


The Heart of The Empire

Discussions of modern city life in England



EDITED BY C.F.G.MASTERMAN

The
Heart of the Empire

DISCUSSIONS OF PROBLEMS
OF MODERN CITY LIFE IN
ENGLAND. WITH AN ESSAY
ON IMPERIALISM ❁ ❁

LONDON
T. FISHER UNWIN
PATERNOSTER SQUARE

1901

0966737-190

PREFACE

THE Victorian Era has definitely closed. For many years it was manifest that the forces characteristic of that period had become expended, and that new problems were arising with a new age. But during the latter years of the nineteenth century men were content to confront the evils of national life with the old remedies. There had indeed been some modification in the general tendency of opinion, but this had by no means kept pace with the altered conditions of the world. The rapidity of social and economic change will perhaps be more easily realised now that the death of the Queen and of the century have reminded us all that nature and time spare nothing, however customary, honoured, and secure. The present can never take refuge behind the past.

Foremost among the changes which have taken place has been the stupendous growth of cities. Vast herds of human beings are penned into small areas from which nature is excluded, and there live, breed, and die. The aspect of life has by that fact been altered; no longer brought into direct contact with the forces of nature, man has carved out for himself new and artificial conditions. The cities which we have to-day are different, not merely in degree but in character, from the large towns of former years; the City population is cut off from the country, in a manner previously unknown. It has developed sympathies and passions of its own, differing in essential characteristics from those of a bygone age.

Parallel with this city growth there has been an enormous increase of wealth. On every side production has advanced in a manner which would have filled our forefathers with astonishment. The fortunes which have accumulated in the hands of private persons have given them unprecedented powers over the lives of men and women. For the first time we are fully conscious how astonishing are the contrasts between the lives of the rich and of the poor, of their complete separation not only in sympathy and feeling, but in actual geographical aggregation. In old days all classes lived together in small towns and villages, the employee boarding sometimes with, always near, his master. To-day we have East and West Ends, business quarters, manufacturing quarters, residential quarters, endless vistas of villadom, acres of Lambeth and Whitechapel.

At the one end of the scale the lives of a large proportion of the rich are far from satisfactory. Separated from many of the realities of life, they are unable to find natural ways of expending their money, and, in consequence, are driven to indulge in sumptuous living or in vulgar display. Thousands of pounds representing the toil of years in the cultivation of choice flowers or rare wines are dissipated for the gratification of a few guests at an evening party. Nor do the owners of this wealth really profit by their indulgence. Tyrannised over by their own conventions, slaves to their servants, frequently devoid of any real appreciation of the beautiful, their lives are spent without knowledge of the highest forms of happiness, with disastrous loss of energy and opportunity—a loss that falls on all.

At the other end of the scale are the very poor—the broken classes—who suffer most from bad homes, bad education, intemperance, and want of any ideal either ethical or religious. It is here that the social reformer is apt to despair of any effective progress.

The town life is manifesting its influence not only upon these two extreme types, but also upon the great bulk of its inhabitants—the labourers, the artisans, the clerks—the “average” men of the coming century. A higher standard of comfort is counterbalanced by conditions of life more

and more artificial ; shortened hours of labour are compensated by a widening distance between home and place of work, and a continual increase in the time cut out of the margin of life in the transit. Improved facilities of education and the stimulating effect of the city are more than outweighed by the increasing monotony of occupation, the separation of classes, and the dulness and dreariness of the districts in which these populations are segregated. The whole result has been the upgrowth of a problem scarcely less urgent than that of the very rich and the very poor.

It must also be remembered that these new characteristics are only just beginning to show themselves. They will be far more developed, for good or for evil, after the lapse of a few generations.

Thus on every side the strange and artificial growth of our cities confronts us. In every class we cannot but observe the evil effects of the enforced severance from natural conditions of life.

In presence of these problems which involve the future value of human life in England, one dark sign is the paralysis of the legislative machine and the sterility of the progressive party.

In municipal government, indeed, a party has arisen stimulated by a consistent ideal and determined to realise a definite scheme of reform. The "London Programme" is already passing from the region of idea to the region of fact : point by point its provisions are being translated into practical realities : the continuous success of its upholders terminating in their latest victory at the polls, produces an object lesson in the necessity of appealing to the people with a clear and definite policy.

But in the wider sphere of national politics the party of progress has fallen upon evil days. The champions fight as those that beat the air. Programmes are adopted at one election and abandoned at the next. "Social reform" is extolled in pompous phraseology, but when examined is often found to disappear in a maze of verbiage. Many of both parties seem endeavouring to ascertain what

the country wants rather than what it needs. While the ruling party shows itself ever more blandly content to shelve real schemes of social improvement, men look in vain to the Opposition, either for appreciation of the gravity of the coming problems or for the importunate advocacy of any consistent measures of reform.

Meanwhile the problems themselves deepen in magnitude and gravity, and the opportunity for solving them in some peaceful and adequate manner becomes daily less favourable.

There are no doubt many who will regard such subjects as of only parochial interest, who will turn with a shrug of the shoulders to the wide questions of Imperial advance. They will assert that it is in the great Empire lying beyond the sea, and not within the narrow limits of the British Isles that the social problems are likely to find solution. To these we would point out the fact that four-fifths of the white subjects of the King are still living within the United Kingdom, and the great bulk of them are citizens of our towns. The policy demanded and approved by the great towns of England and Scotland will be the policy that, during this century at least, will rule the Empire. In order that this policy may be wise and just, it is essential that those who ultimately control it should be capable and intelligent citizens. "The bald-headed man who sits at the back of the 'bus" no longer governs the Empire from behind his solemn and voluminous penny paper. His political influence has devolved on to a different and less solid type of street politician, whose news and politics are supplied by the halfpenny press. It is impossible to say in what direction this change will eventually work as regards the conduct of Imperial politics. But at present the only essential differences between the modern elector and the "bald-headed man" appear to be greater ignorance and more shallow excitability.

Not only the policy but the material of Empire will come from England. The future colonisers and soldiers, to mention the traders, who hold the Empire together, henceforth be more and more the product of the city. It should also be remembered that increased inter-

communication and imperial concentration are carrying the ideas of London to the Colonies, at least as effectually as they bring colonial ideas to London.

Thus an adequate knowledge of the state of our city population is essential. In spite of the researches of Mr. Charles Booth, many people are still ignorant of the fundamental divisions of the working classes; they confound the artisan, the labourer and the casual in one appellation—"the poor."

It is mainly a common apprehension of the gravity of the problems confronting this new England that has united the authors of these essays in the production of this book. They trust to be able to clear themselves from the charge of dogmatism or of arrogance; however definite their assertions they desire frankly to confess their own conclusions and remedies as but tentative and suggestive. Most of them claim, however, to possess a first-hand knowledge of the new city race. Some of the authors have lived in settlements; some in block-dwellings; others have been brought by voluntary effort or the demands of business into direct contact with the districts abandoned to the labouring classes.

They recognise the ineffectiveness of purely academic consideration and of programmes formed in the study alone. And they venture to hope that this immediate practical knowledge may give them some excuse for addressing those who have never penetrated into the desolate regions east of Liverpool Street Station or south of Waterloo.

Over and above the specific suggestions presented in the following essays, the object of the writers is to aid in removing the causes of the indifference which constitutes the most formidable obstacle to social reform. Our foreign policy has now for some years occupied the time, expended the money, and absorbed the energies of the country; and we have to ask ourselves whether the continuance of a state of things admittedly detrimental to domestic progress is either necessary or intrinsically desirable. A discussion of Imperialism in theory and practice thus forms a natural pendant to a volume that

attempts to deal with the problems that face us at the Heart of the Empire.

In conclusion, they would state that in the production of a work dealing with so many subjects, entire agreement has not been attempted. Their unity is of spirit and aim. They all recognise the evils set forth in this preface, they all hope to see more active warfare against them. But individuality and freedom of treatment has been taken as the principle of the book, so that any statement made, or opinion advanced by any one of the writers, must be accredited to him alone.

ANALYSIS

I

REALITIES AT HOME

CHARLES F. G. MASTERMAN

	PAGE
Waning enthusiasm for Social Reform during past twenty years—due to Imperialism ; prosperity ; lack of leaders ; weariness of the poor	1
I. The New Problem that has arisen—The new City race	7
Its characteristics as manifested in London—The "Ghetto" of the manual labourers	10
II. The Specific evils demanding remedy	20
1. The very poor	21
2. Overcrowding	22
3. Drink	25
4. The results of life reared in vast aggregations	27
III. A background to Life—The great need of to-day Present attempts to supply it—The Settlements	32
The Churches :	
α. The Roman Catholic Church	39
β. The Free Churches	40
γ. The Established Church	42
IV. Conclusion :	
The waste of human possibilities	48
The solution of the problem	50

II

THE HOUSING PROBLEM

F. W. LAWRENCE

Introduction	53
Subdivision of the question	55
The Rural Problem	56
The Urban Problem :	
Lodging-houses for men	59
Lodging-houses for women	61
The housing of families	62
The accommodation obtained by different classes of society	62
A one-roomed tenement	67
Insanitary conditions	69
The Boundary Street Area	70
Towniness	71
Method of city growth	73
The growth of London	74

	PAGE
General Remedies :	
Is decentralisation possible?	76
The necessity of protecting the suburbs	79
A new authority required	81
The example of America	83
Taxation and compensation	85
The unearned increment	85
Taxation of unoccupied land	88
Manufacturing and commercial towns distinguished	89
The emigration of manufacturers	90
Improved transit	92
Land purchase	94
The residuum	95
Immediate Remedies :	
The action of municipalities	97
Re-housing the displaced	101
Distinction between providing accommodation and securing health	102
The various building societies	103
Model dwellings	104
The landlord's duties	105
Tenant ownership	106
Conclusion	107

III

THE CHILDREN OF THE TOWN

R. A. BRAY

The object of education—The child's three needs—Internal and external character	111
I. Natural conditions of town life	115
(1) Influence of the nature element	116
(2) Influence of the human element	118
General tendencies of a town environment	126
II. Artificial conditions of town life	128
(1) Voluntary agencies : (a) Relief ; (b) Recreation	128
(c) Country holidays ; (d) Religion	130
Religious teaching	134
(2) The schools—Causes of failure	138
(a) Reforms in external organisation	142
(b) Reforms in internal organisation	148
(c) Voluntary schools	152
General aims of a town school	159
Appendix of reforms needed	164

IV

TEMPERANCE REFORM

NOEL BUXTON AND WALTER HOARE

I. Need of inductive method and of new sources of information 165, 166	
II. Diagnosis of the disease	167-179
The symptoms—moral, economic, industrial and political 167-169	

	PAGE
The causes... ..	170
The public-house... ..	171
Classes who use it	172
Whether disorderly	173
The chief evil is waste	176
Possibilities of reform	177
III. Prescription	179-204
Free trade	179
Control—objections, &c.	180
Two alternatives—Prohibit or Regulate	182
(a) Prohibition	183
(b) Regulation	184
Two systems possible—(1) Licensing ; and (2) Public Management	
(1) Licensing	185
Present anomalies	186
Various proposals	187
Methods of checking excess :	
(a) Restricted number of licences	188
(b) Restricted houses	189
(c) Position of licences	192
(d) Alternatives to the public-house	193
(e) Exclusion of children	195
(f) Punishment of excess	197
(2) Public management	199
Results of English experience	200
The chief need	203
Necessary reforms	204
IV. Difficulties of legislating	204-210
Forces united on satisfactory programme	204
Only compensation in dispute	205
Right method of settling—Arbitration by experts	206
An ideal scheme	207
Comparison with existing proposals	208
Objections to it	208
Tactical considerations	209
Conclusion	210

V

THE DISTRIBUTION OF INDUSTRY

P. W. WILSON

Difficulties of Manufacturing in London	211
Case of printing	212-214
Feeding London from outside... ..	215
Clerical employments	216
Influence of advertising	217
Absorption of country banks	218
Machinery, the predominant factor	219
As opposed to freightage	220
Influence of "tubes" on rents... ..	221
Limitations of tramways	222
Mr. Balfour's scheme	223
Cheap Trains Act	224
Lord Rosebery's suggestion	225-227

	PAGE
London sweating	228
Adjusting local industries	228
Faults of our steam railways	229-233
Productive recreations	233
Educational facilities	233
Value of healthy employes	234

VI

SOME ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM OF CHARITY

A. C. PIGOU

Vastness of the problem of the 'very poor'	237
Purpose of 'Charity' in its relation to these	239
Different classes to be dealt with :	240
I. Chronic poverty	242
The able bodied—Labour Homes	243
The children	246
Old Age	247
II. Temporary misfortune—prevention methods	248
The cruelties of reckless charity	249
Temporary relief—its advantages and dangers	254
The organisation of charity	257
The State and private charity	260

VII

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE

F. W. HEAD

I. The Laity	262
The working-man	262
The children... ..	265
The young people	267
The Church and the laity	268
II. The lay view of the Church	270
1. Supply of the clergy	270
2. Professionalism	274
3. The Church Services	277
Estrangement of the Nation	282
III. The Church as it might be	283
1. Functions of Church	284
Witness to unity	284
Teacher of morality	285
Witness to unseen	286
2. Autonomy... ..	288
Membership	289
Doctrine	290
Efficiency of clergy	291
Reform of administration, in nation, diocese, parish	293
3. Church Income	297
IV. Reform of Church services	301
Conclusion	306

VIII

IMPERIALISM

G. P. GOOCH

	PAGE
I. Errors in the current conception of Imperialism.	
Greater Britain	308
Expansion and ethics	312
National and religious conceit	312
Ignorance	314
Want of imagination	315
Credulity	317
Glorification of war	319
Intolerance	322
The Native Question	327
II. Reasonable Imperialism.	
Ethics and politics	331
The claims of other nations	333
War and progress	337
Education	338
The Native Question	341
III. Colonies and Dependencies.	
Colonial Federation	342
India	346
The economic question	348
The political question	352
Egypt and the Sudan	356
Tropical Africa	357
Rhodesia	359
IV. The South African War.	
Till the Raid... ..	363
Till the Ultimatum	369
Farm-burning, annexation, and martial law... ..	377
The future... ..	379
The duty of the moment	381
V. Foreign Policy.	
The Far East	384
The Near East	387
Russia, France, Germany, and America	390
Ireland	392
Defence	393
Conclusion	394

IX

THE PAST AND FUTURE

G. M. TREVELYAN

The problem of human evolution stated by Arnold's allegory of the river	398
The three forces that mould human evolution :	
(a) Mutual relations of human beings	399
(b) External circumstances acting on the senses	399
(c) Direct education of the mind... ..	399
The three considered separately.	

	PAGE
(a) Stationary or progressive	399
(b) External circumstance of England in the twentieth century conducive to decadence, as compared to external circumstance in the past. No fault of the race, but a chance of economic law. It happens that ugliness and squalor are cheap to-day	399-401
This can only be remedied by artifice or conscious effort overriding strict economic law. This process has already begun. It is the only hope of the world ...	401-2
(c) English education of the mind was better in the past. Nature and economic law gave a narrow but wholesome education	403-4
To-day machinery and economic law have destroyed narrow education and substituted vulgarity	404-5
The new education of the mind (like the new beauty of external conditions) must be made artificially (effect of primary education without secondary)... ..	406-7
Evil has armed herself with the new weapons of machinery and organisation. It is time that Good should imitate her	407-8
The modern conservative party and the modern doctrine of <i>Laissez faire</i> , practically and theoretically contradict all these conclusions. Conservatives hold that the world will save itself without deliberate alteration of economic and physical conditions. But it has been shown that though this may have been true in the past, it will be false in the future. Evils of the strength of conservatism	408-11
Intellectual as well as political tendencies of the age are against action and reform at the very moment both are most needed, for reasons given above. Inactive tendency of modern culture deplored	411-12
Political and intellectual tendencies personified in the present Cabinet	413
Summary	413-14
The allegory again. The "good time coming," and how to make it come	415

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. REALITIES AT HOME	I
CHARLES F. G. MASTERMAN, M.A., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. <i>Albany Dwellings, Camberwell.</i>	
II. THE HOUSING PROBLEM	53
F. W. LAWRENCE, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. <i>Resident Mansfield House University Settlement.</i>	
III. THE CHILDREN OF THE TOWN	III
REGINALD A. BRAY, B.A. <i>Albany Dwellings, Camberwell.</i>	
IV. TEMPERANCE REFORM	165
NOEL BUXTON, M.A., and WALTER HOARE.	
V. THE DISTRIBUTION OF INDUSTRY	211
P. WHITWELL WILSON, B.A. <i>Editor "Railway Herald."</i>	
VI. SOME ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM OF CHARITY	236
A. C. PIGOU, B.A.	

	PAGE
VII. THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE	262
F. W. HEAD, M.A., Fellow Emmanuel College, Cambridge.	
<i>Late Resident Cambridge House University Settlement.</i>	
VIII. IMPERIALISM	308
G. P. GOOCH, M.A.	
<i>Author of "Annals of Politics and Culture," "English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century."</i>	
IX. THE PAST AND FUTURE	398
G. M. TREVELYAN, M.A., Fellow Trinity College, Cambridge.	
<i>Author of "England in the Age of Wycliffe," Lecturer "Working Men's College."</i>	

REALITIES AT HOME

LESS than twenty years ago, in those "eighties" that now seem so incredibly distant from us, public interest and private effort were directed towards the problems of poverty and the possibilities of social reform. The extension of the franchise in 1884 to those classes which really felt the presence of want was regarded as the herald of far-reaching changes in the elemental structure of society. Responsible statesmen of all political parties were engaged each in actively formulating his own scheme of social amelioration. Now it was the renovation of British agriculture by the endowment of every peasant with his "three acres and a cow." Now the removal of the terror of old age by a national scheme of pensions. Now a real attempt to grapple with the evils of the liquor traffic in great cities, or an endeavour to ensure the shifting of a larger share of the burden of taxation upon irresponsible and unproductive wealth. There was a "going" in the air and the noise of movement, filling with the happiest anticipations the minds of those really concerned with desperate social diseases. The work of the Liberal party in the State, maintained with unaltered persistence throughout half a century, had at length reached its consummation; a series of political changes in effect amounting to a revolution had shifted the ruling power from a limited oligarchy to a democracy upon the broadest basis: class privileges, limitations of theology and creed—all the old mediæval relics had been

peacefully abolished. With the machinery of legislation at length smoothly constructed and the government in the hands of the great masses of the population, careful observers, with satisfaction or foreboding, anticipated broad economic readjustments, designed to benefit the toiling multitudes of the common people.

At the same time beyond the actual political arena there was everywhere a stirring and an agitation. The great mass of the people, so long silent, seemed to be slowly breaking into articulate utterance. Trades Unionism was penetrating into the depths of hitherto unorganised, unskilled labour with apparently astonishing success. Leaders had arisen from amongst the workers themselves capable of voicing the prevailing grievances and determined not to let these evaporate in idle denunciation. Socialism and Anarchism in varying forms were making rapid progress amongst working men's clubs and the artisans of the big cities. Popular discontent, especially in London, appeared gathering to a focus; riots, strikes, and noisy demonstrations seemed to give foretaste of the coming struggle between Capital and Labour. While the defenders of the rights of property gazed towards the future with gloomy apprehension of the approaching economic revolution, those who had been inflamed with roseate visions of the coming years hailed these upheavals as the necessary accompaniment of the dissolution of the old order and the dawning of the Golden Age.

The future that almost all competent observers foretold was the active realisation of that "Class War" which haunts the minds of so many German Economists: a struggle ever growing more bitter between the holders of property on the one hand and the workers on the other. Many anticipated a course of development similar to that in the German Empire—the formation of a Workman's party in the legislature, in effect, if not in name, socialistic, capturing gradually all the seats in the great towns, and growing in strength and importance with every successive election.

While the upheaval was thus gathering strength amongst the *proletariat*, an equally important change appeared to be

manifest in the ranks of the *bourgeoisie*; and a number of the better minds of the country had been awakened to the necessity for united consideration and effort in grappling with the ever-widening problem of poverty. The work of the prophets of the mid-century—Carlyle and Ruskin, Maurice and Kingsley, all who had denounced the comfortable creed of indifference, was at length becoming manifest. A generation had arisen willing to listen to their message. Revelations, voices from the abyss, as "How the Poor Live" or "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London," or novels like those of Sir Walter Besant, had stirred with at least a transitory emotion the dwellers in the squares and terraces of West London. At the Universities the enthusiasm of the coming generations seemed to be calling into being a great movement designed to place the culture and intellect of Oxford and Cambridge at the service of the poor and ignorant. Royal Commissions were considering the Housing of the Working Classes, the Condition of Agriculture, the Improvement of Elementary Education. Within the Churches themselves men were found deliberately to associate themselves with the growing aspirations of Labour, and to identify the principles of Socialism with the teachings of Jesus Christ.

One who had gone to sleep in the midst of that stirring time and suddenly awakened at the commencement of the twentieth century, might be pardoned if on rubbing his eyes and gazing on the present ideals and conditions of society he maintained that he was still dreaming. For a wave of "Imperialism" has swept over the country, and all these efforts, hopes, and visions have vanished as if wiped out with a sponge. Relics indeed remain, survivals of a departed age, like the fossils that attest the previous existence of types that have vanished before a stronger life. Here an "Independent Labour Party" of pitiful dimensions testifies to the existence of that which was once regarded as a menace to society; there a Settlement drags on a starved and stunted life, witness of an enthusiasm that has almost passed away; in some obscure corner a Kyrle Society or a Children's Happy Evening

exhibits evidence of the once fashionable interest in the recreation of the poor. Programmes of social reform repose on the dusty shelves of the brains of great statesmen, and are occasionally noticed in Parliament or at election-time as subject for reproach or peroration. But it is the day of other and noisier enthusiasms—the lust of domination, the stir of battle, the pride in magnitude of Empire; delight in rule over alien nations, commercial aggrandisement, and dissatisfaction with anything short of predominance in the councils of the world.

The "Condition of the People" problem, once so insistent, ceases therefore to trouble the public mind. It appears local, parochial, a problem of gas, water, and drains; politicians feel ashamed to allude to it in public, fearful lest they should distract attention from the acquisition of vast territories on the confines of the world. If men think at all of social evil they cherish a pious confidence that increase of British trade and consequent influx of wealth will remove all discontent, and offer visions of the nation proudly resting from its labours, the centre of the world's commerce, basking in confidence on the wealth poured in upon it by the labour of the inferior races of mankind.

The wide indifference to social reform and the settling down of the strong currents of progress into a kind of stagnant marshland cannot be entirely ascribed to the change of observation from the sordid drama of life in great cities to the more romantic aspect of larger scenes "beyond the skyline." Many other causes have contributed to this result. The prophets of a former time have passed away pronouncing their life-work nought and their strength spent in vain. No others have arisen to take up their burden. The voice of the oracle is dumb. So a sort of cheery belief has arisen that all is well; that the great evils of the mid-century have been effectually remedied; that God's in His heaven and all's right with the world. At the same time the voice of the people themselves has become silent. Partly this is due to a tremendous, if transient, trade prosperity; the armies of the unemployed, whose existence seemed a standing

menace to society, have become rewoven into the social fabric. With all busy working for subsistence, none have leisure to cry out or to demonstrate in favour of change. Partly this is due to a real breakdown in the new party. Socialism has been largely abandoned. Shifted forward to the distant generations of the future, it has failed to provide stimulus for the active sacrifice of the present. The leaders who exhibited such brilliant promise have gone under or passed into obscurity. No one has arisen of magnetic personality to unite the scattered and discouraged forces of progress and push forward towards the attainment of "the day of better things."

And the enthusiasm of the Upper and Middle Classes has ebbed with the failure of the dull and unimaginative population to respond to their earlier efforts. "People," a careful observer has told us, "have become tired of the poor." Results seem so inadequate; the material is so stubborn and unpliant; it seems better after all to let things drift and trust piously in a Divine Providence working all things for good. Age after age has passed, scheme after scheme has been tried, and in essence the problem remains as far from solution as ever. There was the Age of Socialism, when middle-class enthusiasts abandoned their comfortable surroundings to preach to the workers by rainy corner and in dismal meeting the gospel of the New Era. And the result was but scorn and dull indifference and rejection of a creed only promising benefit to generations still unborn. There was the Age of Slumming, when, stimulated by the cloying pathos of the popular novelist, the wealthy and good of the West descended, halo-crowned, into hovel and cellar, to demonstrate by songs and smiles and sympathy the affection of the rich for the poor. There was the Age of Settlements, when the Universities essayed their hands and founded citadels in the dark quarters of the great cities, attempting by the diffusion of diluted knowledge and culture to beautify the lives of the toilers. There was the Age of Philanthropy, falsely so called, when Mansion House Funds and similar charities rained golden showers on an imperturbable and dissatisfied populace; when General

PROBLEMS AT HOME

But even a hundred thousand pounds to eliminate the evils of the slum is the responsibility of the wealthy, improving the opportunities now denied is the true solution of the social problem. It has been said that the poor have risen and flourished in the past century, but the problem still remains in all its complexity and magnitude as insoluble as ever. Still the population of the poorer classes tear themselves from the heavy shelters of the manual laborer in magnitude and density. Small improvements in the culture of all these sanguine schemes, if they are introduced turn away in disgust from the untractable, and refuse to disturb themselves with a problem apparently beyond human calculation.

It would be futile to deny that great changes, and in many respects great improvements, have taken place in large areas since men first awakened in the mid-century to the vital importance of the "Condition of the People" problem. Those observers who have concentrated their attention on the evils noted by former critics may indeed be pardoned if they but note the continuous triumph of light over darkness; if they hold that the forces still working are certain in the long run to produce a final victory. Utter lack of sanitation, great districts neglected by public bodies and private charity, a population hidden behind the trodden ways of men growing up in undisturbed heathendom and bestiality: these appear no longer possible. Public bodies, the London County Council and similar authorities in the great provincial cities, have been pushing their activities into the dark places of the earth; slum areas are broken up, sanitary regulations enforced, the policeman and the inspector at every corner. A series of factory acts, building acts, public health acts, have continually assailed the worst of these evils; and although an amount remains to be done which may well tax the energies of philanthropist and statesmen for many years to come, yet we may agree that the forces of progress are at last attacking these older social diseases, which eventually

must disappear before the machinery which is brought against them.

But while men have slept other forces have arisen and changes taken place even as yet unappreciated by the majority of the people. Throughout the century the population of England has exhibited a continuous drift into the great cities; and now, at the opening of a new era, it is necessary to recognise that we are face to face with a phenomenon unique in the world's history. Turbulent rioting over military successes, Hooliganism, and a certain temper of fickle excitability has revealed to observers during the past few months that a new race, hitherto unreckoned and of incalculable action, is entering the sphere of practical importance—the "City type" of the coming years; the "street-bred" people of the twentieth century; the "new generation knocking at our doors."

The England of the past has been an England of reserved, silent men, dispersed in small towns, villages, and country homes. The England of the future is an England packed tightly in such gigantic aggregations of population as the world has never before seen. The change has been largely concealed by the perpetual swarm of immigrants from the surrounding districts, which has permeated the whole of such a town as London with a healthy, energetic population reared amidst the fresh air and quieting influences of the life of the fields. But in the past twenty-five years a force has been operating in the raw material of which the city is composed. The texture itself has been transformed as by some subtle alchemy. The second generation of the immigrants has been reared in the courts and crowded ways of the great metropolis, with cramped physical accessories, hot, fretful life, and long hours of sedentary or unhealthy toil. The problem of the coming years is just the problem of this New Town type; upon their development and action depend the future progress of the Anglo-Saxon Race, and for the next half-century at least the policy of the British Empire in the world.

Remembering this, noting that a mandate from London may change the happiness and welfare of innumerable

multitudes to whom the very existence of London and of England is unknown, we may well consider this new type and its future possibilities worthy of serious study. Its development is too recent to enable its characteristics to be fully apprehended. Briefly, however, we may say that it is physically, mentally, and spiritually different from the type characteristic of Englishmen during the past two hundred years. ~~The physical change is the result of the city up-bringing in twice-breathed air in the crowded quarters of the labouring classes. This is a substitute for the spacious places of the old, silent life of England; close to the ground, vibrating to the lengthy, unhurried processes of Nature. The result is the production of a characteristic physical type of town dweller: stunted, narrow-chested, easily wearied; yet voluble, excitable, with little ballast, stamina, or endurance—seeking stimulus in drink, in betting, in any unaccustomed conflicts at home or abroad.~~ Upon these city generations there has operated the now widely spread influence of thirty years of elementary school teaching. The result is a *mental* change; each individual has been endowed with the power of reading, and a certain dim and cloudy capacity for comprehending what he reads. Hence the vogue of the new sensational press, with its enormous circulation and baneful influence; the perpetual demand of the reader for fiercer excitement ("more chops, bloody ones, with gristle!") from his papers; and the strenuous competition of the papers, in their fight for his patronage, each to become the most clamorous, lurid, and dreadful.

A change more vital and more ominous for the future is widely attested by those familiar with this new City type: the almost universal decay, amongst these massed and unheeded populations, of any form of spiritual religion. Morally, indeed, they for the most part accept a standard which is the astonishment of their friends. Patience under misfortune, a persistent cheerfulness, family affection, and neighbourly helpfulness are widespread amongst them. But the spiritual world, whether in Nature, in Art, or in Infinite Religion, has vanished, and the curtain of the

horizon has descended round the material things and the pitiful duration of human life. In former time in England, for better or worse, the things of the earth were shot with spiritual significance; heaven and hell stretched out as permanent realities; the "kingdom of all the worlds" rose up as "the theatre of man's achievements" and "the measure of his destiny." To-day amongst the masses of our great towns God is faintly apprehended as an amiable but absentee ruler; heaven and hell are passing to the memories of a far-off childhood, the one ceasing to attract, the other to alarm. The full effect of this change has yet to be demonstrated; but certain results are already discernible. An increasing craving for material satisfaction before the night cometh which will close all, and a fiercer refusal to endure hardship and privation during the lean years, and a concentration on the purely earthly outlook of a commercial Imperialism, heedless of abstract spiritual ideas, will be some of the least results of this change in human character.

The statements thus dogmatically presented will probably require in the minds of most readers further demonstration of their truth; and it will be necessary to examine somewhat more carefully the condition of affairs in the lower quarters of our great cities. The problem, in effect the same in all these gigantic aggregations, has reached its fullest development in London; and we shall do well to concentrate our attention upon this enormous mass of population, where we shall be able to trace most clearly the lines of progress and the change from the old conditions to the new.


I. THE NEW PROBLEM.

Here, then, in London we shall find manifest both the diminishing virulence of the older social diseases and the steadily deepening gravity of the problem of the coming race.

The evils upon which public interest was concentrated in the last period of public awakening are for the most

part passing away. Crime, blank ignorance, foul conditions of existence, a life purely animal, forsaken of God and Man—this was the condition so strenuously denounced by the older reformers. They disclosed a state of things limited in area but appalling in its depths of vice and misery. The history of the past half-century in London is the history of steady effort towards remedy. These things still exist indeed, as everything exists in a city of such dimensions as London; in the aggregate they exist perhaps in greater quantity than ever. The criminals of London, if united, would equal in number the inhabitants of the capitals of the minor European states. The total insanitary areas would form a great township. The children who habitually elude school would double the population of many of our colonies. But at least the work goes forward, and the light seems slowly winning; one black spot after another disappears; progress year by year exhibits a definite advance; there is hope of the coming of the day.

The pools of poverty that may be discovered in the West and centre, hidden away behind the squares and brilliant shop windows, may be taken as typical of the old order of things. Here are the "poor" that we know and are familiar with, as they appear on the boards of a theatre—stolid, wretched, brutal, or pathetic. Here is the Jago: here is John Street; here are the children of the Ragged School, and the typical wreckage of the Imperial Race. Criminals, prostitutes, street hawkers, the sweated, the casually employed, the drunken, those who pander to the pleasure or minister to the varying needs of the rich and successful surrounding them, dwelling in packed court or alley, jammed between mansion and factory, haunted with disease and crime. These still present a sufficiently forlorn problem; still exhibit a goodly array to rise up against this generation and to condemn it. But they are relics of a departing race; all the forces of civilisation are against them; they are destined to disappear. Squeezed out by economic necessity no less than by philanthropic endeavour, sooner or later the heavy hand of the destroyer descends on their abode;



private enterprise or public interference breaks up their undesirable resting-places ; and the inhabitants, exposed for one moment to the light, like the strange, uncanny creatures revealed by the upheaving of a stone in the damp soil, scurry, panic-stricken, away.

But quite apart from these "poor" is that vast population whose numbers weary the mind and appal the imagination, choking up the marshes and waste places of the city, and every day pushing great arms forward over the surrounding fields. Here is a phenomenon and a problem unique in the history of the world. By a process of segregation the different classes that make up the population of London have steadily drawn apart, until now in many large tracts the separation has been completely effected. In the towns of the North, many of them built in valleys surrounded by hills, the wealthy and wise are found established round the rim of the crater ; within, amid the smoke and clang of the factories and furnaces, are packed away the working populations. But it is in London that the segregation has reached its extreme limit. In the centre is the City, still the heart of commerce and finance. Stretching out west from this is the familiar succession of terraces, parks, and gardens, upon which are concentrated the most lavish display of wealth and ostentation at present manifest in the world. But in penetrating to the centre from any other quarter the visitor finds himself gazing down upon a city of singularly different character. Miles of mean streets stretch before him, smoky, dirty, unbeautiful, the general desolation only modified by buildings of a varying ferocity of ugliness, the places of education or of worship of the inhabitants. In this region of strange disorder, cut off within a different Universe of Being from the London that thinks and talks and chatters, at the commencement of the twentieth century of the Christian Era, dwell the pent-up, innumerable multitudes of the common people.

Here lives the average man of the coming century, the specific John Smith of whose objects, ideals, and conditions of life we are so ignorant, During the past

hundred years his ancestors have passed from the fields to the town ; he himself has been reared in block dwelling with occasional glimpse of murky sky ; now, drifting awkwardly through an incomprehensible existence, he endeavours to satisfy the demands of appetite and desire. No one who has leisure to think, power to observe, or capacity to utilise his observations, dwells in his neighbourhood. To the world of society, the member of Parliament, the would-be philanthropist, he is still the poor "in a lump," and his general condition is associated with squalor, vice, and misery. As he sweeps forward, impelled by his ever-increasing numbers, his quarter is continually expanding ; but the original inhabitants upon his approach gather up their household goods and flee away, leaving the world to darkness and to John Smith. He never writes to the *Times* : his grievances never become articulate ; always noisy, he never rises to ordered, intelligible utterance. Whole populations of great cities, numbers equal to that of vast colonies or empires beyond the sea, could be rent from his realm without producing any appreciable diminution. Yet the world as a whole is still unconscious of his existence ; he dwells along ways untrodden but by his own familiar feet ; few even yet appreciate that here in these neglected wastes, in the places his dwellings have made desolate, "a problem destined to strain our civilisation to an extent even yet undreamt of, is rising into pale outline."

Let us come to more detail and attempt to estimate the problem of John Smith, the skilled or unskilled labourer who inhabits the districts into which the manual workers have been segregated. With but local variation the problem is essentially the same ; in little but names or varying depth of deprivation does one portion differ from another. Starting from Shepherd's Bush in the west, and passing by Paddington and Marylebone to St. Pancras and Pentonville in the north, the congested area swells out in the east into a vast aggregation limited by the Jewish quarters of Whitechapel on the one hand and the unimaginably dreary marshes of West Ham and London-over-the-border on the other. Here is the typical East

End in which, to the minds of most observers, is concentrated the problem of the poverty of London. But crossing the river we come into another district in essence similar if more dull and less dirty ; a population numbered by hundreds of thousands in the old marshes of Lambeth, choking up every available space between the suburbs and the river : a region homogeneous in nature though bearing different names in different quarters—Deptford and Bermondsey and Walworth and Camberwell and Battersea : all names suggestive of cheerless, crowded existence in mean and narrow ways.

“What is this great body of disjointed but populous parishes ?” asks Lord Rosebery ; “what is this great desert inhabited by neglected humanity ?” This is the Ghetto, the enclosure into which is penned our labouring population. Outside, some incredible distance beyond its borders, is the world that counts ; those that look before and after, meditate, design and aspire. Within are those to whom the twentieth century belongs ; who appear in the sunshine upon occasional days of national festivity, fatuously cheerful in the daylight, drunken, sodden and abusive when darkness falls. All round the edge of this incomprehensible region are the homes of those who have crawled out of it : the residents of the villas, the clerks who are sustained in their long hours of unhealthy toil by the one triumphant thought that they have not yet fallen back into the abyss below. The continual impetuous multiplication of the dwellers in this abyss drives them ever forward on to these respectable streets. Like some gigantic plasmodium huge, blunt arms sweep forward ; mansions are cut up into tenements, vegetation disappears, gardens vanish into long lines of small houses. Yet the ghetto is never satisfied ; it packs its denizens denser and denser, piling them one above the other into block buildings, contracting families into one house, one storey, one room. But yet it ever advances in continual expansion over the neighbouring fields and marshes. It has spread three quarters round London ; soon the two arms it has thrust towards the west will snap together like a vice ; a ring, shining not with jewels and gold, but illuminated perhaps, though not

to eyes too dulled to see it, with the heroic patience of innumerable human lives, will completely encircle the Imperial City.

No one penetrates here but for business. Except from the under side or through the halfpenny press, the inhabitants possess no knowledge of the outside world. Popular novelists stalk amongst them, seeking fresh sensation to arouse an appetite that custom has staled; their idiosyncrasies are held up to laughter, their occasional nobilities for tears. Churches compete for charitable agencies towards them; their problem is discussed in meetings of women or ministers of religion; their discontent is discouraged as dangerous, their elevation ardently advocated. Of all this they are ignorant: as oblivious as the denizens of the deep sea of the tides that agitate its surface: they know the obvious work confronting them, the necessity for meals and a resting-place at night; they cherish for the future neither hope nor fear; the immediate toil before them is "all their care" and "the rest is the will of God."

Only at sparse intervals does the world that counts awake to the existence of these crowded and forgotten regions. A certain minister—the story is an old one—on being appointed Secretary for the Colonies entreated a colleague to "come upstairs and show him those places on a map." So one can imagine the political organisations studying with suddenly kindled interest the locality of Hoxton or Bermondsey. Recently Lord Salisbury, confident in the devotion of villadom to the New Imperialism, has been troubled by the occasional unenthusiastic Radicalism still manifest in quarters of the city of whose position he is but dimly aware. Seeking for cause for this phenomenon, he finds it in the lack of suitable houses for the poor. He urges the Primrose League to remedy this transitory misfortune, that they may shortly exhibit to the confines of Empire a London palpitating universal gratitude to the Tory party.

So at the time of election the newspapers relate stories, strange but true, of unexpected life. In "Notes from the Constituencies" a naïve knowledge is exhibited of Penton-

ville or Camberwell. Recently a great Conservative daily paper broke into astonishing consciousness of the existence of (Heaven save the mark!) Haggerston! A special commissioner was appointed to investigate this weird region. He journeyed; after a time found Haggerston; reported it mean, dejected, contemptible; "just the sort of place" (such was his triumphant conclusion) "to return a Radical candidate." A correspondent of a great religious weekly is appointed poll clerk in an East End parliamentary borough. He descends warily, and having emerged unscathed from the ordeal, reports to the paper his astonishing discoveries. "It may seem incredible to most of your readers," he says, "that during the day between twenty and thirty men presented themselves at the polling station who could neither read nor write." "One became heartily sickened at the number of pallid, worn-out faces that passed before the voting-tables as the day wore on." "On many of the countenances were legibly-written marks of an indescribable misery, born probably of long-endured poverty and sin, and again there was often a look of patient endurance that was very pathetic to notice." "The whole neighbourhood is one to breed despair in the human heart and mind." Here is the experience of one suddenly brought by his business into a new and unaccustomed atmosphere. Up till now he has only known comfortable homes, children, and human fellowship. The experience is new to him; as if suddenly struck, he cries aloud. But this is only the chance of an occasional election; but for this transitory experience, like the great majority of his fellow-citizens, he would never have apprehended the existence of the ghetto.

What are the characteristic features of these unknown regions? To the first gaze of the casual visitor descending from a different Universe some ten or twenty minutes away by rail, they present a spectacle sufficiently depressing. Walk to any London terminus and take train to any station within the inner ring. You find yourself at Cambridge Heath or Dalston Junction or Walworth Road—in the heart of the mysterious *terra incognita*. Interminable rows of mean streets diverge in every direction.

Dirty, happy children play in all the gutters. Block dwellings of the style known as the Later Desolate, product of philanthropic effort or business enterprise, veritable hives of humanity, sprawl towards heaven. Buildings of red and yellowish brick of an austere and forbidding type of architecture, the schools of the London School Board, rise like oases in the desert of drab two-storied cottages, the staple home of the people. Their proximity to each other testifies to the density of the population. Churches of a melancholy Later Georgian or still more melancholy Later Gothic attest the piety of the inhabitants. Trams, packed morning and evening with shabby men, tardily move down the main streets. At night long lines of barrows brilliant with flaring kerosene lamps contribute an element of weirdness. Past these drifts a continuous stream of tired women haggling for whelks and cauliflowers and other necessities of existence. Every corner sports the brilliantly lighted gin palace with its perpetual stream of pilgrims pouring in and out at all doors. Once to apprehend the noise of chaffering, the shrill, unmusical voices, the sounds of a drifting population wedged together under the quiet stars, the mere physical discomforts of evil odour, unkempt humanity, and the packed mob of struggling human life, is to be filled with mournful inquiry as to the meaning or utility of such cramped and shabby existence, as to the possibilities of a development in which the individual appears equally negligible in the sight of man and of God.

The first impression obtained is the utter ugliness of it all. Here is a life from which the apprehension of beauty has visibly departed. Whatever may be the pleasures, existence here is set in grey—grey streets, grey people, a drab monotony, which after a time gets on one's nerves with a sense of personal injury. Gazing from some high building as "from the battlements of heaven" upon the multitudinous desolation of a great city in its interminable acreage of crowded humanity, one realises as never before the Burden of London—London as it has been called, "the visible type of a Universe hastening confusedly to unknown ends and careless of individual pain." Here are lives not

even kindled by the resourcefulness, subtlety, and individual enterprise of the avowed criminal ; but in incredible multitude, shabby, ineffective, battered into futility by the ceaseless struggle of life. The old dilemma returns with a new note of reality. If there be no past or future and "death closes all," then what but the illogical *aviditas vitæ* keeps these drifting crowds from terminating an existence the most pathetic element of which lies in the fact that they do not realise it to be intolerable? And if the saner alternative be true and these tired, careworn people are immortal spirits journeying between two Eternities, what sort of advance has the human soul made in this passage of the years? What has it learnt in its long progress from the transitory vision of childhood to the dead futility of premature old age, drifting through an existence to the significance of which it seems destined to be for ever blind?

Yet a little personal knowledge will modify this first impression. "The poor in a lump" will always be bad ; when their lives are examined in detail the shadow lifts from the scene. Large areas of these congested districts are occupied by clerks and artisans in constant employment at a fairly high rate of wages. Even below these classes there are sections of the community which, though balanced with extraordinary nonchalance on the edge of the pit, never actually suffer from want and privation. Two hundred thousand of the poor of East London, Mr. Charles Booth notes, are "neither ill-nourished nor ill-clad. Their lives are an unending struggle and lack comfort, but I do not know that they lack happiness." Life in these quarters, regarded not from outside as judged by some ideal standard, but as the personal experience of one of the inhabitants, is by no means unhappy. There is the animal pleasure of physical exercise ; hard toil, food and drink when hungry and thirsty, rest after the day's labours. Then there is a vast amount of quiet family joy, of delight of parents in their children, of wives in their husbands. The apparent dulness and shabbiness is unnoticed through long familiarity. Nature is not missed if never known, beauty is not demanded if the craving for it has been

prematurely stifled. The one thought that to those accustomed to "look before and after" would render the present position intolerable—the hair's-breadth balance of the economic position, "the insecurity against which it is not easy for any prudence to guard," which curses "the common lot of humanity," is so much a matter of course, as the accepted position, that it exercises no more effect than the possibility of sudden death upon the lives and happiness of those who live in the sunshine. The primitive pleasures of bodily satisfaction, the occasional holiday or country excursion, a kind of rough and ready neighbourly acquaintanceship, once at least in the life of each individual the consecration of existence for a brief season under the magical influence of love—these flourishing in the crowded districts as elsewhere give elements which under normal conditions provide real and widespread satisfaction.

Nor may the observer neglect the effect of human effort to assist in this happiness. Research exhibits the desert of populous parishes crowded with multifarious activities designed to stimulate pleasure and alleviate pain. Baths, wash-houses, and public libraries are provided by municipal energy; art galleries, polytechnics, technical schools by private enterprise. Evening classes offer outlets for assiduous youth to better its economic position. The Churches plentifully bestrew the districts with men's institutes, girls' clubs, and boys' brigades; the children are entertained at magic-lantern shows, Bands of Hope, and Happy Evenings. Thrift and loan societies endeavour to forestall the inevitable day of illness and old age. Occasional excursions and beanfeasts pilgrimage to places of interest or public importance. Children visit the country in the summer under the direction of philanthropic societies. Theatres, cheap music-halls, and places of amusement, mostly blameless in morals, have multiplied with marvellous rapidity, and bring entertainment within the reach of all but the poorest. The streets are well cared for; sanitation has enormously improved; the death-rate has steadily fallen, the rate of wages steadily risen. Never in recent years, economists unhesitatingly affirm, has the

English labourer been better off than he is to-day. The traditional poor of the moralist and the sentimental, hungry with want, apathetic, despairing, vanish before the vision of an active, busy population, manfully performing their duties, and daily adding to the wealth of the richest city in the world.

The picture here displayed is not without its attractions. "Wholesome, pleasant family life" (in the words of the greatest living authority), "very simple food, very regular habits, healthy bodies and healthy minds, affectionate relations of husbands and wives, mothers and sons, of elders with children, of friend with friend." "The children have when young less chance of surviving than those of the rich, but I certainly think their lives are happier. Free from the paraphernalia of servants, nurses, and governesses, they are more likely to suffer from spoiling than from harshness." Reading such statements, the optimist, indignant with the denunciation of the sentimental, finds everywhere all for the best in the development of the life of modern cities. Honest toil, family affection, light-hearted, innocent enjoyment, Churches and philanthropists competing to stimulate and to satisfy interests beyond bodily wants; charity organisation societies restoring the occasionally unfortunate; police-court missions leading back the errant to the slippery paths of virtue; municipalities, public bodies, School Boards, and County Councils contributing their quota to elevate the life of the common people—small wonder that he deprecates interference in such a beneficent activity, confident that Providence is weaving human energies into the production of the best of all possible worlds.

Once more back to facts: as from the first limited impression to the wider survey, so now from the surface to the forces working beneath. What is the real meaning of all these activities on the life of the particular family or individual who lives in the midst of them? And why does this facile contentment awaken such indignation and resentment amongst the best men of the time? Whence this ferocity of denunciation which in the sight of this pleasing picture appears so exaggerated and unreal?

Let us seek a little further into the causes that are lowering the life of our city dwellers, and see how far a completer knowledge justifies those who extol this generation or those who condemn it.

Very soon we shall discern that the modern city life of London and the congested centres suffers from evils of two classes. There are certain specific ills which affect nearly the whole of the community, as drink, overcrowding, and the competition of the very poor. And there are certain results of the modern life—the class segregation, the severance from nature, the abolition of a background—which denote a more deep-seated disease, and demand, therefore, a more heroic remedy.

II. THE SPECIFIC EVILS DEMANDING REMEDY.

I. There is first, then, packed in the midst of this peaceful and industrious population still a multitude of the criminal, the casual, the "cadger," the chronically poor; a number which, although scattered in pools and broken up into patches in the midst of the mass of the regular wage-earners, would yet if gathered together present a sight sufficient to "stagger humanity." On the one side they shade off imperceptibly into the class of low-paid, unskilled labourers, round whose neck they hang like an incubus, from which they are continually recruited; on the other they pass into that small class of permanently criminal which live upon society, whose life is that of the predatory animal, the wolf and the hyena. There is the apparently stationary number of the actual paupers. There is the multitude of widows and permanent invalids carrying on a precarious existence upon inadequate outdoor relief, and rearing children who will inherit the vices and the battered physique of their fathers. There are the frankly and shamelessly criminal—perhaps the least hopeless of all this doleful band. There are the continually "tired"—those who do a few days' work a week, who open cab doors, sell newspapers, flowers, or matches, live on the earnings of their wives or the misplaced charity of the rich. There are the incompetent, who are never fitted for per-

manent employment. And there is in this dismal mass a small modicum of the deserving poor—those who have toppled over the edge and fallen into the abyss; a few months' illness, a casual outbreak of a latent thirst, the birth or death of a trade, and even the natural menace of the years, having driven them under, into the waters, from which it is improbable they will ever obtain opportunity to emerge. This class is being continually broken up; polluted areas are cleared and rebuilt; the black aggregations disappear from the chart of poverty in the central districts. But the class itself is not destroyed, and the effect of the scattering is clearly traceable in the surrounding areas. It is as if one washed out an ink-spot on a picture with water; the blot vanishes, but the whole neighbourhood sensibly becomes coloured a darker hue. At the same time, in some far-off regions of unknown suburbs black streets suddenly arise with startling rapidity; a demand for higher rent than the scale of the neighbourhood, a *cul-de-sac*, the passing of the houses to small private owners, or even the first introduction of one bad family, being sufficient to convert streets not two years old on the outskirts into slums rivalling in squalor anything in the central congestion. From the west and centre the broken populations are vanishing; only criminals, prostitutes, and the highly-paid intermittent labourers who have to work feverishly against time can compete in rent with the demands of business extensions. The merely ineffective are therefore drifting away and removing the menace of their squalor from the life of the wealthy. But a glance at the past ten years' changes in the poverty map reveal their own tale; and the blotches of black and dark blue that arise now in the midst of the red artisans' quarters instead of in the yellow area of riches reveal a problem that seems only the more dangerous because the more easily negligible.

This class acts banefully in two ways. It comprehends in itself an importunate problem, summarising as it does an aggregate of actual privation and pain; and it renders increasingly difficult any adequate solution of the problems of the mass in which it is embedded. For the first, it may

with some show of reason be regarded as "not so very bad," as writes Mr. Charles Booth, "that a tenth of the population should be reckoned as very poor . . . but when we count up the 100,000 individuals (in East London alone), the 20,000 families, who lead so pinched a life among the population described, and remember that there are in addition double that number who, if not actually pressed by want, yet have nothing to spare, we shrink aghast from the picture. The divergence between these two points of view, between relative and absolute, is in itself enough to cause the whole difference between optimism and pessimism. To judge rightly we need to bear both in mind, never to forget the numbers when thinking of the percentages, nor the percentages when thinking of the numbers. This last is difficult to those whose daily experience or whose imagination brings vividly before them the trials and sorrows of individual lives. They refuse to set off and balance the happy hours of the same class, or even of the same people, against these miseries; much less can they consent to bring the lot of other classes into the account, add up the opposing figures, and contentedly carry forward a credit balance. In the arithmetic of woe they can only add or multiply; they cannot subtract or divide. In intensity of feeling such as this, and not in statistics, lies the power to move the world." And the same writer is emphatic upon the secondary effect being the real crux of the problem of poverty in great cities. "To the rich," he says, "the very poor are a sentimental interest. To the poor they are a crushing load. The poverty of the poor is mainly the result of the competition of the very poor." "The disease from which society suffers is the unrestricted competition in industry of the needy and helpless." And so convinced is he that this is the key to the whole position, that he advocates drastic remedies, the intervention of the State and the organisation of semi-socialistic labour communities, to ensure, even at enormous cost, the elimination of the unfit.

2. The second of the special scourges is the Overcrowding. While men slept the evil has swollen into

colossal dimensions ; until now suddenly awakened we find ourselves jammed in hopeless numbers within a limited area and fiercely elbowing ourselves for room to live. *Laissez faire* has here presented an object-lesson which he that runs may read : the squalid inequality of unchecked private enterprise, operating through the greater part of the nineteenth century, has bound an almost insupportable burden upon the shoulders of the succeeding generations. From every part the cry arises : increasing rents, ravaging the family income ; poor and insufficient accommodation, houses split up into tenements, tenements into rooms, rooms sublet or crowded with relays of sleepers. A population of nearly a million—larger than the total white population of South Africa—is living in London at the present time illegally overcrowded. The whole would be turned into the streets in a few weeks' time if the local authorities were to insist on the enforcement of the law. Of what these figures mean when converted into specific individual cases only those can testify who have actually lived in the congested districts. Fourteen living in one small room, one of whom was sickening for the small-pox ; a little girl dying and her body kept a week in the sleeping-room of the family ; a man, wife, and children driven from house to house and finally precipitated into the streets on a January night, able to pay for rooms but unable to find any—these are actual cases in the limited experience of the present writer. But apart from certain staggering examples, it is easy to discern the general effect upon the average population. Overcrowding occurs per room ; well-meant attempts to remedy this have caused overcrowding per area ; the snatching of every available vacant space, the erection of gigantic buildings many stories high, the conversion of large tracts of the town into a Peabody-and-asphalte city. No one observant of even the superficial characteristics of the ghetto population could fail to note the result of these two forms of overcrowding : the listlessness and lassitude so manifest in the people of our crowded streets ; the anæmia of town life so strikingly prevalent in our city children, limited in exercise to the playground of the street in the heavy,

“twice-breathed air.” Before the virility and health of the country life that has been entering the city during the past half-century, the street-reared population crumples up almost without a struggle. The higher walks of labour are almost all trodden by men who can trace in the second or third generation a country ancestry. Partially concealed by this impetuous influx, the results of the congestion are but now commencing to show themselves. As the proportion of the town bred to the country bred increases these will become more widely manifest. The death-rate, indeed, steadily falls ; but this appears due far more to improved sanitation and increased medicinal skill than to an improved vitality. More of the unfit now drag out a stunted existence, and transmit the bloodless, ineffective type to succeeding generations. Phthisis and zymotic diseases ravage our packed populations. Those passing in and out of the dwellings, and especially those intimately acquainted with the children, can testify to a perpetual presence of a multitude of minor maladies—weariness, small nervous disorders, irritability, digestive disorganisations, producing a sum total of preventable suffering never heard of outside the boundaries of our dwellings, the tax paid by the poor for the new life of the city.

The repair of the desolation of past neglect will demand the energies of the best minds of England for at least a century. At present the restorative forces are scarcely, if at all, holding their own. Statesmen utter platitudes, philanthropists wring their hands, litterateurs call for a dictator. But meanwhile public bodies peck at the problem, urbanely gratified if they can house a few thousand persons in a city of four millions. Business extension more than destroys the accommodation these annually supply. The mere natural increase of population continually deepens the evil. On the edges and outskirts of the city private greed creates great working-class suburbs of jerry-built houses, which will form in the future a problem as desolate as the problem now resident in the central districts. The centre of Imperialism, as Lord Rosebery is never tired of reiterating, rests in London.

With a perpetual lowering of the vitality of the Imperial Race in the great cities of the kingdom through overcrowding in room and in area, no amount of hectic, feverish activity on the confines of the Empire will be able to arrest the inevitable decline.

3. The third of the particular scourges of the labouring quarters is the drink traffic. Here, again, widespread illusion exists. The poor as a whole are not drunken. A proportion, small compared to the immensity of numbers, does indeed habitually exceed ; and the permanent squalor of many a slum, and the records of the police-court missionary and magistrate, and the tragedies of ruined homes are to be found scattered with too manifest existence throughout the whole dark area. But far the greater number of the inhabitants lead a sober life, only breaking out into occasional excess on "mafficks" of authorised national rejoicing, on the days of public holiday, or on the last night of the year, and other periods of unusual solemnity. The real injury of the drink traffic as a factor in the social conditions of our great cities is not the occasional drunkenness but the habitual soaking. Despite the reduction in the number of licensed houses, the drink bill steadily rises. Despite the increasing complexity of wants in the new town-life, the percentage of the family income spent in this unproductive luxury shows no diminution. Men never drunk are yet found in a perpetual sodden or fuddled condition ; and there can be no doubt that the "moderate drinking" is an enormous yearly tax on the productiveness of British industry. It is not for nothing that in America, which even now is seizing our place as the leader in the world's manufactures, the consumption of alcohol per head is less than half that found in England ; and this despite higher wages, a more exacting and strenuous life, and a far superior standard of comfort. However admirable alcohol may be as a stimulant to bodily welfare or good fellowship, any one at all intimately acquainted with the life of the ghetto must perforce acknowledge that "moderate" drinking is a curse to our packed populations, reducing the whole standard of life and terribly handicapping our

people in the ferocity of the struggle for commercial existence.

The congested districts are studded with public-houses of every size and variety. Wide changes are proceeding even amongst these. The old friendly "pot-house" of shabby but homely appearance, survival of the village alehouse, in which the neighbours loafed in silence or discussed over beer the affairs of the day, is vanishing altogether in the competitive struggle. Its place is being taken by the new gin palace of the public company and the paid manager, imposing bright, clean, with its numerous compartments and its energetic methods. Loafing is here no longer encouraged. Men and women pass in and out before the bars in continuous procession, gulping up the desired liquid with as much speed as possible. All is purely business-like, commercial, respectable; drink as a commodity is required and drink as a commodity is supplied. But the argument so frequently used by the uninformed but warm-hearted philanthropist, that the public-house is the working man's club, and cannot be touched except at great discomfort to himself, is an argument which soon will be altogether meaningless. It is quite a mistake to suppose the average man wishes to go out when his day's work is finished. The long journey home, the supper, a quiet pipe, and then to bed is the regular programme of hundreds of thousands. The great obstacle to all work of philanthropy and religion is the almost complete impossibility of inducing the older men to forsake their own firesides. The journeys to and from work, the midday rest, Saturday, and, above all, Sunday, are responsible for far the larger proportion of superfluous drink consumption; the latter especially, with its listless *ennui* and crowded, spiritless streets full of men waiting in silent gloom for the public-house to open, is perhaps the most tragical sight to be seen in the modern world. None of Mr. Ritchie's forlorn attempts to net the average drunkard by increased penalties or the creation of black lists (surely in big towns the maddest suggestion ever offered) will in the least touch the fringe of the vast problem of alcoholic craving in the labouring quarters of great cities.

The amount of the family income spent thus on drink alone totals on the average to an appalling percentage. Virtually all of it goes to the adult male member ; and overcrowded homes, poorly dressed children, a continual combat with poverty, and an obvious lack of means for any of the higher necessities of existence, are the inevitable accompaniments of hundreds of thousands of homes in which a case of drunkenness rarely if ever occurs. The crime, lunacy, and intolerable miseries produced by the comparatively few cases of habitual drunkenness have struck the imaginations of Christendom, and form the staple ground of appeal of the temperance reformer. But the observer noting the general trend of social progress will find a more ominous symptom in the enormous wealth annually consumed in so-called "moderate drinking," as much wasted for the national production as if poured down the sewers—a tax which no nation can afford to give in the present stage of competitive industry, incontestable evidence of selfish and ignoble pleasure.

