worth their new."
And now his work is done, and again he cries in exultation:

"All through my keys that gave their sounds a wish of my soul,
All through my soul that praised as its wish flowed visibly forth,
All through music and me!"

The success of the achievement—an achievement possible only to music—forces itself upon him, and he contrasts it with the work of the painter and the poet:

"For think, had I painted the whole,
Why there it had stood, to see, nor the process so wonderworth;
Had I written the same, made verse—still effect proceeds from cause,
Ye know why the forms are fair, ye hear how the tale is told;
It is all triumphant art, but art in obedience to laws,
Painter and poet are proud in the artist-list enrolled;
But here is the finger of God."

When Carlyle, in one of his magnificent outbursts, offers the grandest tribute ever paid to music—music "that leads us to the edge of the Infinite, and lets us for moments gaze at that," the sublimity of the thought and the perfection of its utterance, appear to be the unapproached and the unapproachable. Comment becomes profanation; we can only sit in silence and think. Falling but little short of it in impressiveness, is the thought of Abt Vogler—"But here is the finger of God."

He does not stop here, however, but proceeds to furnish this most significant *exposé* of the science of music:

"And I know not, if, save in this, such gift be allowed to man,
That out of three sounds, he frame, not a fourth sound, but a star."

What a conception is this ! A star—the musical triad, the origin and foundation of all musical development ! Pages of dissertation could not express so vividly and conclusively the beginning, continuation, and end of music. For, as all musicians know, there is no possible harmonic combination in music that is not formed upon the triad. It may be inverted, or extended, or mingled with other sounds, but without it no intelligent, recognized association of tones can exist. Who but a genius, then, could thus crystallize all musical effort into one little word ? — But let us hear his own explanation :

“ Consider it well ; each tone of our scale in itself is nought ;
It is everywhere in the world—loud, soft, and all is said :
Give it to me to use ! I mix it with two in my thought ;
And there ! Ye have heard and seen ; consider and bow the head ! ”

But the beautiful palace is of brief existence, and its builder laments :

“ Well, it is gone at last, the palace of music I reared ;
Gone ! and the good tears start, the praises that come too slow. ”

and then follow the well-known reflections upon the mutability of earthly things ; but the note of regret soon gives place to one of confidence and hope. With what earnestness he combats the idea of the actual loss or annihilation of anything good—gone, “ never to be again, ” and of the substitution for it of “ more of the kind as good, nay better perchance ! ”

“ Is this your comfort to me ?
To me, who must be saved because I cling with my mind
To the *same*—same self, same love, same God ? Ay, what was,
shall be.
Therefore, to whom turn I but to Thee, the Ineffable Name ?
Builder and maker, thou, of houses not made with hands.
What ! have fear of change from thee who art ever the same ?
Doubt that thy power can fill the heart that thy power expands ?
There shall never be one lost good ! What was shall live as before ;
For evil is null, is naught, is silence implying sound ;
What was good shall be good, with, for evil, so much good more ;
On the earth the broken arcs ; in the heaven, a perfect round. ”

Apology for so long a quotation of familiar lines might be necessary, did it not serve to show their close connexion in the musician's mind with his all-embracing art. For him all things converge to one single point. All beauty, good, power, survive but for the melodist; all hopes and aspirations unrealized, are "music sent up to God by the lover and the bard;" the failures, disappointments, even the agonizing of life, are but the prolonged pauses before the singing breaks forth, the discords which serve only to enhance the beauty of the harmonies that follow. Sorrow is hard to bear, and doubt slow to be dissipated; each sufferer has his own opinions and theories respecting life and its ills; but, with the utmost complacency, our enthusiast focuses the whole matter into the two lines already cited:

" But God has a few of us whom he whispers in the ear;
The rest may reason and welcome; 'tis we musicians know."

Shall we question the conclusion? Alas! in too many instances we must. But, happily, there are occasional rare spirits to whom Abt Vogler's art means all that it meant to him. They perceive it in the beauty, the purity, the nobility of their own exalted ideals, and at certain moments they are unconsciously borne into far-off realms and into communion with forces and influences known only to themselves. A marvellous but intuitive perception of hidden things seems to be given them, and in all sincerity they exclaim: " 'Tis we musicians *know*."

It is in this and similar passages that the poet's extraordinary power of penetrating into the profoundest mysteries of the art is so strikingly manifest—mysteries, it may safely be said, unexplored save by the elect few.

We come now to the closing verse of the poem. His palace is gone, his dream ended, and the musician is back to the every-day life again;

" Well, it is earth with me."

It may be said just here, that it is a question whether Browning's actual knowledge of music is not apt to be measured

more by the six lines that complete this stanza than by the rest of the poem. Like his "A Toccata of Galuppi's," "Master Hugues of Saxe-Gotha," and "Charles Avison," they deal with the technicalities of the art, and have a convincing tone, an air of finality, which means a great deal to the uninitiated. The introduction of the terms tonic and dominant, chords of the seventh and ninth, the greater and lesser third, and much more of the same kind, several of which appear as well in this last stanza of "Abt Vogler" as in the other poems referred to, naturally gives an idea of a practical knowledge of music that can hardly fail to impress the general reader. But we must not measure Abt Vogler the musician by these few hints of the workshop. A familiarity with the theories of music and the principles of musical syntax is, of course, an essential part of every musician's equipment, but it is an attainment common to thousands of others. Certainly the musician must possess it, but behind it and dominating all, must be the *musical spirit*. In Browning's other musical poems there is more of the *letter* of music, so to speak; not necessarily the "letter that killeth," but enough of it to distinguish them in a marked degree from the one under consideration, in which the *spirit*—the spirit which so assuredly "giveth life"—is so especially noticeable.

To admit this, is in nowise to disparage exhibitions of poetic power and musical insight of a very unusual order; but that the difference claimed does exist can easily be shown from the poems themselves. For the present purpose reference to a single passage in "Charles Avison" must suffice to illustrate the point in question. The disquisition on the Mind and the Soul, following that noble pronouncement:

"There is no truer truth obtainable
By man than comes of music,"

is a splendid example of searching analysis, and a masterly estimate of the relative ethical significance of the intellect and the emotions. The range and force of the argument and the ease and fluency of the peculiar versification command

the highest admiration, but it is precisely these qualities that so conspicuously distinguish it from "Abt Vogler." Instead of the fervid, spontaneous utterances of the ardent musician, we have the close, exact reasoning of the jurist. More profound than anything in its fellow-poem, this very quality removes it to another plane. We discern in it the head rather than the heart—the studied, logical deductions from certain premises, rather than the passionate outbursts of a soul possessed by, and steeped in, an art dear to it as life itself. It is not; "But here is the finger of God, a flash of the will that can."

This spontaneous exuberance of musical feeling is a distinctive feature of the poem. Not only so, but it is made to convert other qualities into instruments for its own use. The very technicalities so ingeniously employed in this last stanza, together with the situation making their introduction possible, serve to enforce one of the marked characteristics of music, namely, a power of expression wholly transcending language. A brief consideration of these closing lines may help to elucidate this point.

We are told in a prefatory note that the Master has been indulging in an improvisation. Undoubtedly, while thus absorbed, he rose to "heights" beyond all power of verbal utterance, as he poured out his inmost soul in communings with his beloved organ. Satisfied at length, he turns from the keys. The ideas and emotions awakened by his playing take shape in words, and we have the soliloquy as we know it. One thought succeeds another, in the order we have followed them, until language is exhausted, and he awakens once more to the realities of life.

" Well, it is earth with me; silence resumes her reign;
I will be patient and proud, and soberly acquiesce."

But the movings of his mind and heart are far from being quieted. Irresistible yearnings, to the expression of which speech is no longer adequate, draw him again to the organ. "Give me the keys," he cries. With these, and these only, he has a language wherewith to indulge those vague, indes-

cribable longings that so stir him. "Give me the keys. I feel for the common chord again."

Are we to suppose, however, that all those longings can be satisfied by the half dozen chords he enumerates? Rather is it not certain that his kindled soul will once more break into a rhapsody of sound? Not, perhaps, the long, intense one that preceded the soliloquy; more likely a quiet, dreamy retrospect—one in which, it may be, he sadly rebuilds the beautiful palace "now gone" with, possibly, a few "good tears" starting—until, sinking into the repose of spirit that comes from satisfaction, he can be "patient" now and "acquiesce." He "feels for," or leads by degrees to, the common chord, and sliding by semi-tones to the minor and the ninth, stopping a moment to recall some notable strain in his improvisation, finds at last his resting-place, "the C major of this life."