Passing from these more specific and perhaps transitory evils, we must note the general results of the creation of the new city type—the life in big aggregations which seems destined to mould the progress of the coming race into such strange and bizarre forms. Apart from the condition of the casual and the criminal, the scourge of overcrowding, and the waste of the drink traffic, what elements are there in the actual condition of the congested district itself which demand concentration upon "realities at home" ?

Even a few years spent actually living in the ghetto will exhibit how far the fancy picture of happiness, effort, and multifarious energies unfolded to the occasional visitor is distant from the true facts. Despite all the apparent stir, life for the great majority of the denizens of the dull streets is incredibly monotonous and mean. "Merrie England" is emphatically a place of villages and small towns, with open spaces and the perpetual presence of the natural world. Englishmen packed for their lives in the labyrinths of drab streets that make up the greater part of London acquire a life of "mechanic pacing to and fro," varied only

by occasional outbursts of brutalising and unlovely pleasure. The mind thus "cabined, cribbed, confined" turns instinctively to any course of stimulating excitement. Betting, the unlimited abuse of stimulants, and the noisy boisterousness of the modern English crowd reveal the ravages of the disease of modern life. The daily drift to monotonous occupation varied by the beanfeast on the scattered Bank Holiday makes up the yearly routine of the vast majority of the new race. The city growth, by sharply dividing his place of work from his place of sleep, has at one stroke cut deep slices out of the margin of life of the London labourer; and the leisure which he is granted for the improvement of mind, body, and soul, outside his sleeping and feeding hours, is mainly spent in contemplating the unattractive visage of his neighbour in the workman's train or the tardy municipal tram. The apparently inexhaustible supply of unskilled labour has resulted in the building up of whole industries dependent on the cheapest, crudest forms of manual service. No demand is made on the higher energies of the vast armies employed of girls, boys, women, and men with no enterprise, ambition, or stamina. A kind of sodden mass of unskilled industry has thus been created, resisting, as dough resists the penetration of outside influences, the spasmodic attempts of State or municipality to encourage self-improvement, education, or the craving for a wider outlook and a deeper knowledge. The existence of this unparalleled aggregation, the dying out of the industrial energy, initiative, and determination to "get on" so characteristic of the North, the inevitable isolation and loneliness of the competing units in a monstrous and chaotic aggregation such as London, and the absence of a background setting present action, however obscure, into some large framework of meaning, and enforcing on the individual the sense of immediate personal responsibility—these are the general conditions which are filling observers of the ghetto life with dreary forebodings for the future.

Much of the apparent activity, therefore, is largely delusive. We possess free libraries, but few of us utilise them; art galleries, which we rarely enter. The total that is brought into direct, vital connection with Churches and

philanthropic agencies is incredibly small when compared with the sum of the population ; a club of two hundred in a parish of ten thousand being so remarkable as to provoke astonishment. All the efforts of philanthropy fail to touch more than the fringe ; the great multitude drifts on unconscious of the existence of these strenuous activities. The ordinary man of the ordinary street is neither a church-goer nor a criminal. His attitude may best be described as that of acquiescence—acquiescence sometimes shot with a vague discontent, more often with a certain fatuous cheerfulness. The things in the world that once testified to the existence of some pleasure not altogether of the crudest animal quality and some spiritual existence not entirely material, have for the most part vanished from his horizon. Nature is represented by a few withered trees, an occasional glimpse of a changing cloudy sky and an annual beanfeast, when for a few hours some Epping or Margate is vulgarised into a grimy caricature of Hoxton or Camberwell. Literature is symbolised by the penny Sunday paper with its dreary garbage from the weekly police reports, its divorce court snippets, its column of clerical crime ; or the halfpenny hysterical daily with its bastard Imperialism and fabulous information—the reading of which, however, being, perhaps fortunately, usually confined to the racing results. Street after street stretches out in which probably not a single book of any kind could be found by careful search from one end to the other. Even the superstitious cherishing of the family Bible in the cottage parlour has vanished before the pressure of modern existence. Art, as any self-directed effort after the realisation of beauty, has altogether vanished ; though the architecture of houses, block dwellings, and public buildings, the pathetic furniture of the living-rooms of the poor, the oleograph and the decoration of the mantelpiece which is the culminating ideal of the most respectable, testify to the taste of the people. Religion is associated in the opinion of the mass with the noise and fervour of the Salvation Army ; the oil lamp, quavering hymn, and perspiring preacher at the street corner on the Sabbath evening ; a watch-night service

on the last night of the year, and the decent interment of the dead. What remains beyond as motive of healthy, strenuous existence? Bodily toil, bodily rest, and the gratification of appetite not altogether unpleasant. Home life still rich and strong, though assailed by every influence that can undermine it—small crowded dwellings, opportunities for cheap pleasuring, long hours of travel to and from work ; woman's labour, demand for girls and boys, and the well-meaning efforts of philanthropic societies. Exercise on occasional holidays, carried out with ever-increasing difficulty as the limits of the open country recede ; cloudy dreams of advancement never to become realised in practical effort ; and a certain cheery stoicism, which sees humour in the trifling discomforts of life, is dimly trustful of an amiable Deity, and hopeful for the enjoyment in another world of the pleasure unattainable in the present.

A background to life—some common bond uniting, despite the discordance of the competitive struggle—some worthy subject of enthusiasm or devotion behind the aimless passage of the years—some spiritual force or ideal elevated over the shabby scene of temporary failure—this is the deep, imperative need of the masses in our great cities to-day. With this the mere discomforts incidental to changing conditions of life and the specific remediable social evils can be contemplated with equanimity ; without it the drifting through time of the interminable multitude of the unimportant becomes a mere nightmare vision of a striving signifying nothing, "doing and undoing without end." No material comfort, increased intellectual alertness, or wider capacity of attainment, will occupy the place of this one fundamental need. The only test of progress which is to be anything but a mere animal rejoicing over mere animal pleasure is the development and spread of some spiritual ideal which will raise into an atmosphere of effort and distinction the life of the ordinary man.

Contrasts are often drawn by fervent progressives between the labourer of the field and the modern town artisan ; and obvious superiorities of the latter are demonstrated in income, intelligence, mobility, and a wider out-

look upon life. The enormous progress made by the labouring classes during the century, as testified by savings banks, increased wages, and a higher standard of life, is the one unanswerable argument of the popular press. Yet there is another side to the picture pointing to a different moral. Life with nature, in continual contact with the earth, resulted in old time in a stability and occasionally in an elevation of character which seems passing from the fickle, hasty, turbulent life of the modern city. Nor need it be impressed how sometimes in obscure and poor homestead and cottage unlearned and commonplace characters were consecrated by a real spiritual faith in which the trivial events of the daily existence became charged with eternal significance. Life became no longer a round of monotonous toil, but a scene of infinite deep meaning and the everlasting conflict between God and His enemies. "In such cases," says Cardinal Newman in a famous passage, "every event has a meaning. They have their own estimate of what happened to them; they are mindful of times and seasons, and compare the present with the past; and the world, no longer dull, monotonous, unprofitable, and hopeless, is a varied and complicated drama, with parts, and an object and an awful moral."

But the progress of the century has seen the breaking down, at least in the great cities, of this consciousness of individual responsibility and consecration of individual energies; until now in the broken populations of the congested districts all religious agencies find themselves baffled amidst masses heedless of their message. Spiritual presences, naturally congruous to the perpetual miracle of nature, do not haunt the streets of the great city; they are lost in the continual echo of moving feet, the absence of privacy and silence, the limitation of human energies along narrow grooves of wage-earning toil. That the population have now abandoned church-going is a commonplace. It would be interesting to learn to how many of the massed population of England prayer is a real experience or the Bible an actual study. The change indeed is not confined to the British Isles, but is wide-

spread in the whole development of modern civilisation. But in this country there is the additional fact that the enthusiasm and ideal which give a constructive background to the individual life, and can replace, at least temporarily, the permanent realities and necessities of the human soul, are here rarely found. The devotion to abstract ideas, the enthusiasm for *Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*, and the passionate worship of the Motherland, and of the Army which symbolises it, which has so largely replaced the old catholic faith amongst the *ouvriers* of the large towns of France, though productive of deeds that astonish the civilised world and the "mad fool fury of the Seine," have yet yielded a common ideal which has bound men together and elevated the lives of unnumbered thousands into a consciousness of mission and duty. And the Socialist creed which has supplanted the Protestant religion in all the great cities of Germany, mingled though it be with much that is crude, grotesque, and material, has provided a cause in which the emphasis is at least elevated from an individual to a class selfishness, able even to transcend the limits of nationality. Neither of these enthusiasms has any appreciable influence in the great towns of England. "The good sense of the British workmen," we are told, has saved him from these foreign exotic importations. But with the older faiths largely inoperative, and no new enthusiasm to occupy their places, life becomes more and more approximated either to a dull persistence in routine, with no attempt to look before and after and to estimate the worth of action, or else to a fierce and uncontrolled individualism, concentrated only on the pleasures and advancement of the family, tearing the social fabric into its component threads, and destined on the arrival of troublous times to ensure its speedy destruction.

III. A BACKGROUND TO LIFE.

"The visible becomes the Bestial," says Carlyle, "when it rests not on the invisible." Beneath all the superficial questions of long hours, low wages, shabby surroundings, or intolerable temptation rests this one fundamental

bed-rock demand : Can any background, illuminating to intellect, stimulating to emotion, and impelling to resonant action, be imparted to the masses that now choke up the dwellings of our great towns? This is a question which will certainly receive an answer before this century has closed ; with the nature of this answer modern civilisation stands or falls.

In a study such as this professes to be we must rule out of consideration any possibility of some sudden spiritual outpouring or the inexplicable awakening of a new religion. We are dealing with facts, not with miracles ; and although such a miracle may at any time become manifest, it is not our purpose to anticipate any immediate definite break in the slow progress of history and the long purposes of God. The point of view of this book is empirical, the deduction of immediate needs, the anticipation of the course of development from an attempt to disentangle and to estimate the forces operating in the present. That the sudden emergence of some new force may render futile all such calculations is at once a truism and a statement irrelevant to the subject of present discussion.

Dealing, then, with things as they are we may also rule out of consideration the innumerable transitory fancy religions and systems which, as in all other periods of decadent civilisation, have flamed for a few months or years amongst the leisured and wealthy classes. Positivism, spiritualism, theosophy, each gather for a time their small bodies of devoted adherents, their languid patronisers ; ethical societies issue volumes of essays, philosophers demonstrate to a select audience, exhibiting outward approbation but inward perplexity, the non-reality of evil. These systems, creeds, and religions rising and falling with a London season, an individual personality, or the cult of a particular salon, seem altogether without influence on the dreary life of the ghetto ; as the movements of the wind on the sea are unechoed in the unfathomable depths of the ocean. Each of them may command some aspect of the truth, all may be adequate to the demands of their disciples ; but the extravagance of each new pretension is discounted by those wearied with the succession

of similar trumpeting, and concerned not with the new interest for the few, but with the importunate need of the many.

Virtually it may be said the only forces operating among the new city race, the only attempts at spiritual or collective effort with which any dweller in it is ever likely to come into contact, are the forces of the older creeds of Christianity. Developing as they are to-day from their limited other-worldly outlook into systems endeavouring by every possible means, through direct spiritual energy, through instruction, through recreation, through political and social effort, to penetrate into the lives of the people, with widespread organisation and the possibility of unlimited store of energy upon which to draw, the Churches to-day present to the observer the most hopeful machinery for the warfare against the degenerating influences of modern town life. However much they may become developed in creed, broadened in outlook, or profoundly modified in intellectual position with advancing knowledge and a wider appreciation of the purpose of progress, they offer the only adequate machinery for the humanising, civilising, and Christianising of masses upon whom the advancement of science has bestowed little benefit, and into whose life the growth of democratic government has brought no illuminating ideal.

To one whose whole experience of life in the ghetto has driven home this fact the actual condition of the Churches, the realisation of the magnitude of their mission, and the astonishing greatness of their opportunity becomes a subject of almost painful interest. How far are the different religious bodies fulfilling their mission in these dense and unknown regions of humanity? And what changes are necessary before they can actually claim to have permeated and welded together the life of the new city race?

There are those who affirm that the day of the Churches is over; that the social settlement, springing either from direct religious motive, or from the mere devotion to the service of humanity, represents the ideal of future development, bringing classes together and uniting rich and poor in a common bond of sympathetic service.

These point to the wider outlook and possibilities in a

settlement, to the enthusiasm evoked by its financial support and the frequent notice of the "Settlement Movement" in the current journalism of the time. They look forward with hopefulness to a time when bodies of educated men and women shall be found residing in every mean street in our great cities, animated only with a passionate desire to give of that which they have in plenty to those who need, keen and eager in the service of man, which is the highest service of God.

Such were the expectations of those who first responded to the call for heroic enterprise twenty years ago ; such are still the expectations of the more hopeful adherents of to-day. What prospect does there appear to the outside observer of the fulfilment of these roseate visions ? Has the history of two decades shown the power of the settlement to kindle the enthusiasm in the successive generations of the Universities, to transcend the limits of sectarian barriers, to evoke from the sheer simplicity of the appeal of human need the outpouring of the forces of human sympathy ?

For my own part I realise that the call has failed. The Universities and the cultured classes, as a whole, care little about the matter. The wave of enthusiasm which created the modern settlement has ceased to advance ; the buildings remain and a few energetic toilers, and the memory of a great hope. Every settlement—Church of England, Nonconformist, Unsectarian—cries out for men, and few men are forthcoming. Some obtain theological students desirous of learning the life of the poor ; some attract individuals of which they are often only anxious to be rid ; a few, like Toynbee Hall, secure recruits through a great personality and a memorable name. In all the London settlements, among over four millions of toilers, there are not a hundred resident male workers ; of these many will stay for less than a year's residence. I cannot believe that this is the machinery destined to bridge the ever-widening gulf between class and class, and to initiate the new heavens and the new earth. The result of this rapid waning of former enthusiasm has been a change in the life of the settlement. The original conception as

advocated by Canon Barnett, the father of all University settlements, was of numbers of educated men making their lives and interests amongst the working people, in quietness and without ostentation pursuing their daily avocations, but forming friendships and participating in the life of the segregated masses of the poorer quarters of cities. But to-day settlements have become transformed. On the one hand we find a few striking personalities, whose influence acts with extraordinary power in the districts amongst which they reside; men whose unequalled knowledge of the conditions of life, the problems of poverty, the noblest and darkest possibilities of human nature in a distorted environment, has been gained by years of patient, unwearying, persistent effort for the welfare and the ennobling of men. On the other hand we discover that apart from these the settlements have become little more than centres of organisation. Lengthy programmes and reports appear: classes on every variety of subject, municipal enterprise, excursions, concerts, children's entertainments—everything designed to galvanise into vitality the dead indifference of the town. One is astonished to discover upon investigation that the whole of this conspicuous effort is being maintained by one or two individuals, mostly the permanent officials, with occasional help from peripatetic visitors, and a few who offer an hour or two a week for the elevation of the masses. I can see but little signs of any wide extension, of the increase of settlements now existing, or of the immediate multiplication of their number. The movement as a whole hangs fire, the difficulty of attracting the right followers seems increasing; a new shaking of the pillars of society appears necessary, some upheaval of thought, wave of common enthusiasm or realisation of national peril, to induce numbers again to interest themselves in a life so far removed from their own as the life of the manual labourer.

The great and enduring utility of the Settlement Movement lies, in my opinion, in its reaction upon the Churches. It has broadened the whole conception of the possibility of Christian effort; and its lessons are re-echoed in a

thousand scattered parishes. In the process of the widening of the Christian ideal towards its older and purer meaning it has exhibited the bringing back of religion into the relations of daily life, the spectacle of the possibilities of various forms of talent, and the wise cultivation and direction of all higher energies now stunted and dwarfed and trampled under in the life of modern cities. While the Churches are limited, fenced in, and exclusive of energy and devotion which longs to expend itself in the service of men, there will be demand for institutions to focus scattered effort and to provide opportunity for concerted action. But gazing round upon present conditions one must sadly confess that there appears little sign of any great awakening of stimulus and sacrifice which will renovate the settlements already existing and perpetually create new ones. The widening of the national religion to give scope to the few who now, outside the definite religious bodies, endeavour to work "to make reason and the will of God prevail" seems to me a more practical possibility than the galvanising of indifference into interest and selfishness into responsibility, which alone would guarantee the wide development of the settlement life and ideal. When every church is not only a place of Sunday worship, but also in its multifarious activities and offer of service a real settlement, then the admirers of the settlements can well reconcile themselves to see their own particular scheme merged in a wider ideal.

Back, then, the observer must come to the Churches themselves—to the actual machinery that here and now is grappling adequately or inadequately with the universal drift downwards which is characteristic of the progress of the mass. And surely here, outside observers would assert, there is ground for hopefulness. Many of the great Nonconformist bodies are held to be strong amongst the lower middle classes; the Roman Catholic Church touches in its large Irish population the very poorest; the Salvation Army is considered to provide a satisfactory religious creed for the submerged and a social scheme of unequalled promise; while the English Church, with its parochial organisation, yields every one the comforting

assurance that each unit of the vast multitude is included within some parish machinery, and cannot perish altogether neglected and alone.

It is difficult to estimate the work of religious organisations as seen, as it were, from the under side, without awakening a suspicion of sectarian jealousy. Of those who notice the subject at all, there are few who are prepared impartially to investigate the actual effect of religious agencies upon the lives of the people. On the one hand there are those who protest despair and futility as they gaze around upon an ever-increasing acreage of squalid streets, and conclude that religion has utterly ceased to influence the monotonous, earth-directed lives of the masses. These note church buildings everywhere empty, a lamentable percentage of membership amongst the total populations; Sundays of sleep, drinking, or aimless wandering in crowded ways; lives from which apprehension of spiritual things seems manifestly to have departed. And they see little but a population practically heathen, materialistic, dispirited, lacking in faith or ideals. On the other hand each particular religious centre, maintaining with insufficient appliance and help a hand-to-hand struggle, is compelled, in its continuous appeal for money or for workers, to demonstrate on paper a multifarious activity. The result is the typical Church or Mission report which, quite unconsciously perhaps, is almost always exaggerated or misleading. We find here in any district a testimony of astonishing energies: men's clubs, boys' clubs, children's clubs, girls' clubs; mothers' meetings, Pleasant Sunday Afternoons, social guilds, Christian Endeavourers; a network of services and Sunday Schools—an apparent progress and perpetual enlargement. How can we reconcile this picture with the actual impression of (say) a Sunday spent in the ghetto? It is the numbers that yield the possibility; the agency everywhere touching the lives of the people is found to be active indeed, but swamped in the multitude of the surrounding population, the whole sum total of activities but picking out here and there some more eager individual from the mass of coagulated indifference.

As the experience of one who has devoted some attention and with attempted impartiality to considering the work of religious bodies in dealing with this new problem, the following observations may perhaps be accepted as at least an honest effort to estimate their possibilities.

a. The Roman Catholic Church is doing heroic work amongst the very poorest. Her schools, on which so much effort has been expended, are in many respects models of their kind. They educate the poorest of the poor—many who are refused on varied pretexts admission to the State Elementary Schools—children of “Protestant” parents, hatless, bootless, half-starved. They are for the most part carried on in a spirit of devotion beyond all praise. But the Roman Catholic Church is too hopelessly submerged by the mere weight of numbers to be any effective influence beyond the limits of its own immediate adherents. Its priests are few and hard driven; its regular Orders show a singular disinclination to throw themselves into work in the congested districts. The lay element is almost completely absent. The sympathies of the Church are democratic; the devotion of many of the poorer Irish and others to their religion, their attendance at Mass, and their offerings from scanty earnings is enough to put to shame richer and more prominent organisations; the work is emphatically “of God.” Few who know anything of the life of the slum will be found to join in the shameful parrot-cry of “No Popery!” which has disturbed the minds of wealthy and languid individuals in a different quarter of life. But the paucity of numbers, both workers and adherents, leaves the body with but little influence upon the general life of the crowd; at present there appears but scanty possibility of such an increase of either as to materially effect the grave questions of the future of the city race.

b. The Free Churches form knots of devoted adherents and in certain parts exhibit an astonishing activity. They are strongly bound together with enthusiasm for each definite chapel. In specific districts, as in Westminster Bridge Road or Stepney Causeway, they rise to appreciable strength. Everywhere their Sunday Schools are large.

In the aggregate their adherents are found to total a goodly figure. But they are strongest amongst the middle classes and in these districts where the middle classes are mingled with the artisans—amongst the shopkeepers, the clerks, the better class mechanics that form the aristocracy of the congested districts. As one penetrates from the border region into the actual depth they are found to become a less and less operative force in the life of the people. This seems due to two main causes. In the first place they do not possess the machinery necessary to maintain endowed Churches throughout this vast district; and few of the scattered Missions are in a position to support themselves. There is nothing corresponding to the parochial system of the English Church with its buildings, parsonages, and certain if small endowments. The consequence of this is manifest: as the ghetto rolls forward, driving before it the middle-class element, so the Free Churches become submerged in the flood; some altogether disappearing, some carrying on an uncertain existence as Missions run by wealthier Churches on the outskirts or beyond the borders. "Time was," writes one mournful observer of one small district and one religious body, "when there was a large Wesleyan chapel in Spitalfields, but it dwindled away to nothing, and, being held on a short lease, was disposed of. . . . Fifty years ago both Spitalfields Chapel, seating 1,200 persons, and St. George's, Cable Street, seating 1,100 persons, were crowded, and the congregations consisted largely of well-to-do people. The Seamen's Mission also was a success. Brunswick, Limehouse, had a most respectable middle-class congregation; whilst at Poplar was built what was called throughout the Connexion 'The Model Chapel.' A very few years brought startling changes. The altered condition of the districts, the extension of the suburbs and ready means of travel, led to a general migration of the prosperous, and the consequence was Spitalfields, St. George's, the Seamen's Grove Road, and Brunswick, Limehouse, became emptied and blighted by poverty; while the new Lycett Memorial Chapel failed to fill. . . . Now Bow, twenty-five years ago the most flourishing Methodist Church in East London, has

succumbed. . . . Poplar also is very feeble. 'Where is boasting, then? It is excluded.'" This doleful history could be paralleled in all the other congested districts and amongst the remaining Free Churches. As the prosperous, energetic, and respectable migrate further and further from the inner ring, so the Nonconformist Churches which have been founded in more kindly environment totter and fall; become converted into Missions, drag out a starved and stunted existence, or are altogether abandoned.

Besides this more mechanical deficiency there is probably an internal reason for the fact that with certain conspicuous exceptions the Free Churches fail to gain hold of the population of the ghettos. Their religion is for the most part still frankly individualistic; they scarcely attempt to grapple actively, as the Salvation Army actively grapples, with the practical problems of poverty. Prominent and energetic as the Free Churches have been during the century in the promotion of political reform, they have failed to grasp the ever-shifting sphere of demand in favour of economic readjustment. They are far too much wedded to the ideals characteristic of the middle classes; through the development of the manufacturing classes they have risen during the past fifty years into a position of wealth and influence at least equal to that of the older religious bodies. In the poorer districts they represent the shopkeeping, comparatively affluent element; they pursue the comfortable, pew-rent Evangelical religion with earnest plea for the conversion of the individual soul, but with no very keen desire to weld separated classes together, or to unite with themselves the wastrel, the labourer, the economic failure. Many of their supporters still retain the older puritanical ideal: the despising of art and literature, the branding of the theatre, of dancing, of any form of Sunday recreation not entirely spiritual as of the nature of sin; the belief in the hard, pushing individualistic creed, and all the "dismal illiberality" characteristic of suburban life forty or fifty years ago.

Nonconformity has a great and increasing work to do amongst the upper and middle classes of England. It is strong in the towns of the North, in certain districts, as

Cornwall and Wales and in many of the villages. On the margin of the ghetto it lives and flourishes. But it possesses neither the machinery nor the enthusiasm requisite to gather in the "average man" of the masses. In the recent Simultaneous Free Church Mission, held with the happiest results upon the definite adherents of the Churches, nothing was more remarkable than the universal testimony that those outside had remained unaffected. If any background of collective and spiritual effort is to be imparted to those who "move amongst indifferent millions to mechanical employments" I am profoundly convinced that this must come through the only body possessing at present machinery adequate to the needs and claiming authority to cover the whole ground—the National Established Church of England.

c. What, then, is the actual influence or effect of the life of the English Church on the massed multitudes of the labouring classes? In all quarters at first sight appears a stirring and a movement. The Church, we are told, has awakened from her old lethargy; the "new crusade" against poverty, vice, and sin is calling to her most enthusiastic followers. Appeals for funds for new churches, for curates and mission workers, for all parochial agencies, flood the papers; buildings of corrugated iron, red brick edifices, Gothic structures, everywhere rise to heaven; disused railway arches become gymnasias, and condemned cellars clubs for boys and men.

One who has actually lived within the congested area is probably more inclined to note the weaker sides of this activity than to emphasise the enormous change that has swept over a Church traditionally wealthy, contented, and somnolent. It would be idle to deny that much is being accomplished. It is no light matter to place a temple of silence and a cultured and intelligent English gentleman in the midst of immense aggregations where no one has leisure and quiet, or rises above the aspirations of the local publican. Nor can it be denied that a vast machinery is at the present moment in operation designed to permeate the lives of the people; combining a gigantic relieving agency, a system of recreation, and a persistent endeavour

to elevate some consistent ideal over the hurried lives of men.

Yet the failures are no less apparent and heartbreaking. Charles Kingsley's reproach against the Church he loved so well remains in essence true to-day. "By the neglect of the Church, by her dealing (like all weak Churches) only with women, children, and beggars, the cream and pith of working-class intellect is almost self-educated and therefore also infidel." Church buildings themselves for the most part remain empty or gather audiences of women only. Associated with soup kitchens, doles, and gifts of food and clothing, they gather the shiftless and less reliant. Sunday Schools are filled with children; but, as many hard-working parish priests have announced, it is impossible to get the people to keep in touch with the Church after they have commenced to "grow up." The old bitter spirit against the Church and Christianity has largely died away. But this has become replaced by a genial indifference perhaps still more difficult to overcome; a quiet putting aside of the claims and calls of the Church which is the despair of all those intimately acquainted with the life of the masses.

Many causes are co-operating to produce this unhappy condition; and some are growing rather than diminishing. There is first the mere difficulty of coping with the overwhelming mass of numbers by one or two clergymen thrown down in parishes of ten or fifteen thousand. And this is intensified by the class separation which has resulted throughout large areas in the complete breakdown of the parochial system simply through lack of competent and willing workers. The district visiting, which should be so admirable a method of breaking up the "poor in a lump" into living, sensitive units, either vanishes altogether or becomes replaced by amiable but unreliable interruptions from the far-off West, or by mere reports from local nurses and others of the sick, needy, and infirm. But the gravest forebodings regarding the more mechanical aspect of the problem is evoked by consideration of the supply of clergy. The quantity itself is steadily falling off, and that despite a population in-

creasing by leaps and bounds. And the quality, considering the multifarious energies demanded from a clergyman in the modern city life, still leaves much to be desired. Some parts, indeed, as round the Oxford House area in Bethnal Green or the Cambridge College Missions in South London, obtain perhaps the cream of the younger clergy; those determined with fullest devotion and by every attainable method to elevate and sanctify the common life of men. But these are oases in the great desert; around them stretch an interminable acreage of mean streets offering no especial attraction or call to heroic endeavour. And in these the obtaining of the right sort of men appears to be increasingly difficult. The amiable young man of pleasing manners and limited intelligence who has taken an ordinary degree at the University, lived a life of contented and blameless indulgence, been crammed with a few assorted pieces of chopped-up theology at a theological college, is still the staple product from which the curate is obtained. He is often earnest and energetic; he will manage boys' brigades, visit the sick, and extemporise breezy sermons for children. He usually possesses hazy ideas of the power of the priesthood and a delight in sensuous music, a garish ritual, and a dogmatic scheme of salvation. But his reading, never very extensive, ceases with his ordination; the feverish activity of club, school, and service leave little scope for the equipment necessary for a leader of men. And for the most part he appears to fail to rise to the enormous possibility open to him as the only man in his parish able from his education and influence practically to affect the life of the massed populations around.¹

The absence of lay help, class separation, and deficiency

¹ Phillips Brooks, a witness of unquestioned impartiality, noted as hampering the English Church "the immense overwork of the clergy in externalities . . . which is an enormous tax on time and absorption of thought. . . . The character of a Church will always be determined by that of its working clergy, and so it is not very strange that a settled trust in ecclesiastical machinery, and sacraments, and sacred duties on the one hand, and a splendidly devoted but unthinking and superficial spirit of 'work' upon the other, are becoming more and more the temper of the English Church."

in quantity and quality of the clergy forms one group of causes hindering the full influence of the National Church. Another is provided by its inheritance from the past. The Church is far too conservative; still regarded as having blindly thrown itself into the arms of one political party in order to prevent its own spoliation. Its aristocratic organisation, its often irritating lack of progress, and its steadfast opposition to many of the movements of the people towards self-improvement, are costing it more than any anachronism of doctrine or division of religious party. It has fought Liberalism in politics: it has bitterly opposed the Educational party in the School Board; it expresses little sympathy with the "Progressives" in municipal affairs. These will not readily be forgiven it. It is far too much inclined to the doctrine of doles and devotion, to the benevolence of the rich and the grateful humility of the poor. Famous names, indeed, at once rise to the mind of those who have deliberately identified themselves with the newer movements: it is perhaps regrettable that these are mainly also associated with devotion to the quaint forms of mediæval ceremony. But despite the influence of these few, the Church as a whole is still distrusted by the more educated and progressive working-class opinion; regarded as being in the West End an instrument for the amusement and edification of the people, providing excellent music and preaching honeyed words: in the East End, as an instrument originally designed to minister to the needs of men, supported by the rates or by endowment for this purpose, and very inadequately fulfilling its function.

Even those who possess least sympathy with her dogmatic position may cherish regret that the English Church is thus handicapped in her struggle with the evils that are entering social life with these new city populations. To her alone seems offered this peculiar work: and much of the future possibility of the greatness of this country seems bound up with her acceptance or rejection of this heroic mission. At present she seems gaining little on the position of ten or twenty years ago;

and there appears scant reason to anticipate any signal awakening in the coming years. She is bound with the grave-clothes of a dead past: her formularies are embodied in antique phraseology; her organisation is still unequal to meeting the changed conditions of a newer age. She possesses no power of collective utterance, no organising body, no capacity of internal reformation. She is bitterly hated by many of the large religious bodies that have gone forth from her: she fails to arouse anything like a large and passionate devotion from the great mass of her outward adherents. Most of her energies seem to be devoted to crises and controversies that fill the onlooker with a kind of desperate astonishment. Her alliance with the State seems to have taken the heart out of her prophetic function and damped the energies of her sacrifice. All they that pass by wag their heads and mourn at her conventionalities, her respectabilities, her lack of discernment of the signs of the times. Yet from the very magnitude of the need men cry to her as out of the deep to realise the opportunity of her position before the time has gone by for ever. She is still national, claiming to gather together under her protection all the diverse classes of men. She still provides the only machinery for combating segregation and drawing together a community which seems falling to pieces under the influence of centrifugal forces impossible of resistance. She still confesses adherence to the ethical system of her Master, claiming to be the judge of intolerance and pride, the friend of the poor and oppressed, the redresser of social wrong, the eager champion of the weak and the afflicted. She has now offered to her a work, the magnitude of which may well dazzle her; and on her action during the next few generations her future appears to stand or fall. If she can become in the truest sense Democratic, gather together around her the new city populations, transform their excitable, turbulent, half-conceived ideas into something of the spirit of her earlier ideals, evoke once again the spiritual energies of those that own her allegiance, she may indeed be able to combat the estranging forces, weld together into a compact and

homogeneous people a nation that seems breaking up into isolated atoms, and make the name of England as famous throughout the coming century for moral progress as for material prosperity in the century now closed. But if she is to continue to acquiesce in a practical alienation from the great masses of the coming race, to adhere to a dull conservatism indifferent or hostile to crying reforms, and but fiercely to wrangle over the technicalities of ritual and ceremony, then assuredly with the stiffening of the fabric as the life ebbs from it, of her as of others the dreary decree will go forth, "Cut it down. Why cumbereth it the ground?"

IV. CONCLUSION.

Such in briefest outline is the new problem that confronts observers in England at the commencement of the century. Intensified in London, where it has attained its furthest development, it is equally manifest in the other great aggregations of the nation. No effort has been made to emphasise any startling or grotesque defacements of human existence: as the chemical workers who rot at St. Helens or Widnes, the chain-makers of Cradley, the wool-combers and fish-curers and others that carry in their very occupation the seeds of speedy decay. Nor is there any attempt here to exhibit the particular and unique desolation of our northern manufacturing centres: visions as that which John Ruskin termed the most frightful sight he had ever seen—the view from Wakefield Bridge,¹ or the journey from Ancoats Junction to Victoria Station at Manchester, which still remains in the memory of the present writer as a picture of profound disquietude. No superior comfort or material progress, one would hold, even if supplemented

¹ "Since finishing this letter I have driven leisurely through the Midland manufacturing districts. . . . The two most frightful things I have ever yet seen in my life are the south-eastern suburb of Bradford and the scene from Wakefield Bridge by the chapel; yet I cannot but more and more reverence the fierce courage and industry, the gloomy endurance, and the infinite mechanical ingenuity of the great centres, as one reverences the fervid labours of a wasp's nest, though the end of all is only a noxious lump of clay" ("Fors Clavigera," vol. iii., Letter L.)

by a week at Blackpool and the spectacle of the eleven hired players of different towns competing at football on Saturday, can altogether compensate for the unparalleled ugliness and gloom of the districts which their wealthier owners contemplate with so much pride. But attention has been concentrated on the more humane and kindly problem in London—no treeless, smoke-laden waste obviously given over to the desperate pursuit of wealth and subordinating all human developments to this one persistent end ; but the "Condition of the People" problem as manifest in the centre of culture and government, the home of literature, art, and religion, the spot whither all men pilgrimage to seek stimulus and pleasure, the capital of the greatest empire that the world has ever seen.

Looking back for one last survey at the multiple complex problem, the "desolation of many generations," the impression finally retained is not of the positive misery or ugliness, but the egregious *waste* of it all—waste as in the working of some clumsily contrived machinery producing the minimum of result from the maximum of effort. What this abstract sum-total of waste means when traced through a thousand individual channels to the concrete facts of real life, let those testify who have actually made their homes in the lower quarters of our great cities. Consider merely the children at one period of their lives. They exhibit an astonishing eagerness to know and to understand the conditions of the marvellous world in which they are living. They read with avidity fairy tales and histories of adventure. They construct stories of a region of fantasy of their own designing. They press to any form of entertainment, stimulus, or novel change in their surroundings. They manifest a love of colour and form and often a real selective taste : a delight in music and rhythmic action, a refinement of mind, an originality, and often a physical beauty which is a perpetual astonishment to those who apprehend the surroundings from which these have sprung. Human nature, however stunted or dwarfed by cramped dwellings, poor food, or hereditary disease, seems perennially about to blossom into something

holy and divine. Ten or fifteen years later contemplate the same population. "My life down there," wrote one little girl after a visit to the country, "was like a beautiful dream, and when I returned to London I seemed to be awake." In the ten years' interval the dream has vanished for ever, the awakening has come—not, indeed, to full consciousness, but to a sort of nightmare, somnambulant progress through the unchanging monotonous days. No book will be opened again. The taste for form and colour has vanished; singing and dancing and the love of melody have dropped out of existence. The physical beauty has crumpled up and departed; long hours of desolating toil, charring, washing, the premature care of a family, early work in the factories has made the human body of man or woman stunted, deformed, haggard, a thing not good to look upon. Life is becoming contracted to the workshop, the small crowded home, and the daily journey from the one to the other. The spiritual arena, the vision of the Unseen often so startlingly revealed amongst our children when least expected, has given place to a vague discontent against whatever has ordered the present social conditions and a vague belief in the amiability of a distant and unknown God. Life may be tolerable or even happy in animal enjoyment and the alternation of rest and toil; but the waste of the incalculable possibilities in this vast, unimportant mass of human nature seems something that surely one day will demand explanation and requital.

How if in any way the evils of the ghetto can be mitigated is a question which the remainder of this book attempts in some slight degree to answer. There is no broad road of escape, no obvious path through the wilderness by which the people can enter the promised land. After contemplating in detail the problem in one small area, and then striving to realise the immensity of its multiplication, small wonder if reformers in sorrowful acquiescence conclude that—

"We are here
And God is there, and nowhere help at all."

But it will at least be a great step forward if educated

opinion in this country can realise that "a menace to the future progress of humanity" is now silently, without observation, developing in the great cities of England. The old astonishing creed that if each man assiduously minds his own business and pursues his own individual advancement and the welfare of his family, somehow by some divinely ordered interconnections and adjustments the success and progress of the whole body politic will be assured, may at least perhaps be relegated to the limbo of forgotten illusions. We now know only too well that from an aggregation of individual selfishness no healthy, consistent, harmonious social fabric can be woven; that the general drift and trend of things is always downwards, always towards dissolution and disintegration; and that only through the conscious self-sacrifice, devotion, and effort of its citizens can any country be maintained in nobility and healthfulness. No commercial success, climatic advantage, or universal domination can ever resist the dry rot of isolated effort after material satisfaction, tearing individuals and classes apart, and breaking up the organism into an aggregation of isolated atoms.

Back to the land, from gigantic massed populations to healthier conditions of scattered industry; housing reform; temperance reform; a perfected system of national education; the elimination of the submerged; the redemption of women's labour—all these are immediate necessities. But all these are but palliatives of the one fundamental malady—attempts in some degree to check the ravages of selfishness, indifference, and isolation. Accompanying all these must be whole-hearted endeavour to deal with the disease at its very centre. We would plead for the service of all who love for all who suffer; for the proclamation of any way of escape from the evils to come; for the assistance of all to whom ignorance in the presence of knowledge is a perpetual challenge, and misery in the presence of happiness a perpetual reproach. We would welcome energy however aroused, sacrifice however stimulated, ideals however attained. We would acclaim the effort of all to whom moral progress has any value and human sympathy any meaning. We demand more settlements,

more churches, more living intercommunication of class and class; we desire to force into every house a knowledge to which many would shut their ears, and to render the plea of ignorance of none effect. But over and beyond all these, as the only possibility of peaceful escape from the gathering difficulties of the future, we need a real and living religion—some outpouring of spiritual effort which will revitalise dogmas and injunctions now entombed in neglected and unrealised creeds. The reverence for the weaker which Goethe found as the distinctive trait of Christianity; the sympathy only demanding scope for its abundant energies; the apprehension as by sudden insight of the meaning of the statement, "It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish"—if the words so glibly repeated of the Master whom all the Churches delight to honour could only but for one moment of illumination be realised in their full and intelligible meaning, "how soon all worldly wrong would be repaired" and the clouds gathering around the future dissolve and disappear! Before such a spirit the technical questions would find moving power adequate to their speedy solution; the polarisation of society into those who get and those who lack, produced by forces seemingly so impersonal, gigantic, beyond the interference of human agency, would collapse before the determination that all may be one; the calls of a thousand conflicting sects would merge harmoniously into a universal fellowship "wide as human life and deep as human need"; and the ghetto, in its vastness, its gloomy endurance, its multitudinous desolation, would vanish before the eager and passionate sympathy of those for whom in reality the wilderness and the solitary place would be glad, and the desert rejoice and blossom as the rose. At the commencement of the twentieth century of the Christian era, in a world-wide disenchantment, the most progressive races of our Western civilisation stand as if paralysed before a problem apparently beyond human solution—seeing human action vanishing in a kind of wide and barren marshland through which pulsate no tides of the Infinite sea. But if the cry of "Back to the

Christ," which so many observers note as a manifest sign of the coming years, be but the herald of a deep and earnest attempt of the Churches to realise once again the life and the teaching of their Master, then to the anxious watcher the night may indeed be far spent—the dawn be nigh at hand.

THE HOUSING PROBLEM

THE supreme question of the day in London is that of the Housing of the People." So writes Mr. Charles Booth, the greatest living authority upon the statistics of the social evils of to-day.

His words are echoed by statesmen of all shades of opinion. Lord Salisbury has described the present position as a scandal to our civilisation ; and the leaders of the Liberal party have been no less vigorous in their denunciation. The King himself has made especial reference to the housing of the working classes, saying that it is a question in which he has always felt the deepest personal interest. And whatever be the political opinion of a statesman, whatever views he may hold upon the multitude of questions arising to-day at home and abroad, if he really knows anything, either at first hand or by true report, of the facts of the housing question he cannot do otherwise than say, " It is of supreme importance."

Of all the defects of our modern civilisation, of all the glaring inconsistencies with which we are confronted, of all the fearful contrasts with which those who descend into the arena of life are brought face to face, is there anything more dreadful than the contrast between the beautiful productions of machinery—our fine ships, our great steam engines—or our vast mansions, and the squalid constructions which are expected to serve as a home for no incon-

siderable part of our population? This is no matter of speculative statistics. To those who come into contact with the lives of the poorer of the people it is a matter of daily knowledge which is absorbed with the air they breathe. Sometimes, even in that polite world which prefers to remain in ignorance of what the other half of the world is doing, the depth of human pity is stirred by some unusually sad tale of lives crowded out of existence; but the interest is too often short-lived, and the troubles of the 94 per cent.¹ population who compose "the other half" are soon forgotten.

We do not deceive ourselves; we know that this state of things is not right; we know that it is not the state of life demanded of a Christian people, but we fall back upon the idea that it is necessary—that it is the natural order of things—that progress and evolution demand that it should be. "At any rate," we say perhaps, "it is a great deal better than it was a few years back." And the net result is that, partly through ignorance, and partly through deliberate indifference, we do little or nothing to remedy the evil.

It cannot be expected that in a short essay of this kind a great deal of fresh material can be provided; nevertheless I hope to be able to present a certain amount of living information of the facts as they are at present, to indicate roughly the general lines in which the problem is to be solved, and to name some of the particular steps which can be taken at once towards this end.


At the outset it should be clearly understood that when we speak of the Housing Problem or of the overcrowding of the working classes, we are including within this title a number of more or less distinct problems, that some of these are capable of quite separate treatment, and that others are so indissolubly linked together that they must be solved simultaneously if they are to be solved at all. Thus, for instance, the clerk thinks there is a housing problem for him when he finds that it costs him thirty or forty pounds a year, with rates and taxes in addition, to

¹ "Life and Labour," C. Booth, vol. v. p. 18.

obtain a house in a not too congenial suburb. The country labourer when he has to put up with a tumble-down cottage because there are none left that are really fit for human habitation ; the poor widow forced to rent for four or five shillings a single room in which her work has to be done and herself and her children have to eat and sleep ; for each of these and for other sections of the social organism there are housing problems with special characters of their own ; and coupled with all of the above the unhealthy growth of our large cities has to be taken into consideration.

It is the first duty of any one attempting to solve the housing problem to indicate the relation which these problems bear to one another.

I have adopted what seems to me an easy way of depicting the various divisions of the whole question and their mutual interdependence by constructing a kind of genealogical tree, which will enable these things to be detected at a glance :—



Branching out from the general problem are the two divisions of rural housing and urban housing ; the latter must be subdivided into the problems of housing single persons and of housing families ; the problem of insanitary areas and the general problem of the towniness of towns. The housing of families admits of quite separate treat-

ment, according to the class of family which is under consideration ; thus there is a housing problem for the clerk and the highly paid manual worker, a housing problem for the ordinary artisan and the regular labourer, and yet another for the poorest class of the people.

The towniness of towns, on the other hand, is to be regarded as an evil on account of the sheer geographical concomitant of overcrowding to the acre, and also on account of the moral, physical, and æsthetic degradation which is implied by the denial of access to the country.

I have represented the whole problem as a kind of grand ancestor ; perhaps the true idea would have been to have inverted the process, showing all the separate evils as giving birth at the bottom of the tree to the one descendant commonly recognised under the name of the Housing Problem. But the desired result has been achieved if it has been rendered possible to understand the various divisions of the subject and their connection one with another. Of these—(1) Rural housing, and (2) Housing of single persons, can to some extent be discussed without reference to the other portions of the problem.

Before touching, therefore, upon the general question of urban housing, which will form the main subject of this essay, I propose to say a few words on the problem of rural housing. It should be quite clearly understood, however, that I am not making any attempt to deal with the question in detail, but merely to state the case very briefly, in order that no further allusion to it will be required.

It will come as a surprise to a good many of those who live in towns that there should be such a thing as a problem of rural housing at all ; the housing question and overcrowding are so inseparably connected in their minds with the growth of slums, with a long, low line of monotonous houses in an out-of-the-way part of the city, with a number of dirty, unkempt children playing in the street, that it will take a certain amount of solid evidence to convince them that in the open spaces of the country there are cases of overcrowding nearly as miserable as any that

can be named in our towns. And yet such is veritably the case.

In a paper on Rural Housing,¹ which was read at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, March 1, 1900, Mr. Clement Edwards lays bare some of the facts which exist to-day. In the previous autumn he had been investigating the conditions of housing the labourers in the south and west of England, and he found that not only were many of the inhabited cottages in a hopelessly dilapidated condition, with gaping walls and rotting roof, but, in addition, they were often terribly overcrowded. He cites a district in Somersetshire where cottages with two tiny bedrooms each accommodated a family of six or seven persons, and a couple of lodgers in addition; in other cases two families were housed in a single dwelling of the same character.

Again, in Wiltshire, there were cottages with only a single bedroom, each accommodating a family extending to six or seven, and in one case eleven persons. "Some of the facts I gleaned," he says, "were positively revolting in themselves, and much worse in their obvious suggestion of inevitable social and moral results." As to sanitation, it was in a great many places simply non-existent. Moreover, in many cases the labourer's unhappy lot is aggravated by the system of tied houses, by which the tenant farmers take the cottages with their farms and sublet them to the labourers, so that the tenancy is dependent upon the service contract, and the employer of a man's labour has the right of turning him out of his home at the same time as depriving him of his employment.

Similar testimony as to overcrowding is borne by Miss Constance Cochrane, a Member of the Sanitary Institute, who quotes the case of a cottage in Cambridgeshire where "eleven members of a family are all sleeping in a single room because of the scarcity of cottages in the village."

What has happened, then, that affairs are in this condition? We all know that from many districts the labourers have emigrated in crowds to the towns, but the fact is that the old houses have fallen into decay

¹ Published by the Fabian Society as Tract 101.

more rapidly than the people have departed ; and in consequence in a great number of places throughout the country there is not sufficient housing accommodation to go round for the agricultural labourer. In some cases a broken-down railway carriage or a house with the roof fallen in must satisfy the requirements of him and his family, for the simple reason that there is nothing else to be obtained.

At this point, it is possible some people may be unwilling to credit the facts set out, and to ask why, if they are true—if this urgent need of houses exists in certain agricultural districts—it does not constitute an economic demand which is certain to be met with a sufficient supply.

It would be a sufficient answer to this objection to point to the high price of building materials and building labour to-day, and to ask how far it can be supposed that the agricultural labourer with his twelve or fourteen shillings a week can afford to offer an *effective* demand for decent houses to be built even when the cost of the ground may be neglected ; but it is more important to remember that in the agricultural districts we are still dealing frequently with monopolistic rather than competitive conditions.

Here a good landlord who looks after his tenants and is not afraid to expend something on their behalf may see that they are well and satisfactorily housed, while another landlord not far away may not care to take the trouble, or go to the expense required, to build decent cottages on his estate, especially as he cannot be certain how far further migration to the towns may be carried in the course of the next few years.

There is still to-day an agricultural population who are largely dependent upon the landlord of their village to make their lives easy or miserable, and the solution of the problem is therefore to a great extent local.

Where the landlord fails in his duty public opinion should be roused and brought to bear upon him ; the medical officer in all cases should be placed in a satisfactory position and should be able to enforce the fulfilment of precautions essential to health ; and finally the district council should have facilities offered to them for

constructing where necessary reasonable and decent accommodation for the people.

Special considerations are bound to apply to each district, but the fundamental requirement is that people should care a little more about the question, that something of the apathy which prevails at present should disappear.

If people would only insist upon knowing the facts, and when they know them, upon having everything possible done to put them to rights, no one can seriously doubt that the rural housing problem would meet with speedy solution.

THE URBAN PROBLEM.

I propose now to leave the consideration of rural housing and devote my attention exclusively to the question as it presents itself to us in the towns. And as there is one part of the subject which can be still further set apart from the rest and discussed separately, viz., that of providing suitable accommodation for single persons, it will be well to deal with that first and by itself, very briefly, so that the ground may be cleared for the more complex questions which affects the housing of families.

It is not long since the accommodation which was open to single persons was of a character too awful to describe. Any one who found himself alone without friends in a large city, and without sufficient means to provide himself with lodging at an inn, was obliged to adopt the alternative of walking the streets or risking obtaining admission at one of those common lodging-houses which existed at that time. If he took the latter course, in addition to being exposed to vermin of all descriptions, he ran considerable risk of suffering personal violence and of being robbed of any small belongings he might have brought with him.

The last few years have happily seen a marked improvement in this direction. Model lodging-houses have sprung up in a great many places to cater for the needs of the poorest classes of respectable citizens, and have met with considerable success. The great majority of

these "Working Men's Hotels" are clean and comparatively comfortable, and are quite worthy of the name by which they are known.

The most luxurious of these buildings in London are those erected by the Rowton Company, started by Lord Rowton a few years ago.

For sevenpence a night, or in some cases sixpence, a man can obtain a bed in a separate cubicle, and during the day he has the run of the reading-room, library, smoking-room, and kitchen—all thoroughly well appointed; and at the same time he will find that every attention has been paid to sanitary and washing facilities, which are in accordance with the latest methods, and leave little to be desired. Lord Rowton has successfully demonstrated by these experiments that clean and well-arranged lodging-houses for single men can be built economically, and made to pay a full dividend upon capital laid out.

A somewhat similar undertaking has been started in Parker Street by the London County Council, and any one who wishes to learn for himself might do worse than pay a visit to this interesting establishment.

Another lodging-house of a cheaper character is provided in the neighbourhood of the Victoria Docks by Mansfield House University Settlement. At this place, which is known as "The Wave," a man can obtain a lodging which entitles him to a bed and to the use of kitchen and smoking-room for the very moderate sum of two shillings a week, and though the accommodation is not of quite the same class as that of those just mentioned, every care is taken that a clean, respectable lodging is provided for those who demand it. Here, too, it is found that the undertaking pays its way without difficulty, and this in spite of the fact that the class catered for is that of the dock labourer, one of the poorest in existence.

These experiments all go to prove that when such a building can be shown to be required to meet a recognised want, the enterprise can be undertaken by an individual or by a public body, with the confident expectation that if carefully and wisely administered, no financial loss will be incurred.

In carrying out these objects a great deal will depend upon the deputy who is placed in charge. Upon him must fall the immediate management of the establishment, and he will have to bear the whole responsibility of rejecting those who are not fit to be accommodated as lodgers. But if a suitable man be selected there will be every hope that the result of the undertaking will be to give a clean, respectable, healthy lodging in place of a dirty and disreputable one, and thus a decided benefit will have been conferred upon the community.

It must be borne in mind, however, that such a building should not be erected except where a very distinct need for one can be shown. Apart from the question of finance, it may often be extremely undesirable that too luxurious houses for single men should be in existence in glaring contrast to the squalor of many of the homes in which families are housed. The temptation for a man to desert his wife and children in East London and elsewhere is often great enough as it is ; and the provision of cheerful abodes for those who are single should not be pushed to the extent of making this temptation unusually great.

Besides lodging-houses there are a number of shelters which provide something less by way of accommodation for a sum which is generally, wholly or in part, borne by some philanthropic agency. The discussion of these lies outside the present essay.

Various attempts have been made to provide for women what is strictly a lodging-house of a respectable kind, and it is needless to say that those which private enterprise have hitherto supplied are unspeakably bad. More numerous have been the various homes and institutions which are of a slightly different character. Whatever may be the value these may have for those for whom they are intended, they certainly do not meet the requirements of a lodging-house, for they impose conditions upon their inmates to which no respectable, independent girl could possibly submit. A women's lodging-house exists at Glasgow owned by the Corporation, concerning which I have the following information, kindly supplied by

Mr. Menzies, the manager of the City Improvements Department :—

“The house was built about 1870, and has been twice enlarged, the cost now standing at £8,145—after writing off £883 to depreciation. It contains 284 beds, which are let nightly at 3d. and 4d. per bed. The house is always full, and the net return on the capital invested is about 5 per cent. There is also in Glasgow a small lodging-house belonging to the Salvation Army, and several others of a very poor character.”

It would certainly seem that there is much left to be done in this direction in our larger cities ; but the whole subject is fraught with peculiar difficulties which lie outside this essay.

A very different state of things presents itself to our notice when we come to study the question of the housing of families in our great cities.

In the wealthy suburbs we see the spacious houses of the rich and well-to-do ; in other suburbs are the detached and semi-detached villas tenanted by the lower middle class ; nearer to the heart of the city, or perhaps in a poorer class suburb, are to be seen streets upon streets of monotonous houses often inhabited by two, and sometimes by three or even four families belonging to the working classes ; while hidden away from sight down a back court here, or a blind alley there, are the wretched, tumble-down dwellings, the slums of our great cities, in which the poorest of our population seek to find a shelter, if not a home. The housing problem, as it is generally thought of, is a problem compounded of the last two, or perhaps three, of these subdivisions.

To the clerks the problem presents itself as one of high rents and of time wasted in going to and from their work. With salaries ranging perhaps from £80 to £200 a year, it seems excessive that the rent should run up to £25 or £40, or even more, and that on the top of this should come rates and taxes and the heavy expenses of the journey to and from their work each day.

It is upon this class, with their very slender means, that the burden of living up to the conventional requirements

of the twentieth century presses most heavily, and often genuine necessities of life and health are sacrificed in the struggle ; but fortunately a really satisfactory supply of living accommodation has been recognised as a conventional as well as a vital necessity, and in consequence the pinch of overcrowding is felt by this class of the community rather in the size of the slice withdrawn from their income than in the actual deprivation of light and air. The struggling gentility, the innumerable sacrifices of pleasure and comfort made in honour of the goddess of Appearance, are often a subject of mirth and derision both to those placed above them in the social scale and also to those who, earning not much inferior wages for manual labour, are freed from such tyrannous conformity to the demands of the times ; but we cannot but recognise that it is not solely upon this class, but upon other sections of the community, that a large share of responsibility for this condition is to be placed. The evil of their lot lies in the fact that both their money and their time are completely exhausted before the essential needs of a full life are attained. Their income, impaired by convention, is further sapped by the ruinous expenses of their accommodation, leaving the barest margin for even the simplest necessities ; and the portion of daylight not allotted to the far from healthy occupations of their calling is consumed in the inevitable journeys to and from the suburbs in which their houses are situated.

The problem, as it strikes the great majority of the townspeople of our large cities—those who are engaged in regular manual work—is something different ; to them it represents essentially the straitening of accommodation. As wages and rents vary considerably from town to town, it may be as well here to confine our figures to the great city of which we so often think when we speak of the housing problem. I mean, of course, to London itself, and we find here that these classes are in receipt of wages which may be taken as running from 22s. a week up to 40s. or a little more. Speaking generally, not a large proportion of them care to live at a great distance from their work, and the price which they find themselves

called upon to pay, viz., two or three shillings per room in the outer belt of the populated city, rising, as we approach the centre, to something like 7s. 6d. per room in the neighbourhood of Tottenham Court Road, obliges them to give up a very large percentage of their income in house expenditure, or to put up with miserably inadequate accommodation.

Thus, though the artisan in good wages who is able to live in the outer belt may be able to have a whole cottage of four or five rooms to himself, if he will or must live nearer to the centre he is often obliged to put up with only two rooms; while the regular labourer in receipt of perhaps 22s. to 28s. a week is rarely able to attain more than half a house in the outer ring, and must content himself with two very miserable apartments, or perhaps even a single room, if by necessity or inclination he finds himself drawn into the vortex of the great city.

Thus it comes about that the people who live within inner London are housed a class worse than their means would indicate. The artisan who is not really poor is yet poorly housed; the labourer who is poor, but not very poor, is yet very poorly housed.

This general fact is well brought out by the statistics given by Mr. Charles Booth in his figures dealing with overcrowding within the County of London. He has divided the area up into an inner and an outer region, and he gives the figures for each trade for each. Thus he tells us, with respect to carpenters, that of those living in the inner area 44 per cent. live in what he describes as crowded¹ accommodation, while for the outer belt only 27 per cent. suffer in this way. For the mason the figures are 60 and 39; for the bricklayers, 66 and 48; for engineering and shipbuilding, 43 and 22; for printers, 50 and 20; bookbinders, 52 and 26; and we might proceed to go through the whole list of trades and find similar results.

It is possible that there may be some difference between the character of the work done by the men living in the two regions, though they are called by the same name—between the carpenters of the inner ring and the carpenters

¹ Two or more persons to one room.

of the outer ring, for instance ; but in the main the figures afford good evidence of the state of affairs which I have described.

The housing problem presents itself to us, then, with regard to these classes in this form : that in London there are many respectable families of artisans in receipt of good wages, who are cramped in their accommodation, and that in all cities (and in London in particular) the regular labourer who is a full working member of the community, is so cooped up that he and his family have not the necessary living space which decency and health demand, the comfort and the full pleasures of existence being left right out of the question.

When society has to deal with the question as it affects those classes of which I have been speaking, it cannot put forward any of those counter pleas of which it is so anxious to avail itself ; it cannot contend that it is all the people's own fault, that their habits and mode of living preclude the possibility of their receiving satisfactory accommodation. The great majority of them are respectable members of society, who would know how to prize and value a decent house if they could get one, but the exigency of the times denies to them this common right of humanity.

In some districts of our city, where locally there is something in the nature of a house famine, the evil is exaggerated. Insanitary, unhealthy dwellings are tenanted without a murmur, and no whisper of complaint is allowed to reach the sanitary inspector ; for it is well known that any such action by the tenant would speedily bring about a notice to quit or an addition to the rent on the part of the landlord. The evil is great, but it is not the hideous evil affecting the class below, the deliberate waste of human lives by the community which we see there ; it is to this subject we must now turn.

It is the case with almost every social problem with which we have to deal, that after considering the position of the classes above the pressing line of poverty, we come at length to the lowest class of all for whom the problem takes a different aspect. The submerged tenth, as this

class is sometimes objectionably called, have problems to face which are all their own. They are known to many of us through the life-like pictures of their existence which Mr. Charles Booth has given us in his well-known "Life and Labour of the People"; and in the classification which I am making there would be included here the whole of his class "B," with possibly a portion of his class "C" thrown in. The casual docker pressing every morning to the dock gates, often turned away without work, sometimes in periods of great pressure working right through the day and night twenty-four, and even sometimes thirty-six, hours at a stretch, making fifty shillings in a single week; at other times for long periods out of work, with an irregular income, whose average does not rise above fourteen or fifteen shillings; the coster, with his barrow of perishable goods; the fish-porter; and the casual of all and every description in the hundred-and-one occupations in which his services are in irregular demand. Or again the large number of families which look to the labour of a woman for their support: the family of the idle father; the widow with several children left upon her hands, who must make the frequent journey up to the City house to carry to and fro the product of her labour; the young girl who finds her employment in some shop, and out of the small sum of ten or twelve shillings a week has to try and keep herself respectable and preserve something of a home.

These are the people who are living three or more to a room; frequently a whole family of four, five, or six in a single apartment. How many are there such in our metropolis? Eight per cent. of the people are living in families of two or more in one-roomed tenements. Is there any one who thinks this little? Then let him say to himself that there are three hundred thousand people in London who are huddled together in families in this way, and denied anything of what can be called a home. We are so used to hearing this spoken of that it has lost a great deal of the meaning which it would otherwise have for us.

These people are creatures of like flesh and blood as yourself, the reader of this article; their daily needs are

the same, their senses are of similar nature, though possibly with the continual hardness of daily existence, some of the finer of their susceptibilities may have been worn down.

Try and picture just one day of such a family. Imagine yourself forced to live a whole twenty-four hours among them.

Perhaps one of the first things you would do would be to go to the window and try to open it ; very likely it would stick fast, and if not, you would find yourself meeting with considerable opposition from the family. And you would learn that though it may be all very well for you warmly clothed and well nourished to like plenty of fresh air, yet for them insufficiency of clothes and food renders the liability of a chill an incident more to be dreaded than the noxious effects of a badly ventilated apartment in which the whole family have slept and eaten for weeks and months. The night comes on, the children have turned in, and are sleeping on the floor in their clothes, with some slight covering over them, or perhaps in the single bed. At last the creaking of the stairs and a sound of heavy boots denotes the arrival of the head of the family, who probably having drunk, at any rate, quite as much as is good for him, comes home to rest. No privacy, no decency, nothing but a single room for all. So the night goes through and morning dawns. The sleeping apartment becomes the dining-room—the day proceeds. No fresh air, little or no sunshine, day in and day out.

Such are the inevitable conditions almost at their best of the single-room tenements.

What they are on the average or may be at their worst, no pen can adequately describe. So full of vermin that the floor and every object in the room is literally alive ; the walls in every stage of dirt and decay, the air so foul that to be obliged to inhale it is torture, without the smallest ray of sunshine summer and winter, they form the abodes of those who are very poor.

What all this means only those who have lived among them can have even the faintest conception.

Is it surprising that, possessed of homes such as these,

men and women seek to deaden their senses in drink, quarrels are incessant, language takes to itself the character of their surroundings, that in paroxysms of rage deeds are done before which the head bows in shame? Upon whom does the blame and responsibility lie? Is it wholly upon those whose lives are lived within such surroundings?

What chance, I would ask, can there be for a family growing up here? The great Earl Shaftesbury recognised these facts; in his evidence upon the Housing of the Working Classes in 1884, he said: "I have both heard and read remarks that are very injurious to the masses of the people, and likely to prevent any reforms being made on their behalf, to the effect that they are so sunken, so lost, so enamoured of their filth, that nothing on earth can ever rescue them from it. Now I am certain that a great number of the people who are in that condition have been made so by the condition of the houses in which they live. I have no doubt that if we were to improve the condition of the dwellings, there would be a vast number of very bad cases who would continue in the filth in which they began, but I am sure that no small number might be rescued from it by being placed in better circumstances, might have greater enjoyment of health, and might thus be much improved in their general condition."

Those of us who believe this humane utterance to be substantially true to-day are not concerned to deny the wretched character which is borne by a portion at any rate of the class we are considering; some of them are habitual drunkards; not a few of them drink to excess every now and again; not a few of them are bad husbands, bad wives, bad tenants, bad employees; but is the miserable home the cause or the effect of these things? Of what use, for instance, is it to urge that a man's place in the evening is his own home, and not at the public-house, if it is a home of this character which he possesses? Cause and effect are inextricably mixed up; circumstances and character, character and circumstances, it is the same vicious circle into which one always enters when the problems of this unhappy class are brought into the arena of criticism. It always seems a marvel to me that so many

of the children born and bred in such a home do grow up respectable men and women—a wholesome marvel, saying a very great deal for this human nature of ours which so many people are always too anxious to run down.

The evil of insanitation is something different from and in addition to the evil of overcrowding ; and, moreover, it is a communal as well as an individual evil. To the individual it takes the shape described by Mr. Bowmaker in his admirable book on "The Housing of the Working Classes." He says, speaking of a certain section of old property where defects have been greatly aggravated by the neglect to repair, and maintain :—

"A very large proportion of such houses is in the last stage of dilapidation. The windows contain little glass, and even the sashes may have disappeared, or, if present, are in a rotten condition. They are usually useless for the purposes of ventilation, the remaining sashes having to be secured in order to hold the frames together. In Sunderland, a woman hanging up a birdcage at one of these wretched windows, leaned upon the sash, which collapsed, with the result that she was precipitated into the street, sustaining injuries to which she succumbed. The walls are damp and crumbling away, and are often absolutely rotten. The roofs are usually in a bad state of disrepair ; few indeed of such houses having ever been re-roofed. This allows damp to penetrate into the house, as also does defective spouting. The floors are usually rotten, the woodwork being generally in a bad condition, especially in the staircases and common passage. In addition to these and other defects, the want of ventilation in the dwellings, the defective lighting of the rooms, staircases, and passages, and the want of free circulation of air about and through the houses, all combine to give us a class of property which is a disgrace to the community."

Add to this the total failure of any adaptation of the old sanitary arrangements to meet the new conditions under which a house intended for one family has been converted to the use of half a dozen, the fatal proximity of buildings to one another, as a result of which the whole ventilation of one dwelling is effected by air already poisoned by the

drainage and refuse of its neighbour, and you have something of the sanitary problem as it affects the individual.

Perhaps the best description of the communal danger will be given by quoting a passage from the official report of Mr. Stewart of the work done by the London County Council. In describing the original condition of the famous Boundary Street area which was up-rooted in 1891, he says : "The streets were 20 in number, and the average population per room was about two and a quarter, 107 rooms having five or more inhabitants each. The streets and courts were very narrow, the widest being only 28 feet across. In very many cases there was a great difference between the level of the street and that of the ground floor of the houses, the latter in some cases being 18 inches below the former. A large number of the houses had no back yards, and many of the small courts were of a very bad class.

"There were 730 houses, of which 652 were occupied, wholly or partly, by persons of the labouring classes ; the remaining 78 houses consisted of 12 public-houses and beer-shops, 21 shops and factories, 2 registered lodging-houses (153 beds) ; and 43 empty houses. The population, exclusive of those in lodging-houses, was 5,566."

An area of this character not only inflicts a severe and wanton injury upon those who live within it, but by becoming a hotbed of infection and disease, is also a serious danger to the community at large. This is the view which is taken of the question in Part I. of the Act of 1890 for the Housing of the Working Classes, and also in the Public Health Acts, where it is distinctly stated that such conditions are to be regarded as a public nuisance.

When we turn from the actual facts of insanitation to their effects upon life and health, we only find presented to us the natural outcome of such conditions of existence. The Report of the County Council tabulates the vital statistics of the Boundary Street Area, and compares them with those for the rest of the district of Bethnal Green, and those for the whole of London, in the following table :—

	Bethnal Green (1886-88).	Repre- sented Area (1886-88).	Repre- sented Area (1889 only).	London (1889).
General Mortality.....	Per 1,000. 22·8	Per 1,000. 40·0	Per 1,000. 40·13	Per 1,000. 18·4
Deaths from zymotic diseases	3·7	7·9	10·71	2·33
Deaths from tubercular diseases	3·9	8·5	7·26	2·69

From which it will be seen that the death-rate within the area is nearly double that for Bethnal Green, and more than double that for the whole of London. Such figures speak for themselves. If any further evidence is required of the results produced by overcrowding and insanitation, the figures for St. George's-in-the-West and St. George's-in-the-East may be set side by side. In the former, where the official overcrowding is quoted at 10 per cent., the death-rate is 13·2 ; while in the latter, where it stands at 40 per cent. it is 26·4, or exactly double.

I can imagine that some people will be found who with a shrug of the shoulders will suggest that after all it is not such a bad thing that a high death-rate should be prevalent among this lowest class of society. For my own part I could not in any case agree with the inhumanity of such a suggestion ; but I should like to remind any one who holds this view that as the individuals of this class die out their ranks are gradually recruited from those above them, and that not only by present conditions are we failing to give to those who might rise out of the mire the chance of effecting their own salvation, but we are every day allowing others to fall within it who might have been prevented from so hopeless a collapse.

There remains the last subdivision of the problem which I have referred to under the name of the Towniness of Towns. Somewhat of an abstract idea it may seem to some, at any rate as far as its evil is concerned. We Londoners rather glory in the enormous uncontrolled size of our vast metropolis. Six millions of people ! No city of antiquity ever attained such proportions ; or so far outstripped all other competitors in the race. It is only when

we come down to the individual and see the overcrowding which this bigness implies that we begin to wonder whether after all some sort of shame ought not to be attached to it if as a necessary consequence so much misery is entailed. We have seen something of the effect of the growth of towns upon individual overcrowding. To the artisan and regular labourer two rooms for the whole family, or perhaps a five o'clock start to catch the workman's train in the morning ; to the lowest class a condition far worse, in which no human beings ought to be obliged to live.

But it was a slightly different thought underlying the evil of excessive towniness which prompted me to make out of it a separate subdivision of the problem. The evil existing in the number of human beings huddled together in an acre—built up towards the sky in barracks, so many hundred persons all being hived on one small spot of ground ; even if the actual room accommodation be sufficient, this evil is distinct and remains. Closely connected with this idea is the absence of open spaces ; the enormous distances that must be traversed before a man can get out of the sordid streets of the city to the restful green of the country—to the soft, moist fields, the gentle restfulness of trees. The moral, æsthetic, physical loss that all this implies !

Those who have lived all their lives in easy access to the country and who even when they are obliged to live in the city have always within a short walk a large open park with its pleasant shade, can have no idea what this human need is. The sense of deprivation that it implies ! How to one who week in and week out sees nothing but streets dull and dark in winter, or fiercely hot in the glow of the August sun, the sight of the green trees and fields cool and delicious is like a new revelation—a fresh birth.

How often will it be that people living in Southwark or Bermondsey, in the northern parts of Lambeth or Camberwell, in Whitechapel or Bethnal Green will be able to afford the time or the money required to carry them the five, six, or seven miles that separate them from the open country ?

This evil is peculiarly great in the metropolis ; large

towns like Liverpool, Manchester, or Glasgow suffer from it to some extent, but it is when we are dealing with London that it overwhelms us.

It is there that the great problem of time and distance rises into such fearful prominence ; for it takes as long, for instance, to get across London from west to east as it takes to get right away from Paddington to Oxford, or from north to south, as from Victoria Station to Brighton.

There are thus two ideas of towniness : one represented by the number of persons to the acre, and the other by the distance in time and space of the centre from the outer limits of the suburbs. For comparison of one town with another—as towns are at present—these two ideas may be united, and an attempt at a numerical estimate of the towniness of a town may be formed simply by means of its population, the additional overcrowding of a compact town being to some extent compensated for by the greater ease with which it is possible to reach the open country. In a recent work¹ I have endeavoured to show that a relation can be traced between the population of different towns and the average wages of skilled workmen therein.

It is sometimes imagined that a city grows by a process of filling out, of saturation, as it were, like that of filling a sponge with water ; a far more correct idea is to imagine it growing by the addition of successive coats like those of an onion. The extraordinary growth of London during the past century affords an excellent example of this form of expansion ; and a few statistics will serve to illustrate the position. I have divided the County of London up into four areas : the first is the City itself ; the second, or A list of parishes, contains those which are in the immediate vicinity of the City, the principal being the parishes in the Strand, in Aldgate and Shadwell, and the inner parishes of Southwark ; the B list contains those forming the inner belt around the foregoing—principally the parishes of Westminster, St. James's, Clerkenwell, St. Luke's, Shore-ditch, Whitechapel, Limehouse, Rotherhithe, Bermondsey,

¹ "Local Variations in Wages," pp. 7, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18, 46, 50, 53. I there suggest that the square root of the population is the true measure of the towniness of a town.

and the outer parishes of Southwark; while the fourth division, or C list, contains the remainder, or the whole of the outer belt lying within the County of London.

The following table gives the populations of these four divisions in 1801, 1851, and figures for 1901, which will be near enough for our purpose. I have also added the figures for 1851 and 1901 for the aggregate of those townships lying outside; these do not pretend to any accuracy, as the full census returns are not yet published.

POPULATION IN THOUSANDS.

	Acreage.	1801.	1851.	1901.
City	670	128	127	27
A List of Parishes (Strand, inner Southwark, &c.).....	1,054	128	139	73
B List, or inner Belt.....	5,237	345	711	710
Total	6,961	601	977	810
C List, or outer Belt	69,491	357	1,394	3,720
Districts lying outside the County of London	—	—	196	1,700
Greater London.....	—	—	2,567	6,230

Grouping together with the City the parishes of the Strand and inner Southwark, &c. (the A List), we may then divide up the County of London into the centre, the inner belt and the outer belt, the latter containing an area about ten-elevenths of the whole. We see that at the beginning of the century the whole population of London was nearly a million, about a quarter of whom lived in the centre and the remainder were equally divided between the inner and outer belts. During the first half of the century the centre remained about stationary, while the inner belt doubled, and the outer belt quadrupled its population, so that in 1851 the present County of London consisted of two and a third millions of people, only a tenth of whom lived at the centre and a third in the inner belt, while the outer belt had increased by over a million persons during the fifty years, or by more than the whole population of

those living inside. In 1851 the fringe of separate townships which lay outside the present county contained some two hundred thousand people.

During the second half of the century the population of the centre has shrunk to less than half its former numbers, the process of supplanting dwelling-houses by business premises going on so fast in the City itself that less than a quarter of the population remain.

The figures of the other portions are no less instructive. The inner belt, which had become all but saturated in the first period, has remained practically stationary in the second. The census of 1861 gives it a population of 752,000, showing that it has now begun to diminish; while the outer belt, which has increased by about 160 per cent., is now responsible for more than three-quarters of the whole population of the four and a half millions to be found in the county. But still more striking are the figures dealing with the portions of London outside those limits, which in the last fifty years have more than octupled their population; rising from an insignificant proportion to more than a quarter of the grand total of six and a quarter millions comprising greater London. In one or two districts the most extraordinary expansion has taken place. East Ham has nearly trebled itself in each succeeding decade, and the figures of the new census will show that East and West Ham together have increased by nearly 150,000 persons in the ten years, or something like half the whole increase within the County of London. The law of growth is thus clearly indicated; three periods, or perhaps four, can be assigned to any area—the first when it is an outlying district and its growth is extremely rapid, the second when it is surrounded on all sides and a process of steady saturation takes place, the third when it remains stationary, and the fourth (if it comes about) when by the pressure of businesses the population is removed.

In the beginning of the century, while the centre was already saturated and the inner belt was in the second stage of increase, the outer belt was growing very rapidly, the advance being mainly in its inner fringe. Owing to the nature of the subdivisions of London provided in the

census, a definite numerical proof of this fact would require greater detail of analysis than it is worth while here to bestow upon the subject. In the second half the same process has gone on, but each belt has assumed the previous position of the one lying within it, while the slackened growth of the outer region has been taken up with redoubled vigour by the districts which lie altogether outside the jurisdiction of the County Council.

All this is so obvious, it may be said, as to have required no proof ; nevertheless it has an important bearing upon the Housing Problem which is not infrequently overlooked.

GENERAL REMEDIES.

I have endeavoured in what has preceded to sketch out some of the character of the problem, to show how it affects the various sections of society who are grouped together in one term, "the working classes" ; how over, above, and through all lies the question of the Towniness of the Town with its necessary concomitants of overcrowding to the acre and physical degradation. What I wish now to do is to sum up the situation and try to get right at the heart of the evils, to understand their true nature, to form some conception of the ideal method of solution ; to see what steps can be taken immediately in this direction, and to estimate how far anything which is at present being done is good or bad.

Firstly, let us clearly realise the greatness of the economic forces which underlie the growth of towns. Expressed shortly, they amount to the fact that men working together with others in the use of machinery can accomplish many times the work that all would do singly and apart ; that great centres of distribution facilitate commerce, that such organisation is of incalculable value to the progress of the human race.

Some people talk glibly about getting back on to the land, but it is very rare to find among them any who possess a real grasp of the magnitude of the forces with which they propose to contend. I am not one of those who recognise something superhuman and even moral in

the existence of an economic force. I am conscious that occasions may arise in which the community may be justified in exerting itself to the uttermost in an endeavour to check the advance of the tide by every means in its power ; but such remedies are always in the nature of building a dyke to keep out the sea : they are heroic, and should only be resorted to at the last extremity. No such case can be made out for attempting to resist by un-economic methods the almost irresistible forces which underlie the growth of towns ; the increase of population in urban centres and the need of space for industrial and civic purposes are a result of and factors in a prosperity which ought to be general. What is required is not so much to stem the stream as to direct it into healthful channels.

Always admitting that we cannot forecast the future, that another century *may* possibly bring about vast changes, that some unsuspected inventions *may* decentralise the population as rapidly as the tendencies of this century have been to centralise it ; we must yet make preparation for what appears at present to be the trend of events—we may prepare on the assumption that the same economic forces will apply at any rate for some time longer, and only in this way can we escape the adverse verdict of history that, having had every facility for suspecting the advance of progress, we deliberately made no preparation for it.

Now, admitting the enormous economic advantage of procuring a site in London, what is there that prevents a still more rapid growth ? Perhaps some will say it is growing as fast as it can ; but the point is not why does not every suitable business migrate to London, but why, when a new business has to be started, or one has to migrate, does it not set up its abode in that city wherever such a thing would be possible ? There is certainly a stupendous advantage in being at the centre of such a place, but the centre is occupied already ; you have to be content to-day with all that is left—a place on the outside ; or if you want to go in, you have to turn some one else out and to pay a rent at a very high figure.

The difficulty which stands in the way is simply geographical. So long as London is covered you can only get the places that are outside. And there is always under the present system of life, and under any other which might be adopted (even complete land nationalisation), a differential advantage in a central position. This differential advantage falls to whosoever has the right to claim it, and as such to-day it takes the shape of rent.

So far, then, as the case of factories, warehouses, and offices is concerned, we have the economic assurance that the town will not in the main grow faster than it ought. Unless a manufacturer or a merchant or a banker can see his way to making all that he has to pay as rent in the shape of additional profits, he will refrain from establishing his business at the centre of a city, or even on the outskirts unless he is of opinion that such a position will be better than living in a smaller town ; but we have not the same assurance in the case of the housing of the people who have to work in the city. If only a proper living accommodation were a necessity (and by that I mean far more than merely sufficient room space for each family), not only of life but of economics, the matter would be solved in the same way as the other. But as is so frequently the case where human life is concerned, we find that the economic forces, implied in the power of substitution, left to their full freedom fail to afford due protection.

The working man barter away sunlight, fresh air, and decent accommodation for life with additional interests in a great city, and in many cases he makes a bad bargain.

In my work upon "Local Variations in Wages" (pp. 50, 53) I have endeavoured to show that the employer has to pay higher wages in a big town to his men to just the extent that it is necessary to compensate them for the disadvantages of town life. Most of this compensation goes in house rent, and if only good housing had been a matter of economic necessity, the whole additional expense would have fallen on the employer, thus limiting the growth of a town to a healthy and prosperous expansion. Far otherwise is the state of affairs at the present time. We have

seen that while the higher grades of labour are able to obtain some sort of decent accommodation with their superior wages, the weight of overcrowding falls most seriously on the unskilled and the casual workers. The latter, with not even any real economic freedom, are bound to the spot where their work lies; continually pressed in upon all sides by the immigrating population of stronger and healthier folk, they live on, miserably housed—the poorest of our population living on the dearest land—a standing example to the failure of our civilisation to deal thoroughly with the human problems of existence.

So long, then, as economic forces set in their present direction, towns are certain to grow, and grow with startling rapidity. There is not necessarily any great evil in this; what is really essential is that as the town increases it should do so healthily. So long as every individual in the town, in addition to having ample room space, is also within easy walking distance of fine open spaces, with much of the joyousness of the free country about them, we have all that we can expect of a town, leaving to a reformed society to give to each and all the chance of spending some part of their life away in the broad expanse of Nature herself. That these conditions are so far at present from being fulfilled constitutes the real Housing Problem. While a large part of the value attaching to the differential advantage of a central position falls to a special class of individuals, who happen to be in beneficial possession of the land, there is no reasonable security that the health and prosperity of the remainder shall be preserved. Where open spaces are left it would often seem to be as much by chance as by any other determining factor—the arrangement of streets falls to the fickle caprice of small municipalities or, still worse, of small landlords, while house-room for the individual is based on the universal principle that the weakest goes to the wall.

Now is this necessary? Starting with any given principles that you like, are these things going to remain so for another century? If not, how is the matter to be attended to? I have been careful to point out the method in which

our great cities are growing. Take London as the grandest example. It is not in Whitechapel, or in Shoreditch, that new streets are being constructed, but in West Ham and East Ham, in Tottenham, in Croydon, in Willesden, and in all the surrounding suburbs. Prevention is always better than cure. People are complaining bitterly to-day of the blind alleys and crowded narrow courts and streets that are in our city—"Alas," they say, "the property is so valuable, what can we do to put to rights the mistakes of our ancestors?"—and all the while there are being added to London crooked and bad streets by the hundreds of miles every year, and these same people do not raise their voices to stop it. It is a case once more of the "Tombs of the Prophets."

Why, in East Ham and Ilford the population is said to have risen during the last ten years from thirty-two thousand to one hundred thousand,¹ an increase of over 200 per cent., a large part of whom are accommodated in badly built houses, in pokey and narrow streets; and in West Ham I have myself seen during the last year the erection of hundreds of houses of so cheap and nasty a character that not only are they hideous to look upon, but are even at the start very doubtfully fit for human habitation—yet no one raises or can raise a finger to prevent this state of things.

It does seem a mockery to one living in the suburbs that while so much attention is being given to what was done badly many years ago, so little care is taken that far worse things are not done to-day. Let any one suggest that a city should be built with broad avenues and fine open streets, and he will be asked with a smile how much compensation he proposes to pay to the bankers in Lombard Street. But here in the suburbs there are vast areas as yet undegraded by the narrow alley and the slum. Is it not possible to save them? I verily believe that every fifty thousand pounds spent in preventing the growth of slums in the suburbs of our city would be of more use than a million absorbed in rooting up rookeries at its heart.

The Housing Problem is not to be solved in the slums of

¹ The census returns are not yet published for 1901.

Camberwell, or Whitechapel, but in the green fields of Harrow and Hendon, in Woodford, East Ham, and Barking, and the suburbs of the South.

From day to day the venue for the solution of the problem is changed. Yesterday it lay in West Ham, in Streatham, Hackney, and Tottenham; to-day it lies in East Ham, in Croydon, and Harrow; to-morrow it will be in the belt of country lying beyond.

There is no doubt that the public conscience is awakening to the fact that there is a Housing Problem. The result of the elections for the London County Council in last March are an evidence of that far more than of any party triumph. What it is essential that the public conscience should realise is that it must protect its suburbs. Why are they being allowed to grow just anyhow — here a few streets facing one way, there a few streets facing another; here a house or two that are really decent and comfortable, there a whole row of houses that are a disgrace to civilisation?

The fact is that the outlying districts of a great town, instead of being under the administration of some wise body of men who have the interest of the whole organism at heart, are under the control of some board composed of local magnates, who have little or no idea of the vast issues at stake, and who for personal advantage are often prompted to act contrary to the best interests of the community. But quite apart from selfish considerations, even where the very best intentions prevail, it is evident that such a body of men cannot be in a position to have the growth of a part of a large city placed in their hands. I am thinking of London in particular. How is it possible that the forty local municipalities who have jurisdiction on the border of the County Council can, under the present system, act together for the satisfactory growth of the great city? How is it possible for the men composing them to have the knowledge required for this purpose, or to be able or willing on occasion to sacrifice the interests of the municipalities which they represent, for the well-being of the city as a whole? What is really needed is a change that should enable the whole of the district surrounding each

large town to be placed for wide purposes under the control of some administrative authority. It is not necessary for me to lay out a scheme here in order to determine exactly the best forms which this administration should take. It might prove desirable that the whole district should be placed under the control of the central body which governs the municipality of the town ; but it might be found that this would lead to considerable difficulties, one of which would be the friction arising between adjoining townships. Another suggestion would be the creation of new authorities which might be called "Provincial Councils"; or, again, equally beneficial results might accrue from the construction of a special Government department or by completely reorganising the present Local Government Board. It might even be found that if the suggested idea of the formation of Provincial Councils was adopted that it might be convenient the Provincial Council should coincide, in some cases but not in all, with the central authority. Thus, for instance, whereas in such towns as Leeds and Sheffield an arrangement of this kind might be able to work without difficulty ; for the vast aggregate of townships which go to compose greater London it might be far better that a new authority should be created, the limits of whose jurisdiction would extend twenty or thirty miles in each direction further than those of the present County Council.

Is such a scheme chimerical ? I do not think so. I do not know why an attempt should not be made to realise it without delay. Hitherto the policy of drift has been adopted. Man started by building coverings for himself from the weather, and social instincts made villages ; he is only just waking up to the fact that there are such things as cities which need special provision.

If such a body as I have suggested was formed, what would be its powers ? Here, again, it is not necessary to determine fully beforehand what would be the best course—no doubt it would be wise to make them somewhat limited at first, and then by the good sense of the people it would be found possible to extend them afterwards. But the body would, at any rate, have a certain power of

restriction upon the growth of the city. It would be open to it to formulate certain general schemes setting out the main outlines of any general plan of growth, and if any private individual or municipality wished to lay out land in a way contrary to such a general scheme, good cause would have to be shown. It might seem good, for instance, to the authority that the city should grow with broad avenues—not one hundred feet broad only, as are some of our better streets to-day, but two hundred or three hundred feet broad, as we see in some cities on the Continent and in America, with streets running across them in parallel lines; on the other hand it might seem desirable that some different arrangement should be adopted, but in any case some definite plan would be laid down.

It would be almost certainly desirable that they should insist that certain large open spaces should be left as the city grew. That such a determining or restrictive action may exist and yet not necessarily imply any real impediment to individual freedom, may be seen by a consideration of some of the cities of U.S.A.

Take, for instance, New York City. A large portion of it was allowed to grow up quite free of any restriction; in consequence the streets are there as in the greater part of London, just anyhow; but of later years it has been felt that this was extremely unsatisfactory, and in imitation of some of the newer cities steps have been taken to control the further growth. No restrictions are placed to prevent individual owners building how they please except in so far as the general welfare is concerned. The streets must be laid out so as to form part of a well-conceived plan, and they must be broad and open.

Even in this country there are some restrictions of this character, and the municipalities are beginning to see that they must exert some control over the streets; not only as to minimum width, but as to direction and place. Blind alleys are in many cases forbidden, houses must be built in accordance with certain conditions, and sanitary regulations must be everywhere enforced.

It is not, therefore, any fundamentally new check that I wish to see imposed, but rather that public opinion

should act in the direction of making these checks rather greater, and also placing the controlling power under an authority of wider extent who shall have the interests of the whole city, and not only a separate part of it under consideration. No one doubts, I suppose, for a single moment that if the city could be got to grow in a healthy way instead of an unhealthy one, if fine, broad avenues were to take the place of narrow streets, if blind alleys were to disappear, or at any rate cease to be built, if cheerful open spaces were to be left within the dense pack of houses ; no one doubts, I say, if all this could be brought about, that the community would gain not only morally, physically, and æsthetically by such a change, but even in the actual region of economic prosperity. There would be a certain amount of immediate loss of valuable ground space owing to the making of a road two hundred feet instead of fifty feet, of leaving a park where a huge factory might have been erected ; but no one seriously supposes that this loss is more than temporary. The economic advantage of the open avenue with its possibilities of rapid and comfortable transit are self-evident ; and if the economic value of the park is a little further to seek, I do not think there will be many people in this year of grace, 1901, when the economies of health are beginning to be understood, who will have the face to get up and deny the truth of the proposition I have stated.

And yet the community allows the city to grow in its old unhealthy way, and for why ? Firstly, because it is afraid of checking individual enterprise ; but surely the example we have of the American cities ought to banish this chimera for ever from the mind. Secondly, because of the sheer inertia of public opinion which has refused to see the necessity of appointing some such centralising authority as I have proposed. And thirdly—and this is the reason which will strike the majority of people as the most important—because they don't see where the money is to come from to make the temporary sacrifice. The position, then, is this : that they see full well that the economic interest of the community lies in a certain direction, and yet they refuse to go in this direction

because of the initial outlay. A man who adopted this line of action in his business would be convicted of the grossest folly, and yet it is what is being done to-day on every side. The investment of money in human beings and in the health of cities is perhaps the most profitable investment that can be made, and yet how little is done !

The civilised nations have realised it to some extent in reference to education, though there is not wanting even in this matter a reactionary party in some countries who would wish to see us retracing our steps. Public opinion is gradually waking up to the fact that municipalities are custodians of public interest, and that it is right that they should lay out capital for the welfare of the community, the payment for which they should collect year by year from those whose interests have been advanced by the improvements they have effected.

This is undoubtedly sound so far as it goes, and I think we may go further and lay down the following general principle :—

If certain economic forces are working to the advantage of one class (X), and at the same time to the detriment of the health and well-being of another class (Z), it is just and proper that the community should step in and, as far as possible, adjust the balance by imposing upon class (X) the burden of safe-guarding the vital economies of class (Z).

It is this idea that is gradually becoming realised ; we have seen it tentatively put forward in the Workmen's Compensation Act—compensation for risk in the dangerous trades is to be borne not by the community at large, but by the employers or consumers who benefit by the cheapness of the labour employed.

Now we know that in the growth of towns huge economic forces are at play, bringing vastly enhanced gains to a section of the community and deprivation and suffering to another section ; the principle, therefore, which I have enunciated finds here a field especially adapted for its operation. While there may be serious divergence of opinion as to the right of the community to tax the unearned increment for general purposes, there is no doubt that it is to this source that it should look for the

means to enable the town to grow healthy. This doctrine was set forth so long ago as December, 1883, by the Right Hon. J. Chamberlain, who, in an article in the *Fornightly Review*, remarks that, "the expense of making towns habitable for the toilers who dwell in them must be thrown on the land which their toil makes valuable, and that without any effort on the part of the owners." The statement is cordially endorsed by Mr. E. D. Gray, M.P., in his memorandum included in the report of 1884 on the Housing of the Working Classes.

While of late years various efforts have been put forward to place the burden of taxation equitably upon all different species of property, the interests which have reaped the greatest profits from the growth of cities have escaped comparatively free.

It is necessary for public opinion to realise this, to understand that this is a field comparatively untouched, and one from which there is a chance of reaping a considerable harvest in the future ; but it is all-important that the money obtained from this source should not be spent in general improvements or for the relief of other taxes or rates, but should be devoted exclusively to providing for the health and well-being of our cities as a whole.

I am fully aware of the difficulties besetting such a proposal, of the difficulties of finding out, in the complicated tenure upon which so much city property is held, who is the beneficial owner ; I am fully aware that a rashly imposed tax might lead to an endless amount of friction, and might in many cases do little or nothing more than increase the already heavy rents of the houses in the town. Nevertheless, I believe that a really statesmanlike scheme based upon such a proposal is capable of being elaborated, and if the question is pressed forward it seems that there is a chance of one of the great political parties of this country adopting it as a plank in its platform. Whatever is done in this direction must be done cautiously ; the burden imposed at the start must be slight, in order that time and opportunity may be given to enable the actual effects of such a policy to be tested by experiment.

Another scheme has been put forward for preserving a

certain amount of open space when new districts are beginning to form parts of our great cities.

The proposal is that when an owner has determined to build on what has hitherto been agricultural land, the authority who is required to sanction his plans should be able to compel him either to guarantee that a certain portion of his property should remain open and free, or else to hand over a definite sum in compensation which would go towards enabling such authority to purchase in the district a large open space for public purposes.

There is a great deal to be said for such a proposal, and it would require little or no fresh machinery to put it into effect. On the other hand, a certain amount of injustice might arise if stringent regulations of this character were suddenly enforced ; and amounting, as it would, to a tax upon the construction of dwelling-houses, it might in some respects increase the present overcrowding in view of the limited accommodation which is available in our large cities. This argument will appeal with especial force to those who consider the problem of overcrowding to be due primarily to a house famine.

However, there is room for ample discussion of all proposals of this character. Whether it be found possible to form such central authorities as I have suggested or not, these and other schemes by which the community may be able to obtain for the benefit of the whole some of the advantages at present falling to the few, must come up for consideration. Underlying any such scheme there must be the two following principles of justice : the first (which I have already laid down), that while the community has the right to tax the owners of property to provide for general health and well-being, each particular form of profit should be made to bear its own burdens ; and the second, that differential treatment should not be meted out to individuals or particular interests. An example will make this clear. It has long been recognised that the community is perfectly justified in demanding from owners of building land that they should be put to the expense of making up the ordinary roads through their property, but it would be utterly unjust if the community demanded

from one landlord that he should construct an avenue 250 feet broad through his estate, while it allowed the neighbouring landlords to build in the ordinary manner.

Apart from a wholesale scheme of land purchase by the community, which was proposed by Mr. E. D. Gray in the memorandum to which I have already referred, and which, though it has a great deal to recommend it, has hardly yet come into the realm of practical politics, there is one measure which might be immediately carried—a measure of simple justice which would give considerable financial assistance to the schemes of suburb improvement which I have proposed: I refer to the taxation and rating of unoccupied land. The system which is at present in operation is a curious anomaly, and places the owner of such land in a position of peculiar advantage over the owner of all other species of property in the country. I believe it only needs to be clearly understood by the public at large to be swept away for ever. At present we are in this position: a freeholder who owns land unbuilt upon on the confines of a great city and values his property at something like £1,000 an acre (and certainly would not sell it for less) is neither taxed nor rated on this estimate, but on some absurdly lower figure, perhaps less than a tenth of its value—which the land would be worth if its use were solely that of agricultural land. I do not want there to be any mistake; a man bought land, let us say, in East Ham thirty years ago, for £200 an acre; owing to the growth of the city outwards such land is now worth £700 an acre. The proposal which we are at present discussing is, not that he should be deprived of any of this unearned increment (that, as I have pointed out before, may be a matter of debate), but simply that he should pay taxes and rates upon a footing of £700 an acre, instead of on the old footing of £200, or more probably something less. Does not the suggestion bear upon its face the stamp of justice? Then, why is not a demand made to put it into effect? The truth has been that though the owners of unoccupied land have by this present system been placed in a position of differential advantage over the owners of all other forms of property, landowners and others have

been so afraid of the introduction of the thin end of the wedge that they have been unwilling to have even this flagrant piece of injustice put to rights.

A convenient means has been proposed—which might, or might not, commend itself to the good sense of the community—to enable a true assessment of all such property to be forthcoming. It is proposed that owners should be obliged to assess their own land, and this proposal is coupled with a suggestion that power should be given to local bodies to compulsorily purchase land and hold it for the benefit of the community.

A narrow way of rectitude would then be provided for the landowner. If he turned aside to the right and valued his property too low, it could be bought up at his figure (with possibly an additional percentage as compensation for forced purchase); if he turned to the left and valued it too high, he would have to bear the bane of excessive rates and taxes.

In case of the formation of the central authority which I have suggested above, care should be taken that all the enhanced profits of the community from such a source should fall in to it; and the sum derived in this way alone would be amply sufficient to enable it to construct the broad avenues suited to the city's growth, and by looking ahead to acquire large open spaces for the people's recreation.

Such schemes as these, if adopted, will not necessarily, or even probably, put an end to the city's expansion, nor will they directly cure the evil of overcrowding to the room; but they will force the city to grow healthily if it grow at all, and they will strike at the root of the present great evil of the towniness of our towns. They will have secured that the gain of the few shall not be at the expense of the many, and that human life and health shall not fall victims upon the altar of apparent economic advantage.

The second broad truth that I should like to see impressed upon the minds of the general public at large, and of those more directly interested in particular, is the distinction which exists to-day between those large towns which are properly centres of manufacture, and the vast

emporium of the world's commerce—London, Liverpool, and the like, with which we are to-day becoming familiar. It is not Pittsburg or Cleveland in America, but Chicago and New York whose expansion has astonished the world. It is the commerce and not the manufacturing industries of London, and those of other places, that have forced up the ground rents: the prodigious advantage which they offer as centres of banking and exchange, of import and export, rather than any special facilities which they provide for mills or factories, that have produced their extraordinary growth. Imagine any one suggesting that the Banks and Offices of Lombard Street should give place to a huge factory, and we should see immediately that he was making a blunder not less stupid, though of smaller degree, than if he had proposed they should be converted directly into arable land. No doubt the manufacturer as well as the merchant profits largely by the means of distribution which he finds to his hand in these great cities; by the facilities for exchange itself, by their great rivers, and by the complicated network of railways with which they are connected. But does he profit to an equal degree? *Le fabricant—il a chandelle?*

The advance of ground rents is due to the advantages of commerce, whether we are dealing with the sites of the commercial buildings themselves or with the houses of those whose work lies in connection therewith. Can the manufacturer afford to pay this enhanced rate? I am not attempting to thrust an economic principle down the throats of our business men, to try and teach them more about their own interests than they know themselves; my object is solely to remove a popular prejudice. The truth of the proposition which I am urging is proved by the fact that those whose business it is to determine the matter for themselves, are gradually coming to the same conclusion.

It is many years since the Great Northern Works were removed from London to Peterborough and Doncaster; more recently we have seen a partial migration of the Boot and Shoe industry to Northamptonshire, Leicestershire, Bristol, and Norwich, and of the Clothing industry to Leeds, Bradford, Plymouth, and other places; while to-da

that part of the Printing trade which is not essentially bound to the Metropolis is seeking a home in other centres.

By this change the manufacturers are able to effect a saving, not only in the rent of the sites of their premises, but also in the wages of their employees, who have no longer to meet the rental and other heavy expenses of life in a big town. We have seen such enterprises as Sunlight Soap, Cadbury's Cocoa, and a score of others, started not within the precincts of our towns, but in separate localities where it is possible for those who are working in the factories to obtain bright and cheerful houses in which to live. These things are open to the public gaze, and yet only a few people see them, and still fewer appreciate the enormous advantage to life and health which they imply.

Consider, for instance, the Familistère at Guise founded by that ardent social reformer, M. Godin, for his work-people. Here, in addition to the various blocks of buildings serving directly for the housing of the people, he has provided others containing a nursery, a theatre, schools, public laundry, and baths; making an attempt to add to the openness of the country, many of the pleasures inherent in a town life. His success has been extraordinary; and the whole of the employees more nearly resemble a great family than a group of separate individuals.

Those who take exception to the system of block buildings which prevail at Guise, will find somewhat similar facilities offered for the workpeople in Essen by the firm of Frederick Krupp, which has confined its operations to the building of "model" cottages.

Numerous other instances might be given in this country and elsewhere, but to go further into details might be regarded as invidious. It is essential for us to observe that while the vast power which the system gives is capable of abuse in the hands of an autocratic employer—as is alleged to be the case with the township owned by the Pullman Company in Illinois—yet in the advantage obtained in freeing the factory operatives from the oppressive conditions of the overcrowding of our cities, we have an addition to life, and health, and happiness, not lightly to be put aside. On the other hand, it must be admitted that at present the

growth of such local centres has been confined almost entirely to those industries in which something like a virtual monopoly has been held by the *entrepreneur*. But is not the tendency of modern civilisation to increase rather than to diminish the number of such cases?

However, when all that is possible to be done in this direction has been accomplished, and a large part of the manufacturing industries have been got out of our commercial cities, a great deal of work will be still bound to remain in them and to increase. Banks, warehouses, and offices of all sorts for the carrying on of exchange and the general businesses of distribution; docks, railway termini, and the like, and all those inherently necessary appurtenances special to each great centre—to the capital all that is proper to the seat of government—and in addition the vast army of retail traders who are required to supply the needs of the whole.

The problem which remains to be solved for these will be of the same general character as that which exists at present, and possibly a somewhat similar problem will be *en évidence* in those smaller towns where manufactures will still be profitably carried on.

It is just here that facilities of improved transit must come in to take their share towards the solution of the Housing Problem. Mr. Charles Booth lends the full weight of his authority in favour of this position, and in his paper entitled "Improved Means of Locomotion as a Cure for the Housing Difficulties of London," he gives a lucid exposition of the principal features of such a programme. He says: "It is said that the poorer classes must live nearer their work, that they can afford neither the time nor the money for daily journeys; and there is some truth in the statement, though perhaps not so much as is commonly supposed. But, however immovable the very poor may be, the same rule does not apply to men of settled employment rather better paid."

This pronouncement is undoubtedly true. So far as concerns the first class which I have named—that of the clerks and better artisans—the solution is already itself
ing this direction. To-day we find whole rows of

cottages of this character growing up in the suburbs, and there is no reason why in the future the principle should not be extended much further down the social scale, and artistic as well as healthy dwellings be constructed for the regular workers outside the din and press of city existence. But in order that this may come about it is essential that transit facilities should be considerably improved ; that a comprehensive scheme of railways, underground and overhead, as well as of tramways on the surface, should be constructed to carry the population as far out as it may wish to go. There will, no doubt, be considerable controversy as to whether an enterprise on so large a scale should be undertaken by the individual or by the community ; but, whichever plan be adopted, it is extremely important that a controlling power should be placed in the hands of some central authority such as I have proposed for the purpose of taking in charge the larger interests of the city and its environs. For my own part I take my stand with Mr. Charles Booth in thinking that the enterprise should be undertaken by the community itself ; in the first place it will be in the form of a natural monopoly, and while the property will increase in value every year, it will be in the interests of the community that it should be run with as small a margin of profit as possible ; and secondly, because private enterprise would not develop the less profitable though not less necessary routes, or make the service as frequent or as prolonged as the interests of the community would demand.

But while endorsing in the main all the conclusions of Mr. Booth, I think there is one further point that has escaped his notice, and that is, that in addition to provision of various means of locomotion, it is extremely desirable that additional radial roadways should be constructed for accommodation of those who prefer to effect their own transit. Such a means would be provided if it were found possible to construct the avenues of which I spoke a little while ago, and along each of these it would be extremely easy to make cycle tracks for assisting that increasingly large number of persons who employ the bicycle for purposes of locomotion.

Further than this, within the narrower limits of the city, where such wide avenues could not be provided, it would not be difficult to construct tubular roadways underground for the further convenience of such traffic ; and if it were thought necessary that those who made use of them should bear the cost of their construction, some slight toll might be imposed.

But throughout all the schemes, the expenses to the consumer should be made as small as possible, and it would be well if the same rate could be charged for any distance ; the principle which is carried out in America, and has been adopted in London's recent experiment, the "Twopenny Tube." This will have the incalculable advantage of inducing people to live further and further away from the heart of the city, time, and not money, being then the only deterrent consideration.

Another point on which I do not find myself in entire agreement with the position set forth by Mr. Booth is on the question of how far the community should endeavour at the same time to acquire for itself, in some form or other, a portion of the unearned increment of the land in the vicinity of our cities. Mr. Booth himself fully appreciates the desirability of securing these plums of advantage for the community, but he considers that one large enterprise is enough for the public to undertake at once, and a piece of really useful work should not be prevented from being put into execution by wrangling over the apportionment of the profit that will ensue from the abatement of a gigantic evil. There is a great deal in these contentions ; nevertheless it is important to notice that as soon as any extended scheme of increased transit facilities is brought into operation, the ground value of all the property in the remote suburbs will begin to go up by leaps and bounds ; and it is therefore at the inception of such a scheme that some plan of acquiring a portion of the future benefits of the so-called unearned increment would be most advantageously adopted. Such a proposal by no means necessarily implies anything so extensive as actual land purchase on a large scale, but simply the acquisition by the central authority of legal power to obtain a certain

portion of the enhanced value of the land for the community. Those who take this point of view, however, will do well to do all in their power to further such schemes as that of Mr. Booth, reserving to themselves the right to push forward at the same time their own proposals, so that if good fortune should favour their efforts the two schemes would be launched side by side.

In all this discussion we have been considering the housing of those who cannot be classed as the "very poor." We are now to deal with a section of the population (Classes A and B, and perhaps a portion of Class C, in Mr. Charles Booth's enumeration) whose weekly wages range from 22s. downwards. The casual workers, who pick up here a job and there a job, dockers, fish porters, and the like; the costers, and the lowest class of general labourers, the widows with a family to keep bound to appear at their city warehouse every other day to bring back and take out their modicum of employment; the young girls who are struggling so hard to live a decent life amidst the tremendous forces which are tending to drag them down—what are we to say of all these? Can we seriously suppose that these classes of people, so long as they exist as they are at present, can ever afford to live in decent houses at a distance from the scene of their occupations? The answer must surely be in the negative. To a great extent the Housing Problem for this class is merely a part of the general problem of poverty; and only when the vital causes which lie at the root of their poverty are removed, is there any hope that the evils of their housing will be overcome. But is this to be tantamount to saying that for better housing we must await the millennium? Emphatically no! The process of arousing society to the crying needs of its population may be slow, but it is none the less sure; it is not for ever that our brothers and sisters are to be called upon to forego the pleasures that are inseparable from a full life, from wholesome food, from reasonable leisure, and from the green trees and fields and the delight and health that fresh air alone can provide.

But confining our attention to the Housing Problem

alone, we must admit there is no hope in this direction for these classes. And we must couple with these a large number of persons from almost all ranks of society, who will be constrained to live in close proximity to their work. To some of these it will be a matter of absolute necessity; some special cause will always operate to tie them down to the scene of their labours, while with others it will be a matter of choice—they will not be prepared to undergo the trouble necessitated by dwelling in a distant part, with a tedious journey every day to and from their occupation.

But though it must be expected that, for many years to come, immediately round the central business part of the city there will exist a belt in which a portion of the population will be living at some distance from the open country, their lot will not be nearly so deplorable as is that of similar town-dwellers to-day; not only will they be in a position to make full use for the purpose of egress of the transit facilities which have been more especially provided to enable the rest of the community to come into the city, but also there will be no necessity for the monstrous overcrowding to the room which is found to exist at the present time. The departure of the manufacturers, and the carrying out of a large portion of the rest of the population, ought to have removed the pressure which at present exists, and enable the portion that remains to live decently and fairly comfortably, even if still encompassed about by nothing but the emblems of city life—offices and workshops on the one hand, dwelling-houses on the other, telegraph wires overhead, railway lines close by, and intermittently the distant rumbling of an electric tube beneath. Then, too, there will be a chance of enforcing the requirements of the medical officer, of insisting that the houses in which our people have to live are not so wanting in all sanitary requirements as to be utterly unfit for human habitation.

Moreover, it will then be possible to put into practice with more likelihood of success than ever, the scheme of Miss Octavia Hill, which is even to-day of considerable importance. The root idea of her plan is that individual

attention should be given to the lives of the people of the lowest class ; that the landlord of the property or some one acting as his agent—a woman by preference—should make a point of endeavouring to assist the tenants by counsel and superintendence, as well as merely collecting from them their weekly rents. It is well known that success has throughout attended Miss Hill's operations financially, as well as in the moral welfare of the people ; and there is no reason why, quite independently of other schemes, it should not be extended very much in the future. It is a plan which is confined in its usefulness to the lowest class of the population, and therefore it is peculiarly adapted to succeed in the very region where other remedies are likely to fail. I am not without hope that, if the pressure of public opinion could be brought to bear upon them, landlords of city slums might not be willing to adopt this method, especially if it could be demonstrated to them, as I believe to be possible, that there would be no need for their financial interests to suffer at all by the experiment. But in so far as they proved unwilling to adopt the principle of themselves, there would be no injustice in bringing something more than merely moral pressure to bear upon their position. For such a course I think I may claim the authority of Mr. Charles Booth, who, while recognising to the full the difficulty of the situation induced by the present complicated tenure of city property, gives it out as one of his principle recommendations in the ninth vol. of his "Life and Labour of the People" (pp. 402 and 403) that a greater responsibility for the welfare of the people should be thrown upon the landlord who has reaped so large a share of the profits of our city growth.

IMMEDIATE REMEDIES.

Such, then, I believe to be the general lines along which the problem is to be solved in the future. It remains to be considered how far certain other methods of solution which are at present being adopted are tending to further or hinder such an ideal, and how far, even though they may not be tending to assist the future satisfactory solution, the immediate necessities of the case may render

their adoption justifiable. So far as concerns the constitution of a satisfactory central authority to have charge of the city and its environs, not much is being done in London (I do not mean to imply the smallest slur upon the good work of the London County Council, but simply to point out that at present it has no jurisdiction over the outer suburbs) ; but in other cities some attempts are being made to give the Municipal Councils powers over wider areas, and though this may eventually lead to friction between neighbouring townships, it is a sign that a truer conception of the relation of the town to its suburbs is being adopted.

Manufacturers are to a great extent leaving our largest cities, conscious of the economic advantage of such a course of action, but they are doing so largely against the current of public opinion instead of with its full sanction and approval, as I should like to be able to record. Transit is being rapidly improved, in many cases some fairly satisfactory general scheme being produced ; but in London we still see haphazard attempts in this direction. It is of the utmost importance that a far more systematic method of dealing with the question should be adopted in the future.

There remains a certain amount of isolated work being done all over the country by individuals, by societies, and public bodies. To what extent are we prepared to place upon these the stamp of approval ? Let us take first the attempts of Municipalities to build houses in the suburbs. West Ham, for instance, has recently put up 27 double tenements in Bethell Avenue, borrowing £1,360 for the land and £13,620 for the cost of building. The tenements are let at rentals ranging from 6s. to 7s. 6d. and at this rate are found to just about cover all expenses.¹ In addition to these, 45 double tenements in Corporation Street are being put in hand, and 40 more in Eve Road are awaiting final approval, while some 23 acres of land have been obtained in different parts of the municipality with a view to further building operations in the future. On the whole, the work may be regarded as financially successful, the most serious diffi-

¹ Including, of course, taxes, and rates with which the municipality debits itself, as if it were any ordinary landlord.

culty being the requirement of the Local Government Board, which insists upon the repayment of the loan upon land and building in forty years, instead of the full period of sixty years allowed by the Statute. Again, the municipality of Richmond has constructed 132 houses at a total cost of £39,000, of which the land cost £4,200, the buildings £33,000, and the roads and sewers £2,000. Of these, 78 fairly large houses rent for about 7s. 6d., having cost about £250 to build; 42 are smaller; and 12 flats—2 or 3 rooms and a scullery—let for 4s. 6d. and 5s. 6d., cost £326 for the double flat.

Even if such inconsiderable schemes do not go very far towards solving the problem, they act as a wise experiment and as a model for others. If a municipality can build healthy, well-constructed dwellings, and make them pay, when it has both to provide interest and repay capital within sixty years or even less, it stands to reason that it will be well worth the while of an individual unhampered by such regulations to do the same. And, therefore, it is important to notice that such attempts ought not in any way to be a hindrance to individual enterprise. That it should leave wide open spaces upon its own land, such as the city of the future ought properly to contain, may be a counsel of perfection unattainable in its building schemes if these are to be made, as they should, a financial success. But that it should build, looking above all things to healthy conditions, with wide roads and the maximum provision of fresh air, I have no doubt whatever; by this means only can it be a useful stimulus to others to act in the same direction.

Nor do I think it out of the question that, as part of a *separate* scheme, large open spaces should be retained for the public use. It may be true that under the present conditions only a small amount of money derived directly from the rates ought to be devoted to this purpose; but such a society as that of the "Metropolitan Public Gardens," is often able and willing to render considerable assistance, and even private individuals, if rightly approached, will not infrequently give money which will so undoubtedly minister to the general welfare of the

community. Moreover, in the case of rapidly growing municipalities, it can be demonstrated that sometimes it would actually be profitable for them to buy land and hold it open with the express purpose of preventing the erection thereon of cheap and wretched dwelling-houses. In West Ham, for instance, where the School Board rate stands already at 2s. 3d. owing to the frequent necessity of building additional schoolhouses, the Borough Treasurer has demonstrated that such a purchase, even if the interest on the money borrowed had all to come out of the pockets of the ratepayers, would be actually cheaper to them than allowing the population to be increased by building on the property houses whose rateable value is small.

So far I believe little or nothing has been done by the municipalities in attempting to provide accommodation for the poorer classes of tenants, and it may be doubted by some how far it is desirable for them to make this attempt, but I understand that in Richmond a scheme to accomplish this object was at one time set on foot, and even if this is now thwarted by a change in the representation, it is not unlikely that similar attempts will be made elsewhere. If this comes about, the justification of such action will be in its success; if it be found possible to build satisfactory houses at a profit, and let them at a figure within the means of the labouring class without sacrificing the essential conditions of healthful life, it will be worthy of support on the same lines as the building for artisans.

While these efforts are being made by the Councils in the direction of housing the artisans and a certain section of the labourers, and perhaps just to the extent to which these efforts are successful, an attempt should be made to gradually enforce the demands of the medical officer, and pressure should be brought to bear upon the worst cases of overcrowding and insanitation in the neighbourhood to ensure their disappearance. To attempt to do this while there is already a dearth of dwelling-houses in a district is to a large extent to court certain failure.

Turning our attention now to those rather more pretentious schemes, such as that recently put forward by the London County Council to house 40,000 persons at

Tottenham, I think we must recognise that they are really an attempt to gain a portion of the unearned increment for the community in addition to merely building houses for the people, and that they are in the direction of supplanting private enterprise rather than of working with it side by side, as must be the case with smaller undertakings. As such, they are to be judged on rather different lines. I have already expressed a general assent to the principle involved in the inception of such a scheme, nevertheless each separate proposal must be discussed to a large extent on its own merits, especially so long as no comprehensive scheme directed to controlling the general growth of the city, or to providing extensive transit facilities, is as yet forthcoming.

I come lastly to the action taken by public bodies upon the slum areas within the city itself. It is here that the Acts of Parliament dealing with Public Health and the Housing of the Working Classes contain a great many special provisions which those especially concerned should study in detail. Briefly they give to local bodies certain powers over insanitary houses and insanitary areas, enabling them either to compel owners to put such property into a good sanitary condition, or to purchase the same from them at a reasonable price, and effect such improvements as they deem necessary ; at the same time they are enjoined to re-house a proportion of persons whom they turn out by their operations.

I venture to think that this last injunction, so far as applies to re-housing the ejected upon the same spot, is not only of no benefit but actually injurious, and so far as it has recently been extended to re-housing in external districts, has no effect whatever (in large cities, at any rate) in preventing such evil consequences as are a necessary part of every scheme of demolition. In my opinion such action should be *frankly unremunerative*, and an open space should be left in order to give fresh air and health where before all was squalor and disease.

Two main arguments will be raised against this proposal. In the first place the consideration of expense will be put forward. To this my answer is very simple. Even under

the present system frequently 50 per cent., and in London far more (Mr. Wallace Bruce, Chairman of the Finance Committee of the L.C.C., recently stated, in introducing his budget, that two properties for clearance recently purchased for £240,000 were valued for rental as workmen's dwellings at £50,000, the difference being thrown upon the rates) of the output is unremunerative, and I think it will be evident to those who consider the matter that the demolition of one area, and its conversion into an open space, is worth a great deal more in health to the community than the demolition of two such areas and the erection thereon of great blocks of buildings to be inhabited by a teeming mass of individuals.

But it will be urged in the second place that this benefit to the community will only be gained at the expense of the individuals ejected, and of all the neighbourhood round, which they will cause to be overcrowded to a yet further degree. My answer to this is still more simple. You are doing this already. It is well known that the blocks constructed on the site of old insanitary areas are rarely, if ever, tenanted either by any of the people you have ejected, or by any of the people from the neighbourhood. In consequence, not only do you increase the overcrowding of the vicinity in the same way as would be done by the scheme which I set out, but also, by introducing a fresh set of people from outside, you thereby add still further to the overcrowded character of the district so far as the number of people to the acre is concerned.

I cannot too strongly urge the importance of observing that two radically distinct objects are in view. The first of these is a matter of securing adequate accommodation for the people, and the second is a provision for their general health by the creation of open spaces and by the demolition of insanitary areas. In so far as municipalities attempt the first, they are competing directly with private enterprise, and unless they intend to cover the whole field they must be prepared to make their scheme a financial success. In so far as they are dealing with the second, they must be prepared to recognise that not only are they of necessity diminishing accommodation (actual or

potential), but also that their work is by its very nature unremunerative ; it is in no sense in competition with private enterprise, and its whole cost must be borne either out of the rates or by a fund especially destined for this purpose, assisted perhaps by the generosity of private individuals. The only safe course is for the work of demolition to proceed cautiously and judiciously, and some means should be found of making of real effect the clause of the Housing Law of 1890, which expressly enacts that where flagrant cases of insanitation exist, not only should no additional compensation be paid to the landlord for forced purchase, but a deduction should be made from the purchase-money on account of the danger to health and life which his property creates. This clause is eminently just, and has a counterpart in many other enactments, among which may be quoted the right to confiscate insanitary meat, or other foodstuffs, which are offered for sale. The good sense of public opinion should insist that this clause be enforced stringently against the offending landlord.

It is not necessary to enter into detailed consideration of the action of the various building societies, many of whom have done and are still doing good work ; the justification of their actions must lie along somewhat similar lines to those which have been put forward in reference to the local councils, in spite of the fact that they stand upon quite a different footing. At the same time I should like to remark upon the utterly disproportionate amount of attention which is often bestowed upon their efforts. Except in so far as they are admittedly philanthropic in their character, they do not differ intrinsically from the great mass of private enterprise of which they form a section. And in many cases individual landlords are willing to build as wisely and as considerately as those companies are able to do. To realise fully how small a part they have played in housing the people of London, it is only necessary to point to the fact that during the forty or fifty years in which they have been in operation, they have in all only provided some 80,000 rooms, while in the same period the growth of London has been to the extent

of about three millions of souls. A great deal of useful information upon the efforts that have been put forth by these societies will be found in most treatises upon Housing; and there is much valuable knowledge which can be acquired therefrom. But when people speak of the possible action of municipalities in crippling the field of private enterprise, they should not turn their attention to these companies so much as to the effect that will be produced upon the private individual outside.