In order fully to appreciate Browning's group of musical poems, one should recall what has been done by others in the same field. The survey is by no means an extended one. As a matter of fact, it will be seen that brief allusions or short excursions into the domain of music comprise practically all that has been attempted by other poets, and too often in these attempts the timid approaches to the subject, the painful absence of musical knowledge or the utter disregard of it, only accentuate by contrast the value and importance of Browning's work. Each one of the four poems forming this group is a notable composition, distinguished alike for the originality of its substance and the characteristic manner of its treatment. As has already been intimated, three of the four, although of large scope and evincing a learned appreciation of musical art, deal more particularly with what might be called its natural side. In the remaining one, however, the reader is conscious of something very different. In what other poem, it may be asked, does the very soul of music so appeal to the imagination as in "Abt Vogler"? For the first time in poetic literature we are brought face to face with one so imbued with a sense of the comprehensiveness of his art and so signally gifted with a perception and realization of its nature,

that he is able as well to grasp its highest ideals as to explore its profoundest depths, and fairly to startle us with the fulness of his experiences and revelations. Music is presented only as ennobled by an indissoluble alliance with what is most hallowed in human experience, an alliance investing it with a force, an influence and an intimacy alien to all other arts. Nowhere, perhaps, is this intimacy more effectively or more pathetically exemplified than in those passages depicting Abt Vogler's confiding trust and belief in this object of his devotion—in its untold possibilities and unquestionable superiority to every other human agency; where it would appear to be a synonym for all that is good—the enhancement of every joy, the succour from every ill, the support in every trial; where, if not all of life, it is at least so much of it that existence without it would be well-nigh impossible. The hand of one in closest sympathy with all that lies nearest to the heart of the true musician is easily recognized in this indirect presentation of a belief so sincere and unreserved. Indeed, throughout the general delineation of the character of Abt Vogler, although, from the first fantastic flight of the imagination to the most impressive religious truths, no faintest approach to sentimentalism appears, yet we are not infrequently conscious of a deep emotional element, a touch of tenderness, implied rather than expressed, and arising, beyond doubt, less from actual musical experience than from that extraordinary musical intuition to which reference has so often been made.

In conclusion it may be added that, in any just appreciation of this unique poem, the most important fact in connexion with it will not be overlooked, namely, that union of the poet and the musician in one personality to which it owes its being. Such an association of high poetic genius and rare musical acumen as is here shown has seldom, if ever, occurred, and the exceptional union has resulted in an achievement that must always remain a memorable one in literature, and, as has already been affirmed, one that furnishes an exposition of musical art to which the poetry of the language offers no parallel.

JOSEPH GOULD

VIRGIL'S MESSIANIC ECLOGUE

BUT few short poems have been submitted to as much discussion and criticism as the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil, one of his earlier pieces written the year 40 B.C. The chief reason for this interest lies in the striking resemblance that many of its lines bear both in ideas and in language to certain well-known "Messianic" passages of the Old Testament, notably of the Book of Isaiah. Considerations of space will not allow us to set forth these parallels in detail, but the argument of the poem may be briefly, and without strict regard to the order of the lines, stated as follows. "A new order of the world is beginning. Justice and the kingdom of the Golden Age return once more to earth. May Heaven's blessings be upon the child who is coming to birth in Pollio's consulship. He shall be gifted with the life divine. At his birth Nature shall offer her gifts in abundance. As men have not yet ceased to do wrong and study war, first before him, when he reaches man's estate, lies the task of adventure and conquest. But when later he shall come again to rule, the earth shall bring forth abundantly and without tillage. Her wild creatures shall be at peace one with another and with mankind. Peace and Happiness shall flourish and abound. The time of Innocence shall return."

The birth of this child who is to lead mankind into new paths is expected in the year 40 B.C., when C. Asinius Pollio, to whom the poet dedicates his verses, was consul. But despite these and other references to the circumstances of Virgil's own times, and the numerous "pagan" features that the poem presents, the resemblances between many of its lines and passages of Hebrew Scripture are so marked as to seem to be more than merely accidental. The ideas and the language are rather strange to Latin literature. Con-

sequently Christians soon saw in this Eclogue an unconscious "Gentile" prophecy of the coming of Christ. Apart from the words of this particular poem, they would be more disposed to look for such a prophecy in Virgil than in any other heathen writer, because of the purity of his tone, his noble ideals and the tribute that he pays in all his writings to the virtues of "piety" and long-suffering.

The belief in the prophetic character of this pastoral poem finds frequent expression in Christian writings from a comparatively early date and in the Christian art of the Middle Ages.¹ According to Eusebius, Constantine in an address quotes from the poem as authoritative.² To modern readers it is best remembered by the position assigned to Virgil in the *Divine Comedy*,³ and in later times Pope writes his Messiah as an "Eclogue written in imitation of Virgil's Pollio."

Of course many have regarded such ideas as pure fancy bordering on absurdity. Thus Professor Comparetti closes his chapter on this subject with a contemptuous reference to those who "even at this present day take this ancient farce seriously."⁴ However, the essays before us shew that the last word on this poem had not yet been said. It is true that the early Christian and Mediaeval interpretations of it, when taken in their naive literalness, will not stand critical examination.⁵ But these four writers shew that, viewed in a broader light, they were not without a certain element of truth.

1 (a) "Virgil's Messianic Eclogue." Essays by R. S. Conway, W. Warde-Fowler, and Joseph B. Mayor, reprinted from *The Hibbert Review*, Jan. 1907, *Harvard Classical Studies*, vol. xiv. 1903, and *The Expositor*, April 1907.

b "The Divine Child in Virgil." Sir W. M. Ramsay. *The Expositor*, June and August, 1907.

These essays are referred to here as R.S.C., W. W. F., J. B. M. and W. M. R.

2 Comparetti. *Virgil in the Middle Ages*, ch. vii.

3 R. S. C. p. 22. *Inferno* i. ii. Cf. *Purgatorio* xv. where Virgil is spoken of as the teacher to whom Statius ascribed his conversion, as the story went, to Christianity. *Virgil in the Middle Ages*, ch. vii.

4 e.g. The words "Iam redit (et) Virgo" referring to "Astraea redux" were taken to mean the Virgin Mary.

5 J. B. M. pp. 90 seq. Similar oracles of Christian import dating from a later time are still extant.

The original "*Libri Fatales*" seem to have contained more ritual instructions than prophecies, but the latter were apparently admitted in larger numbers into the second collection.

In the first place the coincidences of thought and expression were not necessarily accidental. Virgil may well have come into contact with Jewish ideas concerning an expected Messiah, and the literature in which they found expression. The Jewish people were dispersed throughout the world, having large settlements in Babylon, in Alexandria and in Rome itself, where they were sufficiently well known to evoke more than one unkindly reference from Virgil's contemporary, Horace. At the same time can be noted the wide prevalence of oracles, and "Sibylline" utterances (*carmina*) to which both in the East and in Italy great importance was attached. From early days Rome had had her Sibylline Books. These were destroyed when the Capitol was burnt in 83 B.C.; but soon afterwards the Roman Government began to form a new collection. Hundreds of such *carmina* were brought in from all quarters and examined. A new collection was thus formed of authorized oracles, and assigned to the keeping of the proper officials. Now these oracles were not all "pagan." Many of them were Jewish in their origin, being either original compositions or paraphrases, mostly in Greek hexameters, of well known "Messianic" and other passages from the Old Testament. In other cases heathen utterances seem to have been modified with a view to proselytizing.¹ Some of these oracles had, no doubt, reached Rome independently before 83 B.C. Many others were brought thither during the years in which the new collection was being formed, and remained in circulation, despite the fact that Augustus subsequently ordered the suppression of the rejected pieces and the preservation in closest secrecy of those selected. Thus it is quite possible that Virgil may have seen some such prophecies; he may even have read the very words of Isaiah, and thought on them with more interest than would the average Roman of his day, even though they had not the [same meaning for him as for the Jews.

Moreover, Pollio, whom Virgil addresses, was the friend of

1 H. W. Garrod, J. B. Mayor, *Classical Review*, Feb., 1905. Aug. 1908.

Herod the Great.¹ In the very year of Pollio's consulship Herod came to Rome and received from the triumvirs Antony and Octavian the kingship of Judea. Some years later he sent his sons to Rome to be entertained by Pollio and introduced to Octavian. Besides this connexion, Pollio seems to have had a Jewish kinsman of the same name, the son of a proselyte, who was a member of the Sanhedrin and a supporter of Herod. It has been suggested that Pollio, being a poet himself, may have given expression to ideas borrowed from Hebrew sources, and that Virgil here paid him the compliment of imitation.

If it be granted that Hebrew influences can be traced in this poem, they are, to a modern reader, curiously combined with purely "pagan" elements, derived mainly from Greek and Roman mythology. References are made to the Sicilian Muses, Astraea, Saturn, Juno or Diana, Lucina, Apollo, Tethys (the Sea), the Argonauts, the Sibyl of Cumae, and others. Only a poet could so blend ideas and beliefs so varied into something like a harmonious whole. Similarly in the sixth book of the *Aeneid* Virgil combines elements which to the critic would seem incompatible, simple and sometimes crude Greek and Italian legends being conjoined to the tenets of various schools of philosophy—yet the discrepancies pass almost unnoticed, such is the poet's skill.²

Thus it is impossible to offer an explanation of this poem which shall be simple and consistent in all its details; indeed the attempt to treat any poetry in such a spirit often proves disastrous. At the same time it is hardly possible to ignore the particular references, as if they were merely pieces of poetic ornamentation.

Theories too numerous for discussion have been offered in explanation of the purport of this Eclogue. Sir W. M. Ramsay holds that the child spoken of is simply the idealized Roman, typical of Rome herself, and that Virgil is seeking, in answer to a pessimistic epode written by his friend Horace,

1 Boissier. *La Religion Romaine*, ch. v.

2 W. M. R. *Expositor*, Aug., 1907.

to indicate that there is yet hope for Rome and Italy.¹ Mr. Warde-Fowler, while he agrees with the view that the poet has primarily in mind a regenerated and once more prosperous Italy, argues on the other hand (and the general opinion seems to accord with his), that the simple realism of the closing lines alone implies the birth of a "real infant of flesh and blood."² This being granted, the next question raised is that of the identity of the expected child. One of two views is commonly held. Firstly, that a child of Pollio's is meant. In this case the references must be regarded as playful, since, though Pollio reached the consulship, his position was distinctly subordinate to that of Octavian and Antony. Secondly, it has been held that Virgil has in mind the expected birth of a son to Octavian, Caesar's heir and the future Augustus. In this case the father was destined to disappointment as the child born shortly afterwards was a daughter, Julia, who in after years made an evil name for herself.