A few words may not be out of place in reference to blocks generally, for a full description of which I would recommend the excellent articles in vol. iii. of Mr. Booth's "Life and Labour." Ranging all the way from the best tenant accommodation which approaches the modern society flat, down to the worst "Model," where light, air, and sanitation are at their lowest ebb, the block dwelling possesses many advantages and many disadvantages. Principal among the former lies the fact that they have generally been built for the purpose to which they are now put, and being of comparatively recent construction, are not so utterly devoid of all sanitary requirements as are the cottages which have been converted from the homes of single families to be the dwellings of half a dozen. To this must be added the greater possibilities which they afford of adequate inspection. On the other hand, they are generally ugly and cheerless, and expose the occupants to indiscriminate intermingling with their neighbours.

Whatever advantages they may possess for the better sections of the working classes, I think it will be universally admitted that they are impossible for the lowest. These people are hardly in a position to live in the quasi public manner which the block dwellings imply. In the words of Miss Octavia Hill: "Regulations are of no avail; no public inspection can possibly for more than an hour or two secure order; no resident superintendent has at once conscience, nerve, and devotion, single-handed to stem the violence, the dirt, the noise, the quarrels. No body of public opinion on the part of the tenants themselves asserts itself; one by one disheartened the

tidier ones depart, the rampant remain and prevail, *and often with a very fair show to the outsider* the block becomes a sort of pandemonium."

Apart from all these considerations, however, block dwellings seem to me to be essentially undesirable, as creating a vested interest (either for the individual or the community) in overcrowding to the acre, and in making it more expensive for future generations to deal with the problem. In spite of the practical need of meeting the urgent necessities of the present day, I feel that this argument ought not to be overlooked.

How much is it possible for landlords to do in assisting the solution of the problem? I have already indicated the course which they might adopt with advantage in dealing with the poorest class of tenants. And I think that throughout it is far more important that they should endeavour to ensure a good article for a good price—a really healthy, habitable dwelling at whatever figure they demand—than that they should forego a considerable portion of their rent. Apart from the utter impossibility of expecting any general action among landlords to take less than they can get, it must be recognised that it is the high rate charged for sites for building workshops as well as houses, that alone ultimately checks the growth of our large cities. Just as the high prices charged by the farmers in times of scarcity (in a self-supporting country) are only the mode by which this scarcity is brought home to the consumer, and are the means of preventing the supply from completely running out before a fresh harvest can be reaped, so high rents are merely the means by which geographical unwieldiness of our big cities reaches the pockets of the manufacturers and merchants, and tends to check still greater growth. I am not, however, such a worshipper of the ultimate economic issues as to be blind to the advantage accruing from a landlord reducing his rent, at any rate, a little below the normal rent charged by others in the district. It is remarkable how little this will affect his pocket, for he will be able to have the pick of the tenants, and there will be the smallest amount of loss to be accounted for in the shape of empties or arrears,

for those who come know that they have got possession of a good article and they mean to stick to it. It is not unusual to see two rows of houses side by side, one inhabited by well-ordered people, and the next a slum. Both streets were originally equally well built, and the only difference has been that in the latter the rents have been fixed a shilling more than the former. Those at the lower rents have formed the steady abodes of the respectable people who come to stay ; the latter have had a multitude of shifting tenants, some coming with no intention of ever paying any rent at all.

One word should be said on the subject of the purchase of houses by the tenants themselves. So much is this generally approved that laws have been passed to facilitate its achievement, and Mr. Bowmaker, in his admirable book on the "Housing of the Working Classes," goes so far as to say that no one will presume to deny the beneficial results which have attended the ownership of houses by their working-men occupiers. And yet I venture to think that there are a great many considerations to be urged on the other side. Not only does the essentially mobile character which modern economic methods require of our proletariat place tremendous difficulties in the way of its realisation, but even setting all this aside is it altogether well that a comparatively poor man should be in full control of so expensive a piece of machinery as a house ? He is put to the inconvenience of borrowing money whenever some really large alteration is required. And if some important sanitary improvement is essential, what likelihood is there of its being effected ? And thus it comes about that where any district exists¹ in which extensive tenant ownership of dwelling-houses prevails, not only is there to be found a population obstinately opposed to any reform which might possibly increase the rates, but also a set of houses which are frequently more neglected, and where the medical officer is far more baffled in his attempts at improvement than where the ordinary method of ownership is in existence. Few people who speak glibly of the advantages, which undoubtedly there are, in favour of

¹ Such, for instance, as Plumstead.

tenant ownership are conscious that there is a great deal to be said *per contra*. The experience of the Artisans', Labourers', and General Dwellings Company, London, is of value in this respect. In its Queen's Park Estate the company adopted originally the scheme of selling the houses on ninety-nine year leases, thus making tenants proprietors, but abolished the system in 1879, and has since made considerable efforts to buy back the three hundred and thirty-five houses which it had sold. The reasons for this were :—

"1. That the practice damaged the property in the eyes of investors because of the Company losing control of the entire administration. The Company was thus crippled in seeking to obtain capital, which was very necessary for furthering its enterprises.

"2. The Company could not well prevent overcrowding ; or even the establishment of immoral houses in the neighbourhood.

"3. These houses very largely fell into the hands of middlemen, who rented them about 15 per cent. higher than the previous rates. The original purchaser nearly always sold out at a profit to one of these men when for any reason, such as change of working locality, he found it convenient to live in another section of London. Consequently the middleman was justified in charging higher rent, because he had to pay more for the house."¹

There is a great deal to be said on the subject of Housing from the point of view of the architect and medical officer ; but these are matters which are rightly and properly confined to the specialist, and it does not seem suitable here to introduce any discussion on this part of the question.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, let me say once again that prevention is better than cure. It would be far easier to prevent the growth of slums in the suburbs than to eradicate them from the centre.

¹ Quoted from the special report of 1895 by the United States Government upon the "Housing of the Working People."

Upon the politician I would urge the special importance of recognising the true nature of city growth, and of taking steps to direct it into healthy channels. It is essential that main arteries should be kept open in the outlying districts—not 150 feet broad, but 250 feet ; that in addition to this open spaces should be preserved, and that the minimum width for all new streets should be increased.

In order to effect these changes the haphazard method of city growth must be abandoned once and for all. Either the existing municipalities must be given wider powers, and some method found of co-ordinating them for sufficiently large areas, or if this plan does not commend itself, some new authority must be appointed to deal with the question. But whatever arrangement be preferred, a revenue must be acquired by means of bringing unoccupied land on the outskirts of the city under the ordinary scheme of taxation which prevails with regard to every other species of property. This must be expended by the authority in question in bringing health and fresh air to the city, by providing main arteries, and preserving extensive open spaces. At the same time it must be entrusted with the initiation of a comprehensive scheme of transit, such as that suggested by Mr. C. Booth. No doubt it will be desirable that the powers of the authority should be carefully limited at the outset, but it should prove possible to extend them from time to time, giving them wider facilities for compulsorily acquiring land and for undertaking such improvements as seem necessary.

I would further urge upon the politician the desirability of formulating some statesmanlike scheme for the future by which the community may gain for itself some part, at least, of the increased value of urban rent.

In reference to the powers which are at present possessed by local bodies of building houses for the working classes, I would urge that the Local Government Board should be instructed to allow the full period of sixty years for repayment in all cases where building is allowed, except for any special reason shown ; and, moreover, I would propose that the law should be modified so that a longer period should be allowed for that part of the

loan which is required for the purchase of the land. This is the proposal which Mr. Chaplin himself characterised as reasonable in the discussion on the Housing Bill of 1900.

In the fourth place, I would suggest the abolition or extensive modification of the clauses which make it obligatory upon local bodies to re-house in the neighbourhood a large part of the population displaced by demolition of insanitary areas.

Lastly, I would urge that greater pressure should be brought to bear upon landlords who own insanitary property. Mr. C. Booth¹ indicates a scheme of registration which should be of considerable advantage. What is required is that the landlord should be placed in the position of other owners of property, and if he possesses what is dangerous to life, he should be obliged to set it to rights, or to destroy it at his own expense.

Upon municipalities I would urge the importance of looking some way ahead ; of making adequate provision to safeguard the growth of our cities where such possibility is in their hands ; of doing their utmost to secure open spaces and broad thoroughfares ; of gradually enforcing the demands of the medical officer ; of building houses where it seems necessary for the working classes up to the full requirements of sanitary conditions, and charging for them a rent which shall not be a burden on the rates ; of demolishing insanitary areas generally, leaving them as open spaces, and frankly recognising that such undertakings must be of an unremunerative character.

Upon manufacturers I would urge the importance as far as possible of taking their works outside the great commercial centres ; of founding, if occasion offers, small townships where they can see that proper accommodation can be provided for their workpeople.

Upon landlords I would urge the necessity of setting their house in order. I do not ask that they should deprive themselves by reducing their rents, though I would point out that, by making their rents a little below rather than a little above the nominal rate, they will, at scarcely any

¹ " Life and Labour," vol. ix. p. 402.

loss to themselves, secure a better class of tenants and confer a benefit upon the community. But I do demand that they should see that their houses are fit for human habitation ; that they should insist that a decent article is provided, whatever price they ask for its use. A great deal might be done by them in this direction if they would consent to employ as agents those who will care something for the individual welfare of the tenant, as well as the pockets of their employer.

Upon the working classes, in addition to doing their best to keep their houses clean and in good order, I would urge above all things that they should recognise the value of sufficient air space, that they should be willing to make some sacrifice of comforts, and even of apparent necessities in order to obtain this priceless requirement.

To the general public I would say : Take more care of the suburbs of your large towns—insist that they grow healthily and well ; bring more pressure to bear upon bad landlords, and induce manufacturers to set up their businesses in smaller centres. But, above all, care a little more about the question. These families whom you are depriving of a full life are the families of the nation ; these men are doing the nation's work ; these women are the mothers of the next generation ; these children are the race that is to come. If through your ignorance or indifference their lives are wasted fretting against the cruel bars of their prison, the blame will rest with you.

Do not let the century go by without finding a solution to this problem.

III

THE CHILDREN OF THE TOWN

EACH individual when he enters life as a babe puts to the world the silent question, "What manner of man shall I become?" Years afterwards he finds the answer himself when as a man he replies, "What you see me to be now." Must we wait for the answer till he brings it himself, or can we predict what that answer will contain? Experience tells us that a definite environment tends to create a definite type of human being. If, therefore, we know the circumstances under which the child's life will be passed, it is possible to say in advance that, when he grows to be a man, he will have stamped on him certain distinguishing characteristics. On the other hand, experience also informs us that each child is possessed of certain peculiarities, constituting his individuality, which baffle all exact prediction of his future career. This double experience points at once to the power and to the limitation of the forces of education. Its power is due to the fact that, by rightly ordering the conditions of existence, education may hope to develop the faculties of the child, mould them into some desired shape and impress on his nature some ideal type of character; its limitation is due to the unknown personal element in every man which may balk and render futile even the wisest efforts.

This essay treats of a certain special environment, namely, that found in cities, and attempts first to answer

the question put by the town child, "What manner of man will these conditions make of me?" and secondly to consider how that answer can be modified in order to be in better harmony with the high purposes of humanity. In particular I have in view the children of London, with whom alone I can claim to have any special acquaintance. It is perhaps well that this should be the case. For London is itself the problem of all problems. Presenting in an exaggerated form all the peculiar features of city life, it stands like some voiceless prophet mutely pointing to the strange wounds and scars upon its face which have been the price paid for its greatness. If this essay is to be of any value the child must be regarded as a complex organism, so cunningly knit together that any change in one part reacts on the rest and produces far-reaching alterations, which can never be foreseen so long as that part is isolated and not looked on as being a mere fragment rent from a larger whole. It is waste of time to point out a few evils and vaguely to hint at means for their removal without considering the entire question of child-life in towns. Attempts of this kind usually end in suggesting remedies that bring in their train evils worse than the disease they seek to cure. Better far to face the general problem, to recognise that such a problem does exist, even though the attempt to solve it ends in miserable disaster, than to discourse blindly, though amiably, on some subsidiary point.

A child has three needs : he is, first, an animal and needs to be a healthy animal ; he is, secondly, a thinking animal and needs to think correctly ; he is, lastly, a feeling animal and needs to feel aright. As a thinking, feeling animal he possesses character, which is a product of the physical, mental, and moral state of development. The end of all education is, therefore, the formation of character. Character may be looked on as possessing two meanings—an external and an internal. It is used in the former sense when we regard man as he appears to the world as an acting creature, and in the latter when we think of him as he is in himself, as a being conditioned in a certain way and tending to respond in a definite manner to each

stimulus. The external character is an outward expression and revelation of the internal, which last is alone of permanent importance. This would seem almost self-obvious ; for if one phenomenon is the effect of another, however desirable the effect may be, its presence can only be secured by seeing that the cause of its appearance shall be always at hand. But unfortunately the peculiarity of the general attitude towards education is the tendency to regard only external character ; men consider what acts are to be encouraged and pay exclusive attention to these, while they leave out of account the actor. For example, a common objection raised to the inclusion of some subject in the elementary school course—say history—is that it can be of no use in later life. After remarking that the child would be far better employed in learning to dig a garden or sweep out a room, the ordinary individual considers that he has settled the question in a most satisfactory way. Now if all life were made up of simple tasks like these, and if there were no other alternative except to see them through, there might be some force in the argument. Unluckily, whether the task is done or left undone depends not merely on whether the person is able to do it, but also on whether he chooses to perform it ; and, further, the definition of right living includes something more than a list of pieces of work to be carried out. Some one has remarked that the distinction between the moral teaching of the Old and the New Testament lies in the fact that the former commanded men to do this, while the latter bade them be this ; in other words, the one laid stress on the external, the other on the internal character. What is really needed in right living is not the monotonous repetition of the same acts, but the performance of acts directed towards the attainment of the same end. Conduct can only become consistent when it is the expression of the internal character ; no mere acquisition of certain aptitudes can make anything but a machine—a machine capable indeed of doing the same piece of work under the same conditions, but unable steadfastly to carry through any purpose amid the ceaseless changes of daily life. Formation of internal character must be the object of all educa-

tion ; that is to say, we must strive to so order a child's environment that the germs of all that is highest within him, while he is still young and not yet thrust down into the sunless dungeon of life's servitude, may grow strong and unfold their treasures.

The education of a child is the result of the influence of two forces : the one is derived from intercourse with things, the other from intercourse with man and all that is associated with man. They may be called respectively the nature element and the human element. The effects they produce are very different, and are to a great degree opposed to one another, or perhaps more truly complementary. The peculiarity of the nature element is the calm, tranquil, and stable character it tends to form ; while excitement, wildness, and unrest have their origin in the human element. To understand why this should be so is not difficult. In spite of all the advances of science, Nature still stands before man as a mystery. Her ways are not his ways ; and he finds himself, whether he will or no, face to face with some power greater than his own, which he can only control by obeying. All opposition is vain ; in her presence, as though moved by some primeval instinct, his passions and desires die away. Further, there is the actual peacefulness of Nature when in the silent loneliness of the evening she seems to fall asleep—a peacefulness which so steals over her children that they see in it a promise of the rest that comes to all one day.

Goethe has given voice to this feeling in the beautiful lines below :—

“Uber allen Gipfeln
Ist Ruh,
In allen Wipfeln
Spürest du
Kaum einen Hauch ;
Die Vögelein schweigen im Walde
Warte nur, balde
Ruhest du auch.”

All connected with Nature, her mystery and her beauty, tend to lift a man out of himself (or is it truer to say that they turn him back into his Self ?), and the clang of the

world's battle beats upon ears that no longer listen. All associated with man, however, has a contrary effect ; here he meets a power like his own—a power which, while it resists his will, can yet be conquered, and which in consequence, kindling within him the lust of strife, drives him on into the fray. Each man is for himself ; the fulfilment of his desires depends not on their suppression but on their assertion, and in every success of another he sees the possibility of his own. Not without truth, therefore, is the statement that Man fosters excitement, while Nature makes for rest. It was in the silence of the mountains that Elijah heard the still small voice of God speaking to him ; it was in the turmoil of the town that the people cried for the release not of this man but Barabbas, and clamoured for the crucifixion of their King. Intercourse with Nature in excess tends to create an inactive dreaminess or the stolid stupidity of the rustic ; the human element in excess gives to the town child that restless temperament which appears in its most accentuated form as Hooliganism. True education requires the harmonious co-operation of both these forces ; neither is sufficient by itself.

The surroundings to which a child is exposed produce results that may be divided into two classes. The first comprises the general effects of town life, due to the massing together of large numbers of people, to the lack of open spaces, and to the crowded streets. These, being the distinctive characteristics of a city environment, may be called its natural conditions. The second class is composed of the influence exerted on the one hand by voluntary agencies, such as the clergy and philanthropic societies, and on the other by bodies established by law, such as the elementary schools. These may be termed the artificial conditions of a town. As the object of the latter is to modify the effects caused by the former, these effects must be estimated first.

I. NATURAL CONDITIONS OF TOWN LIFE.

These conditions will leave their distinguishing mark on the physical, mental, and moral sides of the child's

character. Their effect will best be estimated by considering the influence due to the nature element before proceeding to a discussion of the most important factor, the human element.

1. *The nature element.* What, then, is the nature element in the town? It is not easy to find an answer, since all has to be excluded that suggests or is connected with man. The whole town world is a world of human beings, surrounded by human beings, overarched with human beings. From the windows of their homes the children look out, not on distant fields and woods, but on rows of adjacent houses that hem them in on every side. Without in the streets there is nothing different: man alone is visible, every place is filled full and overrunning with man, everything speaks of man, suggests man, sings man in their ears with an undying monotony. Here and there, but for the most part far off, are parks containing soot-stained grass and a few dishevelled sparrows; but the whole place is set in a frame of man and filled with man. During the day the sun doubtless traverses the sky as a matter of routine, acting as a timekeeper to mark the beginning and the end of man's daily work, but empty of any beauty; at night there is no wide expanse of heavens, only the light of a few stars filters feebly through the fog and the smoke, and the music of the spheres is unheard amid the clamour of man. All that is inspiring in the country is a sealed book to the town child—the beauty of sunrise and sunset, the changes of the seasons, the fresh green of spring and the red gold of autumn, and all the loveliness of the night—

“When in heaven the stars about the moon
Look beautiful, when all the winds are laid,
And every height comes out, and jutting peak
And valley and the immeasurable heavens
Break open to their highest, and all the stars
Shine, and the shepherd gladdens in his heart.”

All this is a world beyond the ken of the city child. Yet there is one bit of nature which comes to the town untainted by the hand of man and is cherished by the children with a strange affection—the flowers. No matter what the flower is, they accept it with joy and treasure it

till it is dead. There is something pathetic in the sight of a child standing amid all the whirl of London's weekly carnival, beneath the wild glare of the coster's flickering naphtha jets, and holding in his hands a few faded blossoms. The sight suggests that these poor wanderers from another world, tossed up into the darkling town, are stirring feelings which harmonise but ill with those of the fantastic Walpurgis-nicht revel around—feelings which testify that the love of nature glows within, and only waits the chance to burst into a flame.

But, with the exception of an occasional flower, there is nothing in a city environment that can be regarded as belonging to the nature element. What influence this possesses is due not to its presence but to its absence.

From the moral standpoint this absence means that the factor which tends to form a peaceful, stable character contributes nothing towards the education of a town child; and, further, that the part of his nature which is tuned to respond most easily to spiritual emotion is left undeveloped.

Turning to the mental side, it is clear that there is a world of which he knows nothing and can form no idea. The books he reads speak to him largely in a language that is unintelligible, and the descriptions of country life call up no clear images. The loss is greater than at first appears. If we think of the books that appealed most to us in our childhood we shall remember that the favourite scenes were always supposed to be laid in the neighbourhood of our homes; that, for example, some enchanted forest was a wood a few miles distant, and the caves of the goblins were holes in a hill standing on the horizon; while, if local surroundings were inadequate, they at any rate supplied the paints which coloured the pictures of our imagination. A town can furnish no such material as this. In consequence many of the finest children's stories are but half appreciated; and the scenes, instead of being vivid and distinct, resemble rather the vague, shadowy outline of dreams. The life of nature is almost entirely withdrawn from the cities. That many who live in them become acquainted with nature is not denied, but this is

only possible for the majority when help from outside agencies is available.

2. *The human element.* If the nature element is important merely on account of its absence, the human element is conspicuous because of the urgency of its presence.

(a) *Physical effect.* This is due partly to overcrowding and partly to lack of space for exercise. Of the former's existence and of the evils it brings in its train there can be no doubt; to find a remedy is hard, but, whatever the cost, one must be found. The latter also deserves attention. Vast tracts of ground in both North and South-East London are situated so far from any parks that the child has to journey more than a mile to reach them. This practically prohibits their use. A certain amount of exercise is obtained in the streets, but the more thoughtful parents dislike, and rightly dislike, their children to be exposed to the influences there, and prefer to keep them at home. This is especially the case with girls. The only remedy appears to lie in local authorities, in these districts, acquiring the management of all open spaces, including those squares which are used solely by the inhabitants of the houses surrounding them. At the present time, when such a place is secured, the only idea seems to be to convert it into an ornamental garden with grass plots, on which no one must tread, intersected by narrow paths. A far better plan would be, even where the space available is small, to make a playground and provide attendants to maintain order. The results of the physical education are not very encouraging; all the conditions calculated to rear an unhealthy race are present, and all the conditions absent that encourage strength and vitality.

(b) *Mental effect.* Of deliberate instruction in the homes there is little or none, and any knowledge that the children may acquire is due to those unintentional lessons given by the circumstances of daily life. The consideration of this question brings to light a difference between the effect of the human and the nature element not as yet mentioned. Nature in many respects behaves like a teacher who desires to impress a certain truth on the pupil. She draws her diagrams on a large scale and is constantly displaying

a distinct likeness in the midst of difference. She shows the same familiar fields and woods now green with the freshness of spring, now brown with the tints of autumn, and now white with the winter snow. All seems calculated to convey a definite lesson and to impress on man an idea of an order in the sequence of events. Apart from any deliberate instruction, a child left to the influence of nature will acquire a large amount of what may rightly be called knowledge. A town child, however, deprived as has been proved of this nature element, has to depend on that unintentional education yielded by intercourse with man. This presents characteristics of another kind. A mass of impressions are hurled at the observer, a thousand scenes sweep by him ; but there is nothing to hold them together, nothing to produce a sense of order, nothing to give a perception of similarity. All is bewilderingly different. Consider, for example, the public street : an interminable stream of men and women flow by, nearly all of whom present unknown faces ; an unending line of vehicles move on, ceaselessly altering and apparently coming out of the nowhere and going into the nowhere. There is only a chaotic confusion of change with nothing permanent to be the supporter and bearer of the change. This continuous panorama of shifting scenes produces no conception of a world of connected phenomena, and merely serves to fill the mind with a whole lumber-room of useless, though perhaps entertaining, rubbish. On the other hand, an important influence is exerted on the mental development of the child. He is continually called on to adapt his actions to new circumstances, and acquires great readiness and dexterity in doing so. In this way is developed the characteristic sharpness of the town child—that rapid perception of the new (but not of the old in the new), and that immediate decision how to meet it. But there is no permanent element in this mental attitude towards the world, nothing that will, so to say, subject phenomena to its own purposes instead of adapting itself to them. There is found in the child an acute perception of all that occurs around him, a vast knowledge of isolated events and people which he will, when properly tapped,

pour out in one unceasing flow. But nothing connects them together, nothing preserves them in the memory ; the new takes the place of the old, and the past is little more than a miscellaneous collection of the scenes of the last few years.

(c) *Moral effect.* So far as any definite attempt at the formation of character is concerned, it must be confessed that hardly any effort is made, and the question is for the most part ignored. At home the children come mainly under the influence of the mother ; the father is away at his work all day and is in many cases only seen by them on a Sunday. He determines, indeed, the general conditions under which they live, his wages limiting the degree of comfort possible ; but his personal influence, except in cases where he is a loafer or a drunkard, is a factor of little importance. All the details of home life, all the management of the children falls on the mother, and all the definite teaching, whatever may be its nature, comes from her. This teaching is made up of two parts : the one depends on the general moral standard prevailing in the grade to which the family belongs—a standard that judges of actions apart from their consequences ; the other rests on a sort of utilitarian basis and regards as wrong all conduct tending to produce discomfort in the home.

The first, conventional morality as it may be called, is important because it acts as a continuous steady force tending to lift every one to the level of the standard which it prescribes, and to some extent takes the place of an ideal. If the moral condition of the working classes as a whole is to be improved it can only be done by raising this standard, just as the only way to improve their physical condition is to raise their standard of comfort. High ideals are of infinite value to the individual, but, lacking as they do the sanction of popular opinion, they have no power to influence the masses. To state the classes of actions which this conventional morality praises or blames is not an easy task, since it varies much with the social status of the family. The error, however, is probably small in the assertion that this conventional morality condemns dishonesty and drunkenness, while it approves

of kindness to the weak and respect to superiors. That it should approve the latter may appear strange, but all experience shows that this is the case. In their homes the mother will be found, almost invariably, anxious to check any rudeness or roughness shown towards strangers. This may be some relic of a habit derived from the country, where many of the parents were born. It is also true that the children themselves show very little respect to a superior, so that this custom is possibly dying out. Truthfulness is not one of the virtues which this conventional morality inculcates.

The second factor which forms the other part of the definite teaching rests, as has been said, on an utilitarian basis. Actions which disturb the home and cause annoyance to the family are forbidden ; for example, the noisy and dirty child is punished, and quarrels in the house are discouraged. Conduct such as this is troublesome and is accordingly prohibited. The parents have, however, no idea of a child as anything more than a creature who performs certain acts, usually of an annoying nature. All training is a training of the external character, while the internal character remains quite unnoticed. Every precept takes the form of a command to do this, never to be this. Now it is a general truth that where the external character is alone regarded as important, there a high degree of untruthfulness will be found. This is necessarily the case ; if the world thinks only of the acts, never of the actor, if in all its judgments it never makes any mention of man as a moral being, then each person will come to believe that only his actions count for anything, and, further, only such actions as are known to be his. Respect for truth has its root in the internal character alone ; it is a function of the inner self, and will only be present when a man has learned to regard himself as a creature of infinite value—a creature who is, by slow and wearisome steps, unfolding something divine within him ; a creature who will therefore regard a lie as a thing degrading and doing violence to the highest principle in his nature. It is because the town child has never been taught reverence for himself that he is persistently

untruthful. More need not be said about the definite moral teaching the children receive. The sanctions used to enforce it generally take a very material form in the shape of angry words or blows.

More important in many respects is the moral effect produced by those conditions of town life which are not included in direct and deliberate instruction; they have their origin on the one hand in the circumstances connected with home life, and on the other in the surroundings of the streets.

With regard to home influence, while it is true that high rents cause an overcrowding which makes a proper separation of the sexes impossible, it is very doubtful whether this overcrowding has the injurious effect on morals which is commonly supposed to follow. What evidence there is seems to suggest that the opposite assertion contains more truth. Open immorality does not walk the streets in the quarters of the poor as in the wealthier regions of the West. If vice exists in the former it has largely been called into life to meet the demands made upon it by the latter. This, however, does not very much concern children; they are, as a whole, surprisingly innocent and remain untouched by the harmful influence the conditions of home life might well be expected to exercise. Certain consequences, however, do appear, which are of all the more importance because they are in harmony with the other results of town life. When a number of people inhabit a few rooms peace and order take wing, leaving behind a ceaseless babel of noise. With boys and girls varying in age, from the baby to the child about to leave school, and indulging in their respective amusements, nothing else is possible. From lack of calming influences there is a constant strain on the nerves which renders those living in this way intensely irritable, and the child develops a highly-strung, excitable nature. Children, possessing as they do a surplus of energy, are naturally easily excited; but town children are marked by this characteristic to a far greater extent than those who have their homes in the country. It is the human element, making for unrest.

As for the homes themselves, there is little of attraction or beauty within ; they are filled up with furniture, and require, if they are to be clean, unceasing labour (much of which falls on the girls) to be spent on them. The poor can hardly be said to have a home ; it would be truer to call their dwelling-place a temporary tenement, as they are constantly shifting from one house to another. Indeed, with the growth of block dwellings, many do not possess even a house, but a mere lodging in one of those gigantic human warrens. All the powerful associations connected with a home in which they have grown up are absent, and the place can only in part be filled by the sentiments that sometimes cluster round an old chair or table, which has stood the wear and tear of time.

One more influence of home life there is—the influence arising from the treatment the children receive at the hands of those with whom they live. Of all the forces of home life this is the most important, not only because of the direct effect that it has on the child's character, but also because of the indirect effect. As others have used the child so will the child learn to use others.

On this question little doubt exists. The parents love their children and treat them, according to their own lights, kindly and well. There is, it is true, much suffering caused by improvidence, drunkenness, and self-indulgence ; but of deliberate cruelty to their offspring only occasional examples are to be found. The behaviour of the children is the best proof of this. For if children are seen to shrink from strangers and to try to escape them it is fair to conclude they have been subjected to ill-usage and taught to expect such treatment from those they do not know. If, on the other hand, they meet his advances and look on him from the first as a friend, there can hardly be better evidence that experience has led them to anticipate kindness at the hands of all they meet. There can fortunately be no hesitation into which of these two classes the town child is to be placed. No one with any experience can doubt for a moment ; he knows well how rare it is to find a child who seeks to avoid him and who does not rather seek to make his acquaintance. This friendliness, this unhesitating

trust in strangers, is one of their most beautiful characteristics and the secret of the strange charm they possess. It is sufficient evidence that the poor use their children well and proves in addition that this treatment is extended to the children of others. In all our intercourse with the poor, in all we learn of their ways, there is nothing that excites in us a greater sense of their nobility than this spontaneous affection shown us by the boys and girls of the schools. There must be something great in their lives, something worthy of admiration in this unintentional education they give, when the children look on every stranger as a friend and regard the world as an abode of kindly beings. When I hear good folk blaming them, denouncing their improvident and intemperate habits, there rises in my mind the picture of one of those coarse, drunken mothers gently caressing a fragile little girl, turning back the sleeves to show how thin are the small white arms, wondering whether she can bear to part with the child and allow her to go into the country, and in the end fearing to trust her to a stranger's care.

Another striking feature in connection with the home life of the working classes having much in common with the characteristic just mentioned is the love and pity shown towards all who are weaker and poorer than themselves. In all the world there are no people who help each other as they do, or who show greater kindness towards those in trouble. Fellowship in suffering breeds sympathy with suffering. Those who have trodden the hard road of distress, who have searched for nourishment amid the barren fields of poverty, know what pain means, and seeing it in others strive to bring relief. This behaviour of the parents towards the weak reacts on the children; and towards those who are younger than themselves they show much tenderness.

On the other hand, while it is true that experience of suffering has awakened a sense of pity for those in distress, the general conditions of their life have made them assume a contrary attitude towards those not so placed. Their acquaintance with the world has brought home to them the truth that each man must depend on himself, that

it is only by striving to forward his own interests that he can hope to get any share in the enjoyments of the town. Further, there is so little pleasure to divide among so many that there always remains a balance of unsatisfied desires, a sort of store of potential energy ready to discharge itself in a burst of self-assertion whenever any favourable opportunity occurs. For these reasons it is found that where equals are concerned each is for himself and strives to get all that lies within his power. Children are naturally selfish, or, to speak more truly, put self first, which is a different thing from the deliberate selfishness of the old. With the children of the town this is especially conspicuous, and one of the most obvious blemishes in their character is this setting up of self in the first place, this total lack of any thought for their equals. It is partly to this fact, partly to their natural excitability, that the quarrelsomeness of their disposition is due.

Lastly there remains to be considered the conditions outside the home. Parents, certainly all the more thoughtful of them, are unanimous in recognising the injurious effects of the streets upon their children. They assert that once the children have acquired a habit of drifting up and down the streets, they become more difficult to manage, grow rougher in their behaviour, and acquire a greater delight in such wanderings. The cause of the attraction is obvious ; an escape is offered from the close confinement of small rooms and a change from the monotony of home life. One cause of the evil produced is equally conspicuous. In the street the children meet with bad companions, find a delight in spectacles like that of a man being dragged to gaol or of a drunken quarrel, which can only degrade their character, and encounter nothing but what fosters and appeals to their animal nature. There is, however, another cause to which attention must be paid if the harmful fascination of the streets is to be explained ; it is the power exercised by a mass of men. No one can wander along the crowded roads on a Saturday evening, when the whole world is tossing down the pavement like some stormy sea, without being seized by a curious thrill of excitement. There is

something more in a crowd than a mere collection of individuals; it possesses a character of its own as a whole, so that each person in it finds himself behaving in a manner foreign to his disposition, and experiencing sensations before unknown. A multitude of living beings has a strange intoxicating effect and awakens the consciousness as of some giant power latent indeed, but yet visibly felt. Child and adult are alike in this, and, once they have been subjected to this crowd-passion, crave for a repetition of the emotion. In a small house, indeed in any kind of life, there is nothing to satisfy it except indulgence in the cause that gave it birth. This concentrated power of the human element, when exerted to its full extent, creates the Hooligan; but it breeds excitement and dislike of any restraint in all alike who inhabit a large city.

It is possible now to summarise the effect of the whole environment of a town. Physically it tends to rear an unhealthy race. Mentally it tends to create a people of quick, superficial intelligence. Morally it tends to bring about three results. First, the absence of the nature element, the lack of all that is beautiful, the overcrowded homes, and the influence of the street all co-operate in producing an excitable disposition. Secondly, poverty, while encouraging a love of the weak, incites all to fight for themselves where their opponents are their equals. There is something strange in this truth, that of the three reverences—the reverence for the weak, the reverence for our equals, and the reverence for our superiors—which Goethe calls the three elements of the true religion, that one, the reverence for the weak, should be found which he considered to be the peculiar characteristic of the Christian faith. Lastly, the habit of regarding the external character and of neglecting the internal causes the untruthfulness which exists among the poor.

In the giant workshops of the cities, day and night, year in year out, from such elements are being formed those strange creatures called the children of the town. In a superficial outside view of them as a whole there is little to attract. It is only when we come to know them as individuals, only when we have taken to pieces the masses

and observed them singly, that the fascination they possess begins to dawn upon us. Childhood is always beautiful, but in the town it assumes a form found nowhere else. It is a kind of essence of childhood distilled free from all reserve, all shyness, and all restraint. In their every action is visible an utter self-abandonment to the transient emotion of the moment; they resemble some musical instrument which can be made to yield at will sounds of joy or sounds of sorrow, and, like that instrument also, they are as little permanently affected by the old tunes when once they have ceased to be heard. In this responsiveness lies both the charm they have for others and the danger they are to themselves. They respond too freely to any influence to which they are subjected, and in their character there is no element of firmness which will hold them true to any definite purpose. Their life is a life lived in the present and for the present; the past and the future have hardly any place therein. They have no memories of some idealised past and no hopes of some visioned future to lead them on. This loss of the inspiration of childhood is irreparable, since all connected with it stirs our emotions as nothing else can. When our hearts grow weary and our efforts faint beneath the noon-tide heat of life, then we turn back and tread over again the paths of childhood's garden, now transfigured in the soft moonlight of memory, and find still growing there the old boundless hopes. Deprived of this solid support in the Past, the children of the town present an instability of character which is absolutely powerless to make any stand against the paralysing forces of Modern life. The promise of their youth, which their spontaneous affection, their kindness towards the weak, and their simple trust seem to justify, remains a promise unfulfilled. The children as they leave school to go out into the world resemble the woods in early spring, their leaf-buds are eloquent of a time of beauty when the warmth of summer shall be here; but the summer never comes, the leaf-buds die away unopened, and the trees stand in the midst of an eternal winter with bare branches wailing over a loss that no future will ever repair. This utter wreckage of all the

promise of their childhood, this blighting effect of our vaunted civilisation I call the everlasting tragedy—a tragedy that is being enacted silently, unceasingly throughout the great cities of our land. At the beginning of this essay the babe was supposed to put the question : What manner of man shall I become ? The answer is given now. Full of sadness, yet not wholly unilluminated by gleams of hope, it drives us on to the further question : How can we make that answer different ?

II. THE ARTIFICIAL CONDITIONS OF THE TOWN.

The permanent conditions of town life leave strong impress of their influence on the child, because they are always present ; and because, unconsciously, they are all working together to create a certain type of character. Their effect, therefore, is cumulative. The artificial conditions established by those who desire to modify this result will prove of little avail until the changes to be produced and the evils to be cured are clearly recognised, and until some sort of peace and harmony reigns over the many now discordant, if not actively hostile, forces. These forces consist of two groups, the one formed by voluntary agencies, the other called into life by legal enactment.

The Voluntary Agencies.

These, from their miscellaneous nature, are difficult to classify, but they broadly separate themselves into four divisions.

1. The first includes those who are concerned only with the physical needs of children, such as Hospitals, Free Meal Funds, and many others. Their object, the restoration to or the preservation of health, is laudable ; and so long as the means adopted are in accordance with the principles of a wise Charity they are doing a valuable work. It must, however, never be forgotten that, while attention is being directed to bodily requirements, the influence exercised cannot be so restricted. The effect of the help given reacts on the family. If, therefore, any course of action, adopted from carelessness or a foolish credulity, stimulates a belief that a lie is advantageous and

pays better than adherence to truth, direct encouragement is given to the most besetting sin of the poor, and their moral well-being is sacrificed in order to satisfy some physical need. The question of Charity is too large a one to be discussed here, but it is necessary to remark that the wide-reaching effect of its action is more extensive than many either believe or desire.

2. Secondly come those agencies whose object is to provide amusement. Taking into account the fact that the lives of the children are monotonous, that their opportunities for enjoyment are small, and for healthy enjoyment very limited indeed, there is unquestionably a large and useful field of work open to such societies. Two points require attention—the way in which the work is carried out, and the nature of the amusement offered.

Stress has already been laid on the excitable character of the town children. Anything, therefore, that is calculated to stir up their naturally wild, unrestrained spirits is encouraging one of their main faults, and is probably of a harmful kind. On the other hand, all that tends to calm and tranquillise their emotions, all that inclines them to find enjoyment without a display of animal life, is at least a movement in the right direction, awakening as it does that almost dormant sense of pleasure in what is restful, orderly, and beautiful. It may be laid down as a general rule that in dealing with children all that makes for peace and quiet is good, and all that makes for noise and excitement is bad. Unfortunately many of the amusements now provided fall into this last class. I am disposed to think that the price paid for the pleasure—in other words, the stimulus given to the fierce ebullition of uncontrollable spirits—is too high, and merely supplies them with attractions like in kind to those found in the streets. In all cases the natural faults of character should be borne in mind; for example, in games every effort should be made to encourage a sense of fairness, quarrels should be checked, and attempts made to teach the children consideration of the feeling of others. In writing in this way I feel that I am exposing myself to the criticism that I am trying to turn recreation into a sort of moral drill. No doubt this charge would be justified if

games were to be interspersed with sermons ; but this is not what is intended. What is meant is that the tone accompanying the amusements should be raised. If this is successful there will be no loss but rather a gain in the pleasure derived from these amusements ; for disorder, want of fair-play and quarrels interrupt the games and rob them of their charm.

Next, with regard to the kind of amusement offered, the question should be not " Do the children enjoy this ? " but " How is it possible to teach them to find pleasure in some new way ? " For example, more might be done to induce the children to take delight in the exercise of the powers they have acquired in school, such as drawing and singing. Beauty in music or in art, like the nature element, is able to hush the wild, discordant feelings and so to foster the undeveloped side of the child's character. Or, again, the schools have taught the children to read and they have come to possess a taste for reading. The ordinary books and papers at their disposal, consisting as they do of sensational tales and the comic periodicals, are not of an elevating kind. If they can obtain them they do read and do appreciate the best of the stories for children. Attempts such as these, which endeavour to graft into the home life the effect of the school training, ought not to be neglected. For a new source of happiness is thereby opened which will not terminate when the days of childhood are over.

3. Thirdly, there are the societies that provide holidays in the country. Those that furnish a day's outing are so numerous that few children reach the age of ten without having paid at least one visit there. Men of experience have condemned these excursions, pointing to the wild disorder sometimes present ; they consider that the effect is both physically and morally bad. No doubt there are occasions when that is true, but such mad orgies are not necessary. They are due partly to a lack of discipline, which can be avoided, and partly to a rush of new impressions. If it were not for these expeditions many children would grow up without ever having seen the country. The mental change caused by one day so spent must not

be undervalued. Whatever the circumstances, the children learn the meaning of fields and woods, so that descriptions of country scenery in the books they read, which before conveyed no impression, become now intelligible. There can, however, be no question that the highest good is only derived when the number of children is small. In large numbers they learn something of nature, but can never feel it ; while, if they are few, even in a day's excursion this appreciation of nature becomes to some extent possible.

Next there are the societies that board the children out in the country for a week or more, usually for a fortnight. As the expense is considerable, and the amount of organisation and superintendence required large, the numbers sent are comparatively small. Professedly the object is to improve the health of delicate children, in point of fact the effect produced is much wider. The fortnight's holiday makes a break in the monotonous stream of the children's lives, and familiarises them with quite novel conditions of existence. It is natural, therefore, to expect that a deep impression will be made, and all experience shows that this is the case. The holiday actually does form an epoch in their lives and stands as a landmark in their Past. To speak in this way may appear to be indulging in exaggerated language, but I appeal to those who have any knowledge of the children to witness to the truth of my statement.

But the mere fact of making a deep impression does not necessarily imply that the result is of a desirable kind. All depends upon the group of feelings that stand out most clearly and repeat themselves whenever the picture of the country rises into memory. If the feelings tending to be so aroused are merely those derived from animal enjoyment, it can hardly be claimed that the moral effect produced is of much value. If, on the other hand, the feelings are those which nature is capable of awakening, those emotions which are the peculiar characteristic of the education derived from what I have called the nature element, then the holiday has done something to quicken the side of the child's life left untouched by the town.

That this is no unreasonable expectation is, I think, clear. For the beauty and silent grandeur of nature kindle in the child strong feelings which have much in common with those of religion. At eventide after a sultry day, when soft breezes play around, when soft twilight falls on the earth, when soft whispers come from the woods, the soul of man and child alike grow soft, and in the words of Jean Paul "*alles ist gottlich oder Gott.*" That something of this kind actually does happen I can testify from my own experience with London children while in the country.

That the ordinary child left to himself in the country feels anything of this kind I do not assert : he is probably too intent on his games to be conscious of anything else. All depends on those who have the care of the children. They must help the child to appreciate Nature, place him under such conditions that, so to speak, Nature forces herself on his notice, and they will be surprised at the effect produced.

I have thought fit to dwell at some length on these country holidays, for I am convinced that they are an absolute necessity in the education of the child. If our towns are to continue to present the same conditions as they do now, we must by some means contrive that all the children spend at least a fortnight outside their influence. Nothing else can take the place of this, nothing else can hope to counterbalance the overwhelming power of the human element.

For my own part I fail to see why, just as the Science and Art Department makes grants for the encouragement of these pursuits, there should not be a Nature Department established with a corresponding end in view.

4. Fourthly, there remains for consideration the class of voluntary agencies whose professed object is to influence the moral or religious side of the child's nature. They include Sunday Schools, Bands of Hope, and the like. All that has been already said about the need of repressing excitement applies there also. A discussion of them all would be wearisome. The principles by which they should be judged have in the main been outlined ; and it must suffice if the most important, the

Sunday Schools, receive attention. These are the most numerous, and ought to be the most influential of all the agencies. They possess unique opportunities—first, because most children attend a Sunday School, and, secondly, because the classes are small enough to give scope for the teacher to become intimately acquainted with the individual scholars. Unfortunately the result does not justify these hopes; their influence is confined within narrow limits, and this for two reasons. The first is the lack of efficient teachers. The majority are drawn from the same class as the children, have no conception of what teaching means, and consider that all that is required of them is to instil Bible stories intermixed with a certain amount of doctrine, such as that found in the Catechism, which neither they nor the children understand. The second cause of failure is more serious. It lies in the clergy themselves. The superintendent of the school is probably the curate; he comes fresh from the University or a theological college, knows nothing of children and their ways, and is quite unable to make the best use of the bad material, in the way of assistants, which is at his command. He is beset with a fixed idea that certain truths are of supreme importance—there is nothing to complain of in this—but he is equally convinced that they are within the range of a child's comprehension. Take, for example, the sacramental teaching contained in the Catechism. Children may learn it parrot-like, but the only impression made on them is a sense of utter weariness, and they are filled with a general distaste of such subjects. "Nothing is indeed so apt to close the child's heart against Divine things," says Lange, with truth, "as a too early introduction to their knowledge. But what deep secrets of the Christian faith are only too often discussed with young children who lack entirely the experience necessary to understand them! What can result but verbalism, which fastens itself like mildew on the youthful spirit?" The effect of attempts of this kind ought to be clear from experience. No class of people are more innocent as regards acquaintance with specific dogmas than the poor, in spite of the repeated attempts made, both in Sunday and National

Schools, to inject it into their system during their youthful days.

On the other hand a sort of vague, hazy impression has been left on their minds ; they view the affairs of the next world through the mists that have gathered round their early lessons, and the sole truth that seems clear to them is that a sort of topsy-turvydom will be found there, in which all the rich shall be poor and the poor rich. So much for the effect of early doctrinal instruction. It can hardly be said to exert any moral influence, and serves to render widespread the belief that conduct is one thing and religion another. But the existence of this kind of unmoral religious mist is important because it witnesses to the fact that some effect is produced by such uncongenial teaching as now prevails. Not without foundation, then, is the hope that a real school in which the subjects of instruction are adapted to the respective stages of comprehension of the scholars will be able to leave some permanent mark on the child's character. For proof is afforded that an atmosphere can be created which will remain when the actual lessons are forgotten. The aim of every school should be to see that this atmosphere is not a mere mist, producing only a vague discomfort, but that it is shot through with the light of moral, or, in its highest sense, religious emotion.

The religious emotion has a double origin ; its root lies hidden within the heart of two mysteries—the mystery in nature and the mystery in man. Nature brings to our notice objects of various kinds which leave very different impressions on the mind, according as they do or do not possess distinct visible boundaries or limits. Many of them, like sticks and stones, are complete in themselves, and can be seen and handled as a whole ; in consequence they have an influence on the imagination. Others, as, for example, mountains and rivers, the sky and the starry heavens, fade from the view of the observer away into the distance, without suggesting any definite end ; they awaken the vague yet intense consciousness of a “something beyond” which we can neither see nor know. Trees and growing plants possess a similar power ; they likewise excite a

feeling of a "something behind" them which the most searching inquiry only serves to clothe in a more mysterious form. It is in this "something beyond," in this "something behind," which, so to speak, supports and reveals itself in phenomena, that Max Müller sees the origin of Natural religion, of the faith in an Invisible, an Infinite, a God in nature. In his Gifford Lectures he shows how, out of this primitive perception of a beyond, man built his belief of a power working behind and making itself visible in nature. This belief was developed in the days when the world was young. The objection may therefore be raised that man's early superstitions have no connection with the education of a child. But a child, as he changes from a babe to a man, passes through stages of growth closely similar to the stages of growth through which his race has passed in the process of the development from a savage to a civilised state. The evolution of the child and the race runs on the same lines. One by one, like his forefathers, the child mounts the rungs of the endless ladder of human progress, and only after climbing all the lower steps can he reach the level of his own days. This theory, the theory of the "so-called" culture historical steps, whatever bearing it may have on general education, is of exceptional importance in religious training. For the child does resemble in mind the primeval man; to both alike the world is a place filled full with wonder and mystery, a veritable fairyland; both alike love to people the woods with strange beings, and to imagine behind the wind and the sun an unseen agency. The duty, then, of religious education is to encourage the powers of the imagination and to help the child to perceive the "something beyond" the visible. As he learns the order in the world around there is a tendency for this vision to fade away. The vision will vanish altogether unless in his lessons he is taught that the fairyland of his early days is still real, and that instead of being removed far from him it has approached nearer than when he thought it situate a few miles away. If in the day-school the instruction relates mainly to the world of fact and order, the Sunday School must encourage the

world of fancy and imagination, and show the mystery that lies behind all order. The only way to awaken a conception of an invisible God is to keep alive the vivid perception of the "something beyond." One of the saddest features of town life is that fairyland finds no kindly home amid leagues of bricks and mortar, and is lost amid the gloom of drifting smoke ; in consequence, to see the first mystery—the mystery in nature—is no easy lesson for the child to learn.

The second mystery—the mystery in man—is of later development historically but still belongs to the early ages of mankind. As in nature so in man ; people came to see that there was "a something beyond"—"a something behind" man which remained as a kind of permanent background to the shifting scenes of his daily life, and which, while appearing in all his actions, was something different from any one of them. Hence grew the belief in an Infinite, a Divine, in man. It will perhaps be urged that all this is beyond the apprehension of a child. But a child is naturally metaphysically inclined ; he has a way of putting questions which his wise elders usually dismiss by terming them nonsense. Instead of meeting with disapproval he ought to be encouraged to ask questions of this kind and to see, in the failure to find an answer, the presence of a mystery he cannot fathom.

All religious teaching must strive to awaken in the child a consciousness of these two mysteries lying behind man and behind nature. But something more must be done ; for neither mystery has any necessary connection with morality. They are both unmoral and need to be illumined by the light of some ethical ideal. This result can best be secured by teaching history and the Bible from a certain standpoint ; by showing man as a moral agent, working out in himself a moral purpose ; by judging all his actions, his victories and his defeats not by the world's standard of social or commercial success, but by the rule of right and wrong laid down by the lips of the one supreme man, Jesus Christ. The child will learn not the miserable degradation of man, but his infinite dignity ; he will have impressed on him not the fall but the ascent of man ; he

will be taught to reverence himself as a being made in God's image—a being against whom he is doing violence by any mean action, but whom he is lifting to fill his true position by all that is pure and good. Not till the mystery in man is seen to be charged with a moral significance will it be possible to clothe the mystery standing behind nature in the garb of righteousness. Then at length, by slow steps, the child will be led to build out of the perception of a "something beyond" the conception of the unseen God of love, in whom he lives and moves and has his being.

The natural soil, from which springs the consciousness of the mystery in the world, can be rendered more fertile and its resources more lasting by the help of artificial conditions. These are included in what may be called symbolic education. Goethe has described in "Wilhelm Meister" a wonderful school founded on this principle. By means of symbolic gestures and ceremonies, whose effect is enhanced by all the forces of art and music, the children are trained to feel what he terms the three reverences. It is impossible to read the pages without being struck with the suggestive truths they contain. For the most part symbolic education is entirely neglected in England. Its importance is recognised alone by the Roman Catholics and the High Church Party. They are entitled to the highest praise for having seen the need and for having tried to meet it. They have by means of their ritual, their incense, their lights, and their music, created within the Church a kind of miniature world of nature, which, like nature, appeals through the senses to the emotions and awakens the feeling of a "something behind," hidden, invisible, and awe-inspiring. Children are deeply affected by ceremonies and respond freely to anything of a symbolic character. There can be no doubt that, at any rate in a town, the creation of this miniature world of nature is a necessity. So far from meeting with opposition, those who are striving to render more vivid the consciousness of the mystery in religious services ought to obtain the support and the following of all thoughtful men.

A word must be said about the part doctrine should play in religious training. Each dogma is a crystallisation, a materialisation of some fragment of the elemental feelings that cluster round the two mysteries. For example, man is conscious of the inner contradiction between his higher and his lower nature; this vague feeling is precipitated in a definitely ordered form as the doctrine of original sin. The use and abuse of doctrine become obvious. Each specific dogma is an expression of certain facts of human experience; without that experience it is a meaningless symbol. To teach doctrine in the hope of its creating an experience is like offering the child an empty cup and saying, "Drink the cup and the milk will come."

The various voluntary agencies at work in towns have now been briefly discussed. To estimate their actual result is a task that cannot be performed. What is more important than their present influence are the possibilities that lie within their power. That these are great, considering the large number of people engaged in the work, cannot be denied. But what is wanted to realise these possibilities is co-operation; not indeed actual co-operation, but a common conscious recognition of the extent of the general problem, of the conditions that any solution must satisfy, and of the end towards the attainment of which all efforts must be directed. So long as their strength is not united, so long as men rest content with finding remedies for isolated evils and do not take a broad survey of the whole question, so long will the fruit of their labours be scanty, unattractive, and scarcely worth the gathering. As in all else, if men are to leave the stamp of their influence on the world around, they must have an ideal and judge all their work by the light of that ideal. In this way alone is there any hope of the voluntary agencies being able to make any effective stand against the forces of town life.

The Schools.

All the forces of town life considered up till now may be classed among those which only unintentionally and

not deliberately make for education. None of them have attempted to face the problem of the child as a whole ; they have each tried to satisfy some particular need or to remedy some special evil. The parents, though they have the opportunity, lack the necessary knowledge ; the others, concerned with the child as they are only at scattered intervals and without unity of aim among themselves, can hardly be said to have the opportunity and to a large extent do not possess the knowledge. The schools have the opportunity and might have the knowledge. They are brought into regular and intimate relations with the child for a considerable period of his life ; and there exists a Central Authority who might fairly be expected to formulate the general problem and to lay down the broad lines to be followed in arriving at a successful solution. It must, however, be confessed that the schools have not realised the sanguine expectations formed when the Education Bill of 1870 came into operation. The effect of the discipline of the children and their ability to read and write have undoubtedly led to important results. But the influence on their character is not strongly marked ; the majority leave school without any desire to continue their education, and the traces of their training, instead of being permanent, gradually disappear. It may be urged that the hopes entertained were visionary and could therefore never find fulfilment. There are, on the other hand, many causes which go far to explain the comparative failure of the school system and justify the belief that, were they removed, these happy dreams might remain dreams no more. The question of the school education of town children cannot be discussed wholly apart from that of country children ; and in what follows, though special reference is made to the former, the reforms advocated are just as urgently needed by the latter.

The obstacles that have barred the road to educational progress are two in number. The first is due to the attitude of the general public, the second to the evils of the present system.

The general public regard education in the light of an apprenticeship to commerce, and consider no expenditure

of money justified unless it is likely to manufacture a citizen of a superior wealth-producing capacity. The theory, dear to their heart, may be called the compartment theory of education. A child's head is composed of a certain number of compartments, each of which is entirely isolated from and has no connection with the rest. The object of education is to fill these spaces with suitable furniture. About the principle that determines the selection of the furniture there is no doubt whatever. A human being as soon as he ceases to be a child becomes a money-making machine. His highest end is to make money, and the measure of a man is the measure of the money he can amass. Now in the merciful dispensation of Providence things have been so ordered that only a few can possess themselves of wealth, and the proud privilege of the remainder of humanity is to devote their lives to the service of these few. In the near future it may be found possible to do without their help and to carry on all the affairs of life by means of an inanimate machine. This will be far cheaper and the children of the working classes, being of no further use, may then be permitted to disappear. Unfortunately at present this is not possible, and the human machine is still indispensable. Education, then, has to turn out as good a machine, poor makeshift though this is, as conditions allow, and must store the compartments of a child's head with such chattels as are required to qualify it for this purpose. Reading, writing, and arithmetic are of value. So also is another language, which must be taught to prevent the importation of foreigners—the latter a most extravagant proceeding since our own people, thus thrown out of work, have in the ridiculous state of the law to be supported out of the rates. Any subject such as drawing or music must be rigorously excluded, since, tending to encourage a love of what is beautiful, it would cause the poor to grow dissatisfied with their ugly though to others remunerative surroundings. I am aware that I have stated the theory and its applications somewhat baldly and it may be denied that any such theory exists. Perhaps not; but it is a logical deduction from current expressions on educa-

tional matters. For example, when the farmer complains that the schools have robbed him of his most intelligent labourer ; when the manufacturer attributes the discontent among his hands to the spread of knowledge ; when the mistress, whimpering over the difficulty of obtaining good servants, pitifully wails that education has put ideas in their heads ; when these speak in this way every assertion derives its force from the tacit assumption that the duty of one class is to serve the interests of another and the duty of the teacher to see that this is done. Further, they usually go on to urge that in this servitude lies the sole source of happiness, nay, even the sole means of existence, for the working classes. That the methods they advocate will not produce the results they desire, I have already tried to show when speaking of internal character, which alone can lead to consistent conduct. It would appear that Providence, after vainly attempting to inspire men with high aspirations, has ordained that low ideals shall go hand in hand with a blind inability to see the means of realising them.

To attempt to advocate reforms in the face of this theory, which is apparently sweeping all before it, might well appear a hopeless task. But for several reasons there are grounds of hope. First, many people, while they use the current arguments, would indignantly repudiate the conclusions to which they lead if once they were conscious of them. Secondly, a steady opposition is growing up among the poor themselves. Vague, voiceless, and inarticulate as this is, it yet makes itself felt as a kind of hidden, massive power, spreads like some subtle aroma polluting the pure air of commercialism, drifts as a swarm of discontent microbes infecting men with the fever of unrest and forebodings for the future. In this spirit of resistance to prevailing thought lies our chief hope ; this spirit which cannot altogether rid itself of the belief that man is something more than a machine, that he is a strange creature capable of visions and inexplicable yearnings, and that he is working out in himself a Divine purpose which has nothing in common with the sordid magnificence of a trading community. Lastly, it may be well to

call the attention of those who object to any additional expenditure on education to the fact that the growth of giant cities is a phenomenon which has never before appeared in the history of the world, and to ask them what they intend to do in view of the truth that a new species of man is being developed. Changed conditions of existence are slow to work their full effect, but they are ceaselessly moulding men into some preordained form. This new type of man, whose characteristics I have tried to describe, suggests the question whether a town, fostering excitement while it diminishes vital force, is not rearing a people whose decreasing physical vigour will render them unfit for any useful work, and whose increasing instability of character will prove a real danger to the very existence of the Empire.

The evils in the present educational system may be divided into three classes—those due to external organisation, to internal organisation, and to the Voluntary Schools.

1. *External Organisation.*—Here we find ourselves face to face with a chaos of conflicting authorities who are continually trespassing on each other's spheres. There is, first, the Central Authority at Whitehall; secondly, the School Boards, providing elementary and to some extent secondary education; thirdly, the County Councils, concerned with technical and also with secondary education. The result is confusion; the work of the different bodies overlaps and no one quite knows what the other is doing or intends to do.

The constitution of the School Boards themselves can hardly be called satisfactory; even in the larger of them few members possess any expert knowledge of education, are competent to select the subjects most suitable for instruction or can criticise different schemes of work. Such questions have to be left entirely to the individual head-teachers; the Inspector has, indeed, to approve, but cannot take the place of a Local Board, if one could be found, possessed of the ability to adapt its schools to the real needs of the neighbourhood. In the case of the smaller School Boards matters are much worse. The

members are often not only incompetent in but indifferent to educational questions. Further, their hands are tied by the heavy burden that any improvement in their schools would throw on the rates, so that they can hardly be blamed for their parsimonious economy. With an educational rate of over one shilling there were, in 1899, 38 boroughs and 240 parishes, the rate in some instances rising as high as 3s. 6d. Such a state of affairs naturally renders expenditure on education unpopular.

Further, the religious controversy has turned many of the Boards into an arena for the exhibition of sectarian and unsectarian prejudice ; in the dust with which these fierce gladiatorial displays have filled the air those unfortunate little beings, the children of the schools, have been swallowed up, and their interests become as nothing compared with the victory of this or that side.

Lastly, there is one further evil due to the present organisation—an evil to which attention has not been sufficiently directed. The Board Schools stand isolated, and have no organic connection with the life of the neighbourhood in which they exist. They are plumped down in the middle of some area, the teachers come from outside, do their work and then go their way ; the children attend, are exposed to certain influences for a time, and then they too go their way. Outside the school there are various agencies, philanthropic and religious, employed in work among children, but there is no necessary connection between them and the schools, and in point of fact there is frequently none at all. These two organisations, having as their object the welfare of the child, ought to be in close co-operation ; each can help the other, each possesses special knowledge, the one of the home and the parents, the other of the children, and each has peculiar facilities for the exercise of its power. At present they stand separate, in part cover the same ground, and leave untouched tracts that need cultivation. Further, the influence of the schools necessarily ceases when the schooldays are over, but the influence of the religious bodies does not ; if these two stand in close relations, the one is in a position to take up and continue

the work of the other, and the sudden snapping of old associations, which is one of the causes of what I have called the everlasting tragedy, will not occur.

These four evils—namely, the complexity of the existing system, the incompetence and the poverty of many School Boards, the religious controversy, and the isolation of the schools—are those which any true reform must endeavour to remedy. The special question of Voluntary Schools will be discussed separately.

There appears but one course open—a single educational authority must be established for each district. The area ought to be large, and would conveniently be the same as that of the County Council or, where it exists, of the Borough County Council. This authority should be an elected body and not, as was proposed in the Bill of 1896, a mere Committee of the County Council; and that for many reasons. In the first place, as many of the County Councils then said, they have plenty of work of their own without taking on their shoulders the burden of the schools. It is most unwise to increase the duties of any public body to such an extent that it practically has to leave everything to committees, and is unable, as a whole, to supervise and control what they do. The immense amount of detail connected with the management of schools would certainly prevent the Council from doing more than voting the money required by the Education Committee, and would preclude them from taking any active part in the questions at issue. Further, we might have the ridiculous spectacle of a County Council election run on religious lines, in which men would be elected because their theological views were sound while their opinions on drains and the housing question might be sadly wanting, on the ground presumably that a pure religion is a compensation for a polluted water supply. Again, the little interest now shown would become still smaller if the management of the schools were made merely the work of a committee, and were classed with such matters as sewage purification and the provision of fire-escapes. Lastly, education is a sufficiently large question and raises sufficiently important issues to justify and

to render advisable the existence of a separate body elected for its control.

In order to have expert opinion represented it is most desirable that there should be a considerable number of co-opted members. There are many who would be unwilling or, from their position, unable to offer themselves as candidates at an election, but whom it would be most advisable to have on the Board. They should consist of men and women chosen from inspectors, head-teachers, managers of secondary schools, and County or Town Councillors, and of any others possessed of special knowledge. A Board so formed would be competent to supervise their schools in an intelligent manner, and to promote a rapid improvement in educational methods.

Next, with regard to the powers of this education authority. In the first place, it ought to possess the powers now exercised by the School Board. Secondly, it should have the right of building and maintaining its own training colleges. How urgent this need is will be clear from the following quotation from the last report on training colleges: "At the Queen's Scholarship examination at Christmas, 1898, no fewer than 11,631 candidates were examined, of whom 6,189 were qualified as Queen's scholars to be admitted to training colleges. But there was room for not 3,000, probably not for more than 2,400. So that, at the latter estimate, 3,789 young persons, the great majority of whom earnestly desired to qualify themselves properly for their life's work, were unable to do so, and had to attain recognition as teachers through what I cannot help calling the back door. . . . No one who is acquainted intimately with the elementary schools of the country can fail to be struck with the distance in character which, as a rule, separates the instruction of a school taught by a trained teacher from one taught by an untrained." This extract requires no comment. Attention is called at once to the necessity of training, and to its impossibility for most teachers under present conditions. Thirdly, the education authority must be given the powers now possessed by the County Council in respect of secondary and technical education. It should be per-

mitted to found scholarships with the object of enabling the children to continue their education ; and it ought, above all things, to try and widen that famous bridge connecting the Board School and the University. Being the authority for both primary and secondary education, it would be able to bring the two methods into better harmony, so that the transition from one to the other might be rendered easier. It should be at liberty, besides making grants to existing secondary schools, to build secondary schools of its own or to make special provision for a more advanced education in the present elementary schools. Finally, it must be given freedom to start evening continuation schools unfettered by the late judicial decision which apparently questions the legality of much that has been hitherto taught. The importance of encouraging children to continue their education cannot be overestimated. The Commissioners on Secondary Education are right when they say : " It is by those who have received a further and superior kind of instruction that the intellectual progress of a nation is maintained. It is they who provide its literature, who advance its science, who direct its government," and, it might well be added, who alone have access to the highest joys of which man is capable.

Next, with regard to finance, there can be no question that far the greater part of the money required should be provided by a Central Grant. Education is of advantage to the country as a whole, and the country as a whole should pay for it. Indirectly, through immigration, the towns suffer if the schools existing in the country are inferior. Moreover, there is no justice in a poor district having to content itself with a poor education just because of the poverty that prevails. Some definite rate, the same everywhere, should be levied ; but all additional cost, over and above this, ought to be met, not out of the rates, but from general taxation. Possibly certain branches of technical education, being of special advantage to the neighbourhood, should be paid for out of the rates.

As regards inspection from Whitehall, it would, I think,

be desirable to retain this to some extent, as a guard against reckless extravagance, and as a means of securing everywhere a high standard of efficiency. The schools will, however, still remain isolated patches in the neighbourhood. Their number, moreover, will be too large to secure the individual attention and interest which make so greatly for efficiency. This fault can best be remedied by the Educational Authority deputing certain of its powers to committees of local people ; in other words, by creating bodies of local managers similar to those now existing in London. On them would be represented the ministers of the different denominations, parents of the children, and any one else likely to prove useful. They would be appointed to manage one or more schools ; they would visit them, maintain a general supervision, and see that the regulations of the authority were obeyed. Subject to the authority's approval, they would have the selection of the teachers, possibly, in the case of the head-teacher, choosing one of a number submitted to them. That they should have the selection of teachers is essential, as by this means alone can the individuality of the school be considered, and the teachers chosen accordingly. Their most important duty would be to become acquainted with the children's circumstances, to ascertain whether or no they are connected with any religious organisations, and in case of need, by visits paid the parents, to endeavour to secure this result. Of course, active proselytism would have to be guarded against, but I do not believe much in the danger of this, and it would always be open to the authority to remove from the managers any individual who transgressed. An arrangement of this kind ought to link the school closely to the life of the neighbourhood. The objection may, however, be raised that this close connection has not been established in London. There are, however, two reasons which explain the apparent failure ; first, the School Board, in its efforts towards centralisation, has withdrawn so much of the power from the managers that there is little inducement to serve ; secondly, the clergy as a body are hostile to Board Schools, and, regarding them as a thing of evil, take

little interest in their welfare. The first admits of remedy, the second does not. If the neighbourhood declines to take any interest in their school, it cannot be compelled to do so ; it can only be afforded the opportunity.

Finally, there remains the religious problem. The question whether or no there should be religious teaching in the elementary schools, and of what nature it ought to be, since the interest of the whole country is involved, is clearly a question for Parliament to decide. The sole result of the various controversies that have raged round this subject has been the emergence of what is called undenominationalism. This somewhat uncouth term is applied to that religious teaching which remains as a sort of residual calx after the removal of the doctrines that distinguish the particular Churches. Such teaching, while gaining the favour of the majority and being actively opposed by only a few extremists, would probably form a satisfactory basis for a compromise. Above all things, peace must somehow be established. The real danger of the present bitter contest lies in the fact that, if continued, it can end but in one way. Men will grow weary of the incessant strife, and will say, "Better no religious teaching at all than this ceaseless war of tongues." What is to take the place of religion in the formation of a child's character it is not easy to see. Whatever may be said from a theoretical point of view, as a matter of practice religion has been found the only means of imparting definite moral teaching. The sole body of persons with any rival plan have been the Positivists, and the success attending their lucubrations has not been encouraging. It is well, therefore, for those who scoff at compromise to consider whether this is not better than the only other alternative—the abolition of religious teaching throughout the schools.¹

2. *Internal Organisation.*—The next question calling

¹ I cannot conclude this portion of my essay without recording the deep debt of gratitude I owe to Mr. T. C. Horsfall for his most valuable pamphlet on Education. I have made free use of it, and even where I have ventured to take a different line I have done so only with considerable anxiety, and after careful reflection.

for discussion is concerned with the faults that exist within the schools. They are due, on the one hand, to the pupil teacher system, and on the other to the attendance problem.

It is impossible to read the reports of the different inspectors, as given in the third volume of the 1899-1900 Board of Education Blue Book, without feeling that the whole pupil teacher system is breaking down. From all quarters of the country come complaints about "the dearth of pupil teachers," and if the supply of teachers is to depend on them there is likely to be found a dearth here also.

It is not only a dearth of pupil teachers that exists. There seems also to be spreading the opinion that the system is not altogether satisfactory. School Boards first, and the Education Department later, have found it necessary to limit the time during which the pupil teachers are employed in teaching. Under the best Boards, for at least the first two years of their apprenticeship, they do not count on the effective staff ; while in Voluntary Schools the limitation of the hours allowed to be spent in teaching is hastening their disappearance. "The pupil teacher system," says Dr. Airy in his report, "seems likely to wither away among the Voluntary Schools here ; managers find it difficult to obtain them, and the head-teachers don't want them ; and there is a substitute at hand. I fancy that my lament will be echoed in any district in England. The teacher under Art. 68 is rapidly becoming mistress of the situation." Such being the case, the question suggests itself whether the time has not come for abolishing the pupil teacher system altogether. Germany and Switzerland have no pupil teachers, and there is nothing in favour of their retention except their cheapness. The weight of this argument is, as has been shown, rapidly disappearing. There are many reasons for making this change. First, the system is unfair to the pupil teachers. Besides continuing their general education and passing a yearly examination, they have to spend a considerable time in school. The strain of teaching is great for an adult, and much too severe for one who has only reached

the age of fourteen or fifteen. When in addition they are obliged to devote their leisure and their Saturdays to study, it should be obvious that anything like serious education is impossible. Further, the continuous drudgery breeds a distaste for teaching, and many give up the profession when the apprenticeship is over. Secondly, the system is unfair to the children. The pupil teachers have neither the necessary knowledge nor the necessary power of imparting knowledge; their lessons are uninteresting, and their powers of maintaining discipline imperfect. Lastly, they have to teach before they can form any idea of what teaching means; they are inclined to believe that its sole aim is to store the child's head with facts, a belief which residence in a training college does not always eradicate; in consequence they return to their profession without any high ideal to direct their efforts. In towns where pupil-teacher schools exist, and where the time spent in actual teaching is strictly limited, the evil effect is less marked; but in Voluntary Schools, where the instruction received is given, often grudgingly and of necessity, by the head-teacher, the result is disastrous. In place of allowing the system to die of a lingering disease, surely the wisest course is to end its miseries at once. Instead of becoming pupil teachers the students should continue their general education to the age of about eighteen. They ought then to undergo some special instruction in a training college for two years. During this training they would study such subjects as have a special bearing on education, would learn the methods which have proved most successful in imparting knowledge, and would see carried out in some school, and learn to carry out for themselves, these principles. In order to obtain a supply of teachers, and to enable children from the elementary schools to become teachers themselves, their training must be regarded as an apprenticeship, during which they will receive salaries just as though they were still pupil teachers. It is very desirable that the schools they attend should not be reserved exclusively for embryo teachers, or the tendency to specialise too soon, and the uniformity of their surroundings will narrow their

views and injuriously affect their general education. Where Board Schools are concerned the expense will be little more than at present, though in Voluntary Schools some additional cost will be incurred. But as the whole failure or the whole success of education ultimately turns on the character of the teacher, this is not a consideration that ought to have much weight. It is impossible to overestimate the influence of a really good teacher. I have noted, as every one else has noted, the difference in behaviour in school between a class taken by a good assistant and a class taken by a bad one. I have also had the opportunity of comparing the two classes of children out of school, and the same difference in conduct can still be marked.

To many it may appear unnecessary for one who is to take part only in elementary education to require more than an elementary training. No doubt if a teacher is regarded as a mere cramming machine, this is to some extent true. If, however, he is looked on as one who will have a share in forming the character of the rising generation, and if, moreover, the fact is remembered that he is in many cases the sole person of culture with whom the child comes into close relations, it is clearly impossible to carry his education too far. The best teacher may never be able to impart to his pupils all that is most valuable in his knowledge, yet its possession will transfigure and animate all the lessons which he gives.

Finally, there remains the question of attendance. Half-time still exists, and the children can still leave school, under conditions, at the age of twelve. In Germany education is compulsory up to fourteen; in London this is practically the case now, since only children who have passed the Seventh Standard can leave at thirteen. There appears no valid reason why the age of fourteen should not be regarded as the minimum age of exemption. The ancient argument of interference with trade will no doubt once more come to life, and clothe itself in that spectre garb which it assumed first to scare men from forbidding the labour of women and children in the mines, and which

it dons anew when proposals are in the air to strike off another link of childhood's fetters. But the ghost has lost its terrors. Its gloomy predictions have never been fulfilled, and it might well be allowed to rest peacefully in that charnel-house of oblivion to which time consigns all worn-out bogies and misleading prophets.

But it is not sufficient to retain the children in school till the age of fourteen ; if nothing more is done their education will in many instances be wasted. There are evening schools, but they are not well attended, and in London, at any rate, they have proved to a great extent a failure. There are occasions when a supply rightly waits for a demand ; there are also times when the supply has to precede the demand, and if that is not forthcoming, then the supply must be forced on those who ought to demand it. It is so with education ; and if many of its best fruits are not to be wasted children ought to be compelled to attend evening classes up to the age of sixteen for at least three nights a week. This would make the sudden change from school life less abrupt ; it would afford many the opportunity of continuing their education—an opportunity which frequently they desire but cannot use ; it might hope to encourage in others interest in studies that would prove a lifelong pleasure ; and, lastly, it would do something to limit the long hours of work to which a lad is often exposed when first he starts to earn his living.

One other reform in connection with attendance is needed ; it is the appointment of special magistrates to deal with school cases. At present the work, being very tedious, is shelved as much as possible. Further, though this is not as bad as it was, there are still magistrates who play up to the gallery of the public by treating the attendance officers as criminals and the offending parents as ill-used victims.

3. *Voluntary Schools.* So far the Voluntary Schools have only been alluded to incidentally ; now the whole question must be faced. Their existence under present conditions is far the greatest obstacle in the way of educational reform. They not only give an inferior

education themselves, but also exert a steady force tending to check improvements in the Board School. The inspectors cannot insist on many necessary changes without being met with the charge that they are seeking to kill the Voluntary Schools, which would be unable to comply with the demands. Now, considering that more than half the children of the country attend Voluntary Schools (the actual figures of average attendance are in Voluntary Schools 2,500,075 and in Board Schools 2,144,118) the issues involved are of the utmost importance. The "intolerable strain" on Voluntary Schools is a very real one, and is felt not by the managers only, as is usually implied, but also by all the children who attend. More than half the children of the land are offered what can only be called an inferior education—inferior in management, in buildings, in apparatus, and in teachers. Some justification for this statement will naturally be called for, and each of the points raised will be discussed separately.

The management of a Voluntary School is usually in the hands of the clergy. As a rule they have no special qualification for this position, certainly no expert knowledge, and their work in connection with the school forms a small fraction of their regular duties. There is also the great element of uncertainty always to be found in a management of this kind. A vicar who is zealous in the cause of his school may be succeeded by one totally without interest in it, who will prefer to devote what money he can raise to forwarding other branches of parochial work. There is, however, one advantage possessed by Voluntary Schools—they are, or could be, vitally connected with the life of the neighbourhood.

Next with regard to buildings, accurate figures comparing Board and Voluntary Schools are not to be obtained; but the Education Department estimates that since 1870 the managers of the latter have spent £11,000,000 on buildings and improvements to buildings, while the Boards have had sanctioned loans to the value of £39,000,000 for a similar purpose. These figures cannot be compared quite fairly, as many of the Voluntary Schools were built

more than thirty years ago. On the other hand, schools thirty years old must be regarded as antiquated, and it is a striking fact that the Boards, while educating less than half the children, have expended on their schools more than three-quarters of the whole amount of money devoted to buildings. As regards results, speaking from my own experience in London, in passing from a Board to a Voluntary School I always feel that I am plunging into a perfectly different atmosphere. In the Board School, almost universally, each class is taken in its own room; occasionally two standards may be taken in a hall, but this is an evil already recognised as one to be remedied. There prevails, as a whole, in the schools an air of brightness and order which reacts favourably on the children. Each class can carry on its work undisturbed by the next, and discipline becomes comparatively easy to maintain. Entering a Voluntary School it is impossible not to be struck by the change. In many schools the classroom system is still practically non-existent, one or two apartments have to do duty for all the pupils, and three or four teachers may be seen wrestling with their children in the same hall. An air of gloom and rusty antiquity seems to pervade the whole place. The labour of the teachers is heroic in the extreme, and the results achieved are surprising considering the conditions they have to face. But there is present, just as there is present in the children's homes, an apparent massing together of many people, each disturbing the other and putting a strain on the already too irritable nervous system. In such schools are to be found just these elements which have been shown to be the distinguishing features of a town environment, and which ought therefore to be carefully excluded.

If the Voluntary Schools are inferior in buildings they are equally so in respect of apparatus, books, pictures, and the like. Here figures of comparison can be obtained from the reports of the Board of Education. As we are concerned with town children when possible the figures will be given for London. The figures for the whole country, however, all lead to the same conclusions, though

the differences are not quite so extreme; they are extracted from the 1899-1900 report. The Board spent on maintenance apart from teachers' salaries 16s. 2d. per child, and the Voluntary managers 14s. 6d., a difference of 1s. 8d. per head. Considering the continual improvement in text-books, illustrations and the like, this extra expenditure must imply a large balance of advantage to the scholars.

On salaries of teachers the Board spent £2 19s. 7d. and the Voluntary managers £1 18s. 6d. per child, a difference of £1 1s. 1d. in favour of the former. This difference is due to two factors: the Board staff their schools more adequately and they pay their teachers better salaries. The first is important because it means that the classes are smaller, and that for the first two years of their service pupil teachers do not count on the effective staff. The second is of even greater importance, because it is evidence that the Boards obtain the best teachers. Nothing else is possible. The teachers naturally go where the salaries are highest. How great this difference is the following extract with reference to the salaries of London head-teachers from vol. i. of the Education Reports will show: "In the past year the average salary of 350 masters in Voluntary Schools was £167 1s. 4d., and that of 458 masters in Board Schools £291 6s. 7d., while 934 school-mistresses in Board Schools enjoyed an average income of £204 9s. 3d. as compared with £100 7s. 11d., that of 797 mistresses in Voluntary Schools." For England and Wales the average salary of certificated masters, other than headmasters, was for Church of England Schools¹ £81 9s. 10d. and for Board Schools £107 9s. 10d. while for mistresses the corresponding figures are £57 15s. 11d. and £83 6s. 11d. Results of this kind can mean but one thing: the Board have the pick of the teachers, while the Voluntary Schools have to content themselves with what are left. Even this does not represent the full extent of the evil, as it refers only to certificated teachers. But there are two other classes of teachers which the London

¹ I have not troubled to calculate the figures so as to include the other Voluntary Schools, as they would not appreciably affect the result.

School Board do not now engage, but of which the Voluntary Schools make an increasing use. They are "assistant teachers" qualified under Art. 50 of the Code and "additional teachers" qualified under Art. 68. The former as a rule have passed the Queen's Scholarship examination, the latter have not, and their sole qualification are that they are women above the age of eighteen who have contrived to satisfy the inspector. The Department remarks on and many inspectors lament over the increase in the number of these untrained, uncertificated, unexamined teachers. Their number in 1893 was 8,534 and in 1899 no less than 16,717, an increase in six years of nearly 96 per cent. If there is anything in my plea for good teachers, if there is any truth in my statement that the value of such teachers cannot be overestimated, it will be clear that Voluntary Schools, compelled as they are to employ the worst of the certificated teachers, and in their straits for staffing to descend two grades lower yet, must be affording more than half the children of the country an education which is inferior not merely in those forces that render the acquirement of knowledge easier and more pleasant, but inferior also in those influences which most of all make for the formation of character.

To some extent it is possible to make a direct comparison between the results of the two classes of schools, using as the common standard the grants earned. This is not an altogether satisfactory method, for we must remember that there is a limit to the sum that can be obtained; that, so far as the main grant received is concerned, the maximum is withheld only under exceptional circumstances, and that the most valuable qualities of a school can only be determined by such indirect means as those used above. The annual grant was for the last year in London Board Schools £1 os. 11d., and in London Voluntary Schools 19s. 11½d.—nearly a shilling difference.

There is, however, one occasion on which the schools compete against each other—namely, in the County Council scholarships. In the last return for London 166 children from Voluntary Schools and 1,595 from Board Schools were

awarded Junior scholarships. In other words, out of 1,761 scholarships the Voluntary Schools, instead of winning 520, as they should have done taking into account the number of children in their schools, only obtained 166. The figures speak for themselves.

Other figures, all pointing in the same direction, might be given, but these are sufficient to prove the inferiority of the Voluntary School and to justify the charges I made above.

Recognising frankly the great services Voluntary Schools have done in the past for education, but remembering at the same time that no services in the past can confer a prescriptive right to do harm for the future, we cannot help the conviction being forced upon us that it is wrong to allow the present arrangement to continue unmodified. There are no signs of improvement, the subscriptions remain unaltered, and the Aid Grant has only served to render more manifest the dismal financial condition of the Voluntary School.

The real difficulty in the way of any solution has its heart in the religious question. This to a large extent is a manufactured quarrel; the vast majority of parents are quite indifferent to the nature of the religious teaching given, and their supposed rights and wrongs have not been ventilated by them. But certain extremists on either side, for the main part devoid both of knowledge and understanding, have chosen to raise fictitious cries and false issues. This small faction on either wing, whose truculent pertinacity of behaviour is only equalled by the shameless disregard of truth displayed in all their words, have bred, of the wind of their own breath, this controversy, which has stood in the way of all educational reform.

If any solution of this problem is to be found—solved it must be and that soon—two considerations must be borne in mind. First, it must never be forgotten that the schools exist in the interest of the children and not for the sake of those who manage them. This being the case, all that tends to injure the children, all the prejudices, all the high-sounding principles, all the so-called rights and

wrongs of man must take a second place. They all form interesting subjects for debate, but it seems, to say no more, unfair that the adults shall get all the joy and glory of the fight, while the children shall bear all the pain entailed by disputes in which they play the part of passive though suffering spectators. Next it must be remembered that the need of improving the schools is urgent ; this is a practical question, and we must content ourselves by getting the best practicable solution possible under present circumstances, instead of opposing all reform because it fails to realise some unattainable ideal. To suggest the abolition of Voluntary Schools would be to suggest the impracticable. Their supporters are too numerous for any measure of this kind to commend itself to Parliament. On the other hand the managers have neither the capacity nor the money required to put their schools on a satisfactory footing. There is but one possible way of escape : the County Educational Authority, proposed above, must finance and take the general control of the secular education. The present managers would be placed in a position similar to that of the local managers, with the same powers attached to it. There would, however, be three differences. They would be a permanent body and not removable at will by the County Authority ; they ought also to have the right of appointing the head-teacher without any restriction except the possession of certain professional qualifications ; lastly, they would control and direct the religious instruction. This change would place the education given in Voluntary Schools on a level with that given in a Board School, while the advocates of definite religious teaching, or, more correctly, of theological instruction, would still have their way. The question of voluntary subscriptions still remains. Now the right of a class to superintend the religious teaching of the schools is a curious one. There is no logical reason why they should possess it. On the other hand there is equally little reason why they should not. They do possess this right now, and appear likely to retain it in the future ; they ought, however, to be ready to pay for the privilege. Mr. T. C. Horsfall, when proposing a

compromise very similar to the one just advocated, suggests that the Voluntary managers ought to pay the interest on the capital which would have to be borrowed to improve the buildings of the Voluntary Schools. This appears fair; an arrangement of this kind would, moreover, have the incidental advantage of proving whether the defenders of Voluntary schools support them on the ground of the religious teaching given or, as has been insinuated, because of their cheapness.

If the reforms advocated were adopted the chief obstacles in the way of a satisfactory system of education would be removed. Not till this has been done is it possible to hope that the schools will be able to make a successful fight against the forces of town life.

A few remarks on the right aims of a town school will not be out of place.

The physical conditions to be found in the homes and in the streets all work together to rear an unhealthy race, so that the schools must not be slow to counterbalance this effect. Drill and physical exercises will be everywhere encouraged, and, with a view to making them as effective as can be, a hall containing a piano will be provided. The schools will be light, airy, and cheerful, each class will be taught in a room by itself, and the number of children allotted to each teacher will be steadily reduced. Swimming and gymnastics also will not be forgotten.

As the question of feeding children has lately come to the front, a word must be said on this point. For every reason it is best to leave this to voluntary agencies. The need for meals has been much exaggerated, as the number who accept them is no test of the number who require them. As parents have told me, the children like the dinner at school as a change from the one provided at home, and in one instance they had the meal there in disobedience to the command of the father. That a certain proportion are underfed is true, but to deal with these is well within the power of Charity. Charity can do more than any Board that merely supplies food; it can ascertain the child's real need, provide him with clothes, give him a change of air, or, best of all, put the parents in a position to perform their own duties.

Passing next to the development of the mental faculties, the teacher will try and bring some order into the chaos of isolated facts to be found in the child's mind. An attempt will be made to tell him something of the town in which he lives, the way in which it is governed, the position of the streets, the means of transport, and the manner in which food and other articles are obtained. In addition visits will be paid to museums, art galleries, and other places of importance, the cost being defrayed by the Educational Authority. Further, to give him some acquaintance with Nature and her ways, excursions, in small numbers at a time, will be made into the country—a practice which is followed in Berlin. All will be done to help the child to realise the meaning of a town and its complex organisation, and to awaken a many-sided interest in the world around. It does not come within the province of this essay to discuss in detail the subjects that ought to be included in the curriculum ; but to inspire the children with a love of their school so far as possible only such subjects will be selected as are naturally attractive. A subject like grammar, except so far as it is of use in composition, will be omitted, and a foreign language, being of little value from the point of view of training and of use to only a few, can hardly claim a place in elementary education. Cookery and laundry may be taught, but they ought to be optional and not compulsory subjects, seeing that many parents dislike their children attending these classes. Some form of manual training, being, as it is, thought in action, ought to be taught in every school. Lastly, there is some truth in the complaint that the education given is often shallow and superficial, and that the children are frequently unable to make use of the knowledge they possess. It is not enough for them to be able to answer the questions of the teacher. They must be taught to understand that the affairs of daily life are continually putting such questions to them and must be shown how they are to find the answer. Lange remarks that it would be a good plan if every subject had its application book in which the children worked out examples just as they do in arithmetic. Further, the

truth must never be forgotten that the brain is an organic unity and not a collection of isolated compartments. Every effort therefore will be taken to insure that the knowledge of the child shall be such an ordinary whole that, whenever any decision has to be made, all the facts bearing on it which are in his possession will naturally focus themselves on the point at issue. This brings up the great principle of Concentration, on which so much stress is laid in the Herbartian theory of education. When a lesson has been given the lesson must not be regarded as finished until it has thrown light on previous lessons on the same or other subjects and in its turn received light from them. In this way all the subjects of instruction are connected together, the whole of the child's knowledge is continually being brought forward, refreshed, sifted, and the necessary elements concentrated on the one lesson that is being given. If more thought is paid to this principle of concentration the charge of shallowness brought against the elementary schools will soon be without foundation.

Finally, singing and drawing merit especial attention, since these subjects, on the one hand, are a training of the faculties and an expression of the self in action, and on the other cultivate the taste and so have a direct influence on the formation of character. As Rein says in his "Theorie des Volksschulunterrichts": "Ethics and Esthetics are at bottom so closely connected that they may be said to spring from a common root. This common root lies in the absolute pleasure that accompanies their pure, disinterested presentation." They form a natural transition from the mental to the moral side of the character, and their cultivation may to some extent compensate for the absence of the nature element from city life. As regards direct moral or religious teaching little need be said, as the question has been discussed more than once. The teacher will naturally bear in mind the special faults of the town child and on every opportunity encourage fairness in work, consideration of others, and above all will try to inspire him with a sense of his own dignity. He will further seek to develop the corporate spirit, which is the characteristic of the great

public schools, where the deeds of each are looked on as the deeds of all, and the fair name of the school is to each boy even as his own. Strictly speaking, all education is religious in so far as it is constantly endeavouring, on the varied material passing through its hands, to impress a definite type of character. This must never be forgotten, for all work becomes purposeless and ineffective without some ideal to direct its course. It is the undying glory of the school of Herbart that they have always put this fact in the forefront of all their teaching. To their writings, wearisome as they often are, this idealism gives a fascination that the English scientific treatises on education never possess. The former regard the child as a living spirit and education as the means of unfolding the hidden treasures of a soul, while the latter seem to look on him as an animal to be fattened as expeditiously as possible on educational nutriment.

The influence of the day-school will be strengthened in two directions. In the first place, using the school as the natural centre of all work among children, the local managers and other agencies, co-operating together if not in action at any rate in aim, will bring it into intimate connection with the life and organisation of the neighbourhood.

In the second place, evening classes will continue, and render more permanent the impression left by the day-school. Their object is threefold : first, to give children an opportunity of carrying on their general education ; secondly, to afford technical instruction of a kind that will be useful to them in their profession ; lastly, and most important of all, to offer facilities for the pursuit for its own sake of some study, no matter what, which, while bringing with it no advantage to be measured in money, will yet open out new possibilities of happiness that can be enjoyed when the work of the day is over.

If these results are to any extent secured when the time comes to leave the day-school, there will not be the sudden break of old associations, the sudden irresistible attack of the untempered forces of modern civilisation that ends, as has been shown, in the everlasting tragedy. The transition

will be gradual, new ties will be formed before the old are severed, new interests acquired before the old are gone, and the old life, instead of abruptly closing, like a tale that is told, will imperceptibly widen out into the larger life of the grown man.

The purpose of this essay is completed. Starting with the question, "What manner of man shall I become?" put by the child, I have sought to show what answer the town gives to it; next I have tried to find a reply to the further question, "How can we make it different?" There remains but one step more: to say what that different answer will be. Dreams of days to come, though destined to remain for ever dreams, have yet their value. Without them man is but a pitiful, ineffective drudge, blindly plodding his way through a world wrapt in a veil of mist and gloom; with them he tears aside the veil, catches a glimpse of the light of far-off stars, and, though the darkness gathers again, strides boldly through with head erect to meet the future. For dreamers like these there seems nothing extravagant in the answer that physical training and brighter surroundings will make healthier bodies; that country holidays will erect landmarks in the Past; that the recreation provided will cause existence to be fuller; that a knowledge of the world around, its wonders and its secrets, joined to a love of music and things beautiful, will open out broader interests and wider prospects, thus giving some form to the otherwise blank Future; that the religious teaching, whether in the Sunday or the day school, will awaken the consciousness of the mystery hidden alike behind man and behind nature; and that, finally, all the forces acting together in harmony will change the cry of the everlasting tragedy into a song of thanksgiving, and create an atmosphere of tranquil calm which shall permeate and hallow the whole life of the child.

EDUCATIONAL REFORMS NEEDED.

*I. The establishment of a single Education Authority for each County or Borough County Council area.**(1) Its constitution.*

(a) Three-quarters of the members shall be elected, and the remaining quarter co-opted by those so elected. Those co-opted shall be chosen from inspectors, managers of secondary schools, elementary school teachers, and others interested in education.

(b) In the election there shall be single-member constituencies.

(2) Its powers.

(a) It shall be given the powers now possessed by the School Boards, together with those powers relating to secondary and technical education now exercised by the County Councils.

(b) It shall have power to promote secondary education, either by building schools of its own or by establishing special classes in the elementary schools, or by making grants to existing schools, or, lastly, by evening continuation schools. There shall be made no restriction as to the subjects taught, or to the age of the scholars attending.

(c) It shall have power to build and maintain its own training colleges.

(d) It shall depute certain of its powers, such as the appointment of teachers, to groups of local managers supervising one or more schools.

(3) Its finance.

With the exception of a rate, say sixpence, the same throughout the country, all the money required shall be supplied by a central grant.

(4) Its relation to Voluntary Schools.

It shall direct and control all the secular instruction given in Voluntary Schools ; but their managers shall supervise the religious teaching and, subject to the possession of certain professional qualifications, shall appoint the teachers. The managers shall pay the interest on the capital expenditure required to improve or to rebuild the schools.

II. Special reforms.

(1) The abolition of the pupil teacher system.

(2) The raising of the age of exemption from full or partial attendance to fourteen.

(3) The compulsory attendance at evening schools, after leaving the day-school, up to the age of sixteen.

(4) The appointment of special magistrates to deal with school cases.

III. The question of the retention and the nature of religious instruction to be settled by Parliament.

IV

TEMPERANCE REFORM

WHAT excuse is there for any further literature on the drink question? We venture to think that there is at least one. When Sir George Cornwall-Lewis was asked to consider proposals for legislation he would reply (so Mr. Bagehot tells us), "The facts are these and these. Your theory is so-and-so. It accounts for facts Nos. 1, 2, and 3, but fails to account for 4, 5, and 6, and what is your object?" Till he got a plain answer, and a proof that the plan was good, he would not look at it. An exact account of the evils complained of generally showed that the proposals rested on a flimsy foundation. The inductive method which he demanded has, sometimes at least, been lacking in the discussion of temperance. There have been whole libraries of denunciation and prescription, but they would not satisfy Cornwall-Lewis. It might be said of their authors, as of a great statesman, "He could never have appealed to the people by the felicitous attraction of his words." Would that it could, as of him, be added, "He had a surer source of popularity in the intelligibility of his plans"!

Their spirit, even if it strives but little to effect actual reforms, is infinitely better than the genial complacency which is so widely approved, but it does not help us to advance (in Mr. Balfour's phrase) "out of the stage of rhetorical description into that of practical proposal."

At the opposite pole science has had its say upon the question, but its frigid indifference to the urgency of the problem has made it almost as useless as the exclamations of the fanatic. The legislator or social reformer bent on informing himself will find scarcely any scientific book that can be called practical, nor will he discover a supply of works upon reform that can be accounted scientific. With the honourable exception of Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell's recent volume, and an invaluable, though all too brief, essay by Canon Barnett,¹ it is to Blue Books alone that we must turn for any attempt at a real study of the subject; and even there it is disappointing to find whole subjects of inquiry omitted, and especially the nature of actual drinking habits, and of the public-house itself; while, unhappily, the good which Blue Books contain is embodied in a form which apparently dooms them to oblivion.

Deeply as we sympathise with strong and even violent feelings about the drink evil, we cannot but recognise the need for an inquiry which should combine the enthusiasm of the idealist with the comprehensive view of the scientist and the calm judgment of the historian. We should like to see, as the late Frederick Myers put it, "the extension of scientific method, of curiosity, candour, and care into regions where many a current of old tradition, of heated emotion, even of pseudo-scientific prejudice, deflects the barque which should steer only towards the cold, unreach-able pole of absolute truth." Fully conscious of our inability to act up to this ideal, we feel it a duty to attempt at least something more than has been done.

There is a further excuse for writing—viz., that it may be useful to collate not only the views of various writers and authorities, but the opinions of people intimately acquainted with the life of those classes to which the problem of drink legislation applies.

The recent Commission collected views from various official sources, and in 1879 the Convocation of Canterbury circulated questions to clergymen, chief constables, and

¹ "The Church and New Century Problems."

governors of public institutions ; but those with personal familiarity seem to have been ignored. We have, therefore, collected opinions from the agents of religious and philanthropic societies working among the poor, from clubs, inebriate homes, temperance workers, and (when possible) from working men and publicans themselves. Enthusiasm does not always insure sound judgment.¹ But a vast amount of useful information was contributed, and may, we hope, be of service in solving the problems to which we have applied it.

Dealing as we are with social reform, it is our business to consider the organised methods of treating excess in drink. This problem properly includes the question of providing recreation and education of every kind, but the field which is least fully occupied is that of Governmental action bearing directly on drinking habits. As this is also the field to which most interest attaches at the present time, we shall confine ourselves mainly to it, endeavouring to base our conclusions on the fullest available stock of facts and of experience.

II. THE CONDITIONS.

It is a doctor's truism that healing is an easy matter when the condition of the patient has been mastered ; the real difficulty is not prescription but diagnosis. Those who prescribe for the disease of the community which we are considering have been apt to deal severely indeed with the actual symptoms, but they have neglected, as a rule, to consider the general condition of the patient, his surroundings, and his willingness or otherwise to adopt the remedy proposed.

The symptoms of the drink disease are, indeed, obvious enough, and we are far from wishing to minimise them. The question of moral and physical degradation hardly needs confirmation. We at least are only anxious that it should be more fully realised. The trade leaders them-

¹ For instance, to a question as to whether more harm was due to the public-house or the grocer's license, we received the inspiring answer, " May the Lord sweep them both from our land " !

selves have declared that "hardly any sacrifice would be too great" which should diminish it. Teetotal denunciations are amply justified, and if sometimes they mistake the spirit of the New Testament we are not disposed to deny them the support of the Old, for one must admit, with Professor Adam Smith, that "temperance reformers, though they are often blamed for the strength of their opinions, may shelter themselves behind Isaiah."¹ We thoroughly agree with Archdeacon Wilson that "it is a dwarfed, distorted, miserable Christianity that ignores great questions like this." When it is urged that only a residuum of drinking is excessive, and that what is wanted is not a reduction but a redistribution, we can only reply that if some are prepared to defend 6s. per week² as a fair allowance for drink to John Smith, the London labourer, with wages of 24s. and a family to keep and a rent of 7s. to pay, we at least are not equal to the task. The average workman is not a drunkard, but he is shamefully extravagant. The treating customs of London workmen involve unbounded waste; and there is evidence for the fact that in some districts an artisan hardly likes to invite a party of neighbours to come in after supper without providing a similar number of bottles of beer, a bottle of whisky, and a bottle of port wine—6s. or 7s. for one evening. Mr. Woodward, an architect, recently stated that London bricklayers who have been paid £3 on the Saturday are often obliged to borrow the price of their dinner on the following Tuesday.³

There are other aspects of the matter which have been insufficiently regarded; and it has remained for Mr. Sherwell to open our eyes to dangers from industrial and economic losses, which will appeal not only to the patriot but even to the merest Jingo.⁴ There may be much to add to his statements but there is nothing that we wish to subtract. The country must face the fact that in the struggle for

¹ "The Book of Isaiah," p. 45.

² "The Temperance Problem and Social Reform," p. 11.

³ *Nineteenth Century Review*, March, 1901.

⁴ "The Temperance Problem and Social Reform," chapter i.

trade (which grows daily fiercer) we are heavily handicapped by causes in each of which drink plays a large part, by shortened lives, by the labour spent in dealing with crime, sickness, and pauperism, but chiefly by inefficiency and loss of time to which intemperance ministers. A firm of London shipbuilders have kindly supplied an illustration. They write : " The wages which a man receives are enough, in most cases, to compel him to work not more than three to four days a week, the rest of the time being usually spent in the public-house. Should the works be closed for a day, the men make it an opportunity for remaining out three days. If one man, out of a set, is unable to appear at work (usually owing to drink) the rest feel it their duty to remain out also." But London is comparatively sober. A firm in the North have calculated that their workmen have lost £17,000 in one year owing to loss of time, not including time lost through holidays and wet weather.

On the further danger which Mr. Sherwell deals with—the *political menace*—it may be useful to say a few words. The central point on which this danger hinges is the fact that opinions are formed at the places where people meet and talk, and that in the public-house, which is the commonest meeting-place of this kind, the publican has often an influence in forming opinion.

Obviously the sellers of drink will be opposed to alterations which are likely to injure them, and so far as the licensee must always be influential in his house and cannot be debarred from political power, the danger is undoubtedly, as Mr. Sherwell urges, an argument in favour of public management. We are fully aware of the difficulty of fighting the licensed trade ; and the view of politicians on this point was sufficiently proved at the Election of 1900 by the defection of a great number of Liberal candidates from the standard of Lord Peel. But the present power of the trade is largely due to defects in our system which could be remedied, and not to inherent evils in the system. The plan proposed by Mr. Bruce, in 1871, of granting licenses for definite

terms of ten years, would greatly diminish the present dangers.

At this point diagnosis is apt to end, but the knowledge necessary for successful prescribing is not complete. What is the general condition of the patient, and what are his surroundings? In other words, is there anything in the people's life and habits which produces the disease, and which can be altered by law? Canon Barnett, in one of the most valuable contributions ever made to the cause of temperance, sets an example of examining the real sources.¹ He classifies them as Self-indulgence, Dulness, Neglect, and the Trade.

The first—the weak wills of men and women—does not now affect us, for we are concerned only with Government. The second and third—dulness and discomfort—move in a vicious circle with low wages and drunken habits. Better housing and recreation, and improved conditions of labour, will make some people more temperate, but when Mr. Ritchie declared that the drink evil would be met by a Housing Act, we can only regret that he is not free to say all that he thinks.

The fourth possible cause of excess lies in the defects of our system of distribution. It may be a bad system, or, again, its provisions may be badly administered or ignored. But, whether it be through bad regulations or laxity of the police or misconduct of the publican, excessive drinking is largely attributed to needless temptation, defective discipline, and impure liquor. To discover how much it is due to these is to solve the problem in hand, for it is with these alone that temperance legislation can deal.

The inquiry resolves itself into a study of the public-house and the other facilities for obtaining drink. It is natural for the teetotaler to conclude that, because the drink is obtained at one of these, the obvious remedy is to abolish them. But to the "moderate," whose co-operation is to be won, it will appear imperative, before deciding on a remedy, to examine them more closely than has been the custom.

Here a difficulty at once arises in that there is so little

¹ "The Church and New Century Problem."

first-hand evidence to be obtained. To most of us the public-house is as little known as China, and there is perhaps no single field of life where it is so difficult to find witnesses who combine enthusiasm for the public welfare with a familiar knowledge of the place to be reformed. How few of our cocksure reformers have troubled even to enter it! Probably no single institution was ever so much spoken *against*, or so little spoken *about*.

In a study of the public-house there are many questions which must be answered. What are the classes who use it? Is drunkenness common there, and does it pay to permit it? Is disorder frequent and the conversation often scandalous? Has the manager much influence in keeping order or in making people drink? Are larger houses better than small? Are the houses used by respectable workmen or workwomen? Do the children who come to it meet with demoralising influences, and does the fetching of beer mean child drunkenness, or drinking at all?

When we have learned these facts we shall be better judges of possible improvements, and shall be able to gauge the value of opinions on such problems as these: What would be the effect of having fewer licenses? of closing the houses earlier? of excluding children? or of stricter action by the police? But since drinking is not limited to the licensed drinkshops, our commission of inquiry must include many questions affecting the habits of the people elsewhere. Do men or women drink much at home apart from meals? Do many get drunk elsewhere than in the public-house? Would people insist on getting drunk if the public-house were closed? We must also do our best to understand the nature of the grocers' trade in alcohol, and of the customs, drinking and other, of workingmen's clubs. We shall then be in a position to judge how far the evils of the public-house are the cause of low character or its effect—to solve, in fact, the time-honoured problem, whether it is the pig that makes the sty or the sty that makes the pig.

Those who have taken for granted that the public-house

is commonly the scene of brutal disorder and excess, but have discovered the absurdity of this view, usually fly to the opposite delusion and deprecate all attempts to alter it. Any light upon the realities of the case will be new to most of us.

Who are the people, so few of whom we know, who contrive to spend a hundred million a year across the public-house bar? We shall do best to quote from one whose knowledge of the subject is extensive and whose judgment may be relied upon. He says: "They may roughly be divided into five classes:—

"1. The well-to-do who frequent the saloons of the better houses, and who may or may not spend more than they ought in drink. They are not such as would be dictated to as to how they should spend their money. In large towns this class is more numerous than might be expected, and they spend largely.

"2. The City or commercial clerk, the tradesman, the lower middle class generally, who use the gilded saloons and billiard-rooms of the important thoroughfares or the respectable neighbourhood house.

"3. The working class, who fill the public bar of the best houses and the different parts of medium ones.

"4. The residuum, who throng the inferior houses and intrude themselves in the roughest parts of almost all.

"5. The large class drawn from classes two, three, and four, who send for drink to be consumed in their houses. For this nearly every house has a distinct compartment.

"There are two classes among whom reformation is urgently demanded, but who differ widely from each other and demand separate consideration.

"The first comprises those who spend an absurd proportion of their income in drink and yet are not morally degraded by it, rough though they may be. The other consists of the loafer, the dissolute, and the abandoned—the class, in fact, which John Bright termed the residuum. This class is the despair of the statesman, and though it may bring revenue to the trade by money acquired by spasmodic labour, by begging or crime, no one would regret its elimination from the body politic. But to

suppress the public-house in order that these people should not frequent it would not be tolerated, nor would it alter their character.

"It is with the first-mentioned class that the reformer is most concerned, for it is a hopeful one; and yet we can hardly expect that the publican will very heartily co-operate with us to lessen a trade which means profit to himself, and which, at the same time, does not shock his general sense of fitness. The tradesman who allows a weak customer to run into his debt, and the publican who does not check expenditure, so long as good behaviour is maintained, are both acting on the same principle—that it is a good thing to sell their wares, and it is the buyer's business to take care of himself. But the public-house is a place of public resort, where a peculiar article is sold, and the law imposes restrictions which are not necessary in other trades; and since it cannot be closed to the residuum, who are a danger to the state, the policeman's beat must extend to the inside of the house.

"It may be taken for granted that though there remain houses that are ill-conducted, great improvement has taken place in the last twenty years. This is largely due to the number of "substantial" men who have become publicans. Many of these make sacrifices by purging their houses of the worst characters when the previous owner had allowed it to become their resort. This may be done for the sake of the publican's own reputation, or to insure comfort for his more respectable customers. A man of this stamp will control the people who frequent his house even to the extent of risking the loss of trade by offending those who resent his dictation. Many a publican has become proprietor of several houses, the managers of which he supervises strictly, and being himself withdrawn from immediate contact with the customers, he is not concerned with their individual expenditure, but runs the business on strict lines of discipline, and adventitious inducements to drink are not held out. Some improvement may also be due to the increased control of licenses by the brewers. There are many instances where brewers have given large sums for houses, and have made great sacrifice of money value in

eliminating objectionable features in the previous conduct of such houses. In each of these cases not only does the action of publican or manager tend in the direction of sobriety and good order, but such an one would be more than likely to welcome further restrictions if they were imposed in a way which would not drive trade from the better class of house to the worse, where the management is of an unscrupulous character. The best men do not so much fear the diminution of trade as a whole, but they would strongly object to restrictions which might injure them without effecting real improvement. Great restrictions are possible so long as they are gradually introduced and the habits of the people are not too suddenly interfered with, and so long as the trader has time to adapt himself to new rules and is not put at a disadvantage with his rivals."

But granting that a great improvement has taken place, to what extent is there still disorder? In our opinion each side has spoilt its case by exaggeration. The views we have collected are often biassed, but those of religious agents prejudiced against the publican are strong evidence in his favour. Therefore, if we do not (as some fanatics are said to do) "gloat over a particularly bad drunkard," we may rejoice to learn from this unpoisoned source the opinion that most houses are perfectly quiet and that noise does not pay; that the publicans do their best to keep order, and are greatly improved in character; that there is very little visible excess, and that bad language is generally restrained. There is often a box for collecting halfpenny fines for this offence; nor is the rule a farce, for some societies, such as the London City Mission, receive large sums through them. Notices against gambling and swearing are frequent. There is no suspicion that the tavern of to-day is ever a "disorderly house," and great numbers of what even a missionary calls "respectable" working men use it, though they are careful to avoid the lowest kind; some houses collect a *clientèle* of "respectables" alone, so as to become irreproachable resorts. Large houses are thought better managed than small; the publican has more to lose and is probably more business-

like. The much-abused gin-palace is often the most unexceptionable of all.

The opinions we have obtained from working men, as well as those of agents of charity, differ widely from those of reformers with less personal knowledge. General testimony is borne to the character of the average publican. He may give the children sweets, or encourage "friendly leads," but his influence is far more used in dissuading than in "pushing." Indeed, a Church Army agent is so impressed by the publican's orderly management that he pronounces him "a lesson to Christians." "Respectable" workmen often use the "public" without loafing there. Some fetch their supper beer, or go round afterwards for a glass. Others drink half a pint on the way home from work, or treat a pal when he calls. Many teetotalers use the houses also. As to excess, it is distinguished from drunkenness. Most of the drinkers are thought "excessive," though intoxication is rarely seen in the house itself.

But there is another side, as not only missionaries but publicans admit. Many houses are monopolised by undesirable gangs—the special resorts of bookmakers, thieves, or prostitutes. Appearances may be quiet enough here, but in others there is no lack of disorder. A South London publican ingenuously describes the expressions common in his house in terms unfit for repetition, and on Saturday nights he takes care to have a professional "bruiser" in attendance. A hard drinker, even though shaky, can generally get a pal to pass him a drink in the crowd, and where the people are rough the invariable custom of treating is sure to cause excess.¹ Needless to say, every house depends on its customers. A rowdy house is very exceptional—at least in London.

A balanced opinion must always be unexciting, and cold controversy, as Huxley said, is a nauseous dish; but, speaking from experience of considerable extent, we

¹ The following curious classification is given by a publican of his customers: "60 per cent. sober; 30 per cent. occasionally drunk; 7½ per cent. continual drunkards; 2½ per cent. habitual drunkards," followed by the remark that only 10 per cent. of the consumption is "excessive"!

ourselves are unable to take the sensational view as to actual inebriety. Public-house drinking as a rule seems to correspond closely with drinking of which few disapprove. As is the supper-room at an evening party, so is the bar at a modern public ; in each case the occupation is essentially the same, conversation accompanied by drink ; and just as in any smoking-room a glass and a weed assist the talk, so do they, and no more, in the snug "saloon bar." At great gin-palaces, even on Saturday night, the roar of chatter fades quietly away at midnight, and in the small houses of side-streets the lights are often out before closing-time. In outward conduct there is little to choose as a rule between the drinking of the rich and that of the poor ; but there are in reality two profound differences. In the public-house there is, firstly, heavier drinking ; and, secondly, there is unbounded extravagance.

We are far from wishing to belittle the evil of drunkenness, for every case is a crime ; but it is rare in the public-house, and to-day the main evil is one of *waste*. This is deplorable enough. It may be argued that, without actual excess, a man might easily be worse employed than talking in a public-house. Not to speak of darker possibilities, a club is not unlikely to be less desirable. Though a good one may be better (for association and responsibility are involved), to the workman a club too frequently means little more than greater facility for "*boozing*," and in some cases for amusement of the foulest kind, while in the public-house there is at least some kind of restraint. So much must for the sake of truth be said. But is not the evil even in its less exciting form urgent enough—an evil which often makes home life a farce and leaves the children unfed ? Is not the prevalence of this evil at least as deplorable as the more rare disaster of drunkenness ? Moreover, when we have stated the orderly appearance of the public-house with rigid truth, there still remains a sufficiently scandalous amount of intoxication apparent in the streets, which does not reveal itself while the drinker is in the house.

And apart both from waste and disorder there are some specially mournful features to be noticed. Even Mr.

Shadwell,¹ while stoutly denying the need for legislation, admits that though "we have not a monopoly of female drunkenness, we have far more than our neighbours." An unwonted visitor to the public-houses of London will be most surprised at the great number of women among the customers, not only in the public bar, but of the well-to-do and well-dressed class. Some houses are, indeed, mostly used by them, and many have a women's bar. The use by women of the public-house is undoubtedly growing, and there is evidence of increasing female drunkenness. Parents setting their children on the bar and plying them with drink is an ugly sight, but not a new one; the phenomenon of the tidy housemaid bantering in the private bar, or the factory girl boasting that this is the "fourth port" she has been treated to, and foreshadowing by incongruous hilarity the beginning of the end, is uglier still, and is a growing one. But even here we must be fair and admit that perfect sobriety is almost an invariable rule; what offends us is a sense of unfitness, perhaps partly born of unreasoning conventionality. The presence of children often appears unobjectionable, for they never linger in the bar unless brought by their parents; and as a rule there is little to corrupt them except the occasional folly of parents themselves, which the Child Messenger Bill would not affect. But children are out of place in a drinking-bar, both on their own account and the publican's, and many of the latter would welcome a rule which would confine the children to a separate bar.

Is the public-house, then, past hope of reform or not? Should we strive to improve it or merely to restrict it and destroy it when we can? It must be admitted that a large class of workmen condemn it as it is; others draw a sharp line between good and bad houses, or between those who use it merely to get a drink and those who make it a loafing-place. Whether its presence is the cause or effect of excess, it is the scene of habits which reveal the deplorable prevalence of weakness, boorishness, and selfishness among our people.² But there are hopeful signs.

¹ Article on the "English Public-House" in the *National Review*.

² See below, under Limitation of Hours.

Improvement has been great ; much of the trouble is traceable to defects of system and of administration and lack of control, and each of these can be improved. The houses differ widely in character, and some are already acceptable resorts. We cannot but concur in the opinion of one who, with special qualifications, has made a particular study of the subject, the Rev. C. Noel : " In ten years' experience of London and country public-houses I have met with little actual drunkenness within their doors. Judging from the ordinary and saloon bars of every sort of public-house where I have been for a glass of beer and a chat with any one I might find there, I consider the teetotaler's account of their abuses grossly exaggerated ; on the other hand, though I have often seen an order for more drink refused (and such a refusal is difficult work), publicans are by no means strict enough in this respect. But I should think it detrimental to the ultimate welfare of the country if public-houses were closed, unless at the same time there were opened some other kind of meeting-place where temperance drinks and meals could be easily obtained, and where a certain amount of alcohol should also be procurable. Alcohol must be included ; it has its social use as well as its abuse. I regard the inn neither as a social pest to be stamped out nor as a necessary evil to be grudgingly tolerated, but as an institution possessing in the germ real positive usefulness. That the use of alcohol is capable under proper management of contributing to sociability and good citizenship both among men and women (an end which we cannot afford to ignore), I do not for a moment doubt."

When we have done our best to understand the disease, the general condition of the patient, and his surrounding circumstances, there is one more item to study, which has too often been neglected—his willingness to adopt the remedy proposed.

We must bear in mind the whole situation. Nine out of ten are drinkers, and to such an extent that the consumption of every family averages 8s. a week. Most Englishmen firmly believe that the moderate use of alcohol is beneficial—a view which the bulk of medical opinion is believed to

support. We have a network of drink-shops, which, though we cannot regard them as essentially vicious, are too frequently the scene of waste, and sometimes of disorder and drunkenness. We are bound to consider the state of things as deplorable in the extreme; but the evil is complex and so must be the remedy. The nation as a whole believes in alcohol, and thousands prefer the amiable toper to the virtuous teetotaler. Cordially as we detest such a view of life, if our efforts for progress are not to be futile we must remember the nation's ideas and adapt our proposals to them. We must find, as John Bright put it, "some plan, not violent, not unjust, not regardless of the habits and customs of the people."

III. PRESCRIPTION.

If such are the conditions, must we be content with lamentation or is there anything to do? It is never amiss to remember Lord Palmerston's question, "Why can't you let it alone?" but to its applicability in the present connection we emphatically demur. We should naturally be glad to conclude that reform was unnecessary; but the blindest prejudice could not prevent our thinking that some alteration is imperative, and that improvement is not impossible. Among the multifarious causes of excessive drinking some at least can be removed.

It will, at all events, be profitable to set our ideas in order, to consider what at present is in fact our treatment of the matter, and to review *de novo* the conceivable ways of dealing with it.

What are the possible modes of governing the drink traffic? It is so many centuries since King Alfred ordained that there should be but one tavern in every village, and even since Edward VI. introduced the present succession of licensing laws, that these have come to be regarded almost as part of the natural order. The original and normal state of affairs, viz., free trade in alcohol, is regarded as an extreme and "wild-cat" proposal.

It may be urged that *free trade* is not worth discussing because reformers have practically abandoned it; but we are painfully aware that to set in order our licensing laws

the existing reformers are powerless alone. The mass of men must be aroused, and the views of "practical," unexcitable people be considered. For this reason it is not idle to discuss free trade. These people have objections to the whole system of interference with normally harmless actions; they may illogically support the present system (as if it were not profoundly "interfering" already!), but they will do nothing to improve it. They resent "grandmotherly government," vaguely confusing it with "socialism," while some who are Liberals are unable to reconcile it with the supposed connection between Liberalism and liberty. Others of a more scientific turn are struck with the usefulness of alcohol as a selective agency in social evolution. They regard the excesses of liberty as proper to this world of education and selection, and as useful for the elimination (which unhappily does not take place) of those weak individuals whose physique or character cannot resist alcohol.

In this connection there is one whose authority will not be denied by either political party—Professor Henry Sidgwick. In his "Elements of Politics" he deals with the very subject of drink legislation, and justifies it as "indirectly individualistic" "in a utilitarian sense." He adds that restriction is often urged rather on the "individualistic" than the "paternal" ground—*i.e.*, "more on the ground of the proved tendency of alcoholic excess to make a man beat his wife and starve his children—than on the ground of its tendency to injure the drunkard himself." And, further, he claims that both "paternalism" and "socialism" have their place, the first because "an adhesion to the principle that men are the best judges of their own welfare is not justified by the evidence," the second, "as a supplementary element in a system mainly individualistic."