Leaving on one side the discussion of these questions, we may note that the references are primarily Roman, being suggested by the political events of the moment, the treaty of Brundisium between Antony and Octavian, and the prospects of peace. An indication is here given of the hopes that were beginning to centre round the young Octavian, under whose guidance Rome, Italy and the Empire might once more be restored to prosperity and begin a new career of greatness.

If this is the case, what of the Hebrew influences upon the poem?

The poetic beauty of such passages as have been referred to, even if they had been slightly distorted by the oracular form and the Greek rendering, could not fail to appeal to a poet such as Virgil, whose sympathies even in earlier years reached out beyond the limits of Roman prejudice, and who in his poetic work would be ready to avail himself of the

¹ Sir. W. M. Ramsay thinks that the rhythm of the verse is unusual to Latin, as if it were written in imitation of Hebrew poetry; e.g., in the simultaneous endings of lines and sentences; and the repetition of the thought in the same verse or group of verses. Expositor, June 1907. Mr. Warde-Fowler, however, questions this view.

² W. W. F. p. 57.

imagery even of Hebrew poetry, however far it might differ from the commonly accepted Greek or Roman standards.¹

Again, in seeking for an interpretation of such a poem, we may with some reason look for a deeper meaning, such as often reveals itself beneath the surface of poetry. A significant feature of the Eclogue is its hopefulness. Sir W. M. Ramsay points out that ancient thought often tends towards a pessimistic view of the world's history,² especially in the East, and that even in modern times there has been much to justify such a view. (His words were written before the occurrence of recent events in Constantinople. The future will shew whether they will constitute a happy exception to this tendency.) According to this view the Golden Age degenerates into one of iron; even if there are cycles of events in human history there is only a repetition of the process of degeneration. All idea of permanent progress is vain; there is no real hope for the lasting attainment of better things. But to Virgil a new order of the years is beginning, and it is one full of hope and promise for the future. This is not mere juvenile optimism. The same thought finds expression even in his later works, in which he often dwells upon the sadness and sorrow of much in human life. The Messianic prophecies or kindred utterances may well have appealed to one writing in this mood.

True, we need not ascribe too much to Jewish influences. In Rome and Italy men were at last looking for better things. The political outlook was brighter. Though one more civil war awaited the Roman world in the near future, a certain sense of relief was apparent after the miseries of a century of revolution.³ At the same time the horrors of civil war,

1 W. M. R. Expositor, June 1907, pp. 557 seq.

R. S. C. pp. 33-37.

2 R. S. C. p. 32.

3 Prof. Mayor traces in detail the parallels between passages in this poem and in the Hebrew Scriptures or "oracles." Some of these are here indicated. Even where the resemblances of language are not marked, the general similarity of tone is noteworthy in view of the comparatively few passages found elsewhere in classical literature giving expression to such ideas.

Prof. Conway prefixes a verse translation of the Eclogue to this volume of essays, from which and from another by Mr. F. E. Thompson in the *Classical Review* for March 1908, some expressions are borrowed.

Virgil Eclogue iv. 13-30, 48-49.

massacres and proscriptions had left their impress upon men's minds. While among the upper circles in Cicero's time much apparent scepticism prevailed, the thoughts of some went deeper; something of a religious revival was beginning. These evils, it was felt, must be a visitation from Heaven upon mankind for their sins,—real sins in the Jewish sense, not merely political blunders and shortcomings. Yet to this feeling was added a brighter hope, not only for political peace and returning prosperity, but for a purer and nobler human life. If Augustus' subsequent attempt to restore the old religion was in some respects forced and artificial, undertaken to add a flavour of respectability to his reign, yet behind it there must have been a real religious movement amongst his subjects. The Oriental forms of religion which were by this time exerting so strong an influence even in Rome itself seem to have provided for a felt want, with their warmer and more emotional appeals, and their greater enthusiasm, such as was suspected by Romans of the old school. A combination also of religious and political feeling soon afterwards began to find expression in the worship of the "Genius" of Rome and Augustus, which rapidly developed into the "deification" of the Emperor, both living and dead. Beginning in Greece and the East, this form of belief and worship became in a sense the "established religion" of the Empire, conformity to which was the test offered to those accused of being Christians. Strange as such a development of religious belief may seem to a modern reader, it can be explained

"If any traces of our former guilt remain they shall pass away and thus set free the lands from perpetual fear. (He shall receive the life of gods, and see heroes with gods conjoined and himself be seen of them) and with his father's virtues shall rule the world in peace." . . . "For thee, Child, the earth untilled shall freely spread forth her first offerings—the trailing ivy and the foxglove, the water lilies mingled with the smiling acanthus. The goats shall return home uncalled and laden with milk, and the herds shall fear no more the mighty lions. Around thy cradle shall sweet flowers spread. The serpent too shall die and the poisonous, treacherous herb. Freely shall the Assyrian balsam grow. So soon as thou shalt learn to read the praises of heroes and thy father's deeds, and to know what virtue is, then slowly shall the plains grow bright with the tender ears of wheat, and the reddening grapes hang on the uncultured thorns, and the dew of honey from the hard oaks flow forth" "Approach now thy high honours, dear child of the gods, Jove's great offspring. See how shakes the vaulted firmament, and earth, and tracts of the sea, and depth of the sky! See how all the world rejoices in the age to come!"

as arising from a long inherited tendency to deify "heroes," and acquiring unique force from the gratitude of men to those who created and maintained the *Pax Romana*.

Virgil is looking first at his immediate surroundings, but in seeking to interpret and give expression to the deeper thoughts and higher aspirations of his generation, he may well have found some help in ideas taken from the beliefs of a foreign people who, while their political past was largely one of failure and their political hopes were doomed to disappointment, had held firmly to the ideal of righteousness before God.

Virgil's idea of a child to be born, who is to renew the Golden Age, is not perhaps directly suggested by any Jewish Scripture. It is as a Roman that he is to live and conquer and rule as the guardian of the world's peace. Yet the Messianic prophecies may have influenced his conception, as he sought, though vaguely, to find some utterance for the thought that the new age must be typified by a new birth and by the innocence of a child. A lost simplicity and purity of heart must be recovered before that age could hope for Heaven's blessing.

In the event, the new order instituted by the child that was born was not such as the poet could have foreseen. In fact in the end it proved, along with other causes, fatal to the political system on which his hopes were fixed. In the Mass of St. Paul sung at Mantua in the Middle Ages the Apostle is represented as saying before the poet's tomb, "What would I not have made of thee, had I found thee living, thou greatest of the poets!" Whether Virgil, had he lived later, would have accepted the teachings of St. Paul it would be profitless to enquire. Yet in the old view, however crudely expressed, that in him there was something akin to the Christian spirit was not wholly mistaken. Virgil "read the spiritual conditions of his time with profound insight, and with not less profound hope declared that some answer

would be sent to the world's need."¹ While these words are applied to Virgil's work as a whole, this Eclogue shews how early in his life he began to read some of the signs of his time. Bad as the times were, it is not true to say, as has been said, that the world was worse than ever before, hopelessly sunk in iniquity. It was rather a moment when men's ears were open to hear a message, and Virgil was one of those who called on them to hearken and thus took his part in the *Præparatio Evangelica*.

G. OSWALD SMITH

¹ Isaiah xxv. 35. 1. "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad, the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose." (autumn crocus R. V. Margin.)

Lv. 13. "Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree."

xi. 6-9. "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together and a little child shall lead them. The cow and the bear shall feed, their young ones shall lie down together and the suckling child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adders' den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain."

Cf. lxxv. 25. ix. 6. . . . "A child is born. . . . The government shall be upon his shoulder. . . . of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end."

THE BEAUTY OF CICERO'S SPEECH

SO much attention is paid to the grammatical and philological details of Cicero's speeches that the more important beauties pass unobserved. In him we find examples of the best qualities of the highest oratory in any language. His power of appealing to the subjective disposition of his audience, his skill in choosing and arranging arguments, and the facility with which he clothes those arguments in language both clear and forcible proclaim him one of the foremost orators of any age. Nor need this be matter of wonder when we remember not only his natural gifts but also the training he underwent. For, even as a child, his mind had received a stimulus in the direction of the liberal arts from the poet Archias. And, later on, he studied philosophy under the Greek academician, Philo, whilst the technical part of oratory was imparted to him by the rhetorician, Molo. To these advantages must also be added constant practice and the opportunities which he enjoyed of hearing continually all the famous Roman orators.

It may not therefore be an altogether useless task to consider somewhat in detail the peculiar oratorical beauties of Cicero's style. In so doing, we might follow one of two alternatives. We might select passages from his various speeches or we might confine ourselves to one speech only. The latter course seems preferable. Otherwise, it would be difficult to bring to the front those qualities that make for that unity of construction which is of highest importance in an orator.

The speech that perhaps lends itself to the treatment proposed, is the speech "Pro Lege Manilia", or to use the more correct title "de Imperio Grai Pompeii". We will assume that the substance and purport of this speech is

generally known. We would only remind the reader that Cicero was endeavouring to secure the passage of the law conferring upon Pompey the honour and responsibility of conducting the war against Mithridates, king of Pontus, a powerful and ambitious man ever encroaching upon the sphere of Roman influence in the East.