Professor T. H. Green, in an essay on Liberal legislation, deals with the same subject, and combats the argument that drink legislation is an interference with liberty; this "is to ignore the essential condition under which alone every particular liberty can rightly be allowed to the

* "Elements of Politics," p. 133.

individual—the condition, namely, that the allowance of that liberty is not, as a rule, and on the whole, an impediment to social good.”

The evolutionist values the presence of a temptation which destroys the weak members of the community ; but it must be remembered that the temptation is already largely removed by mere changes of custom, and that, moreover, the victim of drink is, as a matter of fact, seldom restrained from transmitting his weakness. Professor Green justly remarks : “ It is not the part of a considerate self-reliance to remain in presence of a temptation merely for the sake of being tempted. When all temptations are removed which law can remove, there will still be room enough, nay, much more room, for the play of our moral energies.”

There is one other possible objection, with which the world has been startled by recent utterances at St. Paul's and Westminster—the theory that such legislation is opposed to Christian principles ; but the Church will hardly as yet deny her traditional view—“ The Christian teaching that almighty power is used in love, that the feeblest human being has Divine possibilities, and that progress means making men like Christ, is binding on the State as on the individual.”

Similar legislation is, of course, accepted in practice in a hundred ways, and in some measure with regard to the drink traffic it is admitted to be inevitable ; but for the sake of progress it is imperative to realise that interference is also scientific, consistent with a logical principle of law, and worth setting in order.

Those who sneer at making people “ sober by Act of Parliament ” should be bold enough to advocate abolition of the Acts which limit free trade in alcohol. The law cannot make men moral, but it can often make them well conducted ; and, quite apart from the gain to others, the individual's conduct helps to build his character.

If we accept interference as justifiable there are in the main two forms which it may take. We may end the trade or mend it, prohibit or control. We may treat alcohol as a subject either for asceticism or culture.

This is not the place to discuss the question of teetotalism for the individual, but we must carefully examine its bearing upon social action. What is the teaching of Christianity? It is to avoid stumbling-blocks which may make a brother to offend, and to destroy even the right hand or right eye if these should be a hindrance to ourselves. Is alcohol a subject for the application of this rule? To us it appears to be so, frequently, for the individual, and far from regarding teetotalism as necessarily puritanical, we think it often accords, as a form of self-control, with the highest view of culture. If this view were the Christian view for all, the New Testament would not leave us in the dark. That it is the view of the New Testament has been exhaustively argued in such volumes as "Three Aspects of Temperance," but, we think, with singular unsuccess; and if teetotalism is a doubtful principle for the individual, much more is it of doubtful application to Government.

In this connection it is impossible to improve on the recent utterance of Canon Barnett: "If any luxury is justifiable it would seem as if that luxury which is pleasant to the taste, refreshing to the imagination, and stimulating to good-fellowship must also be justifiable. Asceticism, the absolute rejection of the means of pleasure may be necessary for individuals; a man whose hand offends must cut it off, but his neighbour whose hand does not offend—whose drink tends to cheerfulness and not to abuse—is more fit for life. The misuse of drink may be an excuse for teetotalers to condemn drink, but the misuse by a few does not justify general disuse."¹ And we agree with Mr. Lecky when he says: "It is quite right that men who have formed for themselves an idea of life should steadily pursue it, but it is another thing to impose it upon others. By teaching as absolutely wrong things that are in reality only culpable in their abuse, they destroy the habit of moderate enjoyment, and a period of absolute prohibition is often followed by a period of unrestrained license."²

¹ "The Church and New Century Problems," p. 99.

² "The Map of Life," p. 245.

(a) *Prohibition.*—For the present even those who think that alcohol *ought* to be treated as a poison must support a system of regulation only, so long as the people will not either pass, or obey, prohibition. But it is only fair to give full consideration to this the simpler of the two alternative prescriptions. When we consider the magnitude of the evil, or when we catch a whiff of the odours of a low public-house, it is tempting indeed to throw in our lot with those who would make a clean sweep of the trade. It may be true, as Bishop Westcott says, that “legislation cannot work a moral revolution,” but we do not agree with Dean Stanley that “by means of public opinion alone” should the drink enemy be fought. There is no clear principle on which prohibition stands condemned. Christianity is indeed opposed to asceticism, but upon any special point of practice the voice of Christ would simply tell us, “Do whatever is wisest.” If the extent of drunkenness in any place were to reach such a point that alcohol was in practice mainly a poison, prohibition would be justified, as is the prohibition of methylated spirits in Ireland, and the policy should then be judged merely by the possibility of carrying it out. The evidence on this point has long been regarded as conflicting, but there can be nothing to add to the final judgment of Mr. Sherwell, when his opinion has been accepted as conclusive even by the mass of those most bitterly prejudiced against it.¹ Beyond a shadow of doubt the experience of other countries, while supporting prohibition in some rural districts, absolutely condemns it in towns, and no one who disputes this conclusion is likely to be listened to any longer.

But the opinions we have collected suggest various advantages in the absence of public places for drinking in common. No one denies that but for companionship there would be little heavy drinking. In the present state of things the public-house is the only provision for company, and many go there merely to meet others. Great as has been the decrease of treating among richer classes, working men are still largely governed by the fear of being ridiculed or thought unwilling to pay for “standing

¹ “The Temperance Problem and Social Reform,” chap. iii.

drinks." If no "public" were within reach they would be glad of the excuse, and would not trouble to lay in a stock. In the statistics of inebriate homes, showing the causes which led to drunkenness, the vast majority of cases are put down to "sociability." And foreign experience is always of doubtful application to this country; we should be guided better by the result of experiments among our own people. There is, unfortunately, no large area by which to judge, but something may be learned from the condition of such places as Besbrook (in Ulster), of Roe Green, and of the Trevelyan and other rural estates. We have visited several of these and are convinced of their prosperity. Even if this is partly due to abstainers having selected them for residence, the value of such areas is still very great. The inquiry conducted by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1879 elicited the surprising fact that over one thousand parishes in England and Wales were without a public-house or beer-shop, with apparently happy results in every case.

Prohibition has been generally advanced in England in the peculiar form of Local Veto, by a direct vote, but there is no reason why the principle of referendum should be, as hitherto, embodied in the proposal. It would seem far more likely to be applied where really needed if the power of enforcing it lay with some large authority, such as a county or borough licensing body, than if the decision belonged to a parochial body of persons exceptionally given to drinking too much. To prohibit the "common" sale of alcohol (it is not proposed to forbid private sale, as in America) would be but a mild revolution; and, indeed, the suggestion was first made by a brewer, the late Mr. Charles Buxton.¹ In this form, and under proper authority, there may be many districts where the experiment is worth a trial. For the present the question is merely academic, since the proposal is not advocated in either report of the Licensing Commission.

(b) *Regulation.*—Obviously, in England at least, we shall, for a long time to come, not prohibit, but regulate the trade, and some indignation may pardonably be felt against those

¹ "How to Stop Drunkenness," by Chas. Buxton, M.P.

who have so long delayed improvement by refusing all reform except abolition. The real problem which faces the reformer is, How can the drinking habits of the people be possibly *improved*? It is an exasperating puzzle, and to avoid it may be natural; but none the less is despair unpardonable. The most urgent need of to-day is to bring skilled and laborious research to bear upon this intricate subject.

The regulation of the trade must in the main take one of two forms—a system either of licensing or of public management. In either case there are two ideals which may be held: the trade may still be regarded as an evil and the public-house be treated simply as a necessary safety-valve, or a more “humanist” view may be taken and attempts be made to convert the tavern into an acceptable and useful resort. The former is the view of Mr. Sherwell, who would reduce consumption to a minimum; the latter of the Bishop of Chester, who would wage war upon excessive drinking but approve the proper use of alcohol. These views may be applied to either system, and the place of each would depend on local conditions.

1. *Licensing*.—The system of licensing assumes that there would without control be more drink-shops than would be beneficial, but that when limited in number good order can be kept by the police, and that the private trader will be a trustworthy manager, while the motive of financial gain is necessary for the economic conduct of the business. An ideal system of licensing would provide for an efficient local authority which should decide on the number and position of the houses and should grant the licenses for definite periods on payment of value for the monopoly thus conferred. If these periods were not too long the political influence of the traders would be kept in check, and the system would be periodically adapted to current needs. Within certain limits defined by law the authority would have power also to impose conditions with regard to the buildings themselves, to the hours of opening, to the manager's position, and to such questions as the sale of drink by grocers, which might be affected by local differences of custom.

Licensing is many centuries old in England, and the attempts to improve it have been without number, but with all respect to Mr. Ritchie and those who see no occasion to alter it, the English system cannot be described without a blush for those to whom its unabated anomalies and inefficiencies are due. These are far too little realised, and it is in reality to the interest of all parties that they should be known. Whether in constitution, in fiscal arrangement, or in treatment of intemperance it is full of absurdity. For instance, if it is desirable to diminish the number of licenses, it is in practice not feasible to do so without paying a value based upon probable permanence. Thus the London County Council, in taking public-houses for street improvements, is compelled first to pay for the licenses it acquires, and then, wishing to suppress them, to confer this additional value on the neighbouring houses that remain. Why this system of double compensation is regarded by the anti-compensation teetotalers with satisfaction it does indeed beggar imagination to understand. It need hardly be said that the system makes it practically impossible to diminish licenses, with the result that no adaptation of the number to public requirements is effected, while in dwindling communities many remain in existence which can only pay their way by resorting to undesirable methods.

Again, we are content with a system which continues to give away monopoly values of greater amount than ever before. It appears from a return obtained by the Licensing Commission¹ that in the ten years following 1886 there were granted in the County of London 90 new full licenses, 84 "beer on," and 804 "off" licenses. Disregarding those granted in the City, as being practically transfers of trade, it is clear that the above represented a monopoly value of enormous extent. In many cases the recipients received only part of this value, having spent large sums in acquiring licenses elsewhere, to offer as "surrenders" in exchange for the new one; but none the less does a new license bestow a new monopoly value, for which the public receives

¹ Licensing Commission Report, vol. v.

practically no payment whatever.¹ To the temperance reformer, no less than to the grasping taxpayer, some improvement, even without prohibition, would seem to be worth a struggle.

The urgency of reform will best be seen by examining the advantages of a thoroughly organised system of licensing such as Mr. Bruce proposed in 1871. How far we are at present from such a system a glance at the Report of the Licensing Commission, with its twenty-four voluminous chapters referring to England alone, will easily show. A briefer classification of the reforms urged may be borrowed from Mr. Birrell :²

1. Consolidation of the law.
2. Reduction in the number of licensed houses.
3. Reconstitution of the Licensing Authorities.
4. Reforms of administration.
5. Extension of powers.
6. Isolation of the public-house.
7. Shorter hours of opening.
8. Increased stringency of the law.
9. Improved police administration.
10. Control of clubs.

Every one of these represents a wide field of deficiency in the present system ; but in the existing state of public opinion no amount of mere constitutional anomaly will drive the country to reform. Unless distinct gains can be shown in actual temperance (that is, not only a moral advantage, but also an economic and national one) it will still be possible for a comfortable Government, whether of one party or the other, to shelter itself behind vague references to the Housing Question.

We will, therefore, confine ourselves to the chief methods by which a licensing law can directly deal with temperance. These fall under six headings. Each of them follows the governing principle which justifies any system of regulating

¹ The "Dartmouth Arms" at Catford, the building of which had probably cost less than £10,000, was sold in 1900 for £25,150 before the house had even been opened for trade, and there is a recent instance of a single publican clearing a net sum of £30,000 by receiving a new license in a London suburb.

² "Five Years of Tory Government," p. 95.

the drink traffic—the idea that the greatest facility for reasonable conduct should be provided consistently with the maximum prevention of *misconduct*.

1. The most obvious function of the licensing authority will be to *restrict the number* of places licensed for drinking. For this there are many reasons :—

a. The dangers connected with the sale of alcohol necessitate strict supervision. It is impossible effectively to control the houses if they are too numerous or too widely scattered or too much concealed from the policeman's ordinary beat.

b. It is best to avoid intense competition between the houses. There is always a possibility of doing an undesirable trade, and the publican who cannot make ends meet may yield to the temptation to make profit in obnoxious ways, *e.g.*, by serving his customers too freely or harbouring "undesirables."

c. Limitation of number insures a higher status for each licensee, and higher status means as a rule more self-respect, more business-like habits, and less inclination to run risks.

d. A smaller number is advocated as affording less temptation. Lord Salisbury's inclination to sleep is said to be unaffected by the excessive number of bedrooms in Hatfield House, but the working man must be taken as he is, and so long as there are men who, on the way between home and work, drop in at every public-house that they pass, restriction will be justified by the actual moderation it produces. It is sometimes argued that distance does not deter a man from what he wants, and that only misconduct results from unreasonable interference ; but few will deny that as a matter of fact the moral strength of many of our countrymen is easily exhausted. We have personal knowledge of workmen who voluntarily live away from public-houses for this reason, and the most ardent individualist would hardly wish to impose, on these at least, the benefits of temptation.

e. It is important to avoid the monopolising of a house by a gang of "undesirables," such as occurs in very small taverns. Some might argue that the better houses are best

unpoisoned by the infusion from below, but happily the general standard of behaviour is high enough to improve the conduct of the ruffian. We may hope that good is stronger than evil. It is in small houses that drinking can most easily be encouraged by personal influence. The vast majority of those we have consulted think that the rougher class displaced by the closing of small houses would submit to the better discipline of a large one. The influx would, of course, increase the importance of strict management.

f. Another argument for limiting the number is that a main cause of excessive drinking is comradeship, and that the provision of retail drink-shops in every street therefore encourages a habit which leads to drinking. It is the universal testimony of those who know the poor that but for the social attractions of the "public" and the habit of treating, there would be but a fraction of the present consumption.

g. There may be something to say for granting a license wherever a desire for it is proved by an opening for profit, but the present system actually leads to the maintenance of licenses which do not pay. In some cases the benches have—as in Essex—endeavoured to reduce the number of licenses in their area by not granting new ones except on condition that one or more licenses in the same area are suppressed. The effect of this has been that those of little value which could be offered as surrenders have acquired a fictitious value in the market in consequence of the competition to secure them. Their struggling existence may be most pernicious, and no one will deny that it should be made easy to remove them.

2. Following the order adopted by the Commission, the next expedient for preventing excess is to *limit the hours of opening*.

There are several arguments against remaining open too late at night. The rule that we should provide for reasonable conduct does not necessitate keeping the house open for a very few persons who have exceptional requirements, if there are weighty considerations on the other side. The restraint of public opinion is lacking when very few cus-

tomers are left in the house, and it has been urged with apparent reason that when the world has gone to bed a sense of shame will no longer inspire the tippler with the wholesome fear of being seen drunk when he comes out into the street. It can hardly be argued that to drink till half-past twelve (for which we provide in London) is a reasonable practice for the working classes. It is pathetic to hear the men and women in a London beer-shop (as the publican is suggesting their departure at 12.35 a.m.) dismally remarking to each other that they have got to be at work at six o'clock. We may dislike interference, but when industrial efficiency is widely undermined, patriotism may overcome a doctrinaire objection. Perhaps the exceptionally late hours encouraged in London account in some measure for the inferior physique usually credited to the average Cockney.

It is sometimes urged that earlier closing would drive drinking under the surface—that is, to clubs and the people's homes. These are real dangers, but we must assume that with any legislation for dealing with public-houses there will also be legislation for clubs. They constitute an argument only against unreasonable earliness. Working men would not give trouble or money to lay in drink for consumption after midnight, although the open house tempts them to drink later. We are convinced by our own observation that a man who at 12.30 a.m. resigns himself to being "too late for another" will go home with equal resignation at an earlier hour as certainly as he would drink to a later one, if the house were open longer. Nor is it quite out of place to urge the unreasonable labour of the publican and his servants, whose hours of work would in any other trade be thought a good reason for earlier closing.

The same reasons apply generally to the question of closing on Sunday. The arguments are not purely Sabbatarian. The idleness of Sunday (largely the result of law), combined with the fact that wages have just been paid, is a ground for special treatment; and, granting that the motives are largely Sabbatarian, the lover of tolerance need not regard them as savouring of religious persecution.

The vast majority are in favour of a day of rest and quiet, and would justify regulations which made such habits possible.

Some light may be thrown on the possibilities and difficulties of the case by a study of the actual daily takings in London public-houses representing respectively the sumptuous, the medium, and the rougher class. The total receipts for three months on each day of the week were as follows :—

	Sunday.	Monday.	Tuesday.	Wed.	Thursday.	Friday.	Saturday.
"The Stag" ...	£269	£301	£267	£284	£281	£282	£478
"The Fox" ...	140	181	158	148	143	155	246
"The Hare" ...	151	136	174 ¹	109	101	121	209

It may be interesting to examine further the distribution of trade over different hours of the day, during a representative week. The house chosen is a fairly "rough" one, and the presence of a street market causes the trade to show a less marked increase at dinner-time than would be visible in most cases.

"THE BADGER."

Sunday.			Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
	£ s.		£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.
—	—	6 to 10	1 1	1 0	0 15	1 1	1 0	1 4
—	—	10 " 12	1 8	1 14	1 5	1 4	1 4	1 8
1 to 2	2 1	12 " 2	1 12	1 10	1 5	1 7	1 4	2 2
2 " 3	2 0	2 " 4	1 0	1 12	0 12	1 7	1 4	3 12
—	—	4 " 6	1 4	1 1	1 6	1 10	1 7	2 14
6 " 9	2 0	6 " 8	1 13	1 8	1 10	1 8	1 17	2 14
9 " 11	2 10	8 " 10	2 1	2 1	2 1	1 12	2 15	6 1
—	—	10 " 12.30	1 14	1 5	1 1	0 10	1 14	5 11
	8 11		11 13	11 11	9 15	8 12	11 1	25 6

These figures are chiefly striking as evidence of the childish weakness of our working men. A certain number receive their wages on Friday evening, and accordingly the weekly rush of trade begins at about six o'clock on that day; it reaches a climax on Saturday night, and has spent itself on Tuesday. Some aver that it would last an even

¹ Extra trade due to horse sales near by, on Tuesdays.

shorter time but for the fact that many people are obliged to spend part of their wages on Saturday in redeeming goods from pawn, thus reserving part of their drink consumption till Monday, when they again apply to "uncle."

Some practical conclusions may also be drawn. The falling demand of the last hour of the day points to the feasibility of earlier closing. Most "neighbourhood houses" begin their busy time about 7.30 and do little trade after 11.

With regard to Sunday, it will be observed that in the seven trading hours of that day the rate of consumption is vastly greater than in the 19½ possible hours of the ordinary week-day. The special opportunities of Sunday lead to specially absurd extravagance.

But whatever be the suitable hours for any particular place, it is certain that local differences and changes will be common. There was a time when an eminent brewer suggested ten o'clock as closing-hour for London. Parliament cannot be expected to provide for every alteration, and the regulation of hours will not be properly dealt with until it is left to local discretion, within reasonable limits.

3. In regulating the public-house itself the third function of the licensing authority is to attend to the character and position of the licensee. Here arises the vexed question of "tied houses." There may be much to add to current literature on the variations, and the merits or otherwise, of the system; but it is no longer necessary to urge that to prohibit "tying" will not solve the temperance question, for the two sections of the Commission have arrived at a similar conclusion; and Mr. Peel himself has recently pointed out that the abolition of the tie "may be dismissed from consideration on the ground that it is impossible," and that "the only real remedy is a strong licensing authority which will inquire into the conditions of the tenancy."¹

4. There is another field in which governmental action can directly promote temperance; it embraces the facilities for drinking outside the public-house—the alternatives to which the much-harried toper may escape. The

¹ "Practical Licensing Reform," by Hon. S. Peel, p. 33.

periodical campaign for wrecking illicit saloons in America constitutes a sad warning of the danger which may attend prohibition, and even the mild restraints of a licensing law involve perils which must be guarded against. The satisfaction of having ruined the wealthy brewers would be but a poor consolation if the last state of the country proved worse than the first through the introduction of some new and more vicious drinking habit. There is said to be a lady whose passion for alcohol is such that, being debarred by shame from drinking at home or in the public-house, she travels untiringly round the Inner Circle Railway, alighting for a drink at every refreshment-room. There may be few who would rival such assiduity, but we must remember that there is no expedient to which a determined drinker will not resort, even apart from club-, shebeen-, or home-drinking.

The opinions we have collected are unanimous as to the great extent to which excess is assisted by the *Grocers' License*, especially in the case of women. The managers of inebriate homes trace almost all their cases to this source, and consider it decidedly worse than the draught beer "off-license," because it facilitates deception. Drinking at home is a growing custom amongst women, and some report that "half of them drink at home apart from meals, especially laundresses"; gin is described as the usual beverage, while drugs and methylated spirit are mentioned by some. Many drink alone, and a caller is not thought to have been properly entertained without a glass. By some the "confectioners' license," providing a tippling-place without the appearance of one, is regarded as the most insidious evil.

On this question the views of the Royal Commissioners were divided, and nothing is clear but that the grocer provides for a large amount of excess. Abolition may be inadvisable (as was held by the Lords' Committee of 1879), but there is much to say for separating the two kinds of trade. This follows the principle otherwise applied to the trade in alcohol—that supervision requires isolation. To mixed trading there are two main objections, (1) that drink may be hawked about in carts without having been ordered,

and (2) that deception is encouraged on the part of the purchaser, who would be deterred by fear of public or domestic opinion from openly buying alcohol. We have wide evidence of opinion that shame would work beneficially if dealings from the shop or the cart were obviously purchases of alcohol. It is arguable that to deliver drink at private houses along with groceries should be forbidden ; that the brewer and wine merchant would supply the really needful ; that though the practice of laying in a store at home is bad for many, this evil would not increase, for few would be able to afford it. But this would in many places interfere with the perfectly reasonable practice of having bottled beer delivered by the grocer ; and the argument for local adaptation applies especially to this matter where the doubtful points are so many and depend on actual local conditions. The majority of the Commissioners wisely observe, "The licensing authority should have full discretion and power to impose conditions in the case of these licenses as in all others."

With regard to *clubs*, our inquiry shows a widespread apprehension of danger from this source ; and our informants agree that club-drinking is often of a worse character than drinking in public-houses.

The Commission reports deal fully with the subject. According to the Commission's return, there are only 2,900 clubs in the United Kingdom having an annual subscription of less than one pound, but no one doubts that they are increasing and will certainly be formed if the public-house becomes too difficult of access. It appears that of about 2,500 workmen's clubs some five hundred keep open later than the public-houses ; and the evil is not merely one of late hours. It is true that clubs can be registered and inspected by law, as in many British Colonies, but the Commissioners can only suggest certain grounds on which registration should be refused, and the most stringent of these is the ground that a club causes habitual drunkenness. Now it is within our personal knowledge that many clubs (and they political clubs of by no means the lower kind) would easily satisfy this condition and yet be the scene of habitual "soaking" such as

would not be tolerated in a public-house. A large reduction of our present number of licenses is, of course, possible without adding to the club evil, while the control suggested would greatly diminish the present trouble ; but if nothing more drastic is possible than the Commission suggests, the danger remains an urgent reason for providing tolerably frequent facilities for drinking under supervision.

5. There is no question on which reformers are more united or more strenuous than the prohibition of *servng drink to children*. At the same time there is widespread distrust of the proposal, even amongst enthusiastic reformers, and if the point is to be carried there are weighty objections which must be disposed of. It is urged that (1) there would be a violent reaction, (2) public-house drinking would be increased, (3) the children are not injured by visiting the public-house. As to the first, a reaction would certainly be disastrous ; but it cannot be doubted that working-class parents are widely favourable to the plan, and that a great many fathers object to sending the children, whose wives obtain drink in this way, though they would be ashamed to go themselves.

Some say that few "respectable" parents send their children. It is, at all events, significant that labour leaders, Parliamentary and other, have declared for the Child Messenger Bill.

Upon the second point we have collected answers to the following questions : "Do many people drink at home apart from meals ?" and "Do you think the fathers or the mothers would go more to the public-house if the children were forbidden by law to go ?" Replies to the latter are divided, most of our informants holding that many would not take the trouble.¹ It is admitted that some would go (even by advocates of the restriction), but most would drink less, especially women, who now often send their children for gin. On the other hand, it is generally held that there is very little drinking at home apart from meals, at least among men. If this is true, the drink fetched by

¹ One remarks, "Parents may be already drunk, and yet continue to send first one child and then another. If they had to go themselves they would be refused."

children for their fathers is mostly for meals, which must be taken at home ; and the workman will not often be driven to drink in the public-house by his inability to send a messenger. We have it from publicans that most of the child-trade is at midday, when as a rule the men are not at home.

With regard to the effect on the children, great numbers of working parents seem to deplore it. It is significant that many publicans themselves advocate an entirely separate bar for the children on grounds of bad language and example. But to us the reason for prohibition appears to tally with the system adopted by most parents—that of discouraging their children from drinking alcohol. The important question is whether the custom means drinking, and what harm results. We have therefore asked for evidence of actual drinking by child messengers, and actually drunken habits. To our surprise a great majority of answers show specific knowledge of drinking by messengers, and also of frequent child-drunkenness. From clubs there are reports of numerous girl-drunks, and these are confirmed even by publicans.

There must be something sound in a rule adopted by nearly every self-governing part of the Empire except England, and which appears to be approved by the working classes where it is enforced in this country. The principle must indeed be remembered that whatever the best parents would do should be allowed ; and there may be districts where the population is of a uniformly high level, in which the case would be met by providing separate bars, and where further restriction would result in reaction. But the risk of this must not be over estimated ; a regular demand for beer at home could be met by the publican delivering daily to order, as was his custom thirty years ago ; and if child-drinking is a genuine danger, the practice of sending children for drink in jugs cannot be regarded as a reasonable one. The risk of reaction would be met by local option, but this can hardly be applied to legislation affecting children, and if the alternative is between a general prohibition and no alteration, the balance of argument favours the former.

6. The last class of Governmental action directly affecting temperance is the actual *preventing of excess*. The subject is divided in the Commission reports into—(1) offences by the public ; (2) administration by the police ; (3) habitual inebriates ; (4) offences by publicans. There is everything to be said for dealing more severely with drunkenness ; for a system of inspection which will galvanise police administration ; and for helping the unhappy relatives of the drunkard by such means as making it an offence to serve him with liquor. But since the present Government has found cause for dealing with these matters, it is superfluous to enumerate the arguments, for no one can doubt that they are overwhelming. This is perhaps the chief field for direct reform ; and so far from decrying the “Chucking Out Bill,” we regard it as marking a new epoch in temperance legislation.

On the fourth item—offences by publicans—there is more need to speak, not only because it will remain to be dealt with, but also because the study of it is of the utmost importance to the supreme question of compensation. There are seventeen principal offences which a licensee may commit, but the most important fall under five main heads :—

1. Adulterating liquor.
2. Serving to excess.
3. Opening beyond legal hours.
4. Harboursing bad characters.
5. Serving or bribing the police.

Each of these is obviously bound up with the efficiency of the police themselves ; but specific penalties are attached to each offence, and the publicans must bear at least half the responsibility for evils due to laxity.

The only charge regarded by the Commission as deserving of comment is that of serving to excess. Both reports remark on the striking disproportion between the apprehensions for drunkenness and the prosecutions for permitting it, and conclude that there must be some defect either in the law or in the activity of the police. We find a widespread opinion that the amount of drunkenness due to drinking in public-houses is considerable ; and, again,

that the influence of the manager in an ordinary public-house is very great. But the publicans' worst enemy is the drunkard, and they constantly take pains to avoid serving him. The fact that a licensee drinks with his customers may be an argument for the Gotenburg system, but is no evidence of laxity. We have consulted a number of charitable agents specially employed in visiting public-houses, and find them of opinion that most publicans do their best to keep order ; in London, at least, it is generally through a friend that a drunken man gets served. They find fault, however, with regard to "harbouring"—the illegal permitting of bookmakers, thieves, and undesirables in general, of both sexes, to frequent the house. Some houses bear ugly names on this account, and it is not only the opinion of charitable agents, but of many members of the trade, that a considerable number of houses do an illegitimate business of this kind. The extent of such trade is perhaps best measured by the experience of those who have taken over an ill-managed house and conducted it strictly. The London brewer has often found that when betting agents were excluded from the house the business was seriously affected, and a large part of the price given for the license was found to be based on unlawful trade. In some cases an increase of legitimate custom has followed the expulsion of the illegitimate, and this has been the happily general experience of the People's Refreshment House Association, which has conducted fourteen houses, though none in London. It cannot be doubted that a considerable amount of trade is done beyond the strict limits of the law ; but the extent of it, of course, varies widely, and the great majority of publicans should be regarded as blameless. We may hope that the inspectors foreshadowed by Mr. Ritchie will improve matters all round in this department.

Such are possible ways by which, under a system of licensing, the law may check intemperance without vexatious interference. If the reformers of 1871 had been wise and understanding people, the value of each method would be no longer a matter of conjecture. Since 1881 we should have had, as Lord Peel puts it, "a clean slate

to write on." Licenses would have been granted on various conditions which cannot now be imposed ; and we should have twenty years' experience to indicate the possibilities of temperance reform.

2. *Public Management.*—If any of our readers will take the trouble to spend an evening in the bars of some public-houses and to consider what effects the various proposals we have named would have upon the character of the place, he is likely to feel a certain despondency. The customers in nine of every ten houses would probably not be sensible of any change whatever in their surroundings. They would still be gratifying their taste for vitiated atmosphere, and for spending the evening in the consumption of many more drinks than they can afford. If he can remember that prohibition is out of the question, the student will begin to wonder whether after all there is any hope of really altering the character of the public-house without a change in its owners and managers, and a new system of control. The average Englishman will here be met by a vague feeling that any trading not strictly on commercial lines is theoretically wrong, and in practice sure to be economically disastrous ; or, again, he will feel convinced that the recent Committee on municipal trading (in reality it never reported) showed the prevalence of grave dangers. To these objections there are the same replies as we have already suggested, and the final test once more is that of experience.

The success of the Scandinavian system is entirely beyond question, but public management will not be adopted here unless supported by English experience. What is to be said of its effect among our own countrymen ? Unfortunately when the Licensing Commission reported there was little evidence of this kind to impress it. Good reports were received of the Birmingham Corporation experiment at Elan Valley, of the democratically managed tavern at Hill of Beath, of the Rector's public-house at Hampton Lucy, and notably of the military canteen system ; but the chief experiment, that of the People's Refreshment House Association, was declared to be too recent to show any distinct results. That experi-

ence is now more complete, and the results obtained in the fourteen houses of the Company are well worth noting. The rules and theories adopted may be obtained from the Secretary, at Broadway Chambers, Westminster ; they are in themselves sufficient to attract most people to the system. But the final test is now available—the test of actual success. Is there good evidence that the houses are improved, and has it been shown that the public-house can be made a desirable institution ? The reports from police, clergy, and others must be admitted to be strong proof that this is so. The Rev. T. Bennett has written : “The results from the temperance point of view are most admirable.” The Rev. C. B. Collyns says : “I am convinced that the temperance cause is being quietly but really helped by the Association. Many of those who sat and drank by the hour under the old *régime*, and left the house drunk at closing-time, now think it too respectable for them, and stay at home. I can without any hesitation say from my own knowledge that a public-house under the management of the P.R.H.A. is a desirable and positively useful institution. A public-house in the ordinary way is, in my opinion, most undesirable. It is well-known here that the Plymouth Inn is a *refreshment* house, and that it is of no use for any but a sober person to ask to be served ; any other would be refused at once. The existence of the house under your management has certainly had a very marked influence for good in the village generally. Under the old system there was a good deal of noisy drunkenness, but there has never been a row in the village since the Association took over the house nearly two years ago. Wives and children are better off, and I cannot see any objection to the labourers going to the inn for a quiet talk in a decent room over a pipe and a glass of good beer. No harm can come of it, and no little good comes from such social intercourse.”

An experiment, covering a very large trade, but under less favourable conditions, was recently made with some public-houses in London, and was reported on in the *Contemporary Review* for September, 1899. The houses were under managers who had no interest in the sale of

alcohol, but were offered the reward of 20 per cent. on any increase which they could effect in the trade in food and non-alcoholics. In the general result the total percentages for the five houses were thus altered :—

	Teetotal drinks and food.	Tobacco.	Alcoholic drink.
Under managers <i>not</i> interested in non-alcoholics	5·2%	4·4%	90·4%
Under managers with an inter- est in non-alcoholics	6·9%	4·5%	88·6%

The report concludes that the character of the manager is a very important factor ; that stricter management is desirable ; that a commission will increase the non-alcoholic trade, not indeed by persuasion, but by causing the manager to meet the public taste ; and, again, that public management would ensure greater attention to the character of the managers. Mr. Charles Booth, in a preface to the report, while deprecating deductions from this experiment in favour of trading by public authority, remarks : " Reputable management may undoubtedly do much for the character of the house, and so indirectly for the character of the trade carried on in it. Whatever conduces to reputable management tends to improvement in every direction, and for this and other reasons we may welcome interference by the licensing authority, or experiments through the medium of municipal control, or it may be by voluntary association." It must be admitted that from all these experiments, as also from Lord Spencer's, and others, excellent results have followed.

What are actually the advantages of public management? They are often stated vaguely. Those which strictly belong to it are as follows :—

1. Easy enforcement of rules and alterations.
2. " Philanthropic " control.
3. Non-interest of the manager.
4. Control over the manager.
5. Refusal of credit to customers.
6. Limit of supply to each drinker.
7. The supply of food.
8. The supply of non-alcoholic drinks.

9. Dissociation from politics.

There is reality in each of these, but the most important is increased control over the managers. More harm arises from laxity than from deliberate attempts to "push the sale." To avoid the serving of bad characters and tipplers is a matter of taking trouble rather than of "non-interest"; and the fear of a stern master is required to produce strictness in every house.

Similarly Captain Boehmer, manager of the People's Refreshment House Association, attributes most of the improvement in his houses to the conduct of the managers; they are forbidden to drink with customers, and the stricter management always causes a falling off of trade. But it is significant that in course of time the trade has in every case become greater than before the change, through the introduction of new customers, who are attracted by the order and cleanliness of the house and quality of the goods. Captain Boehmer writes: "I am convinced that by our scheme less liquor is served per head for many reasons, but it is spread over a greater number of customers."

There is, of course, some force in the contention that non-competitive trading will result in waste and inefficiency, and again that extensive purchases by a public body will lead to corruption. The dangers must honestly be tested by our experience of municipal trading, but they cannot be urged with the same force against management by a body such as Lord Grey's "trust company." Moreover, where a great moral gain is involved, a system is not to be judged by economy alone. And local opinion could at any time revert to licensing, or the Local Government Board might compel the authority to do so.

Mr. Sherwell attracted many to the system by his enticing picture of people's palaces supported by (and destructive of) the drink traffic.¹ Perhaps more have been convinced by his arguments against prohibition than by those in favour of a general municipalisation: but the movement, aided by the desire to avoid presenting valuable monopolies to private individuals, is firmly on foot,

¹ "The Temperance Problem and Social Reform," chap. ix.

and we may enjoy, without misgiving, the humour of Sir Wilfrid's gibe :—

“ But what's that humble-looking store,
Which stands hard by this open door ?
Oh ! that's another of Lord Grey's,
He blesses men in different ways.
There's no strong drink admitted here,
In vain the sufferer calls for beer.
Here men can come at close of day
And rest and read, or drink or play,
And all the funds—now only think !—
Are got by making people drink !
Oh ! what a grand device is this,
For putting forward human bliss ;
The source of good is now in view,
The more we drink the more we do.
Earls, bishops, workmen, fill the cup ;
Together let us liquor up ! ”

We have now reviewed the possible methods of improving conduct in regard to drink. It remains to enable them to be put in force, but we struggle in the darkness of inexperience, and to lay down every detail for the whole country may end in disaster. Hitherto we have stumbled from one mistake to another because we have insisted on national regulation of provincial differences. In many departments what we want, as Mr. Booth says, is experiment. Canon Barnett justly remarks: “ The question of the way being removed from the control of the local councils, the battle would be fought in closer touch with public opinion and on a smaller field. Experiments would be tried alongside one another in neighbouring counties, and lessons would be learned and applied, and there would be rivalry in establishing temperance which would be a healthy stimulus to opinion. Temperance advocates other than teetotalers would have something definite for which to work and an end within their reach.”¹

The history of the drink traffic in England is a record of fluctuation from one error to another. The mistakes of ignorance or folly will always be with us, but we can at least provide for repairing the evils of the past and using the possibilities of the present. Once we have established a rational system of local discretion within statutory limits,

¹ “ The Church and New Century Problems,” p. 113.

public spirit will be brought to bear in adapting regulations to current needs. Not till then will deplorable delays and vitiation of parliamentary politics cease to bar the way. A wide reorganisation is still imperative, and no programme has the slightest claim to finality which does not include—

1. Consolidation of the law.
2. Reorganisation of authorities.
3. Improved administration.
4. Stricter laws respecting drunkenness, serving children, &c.
5. Power to redistribute the licenses.
6. Extension of powers, *e.g.*, over other classes of licenses and conditions of license.
7. Power to regulate closing-hours within limits.
8. Control of clubs.

IV. CONCLUSION.

When it has become clear what is the proper treatment that ought to be adopted, we have still to deal with "the fatal drollery of representative institutions," with which England, in Disraeli's phrase, is "cursed," before the right measures can be put in force. Progress has hitherto been delayed by the disputes of rival theorists and the division of the forces of reform under various policies. The outlook is more hopeful at last, for they are happily in agreement upon the programme to be adopted. Success was impossible while the policy was dictated by one section alone of the Temperance Party, and that the least likely to meet with general support. Sir William Harcourt may have mistaken the Prohibitionists' view for that of reformers in general, but the mistake is not likely to be made again.

For the present opening we have partly to thank Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell for persuading reformers to abandon a purely vetoist policy, but the result is also due to the work of the recent Royal Commission. With all its mistakes, the Commission has at least united the forces of temperance. The vetoists and the advocates of public management have learnt to despair of a direct

victory for their cause, and have seen that their wisest course is to join the "practical reformers" in support of a scheme for improving the present system of licensing, both as valuable in itself and as a step which brings them nearer to their ideals.

The Commission has helped also to commandeer the ranks of social reformers in general. It was impossible that these, who are mostly consumers of alcohol themselves, should ever be drawn into a campaign for abolishing the sale of what they themselves want. The chief service of the Commission has been to pave the way for the average citizen to join in dealing with the most urgent of his country's needs. This is true not only of Lord Peel's section, but of the Commission as a whole. A vast number of people hitherto unable to join the crusade have been attracted to reform no less by Sir Algernon West's programme than Lord Peel's.

The term "temperance party" must now, happily, include those who, through the absurd misuse of words, have had to be called "non-temperance" reformers. There is, indeed, a wide divergence of views; but the difficulty of co-operation disappears when it is realised that the question of license or no license belongs to the local discretion which both parties desire, and not to parliamentary action.

In the reforms advocated by the Commission's two reports there is no difference of principle and scarcely any of detail. The Church of England Temperance Society has done its best to show the inferiority of the Majority scheme, but in its statement of the differences it can practically find no single point to complain of except the slowness of the scheme for extinguishing licenses, while the points of agreement include provision for all the six methods of preventing intemperance.

What is it, then, that prevents a general co-operation? It is a difference of opinion, not upon any item of reform, but merely as to the way in which we are to deal with interests disturbed by putting reform into practice. In discussing proposals we have omitted all mention of this matter of Compensation, because it is purely incidental to

the general issue. We are aware that to many people it is an integral part of any programme that the sellers of alcohol should be injured. A strong temperance advocate has observed, "To hear some reformers talk, it might be imagined that the idea of recompensing license-holders for their loss involves some terrible wrong."¹ The reader who has had the misfortune to be a parliamentary candidate will understand this readily enough. Endeavouring to harmonise his views on reform with those of temperance voters and inquiring what chief alterations they desired, he will have learnt with amazement that the chief "reform" was to be "No compensation." But those on whom legislation depends will subordinate this kind of emotion to "the rapture of the forward view."

How ought this question to be approached? Supposing it were proposed to abolish the monopoly of the City markets, or to prohibit the sale of meat, how should we decide upon the proper compensation to be given? We should regard it as a highly technical question, to judge of which few people were qualified by sufficient knowledge either of the law or of political, economic, and ethical theory; and we should appeal to arbitration by a commission of experts, for which the reformers would be thought unfitted by their very temperament almost as much as the traders by their financial bias. Englishmen have a wholesome distrust of the theorist; but, if drunkenness is left unchecked because of our differences as to compensation, and because most people decline to advocate any scheme till some principle has been shown in support of it, should not this deplorable *impasse* at least be justified by an appeal to expert authorities upon political ethics? The Royal Commission omitted to call for scientific evidence of this character, and it has remained for a private society—the Christian Social Union—to perform this valuable service. It has obtained through the London School of Economics a scientific *résumé* of principles bearing on this question, as laid down by the best authorities upon political, moral, and economic theory; the utterances also of leading statesmen, and the precedents

¹ "Sober by Act of Parliament," by F. A. McKenzie, p. 175.

for compensation in similar cases. All these are brought to bear upon the peculiar position, legal and other, of the licensed victualler in this country.¹

The conclusions drawn in this monograph should be carefully studied. They indicate in the main that on ethical and economic grounds compensation should be measured by the degree of expectation disappointed, and that the value of this expectation is approximately indicated by the price that reasonable people are willing to give for it. But there is an important qualification to this, viz., that no compensation should be given on account of any trade not done in the strictest accordance with the law. Some deduction should therefore be made equivalent to the trade gained by the laxity of licensees, such as permitting illegal practices or continuing to serve drink beyond the proper point. This deduction would be difficult to assess, and would have to be imposed by a uniform levy.

The appeal to principle would thus appear to favour a scheme of compensation arrived at by deducting from the fair commercial price a certain amount equivalent to the illegal trade. Considering the hardship of imposing this fine upon traders who have set an example of strictness, it would be difficult to fix it at more than 5 per cent. of the profits of each house. The scheme would accordingly provide for the acquisition of licenses at this price, and (if only the licenses intended to be suppressed are to be acquired) provision would be made for recovering the betterment value conferred on the survivors by the suppression of others, and for imposing on them a fine equivalent to the illegal trade. If the funds required for the necessary compensation are not provided by the betterment value and the fine, the balance should be found out of public funds.

Though the Royal Commission did not appeal to authority of this kind, the scheme of compensation proposed by one of the reports has considerable similarity to that which we have just described. It advocates in the

¹ "The Place of Compensation in Temperance Reform," by C. P. Sanger. King & Co.

first place a tax on the surviving houses of one-third per cent. per annum on their capital value. Now their profits are probably about 5 per cent. on this value (and few of them would gain by the suppression of others), so that the loss would be no less than one-fifteenth or more than 7 per cent. of their profits. This is a fine which would hit most of the licensees very hard indeed. Thus, so far as the general scale of compensation goes, the scheme appears to be well supported by principle, while it does not suggest any employment of public funds.

What are the objections to dealing with the compensation claim in this way? The first is that it is unjust to the State to pay so high a price. In view of the legal position of the licensee it appears at first sight very liberal treatment; but the best judges upon the question of political justice are those who have studied it most, and we cannot think their opinion unjust. Compensation is more liberal in the case of the slum-owner, who is compensated for the whole value, often largely illegitimate. At all events, if the appeal is to principle, many temperance reformers must reconsider their views. The ratepayers of London seem to be doing so already. A London paper, commenting on the enormous cost of licenses sacrificed in the Holborn street scheme, spoke of it as a "proof that public opinion has been largely educated in the means whereby the drink problem is to be solved."

Another objection is to the slowness of reduction involved in paying so high a price for each license; but it is not the scale of compensation that prevents rapidity. A large reduction has been shown to be compatible with it, even without any addition to the compensation fund out of revenue.

A third objection is to establishing a precedent which will make prohibition difficult in the future. To abolish licenses over very large areas would certainly be difficult without the use of public funds, though it may be a consolation to some that the precedent would not apply to any case where public revenues were used. Rightly or wrongly, Parliament might in the future give less compensation if the whole trade were condemned on moral

grounds, as was the trade in slaves. Believers in principle, however, will face the fact that, even if all licenses are to be abolished, the proper compensation must be found.

But, if the appeal to principle be rejected, is there no argument for the same scale of compensation on the ground of tactics? The present policy is to wait for the Liberal Party to put into law the Peel scheme. We venture to think that those who are most urgent for reform will weigh most carefully the chance, even then, of passing it through the Commons—not to speak of the House of Lords; they will weigh also the chance of defeating the trade. The futility of defying the publicans is familiar to every candidate, and this fact has already taken effect in detaching many Liberals from the Peel programme. At least thirty Liberal candidates at the election of 1900 have pledged themselves to support compensation on the Majority scale. The prospects of the anti-compensation party are indeed depressing; but if principle is to be trusted, the *just* proposal is one that can be passed, and the situation is not deplorable. On the contrary, the attitude of the trade gives an excellent opening. At the General Election the trade was officially neutral even towards Liberal candidates who supported the Peel reforms, provided they agreed with the Majority on the one point of the scale of compensation.

Again, it is surprisingly fortunate that the licensees should consent to a scheme which inflicts on them the loss of one-fifteenth of their profits. They are, indeed, only reluctantly consenting, and rejoiced at Mr. Ritchie's recent *non possumus*. This, at least, should be enough to disprove the fact that the Majority scheme would be a boon to the trade, and to show that the opening may not last long.

On all accounts nothing would appear more imperative than that reformers should consider the compensation problem *de novo*. If the experts are right, an acceptable settlement is possible (as indeed Mr. Whittaker has suggested) even from the present Government. Thus, on grounds both of principle and tactics, the most idealistic

reformer would support a scheme based on the highest authority, and would urge it upon his followers. Failing their agreement, he would earnestly strive to educate them.

But whatever the attitude of the Temperance Party, the final problem is to stir public feeling. The prohibitionist agitation has failed. Reformers, though now united, are still few, and even the Liberal Party is hardly moved by them. Progress must still wait till a truer patriotism comes to feel (to use Mr. Chamberlain's words), that "the most urgent reform which can be submitted is a reform in connection with the promotion of temperance."

Finally, lest it should be thought by members of the trade or other optimistic citizens that the views and the proposals here put forward are more drastic than is justifiable, we would point out that not by one step do we exceed the limits laid down in the formal declaration of the trade leaders themselves—"a *gigantic* evil remains to be remedied."

V

THE DISTRIBUTION OF INDUSTRY

IN his essay on the housing problem, Mr. F. W. Lawrence asks whether it really pays the individual manufacturer to conduct his business in an overgrown city like London. He mentions many instances of industries that have been transferred, during recent years, to the provinces. To such a list, we could all make our own additions ; and so arrive at cumulative evidence in favour of the ultimate decentralisation of employment. The mere fact that so many of our manufacturers still prefer to put up with London, proves little, for, with equal unanimity, they treasure their antiquated machinery, their illiterate, fossilised and vulgar commercial travellers, and other relics of a bygone and easy superiority over trade rivals that have since grown rich and merry at our expense. To-day, we are scared, as perhaps seldom before, at the dreadful prospect of having to do a little thinking, let alone a little work, in order to maintain our prosperity ; and there is no rule of thumb maxim that we are not prepared to revise. How long it will be before we go to sleep again, time alone will decide.

It certainly seems as if general printing could no longer be performed in the Metropolis at an adequate profit. In January, 1901, the London Society of Compositors made some of us very angry by demanding shorter hours, and consequently higher pay. One of the Society's most

influential officials—strangely enough, a singularly reasonable individual—told me that the real cause of dissatisfaction was the long hours and the overtime. The request for an advance in wages merely proved the rigidity of trade union etiquette. The hours had been rearranged some quarter of a century ago at one of those periods of friction which in labour phraseology is termed a settlement. In the interval, the comps. and their devils had found it necessary to dwell further and yet further from their work, until sleep and domesticity had been sacrificed to the joys of omnibuses, trams, or the all-night service of trains on the Great Eastern Railway. The masters recommended the malcontents to submit their case to the Board of Trade, and Mr. Askwith, the duly appointed arbiter, diminished the time to be worked by one and a half hours per week, and added 1s. to the regular wage. The men gulped down their dissatisfaction, no doubt wondering how their health could be affected one way or another by the enjoyment of an extra fifteen minutes of leisure each day. It seemed like sending a consumptive to St. Paul's Churchyard for change of air and woodland scenery. Moreover, the shilling advance, albeit benevolent in itself, transgressed an unwritten tradition of the Society, whose members had always received an extra florin—or nothing. Perhaps the men fear it will be only sixpence next time.

Yet, as events soon proved, Mr. Askwith was kind to the men, even in his studious moderation. The victory of the compositors, such as it was, turned out to be Pyrrhic. The mere suggestion of a revised settlement has driven printing to Holland, and we are now supplying the Dutch with ever-increasing quantities of the machinery required to cope with the British contracts—machinery not our own, but American, since nowadays we are content to act as agents for other and cleverer people. Moreover, the award, although so meagre, was no sooner announced than the firm which prints Hansard decided to erect new works at some such site as Reading, well beyond the Metropolitan area, where London prices for labour and London rents, rates, and taxes might be avoided.

Years ago the Government condition that the process of immortalising the Parliamentary Debates be actually completed within the boundaries of Greater London had been cancelled, so that, in the not remote future, this piece of quick-time and virtually newspaper printing will, in all probability, be executed far away from Fleet Street.

Of course, this is nothing new. For years our larger printing establishments have reduced expenses by transferring as great a proportion of their business as possible to rural communities. Messrs. Clowes' works at Beccles, the Whitefriars Press at Tonbridge, and many other cases might be given. I have it on the authority of a director in one of our leading publishing houses, that his firm has found it cheaper to transfer orders from printers who did the work in town to those who did it in the country ; and the fact is incontrovertible, that the only way to prevent English printing from going abroad is to close down the works in London, or, at any rate, build, and build quickly, others in villages. Some time ago I came into frequent contact with the senior partner in a printing firm that has grown out of a back room till it occupies several acres. It is situated in one of the less prominent Midland towns, and, lately, it has opened a very attractive shop in the city. My friend commiserated with me, in very jocular fashion, upon my misfortune in being a mere Londoner. He gaily pointed out how he was able to print and publish two or three flourishing weekly trade journals from his vantage-ground in the provinces, while all that he needed in London was a counter at which to sell his wares. Comment is superfluous.

It is, of course, strange enough that printing, of all trades, should be shouldered away from the centre of editorial and literary activity, upon which it so obviously depends. Moreover, the finished product—magazine, book, or periodical—has to arrive in London before it can be distributed for the edification of satiated readers. In no business would it appear to be more clearly necessary that all departments be situated in close proximity. A publisher may require an extra edition, at a moment's

notice, almost every piece of copy gives rise to queries, and every make-up presents curious and maddening problems in practical geometry. In journalistic emergencies, what we in England pretend is our telephone proves but a sorry substitute for a personal interview with the foreman on the spot. Also, the game is irretrievably lost if, through the unpunctuality of a railway train, a publication fails to arrive at the stated time. But, despite these possibilities of inconvenience, and these dire risks of a delay that cannot but spell disaster, not only leisurely book production, but the more rapid and irritating printing of periodicals, is being forced by financial necessities beyond the zone of Metropolitan extravagance.

The finances of a printing establishment are peculiar in that the owner has not, as a rule, to provide any commodity that weighs. The "copy" he sets up may be heavy, but only in another sense, and the paper upon which he prints is provided by the customer. His expenses are therefore confined to rent and other fixed charges, plus wages. On rent, the saving by migration is undisputed; on wages, the economy is equally decisive, and it may be fairly claimed that, in any industry where labour is able to strike a fair bargain with capital, it has made the highest terms for itself in the biggest cities. The reason why this has been so conspicuously the case with the printing trade is that the compositors are powerfully organised; but, in every industry now carried on in the Metropolis, it will be found that absolute sweating only exists until the inevitable establishment of an effective trade union, which, however hopeless the task may appear, cannot fail in the end to restore some kind of balance between wages and an unavoidably high scale of living. The most general proof of the above proposition may, perhaps, be found in the rates of weekly pay on a railway. Trade unionism is notoriously weak on all lines running into London, whether from north or south; and consequently wages are fixed purely by the actual market value of labour in the various localities through which the railway runs. The companies reckon to pay at a slightly

lower rate than that prevailing in other industries, consideration being taken of the fact that the employment is regular ; but the scale for London is always higher than for localities outside big cities. Indeed, the Great Eastern dispute arose because wages in the suburban district had been approximated somewhat too closely to the pittance that rejoice the souls of Norfolk and Suffolk yokels ; and in the now famous interview between the men and the directors, the report of which ran to some eight score pages, one man complained that his promotion to London at a higher wage had spelt poverty.

I have received a friendly challenge to apply the above reasoning to a brewery situated in London and supplying London. I can lay claim to no experience of brewing, whether as a consumer or a shareholder, and I merely speak after provocation. I understand that upon each morning the barrels of beer are shot into lorries, of the familiar variety, and so carted direct to the taverns. But if the brewery migrated into the country, it is asserted that all sorts of horrible complications would arise with railway trains. In the first place, we should recollect that Londoners do not always quench their thirst upon beer, however deliciously arsenicated. On the whole, the traffic in so-called milk is managed with absolute despatch, as, indeed, it must be. The milk is regularly skimmed, watered, thickened with boracic acid, and distributed, not to a comparatively limited number of public-houses, but to every dwelling where a baby, let alone its parents, is waiting to be poisoned. I fail to realise why beer should not be despatched overnight with greater ease than milk, which is only furnished by the alleged cow when morning comes.

Again, brewing is not, I should fancy, one of those industries in which employment is irregular. There is no hour of any day in which any one of us could not collect at least a score of personal friends, all ready for a drink. There is nothing precarious, nothing from hand to mouth (save in the case of a consumer) about the brewing business ; and the manager who transplanted his workpeople to fair fields and pastures new might rest assured that

there would be work for all. And, despite the amicable scepticism that is blown upon me, I yet remain unconvinced of the precise advantages of continuing to brew, even in the city, where there is a vast preponderance of potential and actual drunkards. The rental of a big London brewery itself amounts to a Carnegie donation. If the wages are not higher than they would be in the country, then the men are sweated. And as to the railway bogey, I submit a hypothesis. I believe, as firmly as my ignorance of the technicalities of this particular trade will allow me, that London brewers would never be able, any more than London printers, to withstand foreign and provincial competition, if they lost control of the tied houses which furnish them a virtual monopoly of the means of distribution. Given free competition and they would be driven into the country ; but that is no reason why they should not, by a similar course of action, improve the handsome profits which they enjoy at present. So much for drink. In the case of biscuits, Peak, Fream and Company, of South London, would probably be the last to deprecate the success of Messrs. Huntley and Palmer, who do so well at Reading. And, in the provision trade, Messrs. Crosse and Blackwell, of Soho, cannot deny the competition of Chivers at Hitchin, near Cambridge, to say nothing of Whiteley's, who have recently laid out a fruit farm and jam factory at Hanworth in Middlesex. In these cases it is unnecessary to discourse upon railway facilities. Here are concrete instances of industries which compete, from the provinces, yet with success, against their rivals in the city. The cheapest way of feeding London is from the outside, as time will show.

Mr. Lawrence explains, with truth, that a vast number of clerks will always be required for the management of a large seaport and financial exchange. Admitted. But even here it is possible to point to clerical work, now performed both in London and the provinces, with apparently equal convenience. The Midland Railway is managed from Derby, and there is no reason, other than historical, why the London and North-Western should not be managed

from Crewe, the Great Western from Swindon, the London and South-Western from Woking, the Great Northern from Doncaster, the Great Eastern from Cambridge, and so on for the others. Nor need Clearing House, with its two or three thousand automata, remain at Euston. Rugby or Derby or a dozen other centres would prove quite as convenient. It is, moreover, significant that one of our leading insurance companies, the Norwich Union, is content with a mere branch office in Fleet Street. As the growing impossibility of London is realised by those who direct the occupations of her citizens, so surely will these almost unnoticed facts be estimated at their real importance.

It is never safe for a writer to attribute more than a passing value to his own observation, especially where this is restricted to a brief period, in time, and a limited area. But for a dozen years I have followed the fortunes of a small north country town, in which the industries are varied and the population slightly on the increase. In every case, where a business has languished, there has been in the conduct of it a display of definite and undeniable incompetence. In the cases where a business has developed, the proprietors were men of ability and perseverance, and their success has been such that the town is to-day richer than it has ever been before, yet without soot. One firm, at least, has acquired its position by the judicious practise of advertising, always accompanied by unremitting attention to other details. Industrial advertising has, in fact, revolutionised the system whereby we distribute commodities. In the old days, I bought a piece of soap, and I trusted to the judgment of the man who sold it to me over the counter. To-day, I am dissatisfied unless I buy Somebody's soap. I should be disobeying the reiterated injunctions of countless pretty maidens, unshaven men, flaring mottoes, acoustics, conundrums, and even plump babies, if I dared to use any but Somebody's soap, or, failing that, Somebody Else's soap. The soap may be manufactured at John o' Groats for all I care, so long as I get it and no other. A penny or two more or less in the purchase price makes curiously little

difference, unless it be that cheapness is actually a cause of suspicion. I submit my complexion to the man who drafts the cleverest advertisement, and the soapmaker who makes the biggest profit is the soapmaker with the prettiest wit. Many will say that we have here the *reductio ad absurdum* of modern competition, namely, a condition of things in which quality and price are alike subordinated to an irrelevant ruling factor, viz., attractive and logically worthless self-praise on the part of competing firms. The money which should have been expended on the goods themselves is devoted, ultimately, to maintaining vast numbers of popular journals that only spring into existence because of the allurements of the advertisement canvasser. The advertisement is, in fact, modern England's method of patronising literature.

I do not defend such a system, although, as a journalist, I live by it. I admit that advertising has introduced into our industrial life an element of speculation, so absorbing as to degrade not a few staple trades to the level of a pure gamble. The preparation of foods and beverages, simply for the sake of announcing through advertisements that they are prepared, puts a premium on adulteration. The stuff sells for the very reason that it is doctored. All this I lament; but the point here is that the new and apparently inevitable method of securing custom places the remotest locality in a position of greater equality with the big city, than could ever have been the case in the old days of commercial travellers. At Windermere, for instance, there has grown up a little industry in cakes, entirely through advertisement, and without the expenditure of capital, other than the profits put back into the business. There is something amusing in the way in which the proprietors took their place—a modest one, no doubt—in an arena so fully occupied.

Again, just as advertising has tended to open the way for the development of local industries, so the system of joint stock companies has facilitated the flow of capital, hither and thither, wherever it may be required. Business in small towns is no longer dependent upon the limited resources of some minor provincial bank. Nearly all

these latter have been absorbed by the great financial houses in the cities, and village banking is brought up to the level and is backed by the same credit as banking in Lombard Street. The company promoter is deservedly a person of ill-fame, and it is a question how far any industry can flourish when it never knows how long it may be owned by its present proprietors. But community of ownership, however imperfect our realisation of it, has once and for all annihilated the notion that manufacturers must huddle themselves around the centres of unemployed wealth. A telegraphic message suffices to place the riches of a Rothschild at the disposal of a trader at Vladivostock.