Cicero was not unmindful of conciliating the minds of his hearers from the outset. He pays a compliment to the assembly which he was addressing by declaring that such a place was "*jucundissimus, amplissimus, et ornatissimus, ad dicendum*". He then declares that such an assembly should only hear speeches that had been prepared with the utmost industry, concluding the exordium by reminding his audience of the honour that they had conferred upon him.

Another appeal to the subjective disposition of his hearers we find in Chapter V. There, in a series of contrasts, he plays upon their fear of shame and hope of future glory. He tells them that their ancestors had waged war for comparatively slight causes, such as injuries done to Roman merchants, insults inflicted upon Roman ambassadors, and then he concludes by reminding them how shameful it would be if they remained supine when so many thousands of Roman citizens had been slain and when a Roman ambassador had been tortured. There are certain sentences which by means of well presented contrasts bring out this fundamental idea. Of these the first may be taken as an example of all that follow. "*Majores nostri saepe, mercatoribus aut naviculariis vestris injuriosus tractatis, bella gesserunt, vos tot milibus civium Romanorum uno nuntio atque uno tempore necatis, quo tandem animo, esse debetis?*" Here we find in the first part of the sentence an affirmative statement, and in the second, a question. Also the words are distributed in such a way as to secure balance and clear contrast. Thus, the "*majores*" and the "*vos*" respectively occupy the first place in the sentence, the verbs "*bella gesserunt*" and "*esse debetis*" come last, while the casual fact in each case occupies the middle of the sen-

tence. Then, as the paragraph proceeds, the contrasting sentences become shorter and more forcible. "Illi libertatum civium Romanorum immunitam non tulerunt, vos autem vitam ereptam neglegitis jus legationis verbo violatum, illi persecuti sunt, vos legatum armii supplicio interfectum relinquetis?" Observe the rapidity, the gathering force of these sentences, like a broad flow of water suddenly condensed into an impetuous flood. And finally comes the climax, telling them how disgraceful it would be for them not to keep intact all the glory handed down to them by their ancestors.

In Chap. VI. we can also observe Cicero's appeal to the self-interest of his audience. Reminding them of the fertility of Asia now seriously threatened by Mithridates, he declares that, if Mithridates should succeed in his attack bankruptcy would come upon many Roman citizens. This idea is brought out clearly by explaining that Asia "Tam opima et fertilis est ut facile omnibus terris antecellat;" that in this case even the very fear of the calamity would be disastrous, causing damage to trade and industry: "agricultura deseritur, pecunia relinquuntur, et mercatorum navigatio conquerat;" and then emphasizing the fact that it is not now a question of merely warding off the fear of the calamity, but the calamity itself arising from the attacks of Mithridates.

He then appeals to their vanity in Chap. VII. by telling them how felicitous had been their judgement in a former case when they had appointed Pompey commander in the Mediterranean against the pirates. And this reminder is done in such a way as to produce many and varied kinds of effects. Thus he compares their foresight with the opposition made to the measure by Hortensius, Gabinius, and others. He even quotes their objection which might be raised on this occasion and combats this objection by the pithy sentence: "Obsolevit ista oratio re multo magis quam verbis refutata."

Finally in Chap. XXIV. he again appeals to the subjective element by dexterously reminding them of the close connexion there had been between his labours and the general welfare of the people; also by suggesting in the concluding lines that a favourable judgement now on their part would only be a logical confirmation of the power, trust and honours that they had conferred upon him.

We must now consider his method of argument. Naturally he dwells upon the greatness of the danger from Mithridates, the consequent gravity of the war, and the necessity of appointing as general, Pompey, the one man fully qualified to cope with the situation. The gravity of the war is skilfully brought out by dwelling upon the character of Mithridates himself, the risk of losing much glory and much money, the close connexion between the fortunes of those attacked in Asia Minor and of the Roman citizens at home, and the bad effect which the continued successes of Mithridates would have on the reputation of Rome.

On the other hand, the fact that Pompey is the man best suited for conducting the war is proved by a mass of evidence skilfully chosen and presented. For Cicero successfully proves that Pompey possesses the essentially important qualities of military knowledge, valour, personal influence, and good fortune. Those few points are all successfully demonstrated by appeals to facts and to the evidence of trustworthiness.

But, however stringent might be the arguments of Cicero in support of his contention, they would be worth very little, if not presented in a clear and moving style. Such a requisite is essential in any form of literary composition and certainly not least in the art of oratory. A careful observation will soon show that there are certain artifices or devices which Cicero constantly uses in order to present a highly finished style. And these are especially worthy of attention. For not only does their knowledge facilitate the actual translation of the "Pro Lege Manilia," the student's mind being constantly on the watch for these

literary contrivances, but they are also of considerable importance to any who would wish to compose a speech even in any modern language. These literary contrivances may be classified as follows: frequent use of climax; presentation by way of antithesis; arrangement of words in such a way as to present the idea most forcibly; repetition and emphasis; a variety in the use of the declarative and interrogative form of sentence; and the judicious and sparing use of metaphor.

In regard to climax, the adverbial expression "non modo—sed etiam," "ne quidem", and others similar are sufficient proof of his frequent use of climax. But this important element in oratorical style is frequently accomplished by a series of sentences leading up to the final and climatic sentence. Of this we had an example in Chap. II., in which Cicero enumerates the main elements of the case that he is handling, namely that in Bithynia many cities have been burned, that the kingdom of Ariobazanes is in the hands of the enemy, that Lucullus is withdrawing from the war, and that Pompey is the one man in request. All these sentences are clearly connected in a series by the exact corresponding location in each sentence of the important words. Often the climatic arrangement is effected by a series of subordinate clauses each introduced by the same conjunction. For example, in Chap. IV. towards the end, Cicero asks his audience how they ought to feel "cum duos reges, cum maximis copiis propter adsunt cum uno excursio"...."totius armii vectigal auferri possunt cum publicani familias maximas quas in saltibus habent, quas in agris, quas portibus magno periculo se arbitretur."

Antithesis or contrast also plays a very important part. Already we have seen an example of this in Chap. V. contrasting in successive clauses the defiant attitude of Romans in the past with what ought to be their attitude now. Other examples we have in Chap. VI. when he says "in aliis rebus, cum venit calamitas, tum detrimentum accipitur, at in vectigalibus non solum adventus mali, sed etiam ipse metus adfert calamitatem," and again at the

end of Chap. XIII., "Hiemis enim, non avaritiæ perflugium majores nostri in socioumatque amicorum testis esse voluerunt."

Arrangement of words so as to present the idea most forcibly, is to be found in almost every line. But the method of arrangement seems to admit of classification. Thus the care with which he places the important word at the beginning or end of a sentence, his placing words together so as to produce remarkable results both as regards force and euphony. Take, for example, in Chap. V. the close juxtaposition of the nominative and the accusative in the words "vos eum regem," "illi libertatem," "vos istam ereptam," and similar collocations are of constant occurrence. Naturally repetition occupies a large part in the proper arrangement of words. For example, in enumerating the list of witnesses in favour of Pompey, the words "testis est, testis est," are continually repeated, thereby giving a greater sense of accumulative force. Also his repetition of the verb "finit," occurring in Chap. XII. and in other places, both connects and emphasizes the idea he wishes to convey. Again in Chap. XIII. his repetition of the "quanta" in "quanta fide, quanta facilitate, quanta ingenio," secures both emphasis and unity.

Another feature in Cicero's oratorical style is in his varied use of the declarative and interrogative form of sentence. In Chap. VI., after explaining the approaching evils of an invasion by Mithridates, he introduces variety by asking the question "quo tandem animo esse existimatis?" "putasne vos?" Again in Chap. XIII. he accomplishes the same purpose by using in succession the declarative, ejaculatory, and interrogative form of sentence.

Finally, we come to the use of comparisons whether implied or direct. Cicero's oratorical comparisons are chiefly remarkable for sparkling brevity and force. "Corinthum torius Græci lumen" "imminent duo reges" are two implied comparisons the first of which admirably brings out the importance of Corinth and the second

illustrates the abiding nature of the danger threatening from Mithridates and his ally Tigranes. A more lengthy and laboured comparison is found in Chap. IX., where Cicero compares the flight of Mithridates with that of Medea. Here each part of the comparison is stated and explained, the process occupying about twelve lines. This is perhaps the only lengthy comparison in the entire speech and by its literary digressions adds variety and removes monotony.

It would be possible to mention many other rhetorical beauties of Cicero's oratory. The few that have been quoted are intended chiefly by way of suggestion that a greater and more lively interest might be derived from studying the classic authors, at least partially, in the same way as we study the English authors; and not merely from the philological point of view.

J. A. DEWE

ART AND ARTIFICE

A FRIEND of mine, a middle-aged bachelor, who is well educated, though not an University man, was about to take his first trip to Europe. He is a civil engineer by profession and, besides being a successful business man, he is thoroughly able to enjoy music and even lyric poetry. Much of his life has been spent out-of-doors and his close contact with Nature has given him great appreciation of her beauties; but he talks with equal enthusiasm of the glories of a mountain and of the devices by which a railroad will be built past it.

His house which he has built and furnished according to his own, not his architect's, designs is a model of all the aptness that common sense and good taste can ask in a dwelling place. He appreciates very sincerely the beauties of a lovely face or of a graceful animal, and it was with the anticipation of giving him many days of pleasure that I prepared for him a list of the galleries and pictures he should visit in England. He went and returned. I asked whether the marvellous canvases of the National Gallery had not pleased him intensely. He replied that while the pictures were pretty enough he found them very unsatisfying. I protested and was overwhelmed with this outburst: "It's the fashion to speak of beauty and of the 'æsthetic sense' necessary for its appreciation. People talk of the 'uplifting influence' of pictures, sculpture, or sumptuary handicraft in metal, clay, or textiles. I see more to admire, to feel wonder at, and to reverence in a ship-building yard or steel-making plant than in any Art Gallery; an economically successful monorail car or an æroplane balanced by gyroscopes and propelled by a perfected motor, would excite far more admiration in me than could any possible stone Venus or painted canvas."

The wish to convey his opinion and reasoning to those who read this essay comes from a desire to correct a fetish-like idea almost universal among unthinking people, no matter how complex their education may be. Their credulous belief runs somewhat in this fashion: "Art possesses certain esoteric, abstruse qualities which cannot be defined nor accurately described but can only be felt. The indefinite power of sensing these qualities is desirable and bears with it great merit; but it is possessed by only a few who are thereby proved to be perfectly constituted and more highly developed than their more stolid fellows."

It is evident that such a creed will lead to an endeavour, in those accepting it, to be moved through sensuousness in the presence of a production rather than by an intelligent appreciation of the work itself and of the intellectual ability and manual dexterity necessary for its creation.

It is maintained herein, that all the qualities which decide the goodness or badness of a work of art—a made thing—can be defined and that, judged by the same criteria as are applicable to "artistic" things, a work undertaken solely to fill utilitarian ends may be shown to be the more meritorious.

The question is broad; in order to confine its discussion within measurable limits the following representative theorem is proposed for proof. A similar form of theorem might be proposed for any other branch of artistic production and argued similarly. **THEOREM.** *A good mechanical device is worthy of more admiration than is an equally perfect production of graphic art.* Since painting is the most perfect form of graphic art it alone is considered.

Before the argument can proceed it is necessary to define the qualities by which a painting may be judged. A picture may be considered from two points of view; the first is that of the man who made it; the second is that of those who merely view it. Consequently, a painting has for its artist certain "subjective" qualities which it has for no one else; it also possesses "objective" qualities by which it appeals to all others who see it.

The first and most important of the subjective qualities is the power of a picture to excite in its producer a feeling of honest self-satisfaction in purpose achieved; surely, as is indicated at the end of the paragraph which considers the third group of objective qualities, this satisfaction must be greater in the contemplation of a finished mechanical work which can be proved to be absolutely successful, than it can be in the appreciation of a painting in which the extent of success can only be surmised.

The second of the subjective qualities may be called the "purpose" of the artist in his work; it is perhaps most appreciated during the painting of the picture. Since it is through the success of his purpose that the artist gains satisfaction in his results so this second quality is closely connected with the first. In painting, the artist may accurately define and analyse his purpose in order that it may be intelligently pursued, or, perhaps most frequently, he works towards what he feels to be right without concern in the mental processes through which that feeling has been reached.

The nature of the artist's purpose may be most varied. It may be the simple wish to record impressions, or a desire to teach a lesson, or, again, to show to others a new way of seeing things, but since painting is a means of expression, the end of the artist's purpose is always to express something by a medium through which it may be communicated to others. If the artist's purpose be truthful, its manifestation in his work, even though at first unaccustomed, will inevitably finally be approved by all truth-loving men. Consequently—we assume that men do prefer the truth—the extent of the success of an artist's purpose may be estimated by the success of his pictures in influencing those who see them, and therefore the artist's purpose may be judged by a consideration of the "objective" qualities of his work as they are defined below.

A diseased habit of auto-criticism may permit the artist complete self-satisfaction in a faulty result; a perverted imagination or an ailing perception may induce in him a

mistaken belief in the excellence of purpose of an untruthful picture. In these instances, although the picture may possess perfect subjective excellence, it does so through the deficiencies of its author. In such a case, the painting, the expression of a diseased mind, is itself diseased just as are the senseless scribblings of a weak-minded parietic; neither scribblings nor painting need be seriously considered, since they both lack objective qualities.

The objective qualities by which a painting may be judged are grouped under the following headings:

Group I.—The vividness with which it recalls the original.

Group II.—The aptness of the methods employed by the painter and the deftness with which he uses them in painting it.

Group III.—Its composition.

Group IV.—Its influence in increasing the happiness of mankind.

Group V.—Its "artistic excellence"; this quality is defined later on, when it is fully considered.

These groups of "objective" qualities are treated successively in the following paragraphs and it is considered how far the qualities mentioned in each may be possessed by a mechanical device and by a painting. In this way the comparative merit of each class of work has been successively determined for each of the groups of qualities considered. The conclusion, supported by each paragraph, simply affirms the correctness of the theorem by which the argument is prefaced.

Group I.—The first and most important quality in a painting is the vividness with which the counterfeit recalls the original. All persons do not perceive and sense a given object in exactly the same manner. Some lay more stress on one of its qualities, some on another. So opinions will differ as to which of a number of reproductions of that object most realistically recall it. But in a perfectly normal person it is quite evident that the most accurate likeness will be the most

successful one. This is in reality the fundamental test by which all presentments must be judged; in a line Keats sums up artistic criticism, "Truth is Beauty; Beauty Truth."

Drawing and painting certainly originated in the wish to produce, and have always present, a representation of something by which the reality might be recalled. For example, the thought of his game—reindeer or mammoth—was pleasant to palaeolithic man; it was associated with plenty. He therefore scratched rude outlines of these desirable animals or carved crude representations of them. As painters and sculptors became more expert, representations of more complicated, perhaps imagined, scenes or incidents were produced. These at first, just in the same way as the reindeer sketches, produced pleasure in their beholders by their association with pleasant realities. Hence one of the criteria by which a work of art should be judged is the extent to which it compels recollection of some reality or insists upon the realisation of something imagined; since imagination produces nothing which has not had its origin in experience, the last of the qualities is included in the first. Now, since it is impossible for a likeness to be more like an original than that original is like itself, so is it impossible, on these grounds alone, for a work of art to be more meritorious than the reality it represents.

In Nature's economy every form of energy is transmutable to every other. Is it not then useless to argue which is the most wonderful of her manifestations? Who can say whether the sun's light or his warmth is the most admirable? No one unbiassed could hesitate for a moment in deciding that a Dowsing radiant heat bulb which emits both heat and light more readily reproduces his presence than does even the glory of a Turner's sunset which reflects his light alone!

Many persons doubtless will easily exclaim that they "see nothing in an electric light to remind them of the sun, and that almost any painting of it is a much better likeness." This is because many of us do not realise that men must learn to read pictures just exactly as they learn to read print. To children and savages pictures, particularly drawings in black

and white, are at first quite meaningless. They have not learned that things near the bottom of a picture are near at hand and things towards the upper part distant, nor that a tree perhaps four inches in height in the lower part of a canvas and one half an inch in height further up in it represent actual trees, each some sixty feet tall. They who have never analysed the light values in rounded objects cannot understand why curves should be represented on a plane surface by "shading." We have, in fact, adopted a more or less arbitrary series of signs by which we are accustomed to represent realities in our paintings. By long use a sign sometimes becomes a convention and to most people it is a more acceptable representation of its original than is a far truer likeness. For example: recall the postures of the figures which the old painters drew to represent moving men and animals. The more accurate poses revealed by photography, at first damned as "inartistic," now serve modern artists as the basis of truer drawings, which no longer seem strange to the modern beholder who has been educated to regard these positions as representing motion.

Group II.—Like every other work of man, a painting is to be considered as an evidence of the aptness of the methods used to produce a desired effect and of the deftness of its maker in employing his methods. Though these qualities are quite distinct, they are complementary and often are almost indivisible, as, for example, in a painter who has adopted and uses only an original style.

It is because painting is a handicraft that many find their chief pleasure, while examining a picture, in admiring the painter's methods or the excellence of his technique in applying them. Methods and technique are admired according to the success with which they attain a desired result. Which then should be more admired, the draughtsmanship and colour-mixing achieving a cold, impotent representation of a lightning flash or the mechanical ability harnessing the same energy to daily tasks? The artist strove to picture the lightning, the mechanic to use the force which rends trees. There is no

hesitation in deciding which of these was the more successful and therefore more worthy of admiration.

By way of digression let us consider the curious lengths to which the admiration of technique leads enthusiasts. Some rave over the skill which has so far surmounted self-imposed difficulties as to produce passable pictures with one pigment—and that Indian Red—or with palette knife and fingers alone, or—imitating colour photography—by countless dots from colour tubes. The taste approving these and other eccentricities, for their technique alone, is no more than the love of the rare and curious which prompts the schoolboy's collection of postage stamps and the black-bird's store of glittering objects.

Group III.—The direction of the composition of a picture and the appreciation of what constitutes balance in form and colour depend altogether upon the custom of the people to which artist and critic belong. Just as we are taught to accept certain conventional signs as representing realities, so are we Western people taught to recognize certain types of arrangement as praiseworthy. Thus, the incidents of the ordinary landscape, of one of Constable's for example, are usually more or less equally distributed on either side of the central line of the canvas as though they had mass and it were necessary to distribute their weight lest the picture overbalance and fall. Quite otherwise is the asymmetry of those shadowless and "artistically excellent" Japanese paintings which once seemed so strange to unaccustomed European eyes.