The point upon which stress should be laid is, in brief, that every development of our commercial system appears to reduce the comparative advantages which a large town previously enjoyed. The geographical position of an industry is no longer the material factor it used to be. It is the method by which the industry is conducted or the fiscal policy with which it has to contend that determines its success. For instance, in the north country town, mentioned above, there has been a decline in the woollen trade, not a little due to the McKinley and Dingley Tariffs. Yet a proportional decline has been recorded at Bradford, the exports from which town to the United States have been reduced from £4,000,000 to less than £1,500,000 annually. The common influence affected large city and small town alike, and the small town would have been at least as badly off if it had been a ward in the large city. Cobden's famous miscalculation of the effect of Free Trade upon corn teaches the same lesson. The cost of importation did not act as a barrier to foreign produce, because that cost was negligible when compared with the saving effected by the foreign producer who was in a position to adopt the latest machinery on a large scale. The man at a distance of thousands of miles beats the man on the spot, by sheer excess of good management.

If landlords in this country had combined and had placed their farms upon a modern footing, if they had regarded

food production as a business to be conducted with the smartness and despatch of a German toy factory, if they had educated their future tenants and allowed them the prospect of unrestricted enterprise under properly organised conditions, then Cobden's estimate might have come true. But under no circumstances could hand labour at home have been expected to hold its own against machine-labour abroad. It is not where you place your factory, but what machinery you furnish to your factory, that decides the future of your business.

It is, therefore, as much in the interests of commerce as in the interests of philanthropy that Great Britain must learn to adapt herself to new conditions. It may be freely conceded that the growth of large towns in the past was only what might have been expected. Broadly, it was due to the fact that machinery and the use of steam were placed at the disposal of the manufacturers years before they had been successfully applied to solve the problem of locomotion. Carriage, whether of fuel, raw material, or finished goods, was the paramount item in a firm's turnover, whereas its importance is now reduced to a detail. Factories, therefore, congregated at the seaports, the pit-heads, or, as in the case of London, in close proximity to the richest market. The expense and inconvenience of transport dwarfed every other consideration. But whatever be the allegations against our British railways—and no one will accuse me of having been silent about their imperfections—no one can deny that they have, on the whole, destroyed the economic justification for London manufactures; while even Sheffield has been shedding some of its engineering to the wilds of Cumberland!

With every increase in population, the impossibility of London, as a manufacturing centre, stands out more clearly. We must all feel the greatest respect for those enthusiasts, who, like Mr. Balfour, evolve fearful and wonderful theories of transit and recommend their adoption by a city which has already outgrown conceivable means of locomotion. These schemes may be divided into two classes—(1) Those in which the facilities do not

extend beyond the area at present built upon ; (2) those in which new railways or tramways are to open up unoccupied districts. Let us examine these schemes, not with that desperate enthusiasm which we so much admire in Mr. John Burns and his fellow-reformers, but in the clear light of mechanical fact.

Let us, first, confine our attention to the area which is already covered with buildings or occupied by necessary streets and open spaces. By building upwards—in fact, by removing crazy-looking slums and erecting barrack-like blocks of tenements—the housing capacity of such an area can be increased up to a certain limit. But I fail to understand how facilities for locomotion within the said area make any difference one way or the other to its maximum population. What really happens is that a facility—in so far as it is a *bonâ-fide* convenience to a district—enhances the rental of the district and makes the unfortunate people who dwell there still poorer than before. From the orthodox housing point of view, the Central London Railway, with its rapid service, workmen's trains, cheap uniform fare, single class of carriage, might have been regarded, and was regarded, as an ideal mid-London facility. Yet I have been positively informed by the chairman of a trade union, who lives at Shepherd's Bush, that the effect of the tube has been to force up workmen's rents alarmingly. Families in comfortable circumstances who had previously been content to live out at, say, Richmond or Chiswick, were tempted to settle near the terminus of the new line, and the mere workman found himself "left."

And surely this might have been foreseen. If a particular locality is rendered manifestly convenient for the workman, it will be claimed by householders who are not, strictly, workmen ; while in so far as the central area is rendered healthy, beautiful, and all the other things the London County Council intend it shall be, so surely will its eligibility be perceived by people who at present are frightened away from it by its discomforts. Therefore any facility that stops short of an unoccupied area should be regarded with the utmost suspicion by those who wish

to help the real poor. Whether, under any circumstances, we are wise in entrusting the future of deep-level locomotion to Mr. Yerkes, the Chicago street railway magnate, is a question that should perhaps be answered by those who have experience of that gentleman's previous enterprises. The organisation of London deep-level railways has at last come under the consideration of a committee of experts, and if the result turns out to be a proper homogeneous scheme, we shall truly have cause to rub our eyes.

There is, too, a fallacy in the theory that tramways are likely to alleviate the problem. I admit that London is shockingly supplied with street railways. But how would a perfect system help to house the poor? It may in certain particular instances take them more quickly to their work, but it can hardly be expected to increase the possible areas for workmen's accommodation. The case is quite different where the population of a town does not exceed two or three hundred thousand. There it is possible to arrange for every suburban district to be connected by tram with every industrial district at the heart of the city. In Boston, U.S.A., where is laid down probably the finest tramway system in the world, every suburb is brought into touch with the innermost zones; and many other illustrations suggest themselves. But none of the towns where tramways have been such a triumph, or where they have tended to spread the population, can be compared in size with London. Of course, a tramway could be built from the Bank to Windsor Castle. In fact, we might conceive of a radiating network of lines covering an area of, say, forty miles diameter, and extending in every direction. Such a system would no doubt justify its existence in many ways, but it would be but a very sorry remedy for overcrowding. People are squeezed up because they all wish to live within a reasonable distance, measured by time, from the place where they earn their daily bread. Taking everything into consideration, a tram, under the most favourable circumstances, cannot be expected to maintain a speed of more than eight miles an hour, and in London that would turn out to be an excessive figure. But all the

districts within eight miles of London central manufactures could be, and in most case are, very much more quickly served by trains.

But suppose the workpeople had to depend on trams. Unless we entirely rebuilt, and mostly demolished for ever, the middle of London, there would not be street room in the city for the trams to pass without that congestion which at present stultifies the attempts made by omnibuses to out-distance the pedestrian. At Boston, I have seen a line of separate trams following each other closely and extending at least a quarter of a mile. Yet in Boston the streets are relieved by a magnificent subway under the old town, and if we are to place all our trams underground, why not have "tubes" and be done with it? For in London, a subway, if it were necessary at all, would be necessary almost everywhere. We have to remember that just where a tramway system requires double and treble lines of metal, our streets are hardly broad enough to admit a single line. Omnibuses are slow, but it is not the horses that make them so, but in the main, the policemen. And it is the policeman who would demonstrate in his own quiet fashion the futility of expecting the streets of London to accommodate a large workman's traffic, concentrated into two brief periods, at morning and evening.

Very similar criticisms apply to Mr. Balfour's ingenious motor car scheme. It is, of course, very kind of the right honourable gentleman to spare the time, which might otherwise have been devoted to the defence of London Water Companies, in order that the world may be furnished with a notion that would assuredly never have arisen from any other quarter. What Mr. Balfour suggests is that our main radiating thoroughfares should be built in two storeys, Manhattan Railway fashion, and that the upper storey should become a kind of racecourse for motor cars. Any workman who could afford to keep such a car, and any parish or other council that liked to supply cars for its rate-payers, would simply have to let the thing go, and the trick, so far as that district is concerned, would be done. It is magnificent, but it is not sense. What would happen

to the motor cars when they arrived at the city? We could put up with the smell, the palpitations, the occasional explosions, and the braying of horns. But whether on the third, second, or first storey of a street, congestion is fatal to rapid transit, and congestion of the motor cars would be occasioned by the same causes that would lead us to expect it in a tramway scheme. Besides, motor cars are already rendering our thoroughfares at once perilous and hideous; and if the march of progress proceeds at its present rate, we are not far removed from a period at which a horse will be a rarity in the Metropolis. Probably, the poor brutes who spend a premature old age in omnibuses will be happier extinct, for no pavement yet invented is other than ice to their hoofs in greasy weather. But when the mechanically propelled vehicle becomes the rule, rather than the exception, a state of things will have arrived which may be described as Balfourism on the ground floor. The privately or publicly owned motor car will be at liberty, as indeed it is now, to career into the city, with or without passengers—and it will do so. The only effect of the upper storey would be, virtually, to increase the width of street along any particular route. And over many thoroughfares it would be impossible to build the upper storey without widening the street first, since the lower street would otherwise be plunged into darkness. Moreover, the erection of the upper storey would be accompanied along its whole length by compensation to the dwellings and shops concerned on account of interference with ancient lights. Otherwise this original scheme is feasible, though it would leave the problem of overcrowding still in an atmosphere of philosophic doubt.

We now turn to the second class of suggested facilities for locomotion—namely, those which extend beyond the occupied area, so opening up new districts to the jerry builder. Grant that employment exists in a city for a certain number of people, it is clear that the larger the possible area of habitation, the less necessity would there appear to be for congestion. It is argued that London's sole requirement is rapid passenger railways into untouched

zones, where new houses would spring up, as if by magic. There are those who declare that the existing railways are bound by the Cheap Trains Act, not merely to run workmen's trains where a demand for these has manifestly arisen, but to run them empty into localities where a demand might be thereby encouraged. In fact, some extremists would like to force the Companies to build new lines for this purpose—a fresh form of philanthropy at some one else's expense. On the whole, the railways have had to fulfil their part of the bargain, whereby a portion of the passenger duty was remitted on condition that services of cheap trains be established, although certain lucky Companies, like the North-Western, Great Western and Midland have escaped lightly. But the frequent attacks on the Great Eastern are extremely unwarrantable, and the Great Northern, whatever be its shortcomings, has only failed sometimes because its managers never contemplated the situation that has arisen. They did their best, and are doing it now.

If, however, the population of London is to increase yet further, it would be unwise to depend in the future upon the good offices of a steam railway, even though it be owned, subsidised, or coerced by the State. The application of electricity as the most convenient form of motive power upon railways is only a question of time, and already it has been applied with general success to the tubes. Lord Rosebery has suggested that rapid railways ought to be constructed into Essex from deep-level stations in town, and that an indefinitely great population might thus be furnished with homes in the country. There is no doubt that electric trains will soon be running at speeds which would bring a colony, thirty miles from London, well within the half-hour radius, provided that we can arrive at some proper method of braking the wheels. But there is grave reason to fear that such radiating lines would never be able to pay their way. The workmen's traffic would by hypothesis be carried at a nominal charge, and, even so, there would be none of it save at morning and evening. Even in the Metropolitan area the tubes have proved very expensive to work. Despite its enor-

mous traffic, the City and South London has never properly paid; the Waterloo and City is gradually, but only gradually, arriving at a position in which it will involve no loss to the London and South-Western Railway; while at the last shareholders' meeting the Chairman of the Central London Railway, which carries more than a hundred thousand passengers a day, Sundays included, had nevertheless to face demands from his shareholders, who clamoured for higher fares as a preliminary to higher dividends. The London and Globe Finance Corporation has had bitter experience of how meagre a support the public will give for even such a promising line as the Waterloo and Baker Street Railway. Indeed, I do not see how we can escape the conclusion that a thirty-mile length of line, serving a township of, say, fifty to a hundred thousand inhabitants at its far end, of whom, say, a third at the very most would travel to London every day, and these at nominal fares, could only be maintained at a colossal loss, unless it depended on intermediate traffic throughout all its length during the rest of the day. M. Behr is asking leave to construct an electric line of this length between Manchester and Liverpool, without intermediate stations, but in this case an all-day passenger traffic at full fares is contemplated, and still the financial prospects of the venture are problematical. The Rosebery railway is not designed for wealthy merchants and their representatives, but for artisans whose whole contribution per head to the railway would be, say, two shillings a week, for which they would have to be carried 720 miles at the highest speed possible to science. I can only say that I should not advise anybody to invest money on such a prospectus; and if the State stepped in with a dole, it would have to run to at least six figures in the case of each railway.

If, again, we assume that there is to be intermediate traffic, we at once reduce the Rosebery railway to an electrical duplication of the already existing Great Eastern system. Nor would it appear to be possible to run the high-speed trains upon metals that are in use for other purposes. At any rate, all regular traffic would have

to be absolutely suspended during the two periods at which the workmen were being shot to town, and back again into the country. And, granting that existing railways could be utilised for the purposes under discussion—and this assumption Lord Rosebery does not hazard—it is hardly conceivable that the workmen's traffic would pay its out-of-pocket expenses. A train, accommodating five hundred persons at fourpence return fare, would only earn 2s. 9½d. per train mile, whereas the average earnings per passenger-train mile of all the railways in the United Kingdom amounted in 1900 to over 4s., a figure which yet led to a great diminution in net profit.

But allowing ourselves to assume the feasibility of the above scheme, it would seem that its outcome would be to increase the possible building area, and therefore, ultimately, the pressure at the centre. The time would come when London would be sixty miles across instead of its present somewhat indefinite diameter; and is this an eventuality that any one cares to contemplate? Besides, the workman's train reduces its victims to a life that could hardly be surpassed for discomfort and artificiality. That a man should live in one town and work in another shatters his local associations to an extent which renders him no citizen at all. Any one who has the courage to spend twenty-four hours at Liverpool Street Station will be compelled to realise how deadly a social curse is the workman's train. It is no cure for the evils we lament. It is an evil to be cured. It is like placing a cholera patient in a hospital reeking with small-pox.

And, if the truth be told, there has never been a more profound economic absurdity than the separation of a factory from its workpeople. Let us suppose the distance to be twenty miles. The miles need not all be in the same direction, for the *employés* may live in various localities. But every one of the *employés* must, wherever he resides, be carried up to work and back again, at particular hours of each day, and at a high rate of speed. Yet if the factory were itself established twenty miles from town, at some place where the *employés* could live

beneath its shadow, the railway would only have to transport goods traffic, at a low rate of speed, and at any convenient time, as, for instance, night. Again, the actual amount of the goods traffic—raw materials out, finished products back again—would be far less than the corresponding weight of passenger train; and it could be manipulated on the present railways, without waiting for the remarkable inventions that will be necessary if we are to arrive at the speeds and methods demanded by a further increase in passenger traffic.

In a previous part of this paper I explained how in an organised trade London wages exceeded those paid in the provinces. Unfortunately, hundreds of thousands of Londoners are employed irregularly and at miserable rates of pay by masters whose one reason for remaining in the Metropolis is the inexhaustible supply of cheap, unskilled, unorganised labour. Of course, every extension in London's housing accommodation must, in the end, play into the hands of these employers; and it does sometimes seem the kindest way to allow London to drift to its own impossibility if only for the sake of frightening away the deluded folk who will insist upon swelling the host of the semi-submerged. The fact that in certain industries it is cheaper to depend on London than on rural labour, if the fact be capable of proof, constitutes an awful warning of the damnation that awaits the State which acquiesces in an overgrown capital-seaport.

But the most innocent trade may not provide suitable employment in suitable proportions for the various sections into which every artisan community, large or small, is divided. Men, women, girls, boys—though not, let us hope, children—are to be provided in the village as in the city with regular work. In London and the large centres the law of averages is trusted to adjust employment to the varied needs of the wage-earners, and should there be a surplus of any particular class of the population, nobody realises it. A few more girls on the streets, a few more hooligans in gaol—that is all. But in a small town the idleness of even a small fraction of the community creates an impression. For instance, when the

London and North-Western Railway established carriage works at Wolverton it was found that there was a great shortage of women's employment. The Company therefore entered into negotiations with a large firm of printers, which established works at Wolverton for the express purpose of making the balance even. So satisfactory a solution may not be possible in every case, but in dealing with the problem we ought to remember that we are comparing the village, not with some Utopia, like a Kimberley compound, but with great cities in Britain, as they actually exist to-day, and especially with London. The question is not whether a particular village is certain to provide employment for every several member of every several family or not.

I grant that there may have to be a certain amount of travelling to and fro by train, and also migration from one centre to another. But under no circumstances could the locomotion involved be any way equal, family for family, to that which proves to be indispensable in the large cities, where practically the whole population travels by train twice a day.

During the last year there has been much criticism of our railways as a whole, prompted largely by a sweeping decline in dividends, and fanned into a flame by angry comparisons with French and American systems. The views which I would wish to express here have appeared anonymously in *Blackwood's Magazine*,¹ but the following cut-and-dried remarks may be of value :—

1. Inefficiency of railway management always creates the greatest inconvenience to industries in the smallest centres. Companies will treat a village to neglect that would never be dreamed of in the case of a large city. Even the South-Eastern and Chatham Railways have never punished the suburbs of London as they have Canterbury and the little towns in Kent. Local industries have been driven to bankruptcy by the exorbitant rates enforced and irregular services supplied by our premier monument of incompetence.

2. Until quite recently it was the settled policy of

¹ May, 1900, and January, 1901.

British railways to work with an inadequate number of goods waggons. Possibly the idea was to force traders to supply their own—a great hardship to the small fry, and, as it turned out, a great annoyance to traffic managers, since all sorts of complicated questions of repairs and inspection arise as between the owners of the rolling stock and the Companies that had to manipulate it. When the dearth of waggons became a scandal the practice was to collect all the spare vehicles from the local sidings and send them up, willy-nilly, to the big cities. The result was that factories in villages simply came to a standstill—in one case a quarry closed down for three days through the failure of the London and North-Western Railway to remove the finished stone. If the quarry could have been removed bodily to an overcrowded city, no doubt the proprietors would have been inclined to make the change. Public opinion has, however, compelled the Companies to build thousands of new trucks, though I remember seeing the written opinion of a director of a leading railway to the effect that too many waggons on a system choked the sidings! The delicious *naïveté* of this childlike defence amused me not a little and helped to explain the complaint of Mr. G. H. Turner, then General Manager of the Midland, who stated that he could easily utilise another 20,000 waggons if he had them. I always regret that I did not keep a photograph of the above-mentioned most interesting essay on railway management by a railway director.

3. Traders prefer towns served by more than one railway. They play off the canvassers of competing companies, one against another, and finally pay the bills due to neither! Nominally, the rates for two rival routes are equal, but all kinds of secret rebates are allowed in order to catch business. Railways in this country are further from consolidation than those in America, where, despite all laws to the contrary, a railway trust has been virtually established; but even with us the ruinous game of underhand competition must, in the end, be abandoned.

4. In this country it has become increasingly the practice to order goods frequently and in very small

quantities, so that for years the average weight of consignment has been decreasing. It is therefore difficult to provide from small centres an adequate service of goods trains, since such a service has to include waggons for so many different centres. Trucks have to run half-empty, a fact which disposes of much of the clamour for mammoth American freight cars, suitable, of course, in a land of long runs and comparatively infrequent deliveries. The manufacturer in a big town is sure of his regular daily goods communication with other big towns. In Germany the manufacturer is allowed a reduction in freight on condition that his consignment waits until it can be carried in a *full* waggon, in which, of course, there is a less proportion of dead weight to be hauled.

5. The terminal charges are fixed, whatever be the length of run. The longer the run, the less is the average cost of transport per mile. In Great Britain the average run is very much shorter than in the United States, a fact which appears to make our goods rates per mile look high. Our rates are very complicated, and there are tens of millions of them. But simplification is impossible without special legislation, since no rate may be levelled up without formal proof of additional cost of carriage, and therefore uniformity could only be attained by levelling down. The law is fairly clear, and traders have always the right to appeal to the Railway and Canal Commission, as against a raised rate. Indeed, an appeal by certain representative Scottish mineral masters is now pending against the leading Scottish railways. But the small village is, after all, completely in the hands of its railways, for the law is a "hass" that only a big man can ride. And sometimes it takes a combination.

6. The motor car has transformed every turnpike road into a long unprotected level crossing. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that light railways, albeit encouraged by the recent permissive legislation, will be hardly necessary after the automobile has been reduced to respectability. In France and Belgium light railways have, as a rule, failed to pay a fair interest on dividend invested even when most economically constructed, and when

relieved from the burdens of safety regulations. There has to be a guarantee from the State or a heavy railway. Whether an addition of industrial to agricultural traffic would alter the situation, it is hard to say. The great aim in a subsidiary line should be to reduce transshipments. Suppose it is necessary first to load a cart, then to transfer the load to a light railway waggon, and, finally, to transfer to the heavy train ; it will be seen that apart from haulage, there is a heavy bill to pay for labour. But a motor car places every farm or factory in the position of possessing a private siding ; and it enables the load to be carried, not simply to the nearest wayside station, but, in most cases, to the nearest junction.

7. Canals have been largely bought up by our railways in order that the community may be deprived of cheap transit for bulky goods. The Kaiser risks collisions with lumps of iron rather than give up unpopular canal schemes to connect, for instance, the Rhine and the Elbe ; but we in Great Britain think that apathy is a token of superiority. Yet canals, if managed with sense, would be a great help to depopulated localities ; and it is a scandal that they should be driven to decay.

8. In the United States it is said that a man can travel by the inter-state electric cars along the roads from north to south, and from ocean to ocean. These light railways—or rural tramways—are now being adapted to goods transit. Of course, when the wonderful network of lines was originated, there were no automobiles ; and in any case the surface of the average American turnpike road is not always conducive to speed or easy running. In Great Britain our highways are excellent—a fact which has probably militated against the development of the universal network of tramways.

9. In general, it may be said that no attempt is made in this country to study transport as a science. Occasionally a brilliant idea is adopted, but inventors are regarded as unconscionable nuisances ; and there is a tacit agreement among the powers that be to choke them off. There is no attempt to nurse provincial traffic. No measure that requires trouble or thought has the least chance of being

fairly considered. The man who proposes it is treated like a villain, unless he is a mere powerless enthusiast, in which case he is humoured and invited to talk, for the amusement of officials who have, apparently, leisure to listen to such conversation, provided it be distinctly understood that nothing practical is ever to come of it. It is universally recognised that our railways suffer greatly from the atrophy which afflicts their management. Individually, the officials are in many cases sincerely anxious to do their best. But it is etiquette to snore, even if really the sleeper is awake.

We are often informed that the land has gone out of cultivation, and irrevocably. It may be so, but at any rate we might grow our own vegetables (other than the human variety), and occasionally it is refreshing to taste a new-laid egg. There is no doubt that in a properly constituted village community, butter, eggs, vegetables, and a good deal of fruit would be grown locally. In many instances the workpeople themselves would take to gardening as a hobby, especially if the master had the sense to encourage such pursuits. But there would always be room for a regular market gardener, who could bring into cultivation an acre or two, and more if necessary. It is not pretended that this constitutes a settlement of the great agricultural problem of the last sixty years. But it is astonishing how much may be done by intelligent men of education towards inducing the artisan to provide food for himself.

As for education, it is hopeless in a big city. The only plan is to get the children into the fields. No doubt many of our village schools are grievously inefficient, while in London or Birmingham the exact contrary is true. But any one who travels up and down day by day on local railways, in the Metropolis must, if he has any discernment at all, become grievously dissatisfied with the finished product of the London Board School. The pedagogue has not a chance against the degrading influences that damn the finer senses. And the reason is obvious. God meant men to live in a world where natural, non-human sights and sounds, like the braying of an ass or the glory of a field of

buttercups, should on the whole predominate his leisure hours. It is not that these farmyard rusticities are always grateful, either to eye or ear. But they are wholesome. A city is a place where man has a monopoly, and where man is therefore almost wholly vile. Humanity is an admirable institution when it is well diluted, but we should ever consider that Adam and Eve—alone—were too human for the garden of Eden. Sectarianism and muddle may have worked the usual havoc with our educational system, but in the main it is the adequate village school which turns out the really successful men.

A yet more dangerous symptom is that in the big towns an increasing proportion of these children who do struggle precariously to a pasty-faced puberty are obviously only born with half a brain, which half is saturated in youth with all the filth—pictorial, verbal, and dietary—that a rotten civilisation can devise. These are the "hands" that the employer has to employ, if he persists in glueing his factory to an eligible central situation on the Thames, where the devil has a monopoly of men, women, and children. And what chance has he with such human instruments of competing successfully against nations which realise the value of health and happiness to an artisan or to a factory girl? The manufacturer who is truly up to date will recognise that just as his machinery must be of the latest, so his *employés* must be "all there"—full of vigour, instinct with loyalty, filled with *esprit de corps* and a devotion to the locality which flourishes by their toil. The apathy which we display towards these considerations, our utter failure to appreciate the financial value of a carefully trained workman, and our consequent neglect of all those measures which would secure to us intelligence in the artisan classes, are akin to our idiotic helplessness in the face of the new situation created by American and German improvements in machinery. If only our capitalists were Christians, they would be better men of business. Their religion would impel them to consider the happiness of their *employés*, and indirectly they would find that their profits would increase, owing to the enhanced capability of each wage-

earner. Yet even as it is, a millowner, who will definitely establish a village industry, will, *ipso facto*, have the pick of every respectable and God-fearing working man in the trade. Ask the proprietors of Port Sunlight if this is not the case.

VI

SOME ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM OF CHARITY¹

THERE can be no doubt that the condition of the people of Great Britain as a whole has greatly improved during the past century, and that the poorer classes have fully shared in the general advance.² But though this is a fact, at which all who have the interests of the country at heart must rejoice, it affords no justification for that kind of indolent optimism, which would act as though the existing state of affairs was perfect. There is still a vast problem before the statesman and the philanthropist. All over the country there are numerous families whose resources are too small to enable them to cope with any sudden misfortune, while in our large towns, and especially in London, there exists a mass of misery and degradation of an apparently permanent character. Overcrowded and insanitary dwellings still stand out in gloomy contrast to

¹ The purpose of this article is to focus some of the things that are already known, rather than to break new ground. The writer is unable to claim that practical experience of life in the poorer parts of London which his fellow-essayists possess, and has therefore thought it well to give references to authorities (when possible to Mr. Charles Booth) for such statements of fact as he has had occasion to make. Upon the whole subject he is indebted to books or articles by Mr. Booth, Professor Marshall, Miss Octavia Hill, Canon Barnett, Mr. C. S. Loch, Mrs. Bernard Bosanquet, Miss Dend, Mr. Mackay, and others. His sincere thanks are also due to Mrs. Alfred Marshall, who has very kindly supplied him with many useful criticisms and suggestions.

² Cf. Professor Marshall, "Economics of Industry," p. 774.

the luxurious homes of wealthy men. There are still the shiftless and the workless, the victims of accident and misfortune, the sickly, the vicious, and the starving, still—

“those mute myriads that speak loud to us :
Men with the wives, and women with the babes,
And all these making prayer to only live !”

Mr. Charles Booth estimates that 30 per cent. of the population of London are either ‘poor’ or ‘very poor,’ the ‘poor’ being those who have a sufficiently regular though bare income, such as 18s. to 21s. per week for a moderate family, and the ‘very poor’ those who, from any cause, fall much below this standard.¹ In the fourth week of last December the ratepayers of London were supporting over 100,000 persons, nearly 70 per cent. of whom were receiving indoor relief ; while on one day in January, 1899, the total number of persons in receipt of relief (exclusive of vagrants) in the United Kingdom amounted to some thousands over a million.²

Strenuous efforts are being made both by public and private agencies to deal with the problem which these figures reveal. In London alone the gross annual expenditure upon legal relief is nearly three and a half million pounds. Private charity contributes large sums both directly and through hospitals and asylums, while many persons all over the country devote the best of their time, thought, and labour to work among the poor. Mr. Lecky goes so far as to say that, in his opinion, “there has never been a period in England, or in any other country, where more time, thought, money, and labour were bestowed on the alleviation of suffering, or in which a larger number of men and women of all classes threw themselves more earnestly and more habitually into unselfish causes.”³

But in spite of this, it cannot be denied that in many quarters there is still considerable apathy with regard to social questions. In London there are coming to be two

¹ “Life and Labour of the People of London,” vol. i. p. 33, and vol. ii. p. 21.

² Annual Abstract of Labour Statistics, 1898-1899, p. 100.

³ “Democracy and Liberty,” vol. i. p. 205.

separate cities, the one of the 'haves' and the other of the 'have-nots'; and everywhere the majority of the rich are often shut off by an impassable barrier from the poor among whom they live, passing between the rows of their houses every day, but never witnessing or imagining what manner of life they lead, and therefore never experiencing those stirrings of sympathy which the spectacle of its dreariness might be expected to arouse. Thus their affections are concentrated, and their gifts are showered, upon friends of their own station, whose need for them is small. "This is wonderful—oh, wonderful!" says Ruskin, of the gentle English lady, "to see her, with every innocent feeling fresh within her, go out in the morning into her garden to play with the fringes of its guarded flowers, and lift their heads when they are drooping, with her happy smile upon her face, and no cloud upon her brow, because there is a little wall around her place of peace; and yet she knows in her heart, if she would only look for its knowledge, that outside of that little rose-covered wall the wild grass to the horizon is torn up by the agony of men, and beat level by the drift of their life-blood." To those who are wounded in the industrial warfare the poor are more generous than the rich, because they can realise their position more clearly, and enter more fully into their feelings. We have the authority of Mr. Charles Booth for the statement that "the poorest people give the most in proportion to what they have in charity. The widow's mite is a recurring fact of daily life, and no credit is claimed for it."¹ But the keen sympathy of the poor is always handicapped by lack of means, and sometimes rendered positively harmful by lack of wisdom. The leisured classes possess larger means and better opportunities for acquainting themselves with sound principles of charity, and therefore society is entitled to demand of them, not merely a more sympathetic interest in social questions, but a real contribution towards their solution. At present, however, many of them either give, without inquiry, to all who are sufficiently importunate, or else reinforce their natural selfishness by the reflection that

¹ "Life and Labour of the People," vol. iv. p. 427.

alms-giving is contrary to 'the laws of political economy,' and refrain from giving at all. A superficial acquaintance with economic theory enables them to argue that since many forms of charity do more harm than good, it is better to keep on the safe side, and have nothing to do with any form of it. But, obviously, this conclusion is fallacious, and the only inference that can fairly be drawn from the premises points to the extreme importance of learning to distinguish between good and bad methods of charitable action.

In order that this may be possible, it is first necessary to make clear the precise meaning which is attached to the term 'charity,' and the purpose at which charitable action aims. There are some philosophers who maintain that the ultimate goal, for which all men should strive, is the realisation of the greatest possible sum of pleasurable feeling in the world, and there are others who hold that character and not happiness is the all-important thing. Fortunately it is unnecessary for any one engaged in the practical work of charity to decide between these two views, because his course of action would have to be very much the same whichever he adopted. If he reforms a degraded character, by converting the drunkard to sobriety, or the vicious to a moral life, he at the same time turns him into a more efficient worker, who is better able to earn enough for a comfortable, happy, and independent life. On the other hand, if he finds a family occupying a filthy and overcrowded room, in a half-starving condition and without any of the decencies, not to say comforts, of life, he will find it exceedingly difficult to elevate their character without first doing something to improve the miserable circumstances of their lives. Thus, whatever view he may take about the 'ultimate good,' his direct aim is to improve *both* character *and* material conditions. Since, however, this is the avowed object of many whose work would not generally be classed under the head of charity, it is hardly narrow enough to serve for the basis of a definition. The purpose of charity, whether public or private, may therefore be distinguished from that of general philanthropy by a reference to the fact that those

whom it seeks to benefit are the poor and the unfortunate. Thus, the case may be put briefly by saying that it is the business of wise charity to alleviate distress without injuring character, and with the hope even of elevating it in the process, if that should turn out to be possible.

If this be accepted as the 'end' of charity, the practical problem which has to be faced is that of discovering the best means for attaining it. The whole question is made exceedingly complex by the great differences that exist in the circumstances of those whom it is desired to help, and in the causes which have brought about their misfortune. It is, *primâ facie*, improbable that any single remedy will be applicable to every case, even though certain symptoms may be common to them all. When a doctor is summoned to the bedside of a sufferer, he pays attention to the symptoms, not for their own sake, but for the sake of what they indicate. He does not necessarily attack the pain directly by means of some 'dull narcotic,' but tries to discover the cause to which it is due, and makes it his business to remove that. The social worker, also, must deal with causes and not with their results, if his work is to be really useful. It is little to the point for him to help a drunkard back to the situation he has lost, if no change has been wrought in the habits to which the loss of it was due, for though distress may be alleviated in this way for the moment, it is practically certain to recur. There is, indeed, one form of help which is equally applicable to all cases of distress, whatever their origin may have been. This is that personal sympathy and advice which it is always in the power of real friends to give, whatever be the station of those whom they seek to comfort. Personal sympathy is perhaps already a greater force for good in the lives of the poor than material gifts can ever become. But under present conditions material help is also often needed, and it is therefore important to ascertain the principles and methods in accordance with which it can be most usefully employed. The following pages will be devoted almost entirely to an attempt to arrive at some conclusions upon these points.

If, as has been suggested, it is with the causes of distress that wise charity is primarily concerned, it is clear that before material help can safely be given in any particular case, a very careful examination of all the circumstances must be made. The practice of charity is as ill-adapted as that of medicine to be guided by mere rules of thumb ; for these cannot be of much use in revealing the whole cause of distress in any particular instance, and can only suggest appropriate remedies in certain typical cases, which necessarily lack many of the details that are likely to be met with in real life.

It is, however, possible to draw up some kind of a rough classification of the different people who are likely to need help, and so to indicate the nature of the problem more clearly. The broadest division that can be made is between cases of distress resulting from temporary misfortune and that form of social disease, which may be described as 'chronic poverty,' and is almost always accompanied by degradation of character. This distinction is parallel to that subsisting between the temporary illness of a normally healthy man and the ailments of a chronic invalid. In neither case is there any clear dividing line, and in both the temporary malady is liable, if neglected, to become chronic. A doctor's duty towards the invalid is to try to keep him in as healthy a state as is possible under the circumstances, but he can hardly expect to cure him altogether ; while in his dealings with ordinary illness the chief danger he has to guard against is such a weakening of the constitution as may cause a temporary malady to degenerate into a permanent one.

The difficulties which have to be faced are greatest in respect of chronic cases. The problem is to find the best means of improving the circumstances of that more or less permanently dependent class, of which the aged poor and the 'submerged Tenth' constitute two principal sections. This second division comprises not merely paupers who are legally chargeable on the rates, but also all persons who subsist to any considerable extent upon the charity of individuals or of private societies, and thus corresponds broadly to Mr. Booth's Class B, in

which he places 7·5 per cent. of the population of London.¹ It includes some who have belonged to it for practically all their days, and others who have fallen into it through failure in the battle of life. The latter will generally be those whom charity has failed to save from the evil effects of temporary misfortunes or moral frailties. Some inquiry will be made later on into the methods by which it may endeavour to help them before they have sunk to the ranks of the submerged ; but for the present we are concerned with the separate problem of how to restore those who, in spite of all its efforts, have sunk to this low level. The great difficulty of the problem is due to the fact that partly as a result, and partly as a cause, of the unhappy circumstances of their lives, they generally exhibit radical defects of nature. Either through lack of bodily strength, or of intelligence, or of moral fibre, or of all three, they are inefficient or unwilling workers, and consequently unable to support themselves. One writer goes so far as to describe their general characteristics in the following terms : " In place of foresight we find the happy faith that ' something will turn up,' and instead of self-control, that impulsive recklessness which may lead indifferently to a prodigal generosity or an almost inconceivable selfishness." They are often so degraded in intellect as to be incapable of distinguishing their right from their left hand, or of recognising the numbers of their own houses ; their bodies are feeble and without stamina, their affections are warped, and they scarcely know what family life means. It is not to be expected that any complete remedy for such a condition of things can be found, but it is possible that some practical hints as to the way in which the evil can best be met may be obtained by tracing out its underlying causes. Among these, physical, intellectual, and moral causes may be roughly distinguished from one another. All of them are resident in the persons of the dependent population, and not in their external conditions, but can be reached in a more or less satisfactory way through these conditions. Thus, bodily weakness, being largely

¹ " Life and Labour," vol. ii. p. 21.

due to the unhealthy surroundings, among which the poor of the great cities live, may be mitigated, to some extent, by improved sanitation, while intellectual and moral defects may be combated directly by educational and moralising agencies. Since, however, in any particular case, physical, moral, and intellectual causes are almost sure to be present in combination, it is desirable that the different kinds of remedies should be applied in connection with one another.

There is, for example, a danger that if we try to improve the physical surroundings of the very poor by offering them more sanitary dwellings, without at the same time educating them in habits of cleanliness and care, they may very soon reduce their new homes to a condition nearly as bad as that of the tenements they occupied before.¹ On the other hand educational influences can hardly be brought to bear with any effect upon people in a state of abject physical misery. Mental and moral instruction should, as far as possible, go hand in hand with an amelioration of material conditions, but care should be taken by those in charge of such schemes not to encourage hypocrisy by seeming to make an appearance of moral improvement the condition for winning more comfortable surroundings.

There are several agencies in England which attempt to restore some part of the submerged class to a state of independence by working along the lines indicated above. Of these, the Labour Homes connected with the Church Army and the Salvation Army, and the Labour Colonies belonging to the latter body are the most important. It is impossible, in the space at our disposal, to give more than a general indication of the lines upon which these institutions work. An excellent account of their aims, methods, and results is contained in a paper prepared by Mr. Noel Buxton, and printed in the report of the twenty-fifth annual South-Eastern Poor Law Conference. He defines a Labour Home as "a combination of a boarding-

¹ Their physical surroundings may, however, be improved by the provision of open spaces and playgrounds with excellent results; for these are directly educational in their effects, and, since the poor are neither able nor anxious to provide them for themselves, cannot have a pauperising influence.

house and a place of labour, whether in town or country, where those who are not at present self-supporting may be helped to become so by regaining their health and hopefulness and energy, perhaps by learning useful work, and by being helped to find a situation. It is a reformatory ; it is not a temporary shelter, nor is it (as the workhouse) intended to be a permanent provision for any class." Admission to the Salvation Army's Homes is free to all, but the Church Army will take no one over forty-five years of age, and endeavours to select cases which show a reasonable prospect of reform. As far as possible it works its Homes in close co-operation with Boards of Guardians, who are permitted by the Local Government Board to make payments towards their support. Cases that seem to be hopeful are often handed over by them for treatment in these institutions, and the satisfactory character of some of the results is shown by the following letter from the Chairman of the Paddington Guardians, which is quoted in the Church Army Blue Book for 1900. He writes that " the Guardians could give the inmates of the workhouse casual wards work, but they could not give them *backbone*. That, however, was what the Church Army had succeeded in doing in a number of cases sent to them from the Paddington Workhouse." The object aimed at is to combine the discipline of hard work with fairly attractive surroundings, and the personal influence of a carefully chosen captain. It is hoped by these means to build up character again, and so to fit men for the regular work which the Homes make it their business to try to find for them. The work found is generally private employment, but the Farm Labour Home also undertakes to prepare men for emigration. The length of time during which a man remains in a Home is not generally more than four months, and though, of course, there are many failures, especially in those institutions to which admission is unrestricted, there are also many instances of broken-down men who are restored, by their means, to a decent and independent life. Thus, according to the Church Army's Blue Book, out of 1,155 men and lads who were admitted to their

London Homes in 1899, about 500 may be regarded as completely successful cases, while out of 1,861 received into the provincial homes about 700 may be so regarded.

It is true that there are no means of ascertaining how far the value of these figures may be impaired by the inclusion, as 'successful cases,' of men who obtain situations, only to lose them again immediately; but when full allowance has been made for errors of this kind, it will hardly be denied that, with wise administration, the Homes may be made to render a real service to society. It seems improbable, however, that their work touches more than a small fraction of those who sink yearly to the ranks of the submerged class, while it must be remembered also that it reaches practically none of the lifelong members of that class. Indeed, it seems almost impossible to deal satisfactorily with the great bulk of the adult portion of the residual population. The observation which Mr. Lockwood makes about the inmates of the workhouse applies equally well to those who subsist on private charity: "nine-tenths of those under fifty have drifted into chargeability owing to mental or physical flabbiness (often congenital), of which a complete and lasting cure is in the great majority of cases impossible." Dismal though the conclusion may be, it appears certain that only a very little can be done towards extricating such adult persons as are at any moment to be numbered among the Residuum from the condition to which they have fallen. In the children, however, there is more plastic material to deal with. They are more susceptible to improving influences than their parents, and if they can be taken away from the travesty of family life to which they are condemned, may sometimes be fairly started on an independent career. If this can be done, there is a double gain, for not only are the children themselves saved from an existence of misery and squalor, but charity, in saving them, has saved their children also, and has thus checked the stream of degradation and distress which is continually flowing on from one generation to the next.

It would, however, be very difficult to formulate a comprehensive scheme by which the State or private

charity should undertake to keep and train the children of the lowest class, which would not be open to the criticism that it encouraged improvidence among their parents, and offered them an opportunity of indulging their passions, while at the same time guaranteeing to them immunity from the cost and responsibility naturally attaching thereto. Consequently it seems hardly possible that any such scheme could succeed unless adequate measures were at the same time taken for coping with this danger. Indeed, there is little prospect that a final solution of the problem will ever be achieved if public opinion cannot be brought to sanction, either the forcible detention of the wreckage of society, or the adoption of some other means to check them from propagating their species.¹ Proposals of this kind appear upon the surface to be stern and cruel, but apparent hardness to one generation may turn out to be kindness to the race, when the interests of posterity are duly considered. In view, however, of the violent interference with individual liberty, which they necessarily involve, the present writer is unwilling to do more than suggest the propriety of examining them impartially, and is certainly not prepared to recommend their immediate adoption.

Another large section of the chronically dependent class consists of those who have reached this state merely on account of old age. Old age is put first among the causes of pauperism by Mr. Charles Booth, who refers to "the undeniable fact that of those over sixty-five in nearly all parts of England and under almost all possible conditions, nearly 20 per cent. are constantly, and nearly 30 per cent. are, either constantly or occasionally, constrained to seek relief under the poor law with the evidence that it was age and nothing else that brought this about, as the proportions so relieved are extraordinarily less below sixty-five, and rise steadily from sixty-five years of age upwards."² But though this is true, and though it also appears from the returns that the paupers over sixty-five years

¹ Cf. Mr. Booth's discussion of "limited socialism" in chap. vi. vol. i, of the "Life and Labour of the People of London."

² *Economic Journal*, June, 1899.

of age comprise nearly a quarter of the whole number dealt with by the Poor Law, it must be observed that the problem of old-age pauperism has a smaller relative importance than these figures seem at first sight to indicate, because, since these old people are no longer capable of having children, the evils of their unfortunate condition are not fruitful of new evils in the future. Nevertheless, though its importance must not be exaggerated, the problem is undoubtedly grave. Many plans for dealing with it have been advocated, including several widely known schemes for State-aided pensions for the old, the merits of which cannot be discussed here. The writer's own opinion is that any general centrally organised scheme would be dangerous as well as costly, and that the best way to deal with the question is by careful local inquiry into the merits and needs of individual cases. It is practically certain that very many of the aged must for some time to come be 'chronically dependent' upon somebody, but of course their position is very different from that of the residual class, nor need any stigma attach to the support which the deserving among them receive, whether it be derived from public or private charity. Consequently, a brief notice of their case forms a natural link between the preceding discussion of the methods by which the chronically dependent may be helped, and an inquiry into those which should be employed to prevent others of the poor from becoming 'submerged.'

It is to this problem that we must now turn, inquiring in particular how independent families who have suffered some sudden misfortune may best be saved from sinking under the weight of it into a state of chronic poverty. In practical life the social worker is certain to meet with questions of extreme difficulty, towards the solution of which broad statements of principle can afford very little help. But, unfortunately, the practice of many amateur philanthropists is such as to afford opportunity for the application of certain negative rules of conduct, which can be easily described. It is difficult for charitable persons to discover the right way to prevent any particular misfortune wearing its victim down, but it is comparatively

simple for them to refrain from such action as is calculated to produce misfortune. And yet at the present time there can be little doubt that a large proportion of the evils, that Charity is continually endeavouring to cure, are the direct result of the foolish benevolence of persons who honestly believe themselves to be working in her service. By giving to people, without further inquiry, simply because they look poor, or have a plausible story to tell, they set a premium upon a poverty-stricken appearance, and inspire a general belief that it is possible to live in fair comfort without doing any work. They thus hold out the strongest possible inducement to independent men to give up that struggle, without which independence cannot be maintained. By scattering pence to all and sundry they gradually spread the doctrine that in this enlightened age he, who will not work, may nevertheless eat his fill, and need have no fear about the prospect that lies before him in the lucrative profession of begging.

The harm which is done by charity of this kind is especially great when its bounty is extended to boys and girls, because in that case their parents are tempted to encourage them to loaf about the streets instead of learning a trade, and thus to acquire habits of idleness which will probably stick to them all through life. The following extract from a report recently issued by the Whitechapel Guardians bears emphatic testimony to the harm that is unconsciously done by misdirected kindness : "In London there is an army of loafers, living on gifts obtained in the streets ; a pretext being sometimes made of selling matches, bootlaces, or flowers from house to house, or of singing, or of opening cab doors, or helping ladies to enter their own houses, and at other times directly begging, whether of men or boys, or women with children, frequently hired for the purpose. This of itself is an evil calling for a remedy. But still more is the moral corruption of those who might, but for the facility of 'picking up a living' in this way, get into regular work, and lead useful lives. It is only necessary to recall how many boys from fourteen to eighteen are to be seen looking out for a job, or at a cab door, in order to realise

the temptations to loafing which are due to unwise gifts."

There is a London Society called the "Destitute Children's Dinner Society," from a recent report of which the following is an extract: "Many of the poor mothers brought their children to the hall-door, and begged us to give them a dinner as they had no money to pay for it, or food at home to give them. Not one was ever turned away."¹ This statement is evidently intended to arouse the reader's sympathetic admiration, but it displays a lamentable ignorance of the most elementary principles of charity. Apart altogether from the premium on hypocrisy which such a society affords, it diminishes the motive that impels the father to work, and to refrain from drinking his earnings away, and, to a certain extent, it weakens the prudential check upon large families. No one can refuse to sympathise with destitute children, and no one would deny that charity ought sometimes to feed and clothe them; but to make a general offer to feed any destitute child who may be brought to a particular place at a particular time, without any proof of destitution except the mother's word, simply results in an immense increase in the number of those children who appear to be destitute. A parallel case is not far to seek; for the children of the lowest class are frequently sent to school without a meal, not because their parents are unable to provide one, but because "experience has taught them that the child who goes fasting to school generally brings home at night a little ticket which enables the father to postpone the problem of next day a little longer."² One of the unkindest things that it is possible to do for the children of the poor is to teach their parents that profit can be made by sending them about the streets half-clothed and half-starved. If turning them out to beg with bleeding feet is likely to result in a gift of boots, which the mother can pawn for the price of a drunken debauch, many children will be turned out in this condition every day; and if a bruised

¹ Quoted with approbation by Mr. Burdett-Coutts in the *Times* of December 15, 1900.

² H. Dendy, "The Children of Working London," in "Aspects of the Social Problem," edited by Bosanquet, p. 41.

face and trembling hands add to the prospect of the much-coveted dole, care will be taken that these signs of grace also are conspicuously present. It is not for a moment suggested that the great bulk of the poor are without feelings of affection towards their children. On the contrary, in many cases care and love for them may be the one bright spot in otherwise darkened lives. But there must always be some in every class whose affections are warped and distorted, and there may perhaps be others, among the very poor, in whom misery has sufficed to quench the kindlier promptings of nature. To offer to such people an additional inducement to ill-treat their children is a strange and cruel act to perform in the name of charity. It were better for the children of the slums to be left utterly alone than to be cared for in such a way ; and as their would-be benefactors pass by, smiling with satisfaction at the thought of a kindly deed, the fierce appeal which Macaulay puts into the mouth of Virginius comes vividly to mind :—

"Nay, by the shades below you, and by the Gods above,
Add not unto your cruel hate your yet more cruel love."

But though it is the children who suffer the most from mistaken generosity, all classes of the poor are greatly injured by it, whether the charitable agency be the State, or the individual, or a private society. A striking illustration of this fact is afforded by the history of the English Poor Law. Towards the end of the eighteenth century there was a great deal of distress in England, owing partly to the sudden displacement of labour by mechanical inventions, the decay of the old guild system, the disappearance of small farms, and the French War. The Speenhamland justices therefore decided in 1795 that whenever any one in their district was earning wages below a certain fixed sum the deficiency should be made up out of the rates. The more numerous a man's family, the greater was the income guaranteed to him. This policy was soon adopted all over the country, with the most disastrous results. The condition of those who failed to support themselves

became better than that of those who, by hard effort, maintained their independence, for the latter were obliged to contribute towards the support of the former. There was no longer any check upon early marriage and large families, since every additional child meant an extra dole of eighteenpence a week from the parish. Consequently, the cost of poor relief rose by leaps and bounds, and the spirit of independence among the working classes was almost entirely destroyed. The offer of indiscriminate assistance to paupers had the effect of making paupers of many who had until then been independent. The stringent Poor Law Reform of 1834 put an end to the Speenhamland system, but its disastrous effects upon the working classes have hardly yet been eliminated.

Indiscriminate charity on the part of private persons operates in precisely the same way. Its effect, though less marked, is similar in kind. Whenever there is a general expectation that paupers, *quâ* paupers, will be enabled to live comfortably at the expense of other people, the inducement for those who are just above the line of pauperism to exert themselves to keep above it is diminished. Thus the ranks of the professional tramps are largely recruited by persons who hope to make a living by lying ingeniously to a stupid and sentimental public; and the slums of London are partly filled by people, or the descendants of people, who have migrated to the metropolis, in the expectation of making something out of the vices, follies, and charities of its rich and thoughtless citizens.¹ An illustration of this principle may be found in the fact that the erection of certain free shelters for the accommodation of homeless persons was followed by so great an increase in the numbers of the homeless, that five years afterwards four thousand more of them are said to have been accommodated than were to be found in the whole of London when the shelters were first erected.² Individuals or societies who endeavour to relieve distress by general methods of this kind are in nine cases out of ten responsible for the very existence of the greater part of the distress which they relieve.

¹ Cf. Prof. Marshall, *Contemporary Review*, September, 1874.

It may seem as though the acceptance of this principle involves a condemnation of the existing system of workhouse relief, for the authorities of these institutions are bound by law to provide for any one who is willing to enter them and abide by their regulations. The prospect of support, which is thus held out to any one who may fail to earn an independent livelihood, tends to diminish the motive for exertion, and so indirectly to increase the number of those who need to be supported. In proportion as the conditions of workhouse life are made more pleasant for those destitute persons, who have a right to demand admittance to it simply on account of their destitution, and without any reference to past character or conduct, the greater becomes the temptation to idleness which the State holds out to the poor.

But this is a difficulty which it is impossible to avoid among a people whose natural humanity would shrink in horror from the idea that any among them could be allowed to die of starvation in the streets. Further, since the State provides for the maintenance of the convicted members of the criminal class, it would be putting a direct premium upon crime if it refused to guarantee subsistence to the merely destitute. There can, therefore, be no doubt that it is right for it to give this guarantee, especially as any harmful influence it might have upon character can be almost entirely eliminated if all persons, whom the State maintains upon the ground of destitution alone, are compelled to submit to conditions of life considerably inferior to those engaged by the poorest of those who succeed in maintaining themselves.

Thus the canon of charity which forbids the giving of relief without careful inquiry into the causes which have brought about distress in each particular case, breaks down to some extent in the face of absolute destitution. But even here it is necessary to distinguish those who are really destitute from those who only pretend to be so, and under the English Poor Law this discrimination is generally exercised by means of the workhouse test.

The broad principle that indiscriminate charity is to be condemned may therefore be maintained. But the

problem of how best to save poor families from sinking into chronic dependence is one to which no merely negative principle can afford an adequate solution. If it be granted that charity should be discriminating in its action, it is still necessary to ask upon what principles it ought to decide whether to give or to withhold assistance in any particular case, and what form of assistance is likely to serve its purpose best. Though it is clearly impossible to discuss the problem in detail, the general attitude which the social worker should adopt towards it may be fairly well indicated by the consideration of a few typical cases.

When an independent family is struck down by sudden misfortune it might at first sight seem certain that they ought to be helped over the difficult time and supplied with the means of making a fresh start. But this cannot be done with safety if the misfortune is one against which the family could reasonably have been expected to provide. For, in these circumstances, to save them from the natural consequences of their omission might lead, not only that particular family, but many others of the same class, to neglect to make provision for future necessities, however easily these could be foreseen. It might thus tend to promote recklessness and want of foresight, and so to augment the numbers of those whom sudden misfortunes break down. The case of a family that falls into distress through inability on the part of the breadwinner to find work may be taken to illustrate this point. If the cause of his non-employment be a normal seasonal variation in the demand for a particular kind of labour, as, for example, for that of bricklayers and painters during the winter months, it is dangerous for private charity to come to his assistance. Ought he not to have prepared for the probable falling-off in demand either by direct saving, or by fitting himself for some other work, in case the frost should interfere with his summer occupation? But if, on the other hand, he is a cotton operative, and a civil war in the United States cuts off a large part of the raw material of his industry, the difficulty with which he is confronted is not one for which he could fairly have

been expected to provide, and unless there exists some out-of-work benefit association, which it can be shown that he ought to have joined, it is a wise act of charity to help him with a liberal supply of the necessaries of life until further employment can be found for him.

The case of sickness is similar in many respects, the chief difference being that it is generally easier for a man to join a sick benefit club than one which gives out-of-work pay to its members. If a man has been in such a position that he could have joined a benefit club, and has failed to do so, there is a *primâ facie* case against charitable aid ; while at the other end of the scale, if he has joined a club, but, when he falls ill, has not been a member long enough to be entitled to draw on its funds, there need be no hesitation about relieving him. In the former case, however, the *primâ facie* verdict need not necessarily be confirmed on closer inquiry, for though a man may have had opportunities of joining a club, he may quite well have thought that his surplus earnings could be better employed in thoroughly educating his children than in insuring himself against the chance of an illness into which he might never fall. And further, even if his omission was due merely to thoughtlessness, or to an unwise preference for present pleasure over future security, the dangerous consequences, which charitable assistance tends to bring in its train, might sometimes be guarded against by milder measures than the complete refusal of relief. The thriftlessness, that is produced in those who are unwisely helped, and in others who get to hear of their case, does not arise immediately out of the fact that charity has come to their aid in the past, but from the expectation that it will do so again in the future. The immediate effect of relieving distress is almost always good, so that where the distributors of charity are skilful and sympathetic enough to eliminate the more remote bad consequences, even relatively undeserving families may be safely helped. It may be made very clear, for example, that if they are helped now the father will be expected to join a benefit club as soon as he gets well ; it may be stated emphatically that they are helped only after hesita-

tion, and that their case will not be treated as a precedent; and finally, if those who are dealing with the case succeed in rousing genuine feelings of gratitude, the man they relieve, instead of being demoralised, is very likely, in the future, to become more thrifty, careful, and industrious simply in order to please them.

The whole of the foregoing argument¹ depends upon the assumption that it is desirable for the poor, as far as possible, to make provision for the contingencies of life. There are some, however, who would reply that, in view of the miserable wages they receive, it is cruel and unreasonable to expect them to do more than scrape through life from day to day, letting the evil of the morrow take care of itself. They are hardly enough treated, it is urged, even when all goes smoothly for them; and it is surely not too much to ask that society should step in to help them unconditionally in the day of their misfortune. There is a considerable element of truth in this contention, but it does not really touch the point, since no one is so foolish as to demand evidence of an impossible amount of thrift from the poor, who come to ask the aid of charity. All that is asked is evidence of such thrift and foresight as could reasonably be expected under the circumstances, and if it can be shown that, through no special fault of his own, a man's wages have been so low, or his necessary expenses so high, that he could not fairly have been expected to join a club, his omission to do so need be no bar to his receiving charitable help in sickness or old age.

From what has been said it is clear that the most careful thought and inquiry are necessary before it can be settled whether or no relief shall be given in any particular case of distress. But the social worker, even when he confines his attention to those cases of distress which are due to specific misfortunes, has to do more than decide upon the advisability of supplying the sufferers with the necessaries of life during their time of need. Their difficulty may be one which can be satisfactorily met only by giving them a

¹ This does not refer to the first part of the essay, in which the problem of the Residuum is discussed.

fresh start in a new trade or locality. Thus, the family's poverty may result from the gradual withdrawal from the neighbourhood of the trade at which the father is accustomed to work. In this case he must either be taught a new trade or be helped to migrate to a place where his services are more in demand. He is probably ignorant of the general state of the labour market, and may be greatly assisted by advice. Perhaps he is unwilling to move and inclined to let things jog along in the vague hope of something turning up, or he may be unable to undertake the expense of changing his home. In such circumstances the worst possible policy is to keep on supplying his family with small doles, for it will only confirm him in his inertia, and perhaps lead to his becoming permanently dependent. On the other hand, the expenditure of a considerable sum in helping him to move and settle in a new home may very likely put him in the way of leading a useful, honourable, and independent life.

The administrator of charity may also have to deal with cases in which the head of the family is permanently incapacitated for his old trade by an accident or an illness, and yet is still fit for other kinds of work. It would be a very poor kind of generosity that looked after his family while he was sick, and did nothing for him afterwards. If the case is to be properly treated, he will very likely have to be given the special training and the implements necessary to enable him to make a new start in some other occupation.

The cases that have been referred to are, of course, nothing more than illustrations, but they are fairly typical of that class of problems, in which families that have hitherto been living an independent life suddenly find their material resources diminished, or their needs increased, by some misfortune. The business of charity is to fill the gap which is thus made without rendering the particular family and others similarly situated less resolute to keep it closed by their own exertions in the future. The danger that threatens is twofold. On the other hand, if no help is given, the temporary deficiency of material resources may lead to misery, weakness, bad work, and low wages,

and thence to an ever-growing wretchedness and deterioration of character. On the other hand, injudicious help may affect character directly by destroying the spirit of independence and turning an honest man into a cringing hypocrite, while the example of his profitable poverty is sure to tempt others into the same evil way. Since the problem of material distress is so largely one of character, it is clear that the exclusive employment of strict business principles can never be adequate for its solution, but that the steady exercise of personal influence, of kindly counsel and sincere and open friendship is an integral part of all genuine charitable work.