Some painters, avid of colour and unsatisfied with the brightest tints and rarest combinations that Nature can give, have plunged themselves in wild orgies of painting, where colours are used and combined for their own sake and with little regard for the natural hues of the objects pictured. Pleasing though such a collection of warm tints may be to one educated to admire it, it is none the less irrational, inaccurate, and therefore reprehensible. In some of their work, colourists, like Böcklin and Turner, in no way

transcend a negress who loves brightness and wears a glaring green and blue *doti*. Nevertheless each picture, as a whole, certainly has qualities of balance in form and colour which are capable in themselves of pleasing. These qualities cannot be easily defined and limited since they depend, almost wholly, upon what the beholder has learned to recognize as good in a picture's composition. Their excellence may be measured by the degree of pleasure produced by the picture in one accustomed to the school to which it belongs. It is not possible that the pleasure of an artist or of a critic in examining the balance of a painting which he merely *conceives* to be well constructed, can be so great as that of an iron-master in contemplating the design of a reciprocating engine which he knows, and can *prove*, to be perfectly balanced. As we have indicated already this argument holds equally well in the examination of work produced by the subject or by another.

Group IV.—The choice of the subject of a picture is important and, according as it tends to increase or decrease the happiness of those seeing it, may be a cause of commendation or condemnation. By means of its subject a picture may increase man's well-being through the simple pleasure of recalling pleasant things, by inciting to noble deeds through the memory of past ones, by advising wise modes of action through a warning representation of the results of mistaken morals, and so on. The end may be attained in many ways; the fact remains that an important quality of a picture is its power to influence men's happiness. It is scarcely necessary to insist that Kelvin, Watts, and Arkwright have done more to benefit man by their labour-saving machines than have Hunt, Verestchagin, and Hogarth by influencing his customs through their painted parables, sermons, and satires.

Group V.—A last quality, inextricably bound with those which precede and dependent upon them for its existence, is that "artistic excellence" of a picture, which may be defined as the extent of the success of a conscious desire

on the part of the artist to compel the approval of his public. This is essentially a measure of the artist's sensed or reasoned capacity to gauge the mode of thought of his public in appraising a production which has no practical application and hence has no power to create approval through appreciation of its results.

Man's approval of an object may always be measured by the trouble he is prepared to undergo in order to possess it. Consequently, an accurate equivalent in money can be found for any amount of human effort. Were it possible to remove extraneous influences, the prices which men are prepared to pay for paintings might therefore be properly taken as an indication of the extent of their approval of them. More has been spent in attempting to build a machine intended to move perpetually than has even been paid for any one painting. Even in the production of devices for parting men from their money artist is inferior to artisan!

Conclusion.—It has been proven that in its power of suggestion, in its achievement of purpose, and in its power of pleasing and benefiting men, a painting is inferior to a machine. It is therefore concluded that a good mechanical artifice is worthy of more admiration than is an equally perfect production of graphic art. Q.E.D.

THOMAS L. JARROT

THE SCIENTIFIC CRITERION OF TRUTH AND ITS RELATION TO DOGMA

“ Was furchtbar ist allein ist wahr.”

IN these latter days all things are questioned. Philosophers having doubted all things in heaven and on earth are now repeating Pilate's question. In the pages of that repository of contemporary English philosophy “ Mind,” one can read articles by Mr. Bradley defining truth as the last proposition which presents itself to our consciousness. That, he maintains, is truth—absolute for us, until it is displaced by the next one. On the other side, Mr. Schiller appears to regard truth as what it pleases us in our mere good pleasure to pretend that it is. My late colleague, Professor Taylor, maintained that truth was a proposition the opposite of which was inconceivable and which commanded assent from all minds.

Under these circumstances it appears to me that it is perhaps possible to approach the question from another point of view, and instead of trying to think out what truth is “ in abstract ” to study what it means to those men who in the last hundred years have added most largely to our stock of truths; I mean the students of natural science.

All students of philosophy, nay, even students who, in order to qualify for a pass degree, have to “ get up ” formal logic, are familiar with the difference between the deductive and the inductive method, and are taught that the latter is the one made use of by Natural Science. In the first method, taking for granted that we know certain rules or principles to which things in general must conform, we proceed to infer what their nature must be; whilst by the latter, disclaiming all previous knowledge, we approach Nature in the same spirit as we are bidden to approach the Kingdom of Heaven,

that is, as little children, and patiently strive by observation and experiment to find out what she is. As described by Bacon the method of induction is to collect a great number of facts and then to arrive at a rule or principle which unites them; but of the certainty of this principle we can never be quite sure, for any moment a new fact may turn up which will upset it. Nevertheless as more and more facts are harmoniously explained by it our degree of confidence continually increases, and this is the measure of truth reached by inductive logic.

Such is the inductive method as described in text-books of logic; but such it is not in the real practice of scientific research. Let us give one or two examples of how the method is actually employed. Metchnikoff, head of the Pasteur Institute of Preventive Medicine, in Paris, commenced his scientific career as a zoologist. When he was engaged in studying under the microscope the transparent crustacean *Daphnia pulex* he observed a specimen infected with the spores of a fungus. He could see these spores being attacked by the transparent amœba-like cells of the blood and engulfed and digested by them. Suddenly the thought flashed through his mind that the similar cells in the blood of higher animals and of man himself were engaged in similar duties, that they were in fact the police of the organism. Years of research not only on the part of Metchnikoff but of hundreds of others have amply confirmed this daring surmise: it has now become one of the basal principles of the science of disease.

We may take another example from the domain of astronomy. When in the 17th century the study of astronomy was being ardently pursued, a curious phenomenon was noticed in the case of the fixed stars. Each seemed to revolve in a circle of small diameter about a central point and the revolution occupied a year. When musing on the cause of this the astronomer Bradley was one day in a sail-boat on the Thames. He observed that the pennant flying from the mast-head was not pointing in the same direction as the weather-vane on a neighbouring church tower. A moment's

reflection convinced him that the cause of this was that the motion of the pennant was compounded of the motion of the boat in which it shared with the motion of the wind so as to give a resultant motion making in its direction an angle with that of the wind. Suddenly it occurred to him that a similar composition of motions accounted for the phenomenon that had been puzzling him. The motion of light was compounded with the motion of the earth in its orbit. And hence the star was to our eyes displaced from its real position, which was in the centre of the circle it apparently described. Measurement proved that Bradley was correct, but Tyndall who tells the story remarks: Any man might have guessed the reason of the deflection of the pennant; but it required a genius to see that the same principle could be used to account for the aberration of light from the stars.

If we analyse these two instances we see that the scientific idea of truth is a principle which brings order and harmony into phenomena; and, secondly, that this principle is not arrived at by any mechanical stringing together of facts, but by a flash of insight which may be compared to inspiration, and that the laborious part of scientific work consists in showing that the principle thus grasped does indeed harmonize all the facts to which it can be applied. For it cannot be too strongly stated that scientific truth does not consist of empirical facts. Undigested facts are not instructive, they are only tedious. Science begins when the hidden laws connecting them begin to be guessed at and made more and more certain. But the scientific idea that the Universe contains only these fixed principles must be regarded as a kind of faith. For no scientific man pretends that he knows all the laws required to harmonize all the facts. It is arguable that our certainty that the sun will rise to-morrow is only a probable expectation based on past experience and that the order of things might change in the night. It is arguable that, as we can observe only a little corner of the Universe, it is rash to conclude that the laws we discover in that corner must prevail everywhere. That is so; but the deeper we probe with scien-

tific investigation the wider we discover to be the range of applicability of these laws, and the more the certainty rises in our mind that the whole Universe is governed by such laws. We have the right and the duty in seeking for explanations of new phenomena to apply those laws first which have verified themselves in other domains of knowledge, and see if they suffice for the case in hand before going further afield to look for other causes of the phenomena.

In the instances which I have just cited the law which was applied to explain new phenomena was one which had been verified in a particular case. But there are other cases where, to explain phenomena, a new law has to be postulated, which from the nature of the case, it is impossible to ever experimentally verify and yet about which, on account of the harmony it brings into the phenomena, we come to be as certain as we are about the law that bodies fall to the earth with a velocity which is proportional to the square of the time during which they have fallen. I shall mention two of these cases. The chemist Van t'Hoff was striving to account for the behaviour of certain sugars towards transmitted light. These substances occur in pairs, the members of which are identical in their composition as determined by analyses and in their behaviour to chemical reagents, but they differ in this, that, when a beam of light which has been previously polarized is passed through a solution of one, the plane of polarization of the light is deflected in a certain direction; and when a beam of similar light is passed through a solution of the other the plane of polarization is deflected in the opposite direction by a precisely similar amount. Van t'Hoff found that the atoms composing the molecule of each substance could be arranged in such a way that in each case there was a central atom of carbon with four atomic groups attached to it. These atomic groups could be arranged in two ways and in two ways only. If one assumed that they were attached to the central atom at equal distances from it and from each other they then occupied the angles of a regular tetrahedron and these two possible arrangements corresponded to each other

as an object does to its image in a plane mirror. Here thought Van t'Hoff is the explanation of the opposite ways in which the plane of polarization is deflected, and all substances in which the atoms show a similar arrangement should be found to exhibit two modifications similar to those exhibited by the sugars. A great deal of scepticism was manifested by chemists towards Van t'Hoff's daring hypothesis. What right, it was asked, had we to assume that the atoms within the molecule exercised any such influence on light? No one could explain how they could do it; but experience showed that wherever Van t'Hoff predicted them the two parallel modifications of a substance could be found, and hence the certainty has arisen in the minds of chemists that Van t'Hoff's account of the matter is right.

In the realm of biology we have what Haeckel has called the fundamental biogenetic law which runs as follows: "The embryo in its development into the adult form recapitulates the past history of the evolution of the race to which it belongs." No formulation of science has been the target for more adverse criticism than this, for all admit that this recapitulatory tendency is by no means the only one which has played a part in moulding the form and development of the embryo; and then, as the history of the race is a matter of speculation, how can one be sure that in any case the history of the embryo resembles it? Nevertheless the logic of facts is too strong for the objections of formal logic, and there is not a single biologist who is thoroughly acquainted with embryology, who is not convinced of the essential truth of the biogenetic law.

Let me give an instance of the kind of fact which at once confirms the validity of this law in the mind of a naturalist. The members of the class of bivalve mollusca—familiarily known to the non-biological person as "clams" or "mussels" are in the overwhelming majority of cases provided with an organ known as the "foot." This is a wedge-shaped muscular projection of the under surface of the body, which can be expanded and driven forwards by means of an increasing

flow of blood into it, so that it penetrates like a plough-share into the mud in which the animal lives, and becomes fixed in it. Then by a contraction of the muscles attaching the foot to the body, this latter is drawn after it, and so the animal slowly ploughs its way along. The oyster differs from its brother clams in being incapable of movement and passing its adult life lying on one side, nevertheless the young oyster when it finishes its free-swimming life and first settles down is provided with an unmistakable foot which can be freely protruded from the valves of the shell. How can this fact be accounted for unless on the supposition that the ancestors of the oysters once had a foot and lost it? To take another instance. If we open, under warm water, a hen's egg which has been incubated for three days we can see the embryo chicken lying on the surface of the yolk but it is extremely unlike a bird. The shape of its mouth resembles that of a shark, as does that of its nasal sacs which are connected by open gutters with the corners of the mouth. Its tiny heart shows an astounding likeness to that of a fish, and, finally, we can see in the sides of its throat four open slits, on each side, just as we find in the throat of a shark, the gill-slits. The biologist says that the reason of these phenomena is to be found in the fact that the bird is descended through a countless series of generations from a fish-like ancestor. What alternative explanation have the critics of the biogenetic law to give?

The subjects, however, with which natural science deals are of small importance compared with those dealt with by religion. We can be taught by science how to avoid disease, how to provide ourselves with abundant food, and how to postpone old age and death; but in the last resort, in the words of the Psalmist, "not one of us can defend his soul from death," and the pleasures of this life are at best exceedingly brief. If the subjects dealt with by religious dogma, *viz.*, our relation to the Great Power manifested in the very laws which science expounds, and our fate, when life is done, can be known about at all, they enormously transcend in importance the structure of molecules, the causes of radio-activity, or even the

laws of heredity. The question therefore of how religious dogma can be verified—or if it can be verified at all—is perhaps the most important one ever posited by the human intellect.

Now, as I pointed out in an article on the "Evolution of Religion" in a previous issue of this MAGAZINE, religions are of two kinds. There exist everywhere on the world primitive tribal cults which, when analysed, are discovered to be founded on either a clinging adoration to the memory of a dead chief or leader whose spirit is believed to be still a protector of the tribe, or else on a primitive kind of natural science—*i.e.*, an early and crude attempt to unravel the forces operating in Nature. To this last category belongs the Venus and Adonis myth which in varying guise we find amongst almost all primitive agricultural peoples. This type of religion has no influence on educated people of the present day except as presenting an interesting subject for antiquarian research. The second type of religion includes those which have been founded by great men and which have laid claim to universal acceptance such as the Buddhistic, the Mohammedan, and the Christian. These religions can in turn be analysed into two parts. They consist in the first place of teachings about God and Man, or Man and the Universe, emanating from the founder, and are supposed to be inspired—*i.e.*, suggested to him by the Divine Power Itself; and, secondly, of historic statements about the doings of the founder and his immediate followers.

Now, I venture to suggest that just as the truth or untruth of biological theories is to be tested by the harmonious explanation they give us of biological phenomena, so the truth or untruth of the religious teaching enshrined in the great personal religions can be tested by the way in which they assist us in leading a moral life. In a word our desire for intellectual harmony which convinces us of the truth of Van t'Hoff's theory of the asymmetric carbon atom, although no one has ever seen or can see an atom, is to be compared to the satisfaction of our highest moral ideals by the teaching of Christianity; and it is this satisfaction, and this alone, which

can really convince of the truth of it. This has been the contention of the ablest apologists for Christianity from the beginning, and on the whole this contention has been amply justified. There was too much inclination amongst eighteenth century philosophers to identify the soul of man with the pure intellect, though perhaps this inclination is sometimes erroneously assumed, owing to a looser use by some of these philosophers of the word "know." This error has been frankly abandoned, and there seems to be no *a priori* reason whatever why we should regard intellectual harmony as a sign of truth and refuse to regard moral harmony as an equal sign. Perhaps, however, this must be said, that moral truths stated in the abstract are dry and unconvincing; but acted on carry with them their own attestation. For this reason Christianity cannot be logically demonstrated; if believed in at all it must bring its own conviction by the results it produces in the person who endeavours to follow in its teaching

There is nothing novel in the position I have just sketched. I thought I had made it plain in the article on the "Evolution of Religion" published in this MAGAZINE; but a courteous and even flattering rejoinder on the part of Professor Kirkpatrick of Knox College under the title, "The Place of Christ in Christianity," makes me feel that my meaning is in need of further elucidation.

It is a great pity that the apologists of Christianity seem to think it necessary to claim for the legends about the doings of the Founder the same degree of importance as they do for his teachings. The teachings can be verified by every man for himself in his own experience but the historical character of the legends must be settled by the application of the vigorous canons of scientific historical criticism. Of course I do not mean for a moment to imply that the doings of Christ are of no importance to his teaching, because unless the Founder acts as well as teaches his creed, he is really in no sense a teacher at all. But the accounts of Christ's life have come down to us embellished with a series of supernatural marvels, and Professor Kirkpatrick seems inclined to deny the title of

Christian to all who have doubts as to the historicity of these stories.

He begins by attacking my right to have an opinion on the subject at all. How can a mere biologist, he asks, who has read only one or two books on the subject presume to express a judgement on such a question. I was not aware that Professor Kirkpatrick was acquainted with the extent of my reading on a subject which has been near to my heart for the last ten or twelve years; but let that pass. A mere biologist is commanded by theologians of Professor Kirkpatrick's school to believe in certain alleged historic facts on peril of his eternal salvation. He respectfully claims the right to examine those facts for himself, and it cannot be denied that they are now-a-days just as accessible to him as they are to Professor Kirkpatrick. On the mere question of language he willingly submits to the judgement of experts, though I personally have not found that the comprehension of New Testament Greek makes any extravagant demands on the resources accumulated by an early classical education. Most of the arguments do turn on questions of Greek; they are just as valid if they are based on the words of the English authorized version, and on such arguments a biologist refuses to surrender his judgement even to Professor Kirkpatrick. Passing now to the specific points of disagreement between Professor Kirkpatrick and myself, I am told that there is no trace either in the life of Christ or of his immediate followers of a Christianity in which the person of Christ himself was not the supremely important thing. Now all historians are agreed that Christ did teach with authority and regarded himself as the inspired teacher sent by God whom it was the duty of all to hear and obey; but he expected those to whom he addressed himself to recognize this and to obey because of the self-evidencing character of the truth he taught. This is exactly what I tried to say, when I spoke of "Eternal truth shining through Christ." But that Christ regarded himself in the Pauline sense as the supreme sacrifice for the sin of the whole world there is no evidence,

nor that he regarded belief in this propitiatory sacrifice as a condition of discipleship.

That the Pauline view eventually triumphed we know, but what has been called the Judaistic type of Christianity opposed him throughout all his life; and that those of this type shared his view of the Person of Christ is altogether incredible. How could "the many thousands of brethren who believe and are all zealous of the law," whom Paul met when he visited Jerusalem, have believed that Christ was the one supreme sacrifice, who made all other sacrifices unnecessary?

The next point which Professor Kirkpatrick raises against me is the statement which I made that the narrators of Christ's miracles were ignorant and credulous men. Professor Kirkpatrick says that this is not only rash but in view of what has been written about Luke slightly ridiculous. I presume that Professor Kirkpatrick refers to Sir William Ramsay's demonstration that Luke was well acquainted with the social and political arrangements in Asia Minor during the first century of the Christian era. Now with all respect to both Professor Kirkpatrick and Sir William Ramsay I emphatically reiterate my statement. Professor Kirkpatrick, I am glad to see, accepts the view that our Synoptic Gospels are based mainly on the Gospel of Mark and the "Logia of Matthew." The last document may be left out of account as the only miracles to which it testifies are the descent of the Spirit at the baptism of Jesus, which can be certainly regarded as a vision of the Founder himself, and the exorcism of a "devil," which does not necessarily belong to the category of the miraculous at all, and the healing of the Centurion's servant. On the subject of the critical faculty of Mark, Harnack writes as follows: "St. Mark wherein page by page the student is reduced to despair by the inconsistencies, the discrepancies, and the incredibilities of the narrative." About Luke whom Harnack regards in accordance with orthodox tradition as the genuine companion of St. Paul he writes: "He certainly believes himself to be an historian, and so he is, but his powers are limited, for he adopts an

attitude towards his authorities which is distinctly as uncritical as that which he adopts towards his own experiences if these admit of a miraculous interpretation." Luke's account of what happened at Pentecost—when according to him the descent of the Spirit was accompanied by a magical facility in foreign languages—is surely the embroidery of a Greek on the real ecstatic utterances, the speaking with tongues, described by St. Paul in his letter to the Corinthians.

But I most emphatically protest against the assumption that, because a man was well acquainted with the machinery of the Roman Empire in A. D. 70, he is therefore to be trusted when he relates marvelous tales. Shortly after the time that Luke is supposed to have written his work there existed in Asia Minor a wonderful magician called Alexander of Abonotichus, who professed to do miracles and perform marvelous cures. He claimed to be the incarnation of Pythagoras. He was detected and exposed by the philosopher Lucian who, however, nearly lost his life in consequence and utterly failed to destroy the infatuation of Alexander's followers. Amongst these followers we find Rutilian, an Imperial Senator and friend of the Emperor, no doubt far better acquainted with the internal polity of the Empire than even Sir William Ramsay could ever prove Luke to have been, and yet he was thoroughly duped. The whole of ancient society, common people and philosophers alike, were deeply imbued with a belief in the reality of magic and the power of spirits and demons to intervene in the affairs of this world. The sole exceptions to this rule were a few enlightened philosophers of the Epicurean sect, who were the true fore-runners of the new men of science of to-day, so far as their outlook on Nature was concerned.

The Christians it is true opposed Alexander of Abonotichus not on the ground that he was a charlatan, for they believed in his miracles, but on the ground of his low ethical character. On this account they regarded the spirit that inspired and sustained him as Satan.

In view of these facts it is a bold statement, which I think Professor Kirkpatrick will on reconsideration withdraw, that

“it is slightly ridiculous to regard the writers of the Gospel narratives as ignorant and credulous men,” for that is what, judged by our standards, Mark and Luke undoubtedly were.

But all the other questions connected with the historicity of the accounts of the life of Christ pale into insignificance before the question of the nature of the Resurrection. On this profoundly important subject I adopted the hypothesis of Professor Lake, which in its main outlines is supported by such authorities as Pfeiderer and Wernle. Against these names Professor Kirkpatrick has cited the names of the English scholars, Sanday and Denny. Of these scholars I should like to say a word as to how each of them impresses an enquirer accustomed to scientific reasoning in other fields of research. When such a man reads Professor Lake's book or the works of German scholars such as Harnack, Pfeiderer, or Wernle he feels that he is in a familiar atmosphere, where the facts are clearly presented and dispassionately discussed. He does not always feel that the conclusions are well founded; but no conclusion is put forward dogmatically. For every one reasons are adduced, and an appeal is made to the reader's judgement. Pfeiderer distinctly disclaims religious polemic; he says that the best way to combat a wrong view is to put a right view alongside it.

But when one opens the works of Sanday and Denny one feels one's self in a totally different atmosphere. The author occupies in his own opinion the superior position of a pious person, supernaturally assured of the truth of his own opinions, wrestling with a naughty world and pityingly patronizing blind outsiders. With such an attitude no scientific man can have any sympathy. In Sanday's book, “Twenty Years of Research on the Life of Christ,” he speaks as follows: “The German scholars have really done excellent work and one feels again and again that they are on the point of reaching satisfactory conclusions when they are balked by their ‘Wirklichkeitssinn,’ which seems to me to be merely a begging of the question.” Again: “For some time at least we should cease to ask ourselves the question, Is the account of an

occurrence in Gospel history true? but should ask, what God meant by it first for the generation then living and then for me." I have no hesitation in describing this as priest-craft. As Professor Burkitt of Cambridge has said, the facts happened only in one way, and this way it is our duty to find out, however edifying in Sanday's view the traditional view of the matter may be. It is this determination to get back to reality, which the Germans designate "Wirklichkeitssinn." However many mistakes they may make in their efforts to reach it, the aim is the right one, for ultimately there is no refuge but in the truth.

Turning to Denny one finds to one's amazement, when one brushes aside the mass of pious reflections with which his work is encrusted, that his point of view is substantially identical with that of Professor Lake, and one feels tempted to ask whether Professor Kirkpatrick has read with sufficient care the work he cites. Denny, it is true, says that if one does not believe in a bodily resurrection one should not speak of a resurrection at all. But what Denny means by this is that attempts to evaporate the appearance of the Risen Lord into hallucinations caused by the expectations of the disciples whose hopes declined to be disappointed, or into a spiritual rising of Christ in their memories are really disingenuous and are merely trifling with the question. It is quite clear that something startling and tremendous happened as a consequence of which the utter dejection of the disciples was transformed into triumphant faith; and that the account they gave of the matter was that they had seen the Master alive again. This is fully recognized by such a scientific critic as Pfeleiderer. But the question is still left unsolved as to what the phenomena were which caused this belief. Were the appearances of the Risen Lord visions of much greater distinctness and brilliancy than the telepathic visions of dying people now fairly substantiated, but of the same nature; or did our Lord's body, that mass of disintegrating carbon, nitrogen, hydrogen, and oxygen, defy all the eternal laws of the Universe in order to convince his followers that his soul still

lived. Now Denny distinctly denies that our Lord came back to this world of time and change, and indicates his belief that the story of Christ's eating fish after his death is a myth, but he quibbles over the definition of the word body; indeed his whole idea seems to me nothing but another way of stating Lake's view. On this subject the only quarrel I have with Denny is a want of clearness and directness.

Before leaving the subject of authorities I should like to say a word on the subject of Professor Kirkpatrick's view of Schmiedel. Schmiedel, he says, seems to have made up his mind beforehand what he will believe, and therefore his decision is of no authority. Now when a scientific man like Schmiedel is confronted with a mass of ancient tradition, his first efforts to give an explanation of it must consist in applying to it the ordinary categories of common sense. There may remain a large unexplained residuum; but the only way to get at that residuum is to explain by natural means as much as possible, just as a person of open mind, desiring to see whether there is any truth in ghost stories, must first explain away all that can be explained on the ground of mistake or fraud before he can sort out those which really seem to require another explanation. It may be—it probably is—true that Schmiedel tries to explain too much and to reconstruct history in a fanciful way, but if this is so other critics will be only too delighted to point it out, yet the principle of his method is right. As Darwin said, "A false theory supported by facts does no harm because everyone takes a commendable interest in showing that it is false."

Having reviewed Professor Kirkpatrick's objections, I am still prepared to maintain that essential Christianity for Christ and many of his first disciples meant the belief that the Eternal Spirit shone through him; or, to use the archaic phrase, that he was sent to declare the will of God and was God's representative whose duty it was to establish the ideal Kingdom. That to Paul and others it meant that he was the final fulfilment of the ritual law and had abolished it is of course also clear, and Paulinism is the stock of tradition which gave rise to mediæval Christianity.

But, as Professor Kirkpatrick says, the question is really not what men of the first century believed, but what men of the twentieth century can believe; and his criticism on the religion that I would "retain" is that, whilst it may sustain a few exalted minds in the hours of health, it is not suited for the masses and that it will fail in the hours of sickness and death. Now in answer to this I should like to say that, if there is anything that for an absolute certainty will give way in the hours of stress and storm, it is a belief which we have no right to, which we have inherited from tradition, and about which in the secret recesses of our minds we have doubts. But doubt about the fundamental features of what may be termed evangelical theology is becoming more and more widespread. Even when the doctrines are not directly attacked, the calm acceptance of quite different principles in all matters of mundane interest tends to spread an air of unreality over the teaching in the pulpit, to make the beliefs there assumed and inculcated appear as "those things which are not really believed."

If, however, a man truly believes that Jesus Christ was the revelation of God; that what he taught of God was true; that God's Spirit spoke through his words and deeds; that he was not conquered by death, but still lives,—what higher, what better, and what more ennobling belief could a man possess?

After all between Professor Kirkpatrick and myself there is no essential difference in aim. Both of us wish our fellow-citizens to become good men and women, and both of us think that that end will be best attained by their retaining a belief that the Ruler of the Universe—in whom all must perforce believe—was indeed the God and Father of Jesus Christ, and that man's life does not terminate with the grave. Professor Kirkpatrick appears to think that this end can only be attained by adhering to orthodox tradition. I, on the contrary, am convinced that the spread of education is more and more undermining the belief in orthodox tradition, and so rendering it unfit to perform its purpose. That this is

especially the case with the rising generation, and that if we are to preserve for the coming members of our race the benefits of Christianity, a re-statement of the essential kernel of the truth and a casting off of the temporary husk is a pressing necessity.

Above all things it is necessary to show that at bottom religious truth has nothing to do with magic or miracle but is the same kind of thing as scientific truth and fits rightly into the same Universe. To quote the words of one of England's greatest poets:

I spoke as I saw.
I report as a man may of God's work.
All's love; yet all's law.

E. W. MACBRIDE

THE FORGE

The crippled god lay dead where he had wrought
His many works beside the forge. He lay,
His brown breast bared; and all the muscles' play
Of those two branch-like arms was still, and nought
Of that great strength, of all the grieving thought
Had death sapped from his face. Not Jove this clay
Could cleanse from such a harsh-hued pain. Always
The god had toiled and failed in what he sought,—
To form one perfect weapon. Years ago
Came to that lone, unhallowed grove a band
Of men, and from the fallen Vulcan's hand
They took the tools and with them toiled. And, lo!
They fashioned them a cross and bore it thence—
The dead god's face was touched with calm intense.

MARY L. BRADLEY