All that has been said with reference to the methods and principles of a wise charity has necessarily been vague. But it becomes still more difficult to arrive at a definite conclusion, when it is remembered that the practical problem is not merely to decide what ought to be done if every one was wise enough to do it, but what ought to be done by those who have studied the question in the existing state of general opinion. Thus, it is almost impossible to lay down rules for the guidance of charitable bodies in a particular district without careful enquiry into local customs and habits. The principle that would seem to be best, if every one acted upon it, may not be the best in a place where it is rejected by a considerable section of the people. It may, for example, be, on the whole, advisable, when a branch of the Charity Organisation Society is started in a town, where the richer inhabitants have been accustomed to give largely and recklessly, for it to adopt methods which its own members would unhesitatingly condemn as unduly lax if they were employed elsewhere ; for if its methods are very strict, the rich inhabitants will probably altogether disregard it, and continue their harmful gifts as before, whereas, if it adopts a rather less stringent system, some of them may be induced to act on its advice, with the result that there will be a smaller amount of misdirected almsgiving.

There is a further difficulty in the fact that the methods of Boards of Guardians must influence, and be influenced in turn by, those of local Charity Organisation committees.

Indeed, the spheres of the State, of voluntary societies, and of private individuals are so intimately connected that it is impossible to say what any one of them ought to do, without knowing exactly what the others are doing. Thus the task of the theorist becomes simpler in proportion as the different charitable institutions of the country work in harmony with one another, and determine the ground that each shall cover according to some definite plan.

But apart from considerations of this kind, there are other great advantages to be derived from a thorough organisation and a close interlocking of the various associations devoted to benevolent purposes, while if it were found possible to co-ordinate the efforts of individual philanthropists in a similar manner the advantages gained would be still more conspicuous. The London Charity Organisation Society and its branches have indeed succeeded in making some advance in this direction; but there are still many places, in which either the small numbers, or the lack of enterprise of the inhabitants, have made it impossible as yet to establish a local committee; and even where committees are to be found in full working order, much charitable work is often attempted without consultation with them. Consequently there is a certain amount of overlapping in the work of different agencies, which causes labour to be wasted in double sets of inquiries, and occasionally enables the practised cadger to get relief several times over. That it is possible in many cases to surmount the difficulty of interlocking the different agencies is apparent from what has already been done. Very often, for example, the Board of Guardians and the local Charity Organisation committee have a few common members who bring the two bodies into touch, while the relief agencies connected with religious societies are represented on the committee. In New York the work of interlocking has been carried so far that all public relief, 90 per cent. of the relief given by societies, and 80 per cent. of that given by religious communities, is registered with the local Charity Organisation Society.¹ Continued effort upon the same lines may

¹ *Economic Review*, January, 1897, article on "The C.O.S. of To-day."

be expected to lead to still better results ; nor can there be any doubt that the more completely the different relief agencies work together, the more efficient their work will be.

The way in which the field should be apportioned among them will largely depend upon the character, customs, and natural divisions of the people. Provided that the whole system is thoroughly organised and knit together, it is relatively unimportant to decide what precise sphere should be taken by any particular agency. But the question of the proper distribution of function between the State and voluntary agencies is one that cannot be left entirely on one side. There can be little doubt that a partly centralised system, like that of the English Poor Law, is well suited for dealing with simple cases of destitution, in which a test can be made to take the place of special inquiry. But it is more difficult to decide how far work, which requires careful discrimination, such as the administration of outdoor relief or the care of deserving age, should be left in the hands of Boards of Guardians. In country places, where private charity is probably ill-organised, and where the necessary funds could hardly be raised except by means of a compulsory rate, the case in favour of allowing them a large discretion is a very strong one. But in the large towns, the question assumes a different aspect ; for in them, on the one hand, private effort is generally systematised more thoroughly, and on the other, the mass of distress which has to be combated is so great that no single agency can hope to deal adequately with every part of it. Consequently, it seems desirable to leave the relief of destitution in the hands of the Guardians, and, as far as possible, to hand over the work in which discrimination is required to voluntary agencies. When these bodies are thoroughly organised, and in receipt of adequate funds, outdoor relief on the part of the Guardians might with advantage be abandoned. But it does not seem possible to relieve them of the task of looking after those of the aged and deserving poor, who have no relatives in a position to give them a home. For in this case there is no alternative to the policy of support-

ing them in endowed institutions, which private charity could hardly be expected to provide, and which, in view of the varying numbers likely to use them at different times, could be managed more economically in connection with those that necessarily exist for the relief of destitution. At the same time, though considerations of economy and convenience suggest that such provision for deserving old persons as must be made inside institutions should be administered by the Guardians, it is clear that the treatment accorded to them ought to be very different from that meted out to the ordinary applicant for indoor relief. Loafers and those destitute through age may perhaps be received into the same building, but they should not be brought into contact there, nor should the stigma which attaches itself to the former ever be allowed to fall upon the latter class.

Where State action ends, that of private charity should begin, but the two should have at least one characteristic of organisation in common ; for it seems most convenient that the organisation of both should depend, in great part, upon locality, the different local centres being so far linked together as to be able to supply one another with information at short notice. Further, since detailed knowledge of all the circumstances of the cases with which they have to deal is essential to a right solution, the size of these local centres ought to be confined within narrow limits. For, on the one hand, charitable agencies covering a wide area are likely to find themselves so overburdened with work that it is impossible for their executive committees fully to consider the claims of particular applicants for assistance, or to stand in such close relations with the poor that their gifts can be blended with friendliness and sympathy. Consequently the districts administered from local centres ought not to be very large. But, on the other hand, it must be remembered that it is generally easier to raise charitable funds when subscribers know that they will be employed in their own district ; that the administrative areas should therefore be identical with those from which funds are drawn ; and that these must not be so small that the resources of rich

districts like the West End of London become unavailable for coping with the problem of places like the East End.

Locality need not, however, be the only basis of division. Within the same district good work may be done by the separate charities of different religious denominations, provided only that they are brought together and harmonised by some such central body as a Charity Organisation committee. Churches and chapels have many advantages as centres of charitable action, for the ties between their members are generally closer than those subsisting between mere neighbours. Sympathy will probably be stronger, gifts can be more easily reinforced by kindness, and the distributor of relief is better able to find out the real condition of the people without giving offence. There is, of course, some danger that the clergy, with whom it generally rests to administer the charitable funds of religious communities, may be ignorant of the nature of the work they have to do, or may even be tempted to devote the funds at their disposal to the purchase of blankets and coal with which to bribe hypocritical parishioners to come to church. But there is no reason why these difficulties should not be overcome as a knowledge of the true principles of charity becomes more widely diffused. That were 'a consummation devoutly to be wished'; and when it is achieved local congregations will rank among the most useful of existing charitable agencies.

VII

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE

I. THE LAITY.

OF making many essays on the Church there is no end. But most of these take the standpoint of the ideal Churchman and lay down maxims for his guidance. Perhaps it may not be waste labour to take the standpoint rather of that great class whose need the Church professes to be able to supply—the labouring classes of our great cities. And the advantage of this lies in the fact that we start with no *à priori* theories of what the historic national Church may do, and with no fair picture of successful working in the generality of cases culled from certain honourable exceptions. If we look at the question with the eyes of the working man we may discover some truths which are unpalatable to our most cherished hopes and ideas, but there will at any rate be fewer disillusionings.

What manner of man, then, is the working man, and how does he live? There are roughly three classes. The most numerous is the middle one of the three. It comprises the unskilled and less-skilled labourer who earns from twenty to thirty shillings a week. The main element of his life is monotony. The home life is monotonous, for there is no privacy. The working-time is monotonous, for there is no variety in the labour. The surroundings are monotonous, for all the dingy streets look alike. Yet life is divided into two absolutely separate compartments—

Sunday and the week. The week consists of five days and a half. Every morning M. or N. will rise about five and be at work at six. This work, whether indoors in a factory or out of doors, will go on, with a break for breakfast and a break for dinner, till six in the evening, or sometimes later. Then comes the return home and the evening meal, when the wife and the children are in attendance, and there is often the subconscious feeling that at any rate some of the latter are in the way. Afterwards there is a journey to the public-house or rest beside the fire, and bed about ten o'clock.

Sunday begins on Saturday at midday. Then come the wages, and such of them as remain over after the necessary "treating" are given to the wife. The later part of the afternoon is probably spent at the public-house, and also the evening after supper. Sunday itself is indeed a day of rest. Breakfast takes place about eleven o'clock and is of a light nature. Then will follow a perusal of the Sunday paper in shirt-sleeves, while preparations are made by the rest of the family for the culinary climax of the week—the Sunday dinner. But about twelve the male population is generally to be seen, shaven but not wholly dressed, taking a constitutional in the streets till the public-houses open at one. Then *exeunt omnes* within them for two hours till the Christian State shuts them at three. This is the time for the Sunday dinner, which is followed by sleep or talks with a neighbour till the public-houses open and are filled at six.

The background of all this life of course is the home. And this is known to the outside world by the title of "the Housing Question." But to the working man it is no question of a discussion of possible solutions on a large scale. There is the immediate, everyday, unending though half-unconscious sense of confinement. Either two or three rooms on the average have to be a home for the father, mother, and a family increasing and growing up. And the weariness of the day's work can seldom look forward to the privacy of quiet which will make up for the strain of toil.

Such is the life of M. or N., labourer. It goes on from

the time of early youth until old age makes its continuance impossible. Except for a Bank Holiday four times a year there is no rest, no time off. The prevailing attitude of life is therefore materialistic. The two things that are certain are the satisfaction of eating and drinking and the requirement of propagating the species. Beyond this there is little time for thought, and what there is is not for edification.

Above this class there comes the higher stratum of the skilled artisan, the shop assistant, or the small clerk. With him, of course, the conditions of life are more favourable, for his income will range from thirty shillings to two pounds a week. He will probably begin work at eight instead of six, and will live in four rooms instead of three. But his daily work will be hardly more interesting, and the word "monotony" might be spelt over his life in just the same way.

Sunday is a great break in the week here too. But the pleasure is a little less materialistic than in the other case. The Sunday dinner is still the culminating point to the day, but the shirt-sleeves element tends rather to become a black-coated one. A new ideal, in fact, begins to appear—the ideal of outward respectability. This in a large degree rests on the fact of the extra room in the home. The sense of confinement gives place to a consciousness of expanse. The father need not always have his children with him. There is a sacred room where the blinds hang down all day and there are antimacassars. It is the parlour. And with the parlour there is less need for the public-house. The head of the house therefore prides himself on drinking at home, nor does he always go out to the bar.

The lowest class of the three is the criminal. He it is who is most generally associated in the mind with the vague term "slums." His life is depicted in thrilling novels with a purpose, dealing with social problems. He is not troubled with monotony, for life is always varied for him. He lives not by work so much as by its avoidance. Sunday is not a day marked off, for all days alike are good for the thief, the cut-throat, the kidnapper, the tramp.

But he will always have his spokesmen, for he can call up the element of romance. By means of this, to most people he has become the type of all three classes, and every one getting less than two pounds a week is held to be an inhabitant of a "John Street." And yet he is really in the minority. It is the middle and upper of the two classes that give us the typical man of the people.

But this, after all, is only a description of one part of the subject, for beyond the typical head of a family there is the family itself to be considered. Now the state of the young is an even more important question than that of the middle-aged, for with them lies the future. And there are two divisions—the children, and the young men and women.

In the case of the children the fundamental problem is the maintenance of family life without a home. They are born and begin to grow up with natural responsiveness and love. But the necessarily prevailing principle of family life as conducted in three rooms is "Go out," not "Stay in." And in this everything is involved. For if the child feels that for its games and noisy fun it must not stay indoors but go out in the street, still more if it begins to become conscious of the fact that it is rather in the way than otherwise, especially when father comes back—then there inevitably follows a lack of that influence on its earliest years which only real home-life can give. Yet all the elements of such a life are there except sufficient space and time. The greatest power for good over the working man is the love of his children. But the occasion for its expression is the exception rather than the rule. For in the daytime the father is away and the children are out playing, and in the evening the father wants his supper and there is no room for them. The inevitable and often unconscious result is the shifting of the responsibility of training the child to some one else. That some one else is the school teacher during the week and the Sunday-school teacher on Sunday.

It is really with the day-school teachers that the bringing-up of these children lies. And hence the inestimable importance of the question of education, and

that not so much from the point of view of the amount of knowledge imparted as from that of the influence of the person who imparts it. Leaving for the present all question of actual religious teaching, all the real training of the child's character comes from the impression made by the teacher. And alike in Board Schools or in National Schools the difficulties are enormous. For the size of the classes, except in the case of the highest, makes individual attention practically impossible. The ideal has to be uniform and not individual development. And not only so; but the teacher is drawn from a class above that of the average child, and, though there are honourable exceptions, especially among the women, all duty is done when the day's lessons are over. He then retires into suburbandom and the children are left to their own devices in their playtime.

Nor is the younger teacher, who might still be willing to join in the amusements of his pupils, free to use this means of influencing them. For during several years life for him consists in passing examinations in order to secure certificates in different subjects, and he therefore has himself to work in his spare time. The children are thus left to the chance of outside care, such as can be given by kindly disposed ladies in the Children's Happy Evenings Association, or Boys' Brigades. But these, after all, only cater for the elect, and the average child is still left out in the streets with the affections of childhood finding no response.

Sunday involves a change from the rest of the week for the child as for the parent. Here surely we may be content with the Sunday School. But the weakness of the Sunday School lies in this—that it is useful for the Jacobs but not for the Esaus. The good boy who would be good anyhow likes to come and learn his lessons and get a prize. It is the naughty boy who is the average boy, and who only evinces a real interest at the time of the annual treat. The same reason which impels him to play in the streets on the week-day—the need of room in the home—drives him to the Sunday School on Sunday. And there he is met, not by a body of professional teachers,

but by a number of earnest amateurs who base the practice of their teaching on an absence of discipline. The lesson thus becomes in most cases a struggle between teacher and taught for the bare mastery, and the effect upon the actual life of the children is little. And that little seldom receives support from the example of the home. Small wonder is it, therefore, if we see springing up in many places a reversion to the older method of instruction known as catechising.

Only less important than actual childhood is young manhood and womanhood. Now in any normal development of youth there must be two influences at work, and it is precisely the absence of these two influences which makes the youth of the lower working classes abnormal. The first of these is athletics. The body must have exercise. But this involves some sort of outlay on the means of exercise. And this at once makes any games impossible for the majority of these young men. There is no open land where they can go for any sort of sport, and there is no money to buy materials for cricket, football, or rowing. A favoured minority, under the auspices of philanthropic clubs, do often manage to have some sort of exercise on a Saturday afternoon. But it must always be remembered that the club member is not the type but the exception. For the generality there are only left the streets and their own strong muscles. And the combination of these two into a violent form of recreation is called Hooliganism. Of course this is an evil, but it is after all only the abuse of a good. Its naturalness only brings into greater prominence the want which it testifies in the proper development of the maturing working man.

But the absence of the second influence is still more hurtful because more permanent. It may be called the want of ideal in love. The relations between the sexes are free, and though moral still coarse. The refining influence of womanhood, which counts for so much among the less struggling classes, and without which the modern novel would lose its charm, is lost when the prominent element of courtship consists of good-humoured violence.

The girl is looked on as an inferior being, familiarity with whom breeds contempt. When she becomes the wife, she becomes not the helpmate of her husband so much as his drudge. This harmful factor in the education of the labourer is of untold import, for it robs marriage of much of its highest meaning. To it may be traced the beginning of the break-up of homes which is put down to drink, but in which drink has only come to supply the place of love that made no demands upon an ideal.

Such, then, is the member of the labouring classes, with the varieties that greater respectability or greater crime may make in his condition. Above him, across a great gulf, come all the different varieties of life in what are called the upper classes. But through all these varieties there seem to be two common elements. The main object in life is money-making. There have been ages when the great thing to live for was honour and success in arms, and other ages when it has been devotion to some religious ideal. But now the state of continual war has ceased, and our religious views have changed, and we have become money-seekers. And with this development has grown up the parallel substitution of what has been called a "cash nexus" between men for any feeling of mutual responsibility. The central idea of our business relations is the market value of goods, not the value of the labour which it cost to produce them. The old personal relationship of master and man is lost in the wholly impersonal one of shareholder and factory-hand. And for this unnatural state of things is appearing a doubtful remedy—vague talk about social evils and the necessity of relief for them. But acts are more eloquent than words, and the growth of the suburbs round our great towns, more and more separate from the slum circle left at the centres, shows the seriousness of the cleavage that is growing up between classes whose only link is one of money payment. It is merely a truism to say that the general motive of conduct in the upper classes is becoming more and more materialistic. The average man, who is spending his time in making money, sees little beyond the concrete

things of this life—profit and loss, eating and drinking, business rush, and home-life. More and more the ideal of honest work is becoming to be the only one that appeals to men, for that at least seems to be certainly right. But beyond this the enthusiasm for humanity, the passion to right the wrong, the hope of self-sacrifice, are left uncultivated; for there is little faith in “the things that are unseen” to inspire such motives of conduct.

Side by side, then, the two great classes stand. The chief characteristic of the labourer is his helplessness. The last century was the story of the answers which were made to his cry for help. System after system rose up and failed. Robert Owen and his schemes for corporation, the more developed movement for Co-operative Production and Distribution; the Socialism of Lassalle and Marx, which was to renew the world; the aspirations of trade unions and the hopes which they have only partially satisfied; the growth of social settlements and the difficulty of their maintenance; the revival of activity in the work of the Church—all these have shown the efforts to answer the cry. But one result stands out clear. The labourer of to-day does not look for real help to the Church. The labour leader, the political leader, the free-thinker will command his attention, for he believes that with them lies the power to do him present good. They are marching with the times, and are the leaders who are leading him to gain his right position in the world. But it is not so with the clergyman. Towards him there is a feeling of estrangement; for, though there are noble exceptions, the idea of the clergyman is associated with the idea not of progress but of weakness. It is through the wife that he is heard of, his means of influence are the children, he comes when there is sickness or death, his stronghold is his church, not the open-air meeting where he can be answered. And the result is that the working classes do not look to the clergyman for guidance, and the Church is not in possession of the great towns.

So with the upper classes. For the prevailing attitude here is not hostility, but complete indifference towards the Church. The few who are Church-people do not represent

the great generality who are not. For the test is this : Do the young men, who are the type of what is best in the land, and those who are merely honest in business form any appreciable proportion of the congregations of our churches? A visit to a number of them will show that this is not the case.

To the great mass of the laity, then, it would seem that the Church has little meaning. It is something outside their lives. It will be well to examine closer and try to find some reason for this.

II. THE LAY VIEW OF THE CHURCH.

What is the Church as it appears to this great mass of the laity? It is difficult to estimate different points of view. But the layman in general, and the working man in particular, lives in an atmosphere wholly distinct from that in which the clergyman and the devout Churchman live. It is well at least to try and realise the aspect which the Church assumes in their eyes, though the process may involve the sacrifice of some of our fondest beliefs, and even a distorted view of much that is true.

1. The first point is the supply of the clergy. Now it is a remarkable fact that a majority of them are sons of clergymen. This means that the assumption of Holy Orders in most cases offers the line of least resistance in the choice of a career. For it is always the easiest thing for a son to follow his father's calling. It does not postulate a foundation of independent thought. From the home the boy goes on to a private and then to a public school. And in both the influence brought to bear on him is certainly Christian, and to a large degree, clerical. He grows up in an Anglican atmosphere. Then comes the turning-point. For it is at the University that the boy becomes the man. The result of the new influences is naturally twofold. Some men keep their old ideas unchanged, or at any rate only partly modified. Others find that they cannot believe in the faith that was taught them. But it is largely a question of ability. For only the abler men find the difficulties and questionings,

while the less clever men never rise to the heights of doubt, or else check the flood of the new suggestions as a temptation to be resisted. But the consequences of this are important. For out of the numbers who come up each year with the intention of taking Holy Orders, only a certain proportion pursue this object to the end. And this proportion, in the main, means a survival of the less fit. For it is a serious fact that the majority of them are men who are taking only Pass degrees. Many begin as Honour men, and then, because of the difficulties in their path, in the end take the easier examination. It hardly ever happens that a man who begins to take the smoother course is shamed into becoming a candidate for the Tripos or the Schools. The process culminates in the athlete, who has developed his body at the expense of his brains, who may even in certain cases be a Blue. He often obtains his degree with difficulty, and leaves the University in the happy consciousness that his bodily powers are no mean gift to the Church.

But the continuance of this process does mean, and must mean, grave danger to the Church. For it shows that the more able and more thoughtful men, the men who will count for most in their day, are being thinned out from the ranks of those who are to be her champions. Nor do those who have ambitions in other careers give up professions in which they will use their brains for themselves in order to become clergymen. The abler men from the clerical homes drift off, and their places are not supplied by able converts. And the general intellectual level of the Church is sadly lowered in consequence. One indication of this is obvious. The Church is the one calling in which the element of competition has no place. In every other career, the law of the survival of the fittest holds good, and the man who is highest in the class lists can alone hope to be successful. But here the competition is in the demand, not the supply, and the Pass-man is content, for he feels no need of a spur. But the Church has to pay the penalty of weakness.

The last year of this training is, however, supposed to redeem all. The Theological College has become an

institution which is to make up for the void of twenty-two years in the mind of the candidate for Orders by a one year's repletion. But, by the very conditions of its existence, this year is spoiled. The object is not a knowledge of truth as it may be known in the twentieth century, but a knowledge of Anglican doctrine as it has to be understood for bishop's examinations. This introduces the inevitable evil of getting ready what is orthodox in order to pass, rather than working out the questionings of a man's own mind, in order to satisfy the questionings of others afterwards. For in all this special theological training there seems to be a fatal tendency to look backward rather than forward, and to set before the pupil the ideals of the Middle Ages and the sixteenth century, when the Church was a political force as well as a moral influence, rather than that of the nineteenth century, when so much of her work has been undertaken by other agencies. The groundwork of the English Church is thought to be the Reformation and all that that event involved. Yet in reality the work of the Reformation was largely changed and the religious ideas of men modified by the new era begun by the French Revolution. But of that event and its consequences the future clergyman hears little. When he is settled in his parish he finds the thought of his parishioners, so far as they think at all, modelled on the ideas to which the movement of 1789 gave the impetus. Then he realises that he is speaking a dead language to his people, and has to translate what he has learnt into the vulgar tongue of the twentieth century. And that he finds difficult. Surely it would be worth while to learn more of the modern philosophy, however disproved, to which the working man trusts; of the modern science which seems to him to have superseded religion; of modern economics and social questions which are the only reforms which mean anything to him. And instead, perhaps less time might be given to the Old Testament, and even to the details of the New. For the need is to be able to translate the truth from the past into the present, rather than merely to know how the past interpreted truth for itself.

With this preparation the clergyman's training is complete, and he goes out to his life's work. Yet there is a grave danger in the very completeness of his equipment. The truth once delivered to the saints has been delivered to him, and whoever does not agree with it must be in error. The germ of intolerance is there. He knows; and there is nothing more to be learnt hereafter which can supersede his knowledge, though the details may be open to modification. It is this spirit of certainty which makes a common point of view for clergyman and layman so very difficult to obtain.

The English conception of religion is based upon Sunday. The difference that has come since the Puritan times between Sunday and week-day is ineradicable. And the consequences are stupendous. For with the conception of one day specially set apart for God and six for the affairs of men has come the natural tendency to confine religion to observances on Sunday and to withdraw it from the days of the week. If the observance of the Lord's Day has thus been strengthened, the acknowledgment of the claims of religion on the other six days has been correspondingly lessened. It is on this distinction that the whole fabric of English religion is built. On it depends very largely the strength of the clergy. For on Sundays they have the monopoly of their people. Business ceases, the great bulk of the places of amusement are shut, communications are less frequent. The churches are thrown open, and the clergyman's work begins. And yet, with all this as an advantage, the churches are not filled. To the lay mind there arises a doubt as to whether Sunday is the Divine institution it is claimed to be, and whether life was meant to consist of two air-tight compartments, Sunday and the week; whether the gain to the religious life of the week from more uniformity in the seven days would not compensate for the breaking up of the peculiarity of Sunday. If there was one thing more than another against which the Founder of Christianity inveighed, it was Sabbatarianism. Yet surely it is on Sabbatarianism that the outward form, at any rate, of our religion to-day rests.

Linked with this distinction is another. This is the contrast of things sacred and secular. Efforts of the noblest kind for the sake of others, works of the truest love, or attempts made to ennoble the lives of the toiling classes are labelled as of inferior value with the title of secular. But once introduce the element of a Church service or an orthodox collect or the presence of a clergyman, and the effort is raised to the higher plane of being sacred. Yet a great deal is lost by the distinction. For the larger part of self-sacrifice is deprived of its highest motive if the motive of religion is confined to what is ecclesiastical. To send an ailing child for a fortnight into the country seems to be a religious work just as much as to send it to an ill-ordered Sunday School. The work which the hospitals are doing seems to be as sacred as that of district visitors. But to draw a line between them because one is more definitely part of the Church organisation than the other scarcely seems justified.

2. Such are the conditions under which the fully trained clergyman will come to his people. But the result is the development of what may be termed the spirit of Professionalism. Theologically, of course, this may be justifiable. The office may set the man apart from his fellows. But the average layman is not theological, and it is this professionalism which more than anything tends to separate clergy and laity. For there is created at once an unnatural relationship between the clergyman and his people. There is an uncomfortable feeling of difference between a black coat and a blue one. Men always have a fear that the parson will endeavour to do the layman good.

Take the case of the pastoral visits in which the clergyman spends his week. An unnatural attitude is generally assumed by the person visited, for she feels that it is not for the sake of social intercourse that her visitor has come, but in order that she may be profited. For the clergyman himself it is a professional matter. He does not go in order to make a new friend, but in order that he may perform a duty—and often an uncomfortable one. One point is often forgotten. The word in season may be

spoken or the exhortation made. Yet the question is whether the unnatural conditions under which it takes place make the results really beneficial. Does not all real spiritual help postulate friendship, and friendship mutual knowledge? And can the preliminary few minutes of a first or even second visit really admit of the relation of teacher and taught? The natural reserve which is felt about those subjects between equals is surely a strong argument against any sudden breach of it for a pastor and a member of his flock.

There seems to be one obvious antidote to this. The basis of knowledge of men, of friendship, must be reciprocity. Now this is precisely the element which is lacking in the professional pastoral visit. It is all giving on the outside and all receiving on the other. But in all other social relationships the calling is not all done by one friend, all the receiving by the other. Why, then, should clerical visits be an exception to the rule? If the call at the parishioner's home was followed by the invitation to the parishioner to visit the vicarage, and to meet the vicar not as an official but as a fellow-man, much of the unnaturalness of professionalism would be obviated.

Visiting is of course reciprocal in the wealthier parishes, where vicar and people are of the same social standing. But it is not much the case in poor parishes where there is a social difference.

Another aspect of this difficulty of professionalism is shown in the attitude of the clergy towards the Dissenters. To the great bulk of people the disputes between Churchman and Nonconformist seem quite unimportant. But to the parson they are insuperable. The reason seems almost more professional than theological. The Church is the great philanthropic and religious body in the nation, and those who are ordained in it are committed to a great career for doing good. But independent societies for accomplishing the same objects must be discouraged because they are acting on wrong lines. It is the relation of the doctor and the quack. But unfortunately to the Gallio of the present day, it is open to question whether the Church is the real doctor.

Truly "this people which knoweth not the law is accursed."

One of the characteristics of a profession is promotion. The novice begins in the lowest stages and by ability and success hopes to rise to the highest rungs of the ladder. And this is one of the features of the Church. Happily the abuse of it is distinctly the exception. But that the possibility of a series of promotions does influence some men is believed by many cavillers to be true. The security of a curacy, followed by a vicarage, with the possibility of a canonry, does attract some self-seekers into the Church who would be better out of it. To many it affords no motive. But the working man is rather apt to see the valuable posts and to assume that they form the attraction for candidates for the ministry. Perhaps the best antidote to this, as a recent book has pointed out, is outward simplicity of life. If there were no difference in the scale of living between the dean and the East End vicar, M. or N. could find no ground for complaint.

Is not this prospect of a career partly bound up with the existence of a married clergy? It is often no base motive that makes a man desire to leave a curacy or a poor parish, but merely the fact that he wishes to be married or to do better for his children. The Roman Church has tried and failed to do away with the difficulties attendant on marriage. Yet the attempt to meet these difficulties is something, and our Church is content to accept early marriage as part of the natural course of events. Many a middle-aged curate or vicar with a poor benefice has his thoughts turned away from the ideal of self-sacrifice for his people to the necessity of confining his first attentions to his own wife and family. Occasionally the difficulty takes a more unpleasant form. A new parish is made, and while the church is still unfinished, or at any rate not paid for, there springs up a comfortable house for the clergyman to live in. Now it is points like these that are manifest and tangible which strike the careless layman and give ground for his complaints. Of course no general rule could be made for such a subject without incurring all the evils of a celibate clergy. Yet

were the Church considered less as a career in which, just as in any other profession, the clergy married and were given in marriage, the resulting custom would surely be advantageous. For the hope of maintaining a household would then be the exception; the rule would be self-completion in advancing the families of others.

But there is another side of this professionalism which is no less striking. This is the aspect in which the duties of the clergyman are regarded. To many of the labouring classes the reality of hard work for the clergyman seems non-existent, for they cannot understand any but muscular work. To many of the leisured classes the idea of philanthropy and religion suggests amateur effort, which involves no real intellectual work or effort such as is needed in business. To both the clergyman seems now, as he seemed to Adam Smith, an unproductive labourer. He is sustained by the efforts of others rather than being a workman himself. And the solution of the problem can only be in the practical good which results to the community from the work of the Church.

3. The basis of all the work of the clergy is of course the individual Church and its services. But there has grown up since the Puritan times, and especially since the revival of this century, a reverence for the Church which was not the case in earlier times. The aspect under which it is regarded by its adherents is that of the heathen Taboo—something which is sacred, something which no profane hand may touch, something with which it is impiety to meddle. Yet the consequences are in many ways disastrous. For in so far as the Church and the service in Church lose their contact with the active life and present thought of the worshippers, they tend to become more and more a performance or a function which requires explanation. Now it is just in this that the Church is weak—that most of its ceremonial has little meaning on the surface but requires explanation. Yet *qui s'excuse s'accuse*. For that which appeals to men in modern free-thought, modern secularism, modern science, is the obviousness of their dicta. They speak with the voice of the twentieth century, they appeal to the aspirations

of the average man, they seem to carry conviction by their very simplicity. Very different is it for a man who finds himself a stranger in a church. Nothing is obvious, and the contrast points in many minds towards the simpler systems.

The Church system is based upon the Prayer Book, and to the loyal Churchman the Prayer Book is also a Taboo—a book which must not be interfered with because it is so nearly and scripturally perfect. Yet it is strange how little this book appeals to any but the convinced Churchman. Of course it is based on the Catholic teaching of the Bible, and of sixteen centuries of Christian saints, yet the difficulty is to understand why the compilation of a Cranmer or the ceremonial which appealed to a Laud should be necessarily the foundation of the Church to-day as it was three and a half centuries ago. Is the rigidity of the Morning and Evening Prayer unquestionably good, or is the introduction of variety and spontaneity necessarily Nonconformist? Is the possibility of extempore prayer to be wholly set aside? May we make no changes in the catechism for children? To the convinced Churchman the arguments for all these are convincing. But we are not looking at things from the minority point of view, but from that of the great non-church-going majority. And to them a book which prescribes every detail, which allows no variety in the service, which repeats the same prayers twice every Sunday and every week-day, loses meaning by its very monotony. It is associated rather with the history of England in the past than with the needs of England in the present. There is a need for something that allows scope for special prayers and thanksgivings according to the peculiar local requirements of each parish. Otherwise men will think that no one since the first ages of Christianity has been able to pen a prayer which has been felt to be sufficiently inspired to form part of their common worship.

One of the boasts of the Reformation is that the Church Services were then for the first time rendered into the vulgar tongue, instead of being in the unknown Latin. But this seems to be precisely the condition to which they have now reverted. What meaning does the Anglican Service

of to-day convey to the man who enters a church for the first time? Very little. The musical service means little to the æsthetic man who prefers a concert. To the man in the street, who is not æsthetic nor acquainted with Church formulas, the service evokes a feeling of respect for a rite he does not understand. To the working man it produces a feeling of discomfort because of its unintelligibility. Is this really the only form of help the Church can give to the lay world outside? What does the weary man of business find in the harmonies of a surpliced choir to raise his thoughts to a level above the commercial struggle of the week? What does the man of ambition find in the monotonous intonation of prayers by a clergyman to fill him with thoughts of self-sacrifice? What does the criminal, the victim of his lust or of his crime, find in the genuflexions or mumbled responses, to give him strength to resist his temptation? The answer is not far to seek. If men found what they needed, they would come to the churches. But they do not. Church after church is empty, or secures only a congregation of women. The young men do not go. The middle-aged men do not find themselves any the worse for not going. And the stewards of God's mysteries look round and say the fault is in the people, not in the food that is given them. "As for that, it cannot be changed, for the service has continued for three hundred and fifty years, and could not be changed without shaking the Church to its foundation or dissolving its link with the nation." But meanwhile the less stereotyped forms of Christianity find an echo. The mission-hall with its "Sankey" hymns and extempore prayers finds responsive hearts, while the Church remains empty. The Salvation Army goes into the highways and compels men to come in. Something can be done for the poor man by the impassioned appeal from the heart. But the Church is the only religious agency which has authority to speak to the rich. And the rich, who also need help, can find none. For there are no mission-halls for them. And the churches, empty except for women, or half filled by a crowd which troops out after the anthem, show how little their needs are met.

At the Reformation an attempt was made to lay the stress upon the sermon of the preacher rather than upon the service. And to-day the dissenting bodies find in this their strength. But the Church has laid less emphasis on the sermon since the revival of this nineteenth century. The sermon is merely an adjunct—a Sunday treat as it were, which is instructive but not essential. The English parish clergyman is notoriously a bad preacher. Yet how willing the layman would be to hear sermons if they satisfied his needs. The service, which has become a form of prayer without any direct relation to the individual, might find its counterpart in the appeal to each of the hearers. Yet the majority of discourses are theses on general morality, historical accounts of Old Testament scenes and New Testament writings, or declarations of Shibboleths, which mean much to the preacher but little to the unconvinced hearer. The strength of the sermon at present lies in the fact that there can be no reply to the incomplete argument or condemnation of the wearisome details. The essence of a good sermon is surely conviction, the sacred fire in the preacher's own soul from which he tries to kindle the souls of his hearers. But how can the details of Israel's wanderings, or the accounts of the different Jewish sects and parties which may throw light on our Lord's parables or similar matters help towards this result? Far better a little suffering in the preacher's own life to put him into sympathy with the weary men and women who want help for their everyday lives.

Again, there is the style of discourse known as a "Gospel sermon," which is met with in what is called the Low Church. This form varies in intensity. It may be delivered in a church, in a mission hall, or in the open air. Yet the characteristics are the same in each case. Certain formulas are taken for granted, and the symbols by which they are known are placed before the audience with little explanation. These formulas may mean everything to the preacher, but they mean little to the general hearer. Expressions like "Justification by faith," "Need of forgiveness," or "Salvation," and texts like "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," or "All

have sinned and come short of the glory of God," or "By His stripes we are healed," do not convey any significance to the mind which has not been trained to understand them. Yet they are put before audiences who are meant to profit by them, but who, listening in ignorance of what is meant, go away with little practical help for their daily lives.

The last few years has seen a wholly new tendency to increase the importance of the Holy Communion, till it has become the central part of the system of a large part of the clergy. Yet here again the same tendency is seen as in the Church Services in general. With the increase of mystery in connection with the rite, there seems to have grown up no very great affection for it among the laity. There have, indeed, been more communicants. But it is among those who are most under religious influence—the women and the newly confirmed children. For in the great majority of churches now the really important service of the day is the Communion Service, or, as it is more and more becoming, the Mass, whose essence is mystery. Yet does the worldling, the careless, the hard-worker or the truth-seeker attend it? The answer of church after church cannot but be "No." Perhaps it will be urged that this service is not meant for the unconvinced, but is the inner mystery of all, for the initiated only. Yet if so, what is there for the uninitiated? If matins and evensong are sacred performances whose meaning he cannot easily grasp, and the sermon is seldom one which will appeal to him, there seems all the more reason for leaving this service of fellowship with God and man as simple and as unmysterious as it originally was. What can a labourer or a mechanic understand in a Choral Celebration? When will the hard-working shopkeeper, after a busy Saturday night, realise the necessity for this unintelligible Sunday morning service? One fact these ill-attended services seem plainly to declare—that the Holy Communion is not a strong religious force upon the nation at large.

To the working man, therefore, the Church is a thing apart. His attitude is one of apathy, for it does not concern him in his life. So far as he is hostile, it is because

he sees the need of some brotherhood among men and seeks it rather in humanitarian and socialistic schemes than in Christianity. In his eyes the Church has played its part and should therefore be removed, and its place taken by others. It cumbers the ground and does not serve any useful function. But this is the attitude rather of the leaders of labour than that of the average. The average man takes no interest in the Church. It touches him to some extent when he is ill, for by it his wife is enabled to obtain some material comforts. But adherence for the sake of benefits received never proves very lasting. His children may bring home stories of the Sunday School, but he listens to them as to merely childish matters. The clergyman may occasionally call and meet him. But there is little common ground between them. The great system is there with its representatives and its means of grace. Yet wholly outside it lives the people whom it mainly exists to help. The Church of to-day does not touch the people, and the reforms of recent years have only been the exceptions to prove the rule. Better is it, then, to face the facts and try to look at them with the eyes of the men who are to be helped, than with those of men who only see the perfection of their own system.

The attitude of the wealthier classes towards the Church is one of either tolerance or contempt. To one set of men it is the substitute for their own responsibility towards their fellow-creatures. The Church for them consists of a few clergymen scattered about among the poor. To pay a certain amount towards the maintenance of these clergymen is to do their duty by the working classes. Any personal action is out of the question. The clergymen to the poor parishes is their paid substitute. The Church is accepted as the scapegoat of social responsibility. The other set of men see the effectiveness of the ecclesiastical system, and classing what is bad and what is good together, will have none of it. They feel that the clergyman, apart from his office, is not their intellectual equal, or at any rate shuts his eyes to what does not square with his creed, and they suspect the truthfulness of his teaching. The actual services do not

appeal to them, and they more and more find refuge in the freer thought of the world. The Church is to them a survival of the past—to be respected for what it has done, but to be removed as having done its work. And they therefore do not go where they feel that they cannot really worship God. Beyond both lies the still greater number of men who are living for this life only, and care for none of these things. To them the Church means nothing, for it has no means by which to reach them. If they will not go to Church the clergyman has little chance of reaching them. For there are no mission-rooms for them and no means of coming into contact with them.

The Church as she is at present needs complete reformation. From time to time suggestions are made for the reform of some minor point, while the bulk of the whole system as we know it now is held to be too sacred to be touched. But the training of our clergy, the dangers of a professional caste, the spirit of Taboo which has grown up round the Prayer Book and its services need more than this gentle treatment. Some tentative suggestions for such treatment must now be considered. For it is no mere tinkering that can save the Church, but only a mighty upheaval of all that hinders progress and adaptability. Without this we seem even now to hear down the centuries the cry, "Thou art weighed in the balances and found wanting."

III. THE CHURCH AS IT MIGHT BE.

The Church has lost its hold upon the nation. Yet the need for it was never greater than to-day. The pathos lies in the huge discrepancy between its claims and its realisation of them. Churchman after Churchman has risen up to revive the old importance of this great national body and has failed. Wesley, Simeon, Newman, Maurice, Kingsley, and many others have struggled and died. But the religious body for which they struggled has not taken its rightful place in the nation. Outside it there has arisen movement after movement, leader after leader. And these have but been blindly groping for a Church. But because they had

not the proper shibboleths upon their lips, they have been rejected by an orthodoxy which has gone on withering in its isolation. What was the whole French Revolution but the expression of a passionate though ever-unfulfilled longing for a Church whose creed should be Liberty, Equality, Fraternity? What is Humanitarianism in all its many forms but a belief in the common sacredness of man which makes his progress a religious cult? What is Socialism but the desire to give practical effect to the doctrine of the brotherhood of man? And men like Rousseau, Hegel, Comte, Marx have been only seeking a Church and have not found it.

The great watchword for a century has been Brotherhood—the importance of what is common to men rather than of their differences. And the great claim which the Church puts forth is simply this expressed ecclesiastically under the term Catholicity. The need is realised by the world, and the Church professes to supply it. But instead of this it has become a sect, more and more alienated from the mass of the men of every nation, and assuming the attitude of the Pharisee who despised the Publican for his want of orthodoxy. Few things are more suggestive than the attitude of the world to the ethics of Christianity and its attitude towards the Church. For the ethical teaching of Christ there is the greatest respect. However little men desire to practise this themselves, they admire it in others. But for the Church as a body the world has largely lost its respect, just because it is possible to distinguish the lives and aims of Churchmen from the teaching of Christ. Yet the Church should have no reason for existence but to proclaim the principles of its Founder.

I. (a) There are three main functions which a Church must fulfil. It must, in the first place, be a witness to the unity of man and of his religion. It must proclaim the truth that there is but one body, of which all are members. But a mere travesty of this is offered to the nation to-day. The whole Church is permeated with the party spirit. Within there are High and Low, without there are Dissenters. Each party maintains its cause in its particular organ in the religious Press. The ideal seems rather to convict the

opponent of his error than to leave the truth we profess to justify itself to his mind. The common ideals, the common faith, the common hope which Churchman and Dissenter share are lost sight of in mere matters of organisation, and the surplice, or a rigid form of episcopacy, or unchangeable forms of prayer become insurmountable barriers of fellowship. What is the idea conveyed to the mind by the word Churchman? Not one who loves his fellow-men or is filled with the spirit of Christianity, but one who is a member of a particular religious body, whatever the conduct of his life may be. Linked with this evil is another. There is no protest made to-day against class distinctions. The world has long begun to understand the democratic ideal. But the Church still has its churches for the rich where the poor dare not enter, and its mission-halls where the rich would not condescend to come. The Church does not lift up its voice against the rings of wealthy suburbs spreading round our great towns, while the centres of those towns are teeming with the pent-up life of the poor. The Church still looks with horror on the politician who tries to right the wrong by interfering with the established order of things. At best the existing differences of rich and poor are accepted as necessary evils, to be condoned by subscription lists. The need for the rich to try and fulfil the idea of the community of wealth is not thought of as at all Christian. It is scorned with horror as the ideal of revolutionary Socialists. Yet in this lay the strength of the early Church. The witness to the unity of mankind and to their common need of religion is lost in the loud championship of the difference between one creed and others. The message of patience which is preached to the poor is not the same as the message of charity which is preached to the rich. The Church has failed to uphold the cause of unity.

(b) The second great function of the Church is to be the teacher of morality. But there is no fearlessness among the clergy of to-day, either, with a few exceptions, among the individuals or in the whole body. Yet if they do not bear witness to the right, to whom shall the duty fall? It is for the Church to preach morality in advance of the

general tone of the age. It must lead, and not follow. Only so will it escape stagnation. Its business is not to hark back on the denunciations of evils in past generations while the evils of its own day are left untouched. Only by showing men that what they are doing, not what their ancestors did, is wrong, can the evils of the day be overcome. Already the Press is more and more undertaking this function. More and more people take their views of right and wrong in present questions from the paper rather than from the pulpit. Yet in this way the Church is being paralysed. The whole relationship between men to-day rests on a cash basis. The old idea of responsibility between buyer and seller, employer and employed is giving way before one in which the payment of the price or the wages leaves no further duty to be done. And the result has been the growth of the joint-stock company, where all sense of responsibility is lost in the necessity of showing a dividend; in the sweating system, where the payment of any wage, regardless of its adequacy, is tolerated; in the passion for speculation, which involves the possible ruin of many victims. But in what percentage of sermons are these matters held up in their true aspect before those who practise them? What clergyman insists on emphasising the necessity of honest investments, subordination of profits to suitable wages, the duty of dealing in the most honest, not the cheapest, market? Another question of public morality has recently been before the country—the question of the baser spirit in which this war has been waged. The cry of “Avenge Majuba!” the fierce spirit of hatred evoked against the Boers, the desire to conquer for the sake of conquest, found little check in the utterances of the Church. Yet what an opportunity for a determined resistance to a terrible public opinion! It will be an evil day for the nation when the Church gives up this essential part of her work.

(c) The third great function of the Church is to be the witness to the Unseen. Never was there more need for this than to-day, when the vast majority of the nation are living in towns, and a large proportion in an overcrowded condition. To the slum-dweller there is no unseen—

nothing to raise his thoughts from the merely temporal things. To the mechanic going to and fro between his factory and his house among the endless streets there is no unseen. Worst of all, the children are growing up without the consciousness of anything higher than their own squalid lives. The cities are robbing us of nature, and without the presence of nature there is little strength to maintain the struggle against materialism. Faith is being lost in the pursuit of material comforts. But instead of a united effort to restore faith to a nation which will not believe what it cannot see, the bishops begin the new century by putting forth a united manifesto against incense and other practices of a few disobedient clergy. The need to forget these things and press forward to meet the real crisis does not take hold of the ecclesiastical mind until the opportunity has well-nigh slipped past.

With these three functions fulfilled the Church would be once more the great religious force in the nation. The French Revolution taught the people the Rights of Man. It is for the Church to teach them the Duties of Man. And by the same means. For the sense of nationality awoke the response throughout France to the new system. And to-day the one thing that can rouse enthusiasm is an appeal to Englishmen as Englishmen. Now the Church tries to turn men into Churchmen, and merely succeeds in making a few partisans. But let the appeal be made to Englishmen to turn their patriotism into a religion, to put the duties of Empire first and the rights second, to take up the study of social questions as part of their duty as Englishmen, to maintain the standard of chivalry and honesty in dealing with weaker races or classes for this reason, and there will be a response. The conception of a chosen race must be revived—a race chosen not to seek its own glory, but the glory of God. For that is the true Churchmanship, and the only one. Just as far as men are good Englishmen, so far they will be good Churchmen, for the work of the Church is not to touch a remnant only, but to leaven the whole lump. In this is comprised the whole missionary question. It is not the isolated missionary here or there who will convert the world, but rather the example

which the Englishman—as trader, governor, or soldier—sets to those who come in contact with him that will make the heathen nations accept Christianity. But we are far from this ideal to-day, because the Church has become one of many rivals for a following in the nation. The fact is forgotten that the dissenter, the agnostic, the secularist is a Churchman because he is an Englishman with obligations as such to his God and to his fellow-men.

Very different is the actual Church of to-day. The immediate question is that of reform. Now there are two words which express the whole feeling of the layman on this point—Disestablishment and Disendowment. They do not mean in many cases more than a vague term of disapprobation of the position of the Church, but none the less to him they are the great means to check all abuses. If these two points are faced in their various bearings it may be possible for both sides to see on what lines reform can come.

II. The great benefit of Disestablishment would be Autonomy. The control of Parliament once removed, the Church could legislate for herself. But autonomy need not mean severance from the State, while it would mean the restoration of the power of initiative to the Church. Any change which comes must follow the natural law of development. And that development is towards democracy. The last century was one long struggle for the assertion of democracy in secular life. The present century may see the assertion of democracy in religious life. For the great evil to be fought is apathy. But the apathy has grown up mainly because the government of the Church has become a bureaucracy. The word "Church" has more and more come to mean the official hierarchy, while the laity are a passive mass who receive the services of these officials. If, however, the government and the influence passed to the laity, so that they became really important, there would be less lack of interest in ecclesiastical affairs, for the people would have towards the Church as towards the State, the feeling of a personal share in the government.

An element of separation from the State is involved in Disestablishment. This is the reason why the champions

of the Church oppose it. They assert the catholicity of the Church as the religion of the nation as a whole, as the declaration of membership in the universal Church, as a protest against sectarianism and individualism. But one thing seems to be forgotten. At the time when England separated from Rome, the English Church was the Church of every Englishman. But it is not so now. On the other hand, Parliament is more than ever the Assembly of the whole nation. Why, then, should the link between the two be maintained to the exclusion of the other religious bodies which have grown up since the time of the Tudors? The old rule is necessary here—the Church must lose herself to find herself. Only by uniting all her nonconforming members can she become the real Church of England. Only the principles of life and conduct common to all Christians can be recognised as “established.” And that not by Parliament, but by the nation. It makes little difference to men’s lives whether a certain form of creed is by law established. It makes all the difference whether the precepts of Christianity are carried out by the unwritten law of national custom. Disestablishment, in short, will mean the merging of the present Anglican Church, resting on the authority of Parliament, into a brotherhood of all Christians maintained by the principles of right diffused through the nation.

(a) With such a view of establishment many points arise for discussion. There is, first, the question of membership. And for this the prevailing theory now, like that of the early Revolutionaries in France, is to make a distinction between active and passive citizens. Just as then the man who paid a certain amount in taxes was alone admitted to the franchise, so now certain tests are to be offered which alone shall give men full membership in the Church. But this at once destroys that nationalism which must be the true basis of a national Church. A man is a Churchman because he is an Englishman, not because he is a communicant. The outward sign of this is baptism, but there might well be cases in which willingness to do good might be enough. This qualification of course involves great changes. The Dissenters are at once recognised as

members of the Church. For as Englishmen they and the Anglicans are but varieties of the same aspect of the nation—the religious aspect. The secularist too, or the agnostic, to whom tests like baptism or a creed are intolerable, would find his place in a Church which recognised the value of self-sacrifice and philanthropy without orthodoxy. Instead of the rivalry of sects and the scoffing of the world at their wrangles there would be the consciousness of union, though the varieties might be manifold. For the object of all religious bodies is not to perpetuate their own system, but to uphold the consciousness of duty before every man. It is not for the Anglican Church to declare itself the monopolist of this task.

(b) No less important is the question of doctrine. Hitherto the principle has always been definition. But the need is now for more indefiniteness. There are two obvious difficulties in subscription to the formularies of a religious body. One is the loss of liberty. To promise that a particular form of faith shall be followed for life at once destroys the possibility of development or criticism. There must always be a dread of free thought, a disposition not to pursue truth fearlessly to all its consequences, lest the promise be broken. The other difficulty is dishonesty. Even if certain words can be stretched to mean what we should like them to mean in the twentieth century, is it fair to think that they meant anything like this to the men of the sixteenth? It is putting the letter of the law too much before its spirit. Some men find it possible to accept formularies even under these conditions, but the great mass of the nation outside mistrusts them. And this great mass is the real Church, not the few clergymen who have promised to accept them for life.

It is hopeless to define the undefinable. Right thinking is as difficult as right living. The great need to-day is not for men who will accept what their forefathers accepted, but for men who know what is needed for the difficulties of the present. Now there is no question that the Thirty-nine Articles offer insuperable objections to many of the most earnest men. But it is the Articles themselves and

not the eternal truths which they express in sixteenth-century formula that have become the centre of the Anglican system. To-day the debates have shifted, and we no longer look upon questions of the Authenticity of the Scriptures, the Atonement, Justification by Faith, Predestination, as did the Lutherans and Calvinists. Why, then, put the truths which these Articles represent in such a definite form that they must be accepted or rejected as they are? A man can lead an equally good life whether he have right notions of the Trinity or no. Among all the possible views of the Atonement, why must there be only one right and all the rest wrong? Must a man who cannot take a certain view of the Divinity of Christ be classed as a heretic? The real need is to leave these highest truths undefined. A twentieth-century definition will alienate just as many as does that of the Reformation. But the Founder of Christianity required no test but faith, and why should we? This is the one thing needful. Faith does not require a man's belief in black and white, but leaves much undetermined. Faith only requires the spirit of belief and the willingness to act upon it. And it is just this that all earnest reformers have had in common and often nothing else.

This is a question of course mainly affecting the ministry. But it is one that vitally affects the whole Church, and that in two ways. The abolition of subscription to the Articles and of the use of the Prayer Book would tend to union with the Dissenters. For it was owing to their objections to these that they left the Church. If, then, these were made no longer compulsory, but left optional for those in the ministry of the Church, possibility of the union of the Churches would at any rate take one great step forward.

(c) Another result would follow from this relaxation of doctrine. This is the increase in the efficiency of the clergy. The earnest, intellectual, and sympathetic man who will not fetter his mind or his conscience, yet is anxious to live for others, would find his life's work in the Church. The test would be whether he had faith. This would be made not by requiring his subscription to the Articles, but

by a general consideration of his life, his mental attainments, and his capacity for guiding men. Personal fitness for the work is far more needed than theological acquiescence. The knowledge of the needs of men to-day and the knowledge of the ways in which God is revealing Himself in the twentieth century would then be the study of the future clergyman, not a mere hasty acquaintance with the needs of the early centuries of Christianity or the struggles of the days of Luther. A new conception of Church history is above all needed, lest the cry of Carlyle, that the days of faith are over, find an echo in the minds of the clergy to-day. Only by seeing the hand of God in the secular movements for good in the past century will the clergy be enabled to do the real work that is required of them. But this requires the abler man who is not afraid to think for himself. The result would be enormously beneficial. The abler men at the Universities, the younger fellows of colleges, the men who now enter the Civil Services, those who take the best masterships, would find scope for their best energies and highest ideals in the Church without any conscientious objection. The last century ought to have seen men like Ruskin and Carlyle among the clergy. But they were kept away by these fatal formularies. And to-day many an able man who longs to help in bringing the Church into touch with the needs of the nation will not take Orders because he cannot honestly do so, and the Church thus waits in vain to be reformed from within.

The question of efficiency involves other important points. At present the typical clergyman is not intellectual. He is not the man who is naturally studious, and he therefore puts the intellectual side of his work in the second place. The clerical ideal to-day is organisation. The ordinary curate has to spend his time in a round of meetings, hasty addresses, clubs, or visits, which all fit into the organisation of the parish. But a fixed time every day for reading, so as to maintain his intellectual power at the level of thinking men around him, does not form part of the daily routine. The result is that curates and vicars alike preach sermons which are not convincing

or effective. The argumentative clergyman is almost the worst type, because he will only grant certain premisses and cannot take the point of view of his opponent. But if men could avoid subscription and so take Orders this difficulty of the need for study would right itself. Some clubs or visits might have to be dropped, but perhaps the loss to the Church in the end would not be irremediable.

In the place of efficiency there seems to be growing up a poor substitute—amiability. The clergyman is becoming the man who is kind and good, and makes up for his inefficiency by trying to be pleasant to all. But this will not cover the greater mental deficiency. It is leaders of men that are needed. And leaders of men must have minds as well as bodies, frowns, if need be, as well as smiles, liberality toward all opinions, however unorthodox. Take away the initial barrier of subscription and much will follow, for a new type of man will be able to enter the ranks of the ministry. Individuality cannot be fostered save by freedom, and it is freedom which the rigidity of the Thirty-nine Articles make difficult for the clergyman.

(d) The efficiency of the Church suggests the most immediate need of all—the reform in administration and government. For it is this which is immediately involved in the word “Disestablishment.” The obvious need is for more freedom on the two principles of autonomy and democracy. There are three main aspects of the Church’s work, and in each of these immediate change is needed. In relation to the whole nation the present connection with Parliament has shown itself unworkable; in relation to the counties the diocesan organisations are unsatisfactory; in relation to the towns and villages the parochial system needs reform.

1. At present no change can be made in the Prayer Book except by a Bill in Parliament. Parallel with Parliament the Houses of Convocation meet to discuss questions, but without any practical results. Changes in the working of the Church are obviously needed, but no one dares to advocate the withdrawal of the present connection with Parliament lest the Church should cease to be national, while Convocation acquiesces in its powerless condition

lest even that semblance of effectiveness be lost. What is wanted is a legislative and an executive in religious as in secular matters. That involves a Synod and some sort of Cabinet. The present dependence on Parliament should be changed to autonomy under a Synod. The link with Parliament should be a representative body of three or four bishops and archbishops, who should sit in the House of Lords, not by virtue of their temporalities, but as representatives of the Church of the nation. With these safeguards, the Synod would be free to legislate for the Church. Changes in the Articles and the Prayer Book could then be made, and reform from within would become a possibility.

The Synod would take the place of the present Houses of Convocation, from which it would differ in several ways. For it would consist of one body representing the nation, and not two bodies representing obsolete provinces. It would consist of a large proportion of parochial clergy and a far smaller number of *ex officio* members than at present. But to make it a really national body, two other important elements are necessary. There must be some representation of Dissent, or the Church must remain sectarian. But if some representative Nonconformist ministers were members of it the possibilities of union would be greatly increased. Besides this there must be a large lay element—men elected not because they are merely good churchwardens or have titles, but because they are typical of the thought and feeling of the country, whether devout Churchmen or no. With a body like this the nation would feel that the national Church really did make for unity, and the benefit to religion would be very great.

With this deliberative body we need an ecclesiastical Executive or Cabinet. This should not be composed of bishops or clergymen only, but should also include some laymen. It should be of the nature of an advising body to the Archbishops. With the power of making her own laws, the Church would seek for its direction largely from this Cabinet, and if at least the two Archbishops remained in the House of Lords a connection with Parliament

would be maintained, and that as effectively as at present. This small executive body would also have immense influence in advising the Premier in the choice of diocesan bishops. For to sever this link with the nation would be a great loss to the Church.

2. In the diocesan organisation there is need for a far greater number of bishops. The chief pastor should not be a man who has to combine routine and supervisory work over the enormous areas of modern dioceses. The recent death of one of the ablest of modern bishops has shown this. A diocesan bishop should be aided by suffragans, who should leave him free for the supervisory work. The bishop must not be the far-off being he is, only seldom seen in the parish churches of his diocese. But it should be possible by a large increase of suffragans to bring the episcopate into close touch with the people. Among these suffragan bishops might well be numbered the leading Nonconformist ministers of the diocese. For with the variety which an autonomous Church would be able to allow in its services and usages there need be no hindrance to such a step as this. The effect upon the unity of the religious sects would be untold. Even the leaders of other earnest bodies of thought might well be drawn into the system. Nor must the diocesan bishop be the absolute ruler he is now. Just as the Archbishop needs a Cabinet, so the bishop needs a Council, at least half of which should consist of laity. Without such advice and help the professionalism from which the Church is suffering must increase. But with such a body the head of the diocese would not consider things merely from the clerical point of view. By this Council the suffragan bishops would be elected, and from their number in most cases the Premier would appoint the diocesan bishops. In this way the link of popular election with national appointment would be maintained.

Into the hands of a bishop with such a body of advisers all the patronage of the diocese would naturally fall. For if the patrons ceased to have the right to present directly to livings, but had the right to nominate to the bishop in Council, who might accept or reject, the evils

of private patronage would be obviated. Such a body would be the most effective for meeting the great difficulties of the Church—the inefficiency of the parochial clergy and their lack of numbers. For the men would be appointed less for their ability to pass an examination in Anglican orthodoxy than for their past record in the class lists at the Universities. The man who passes a bishop's examination after an unsuccessful career at the Universities is not the sort of man whom the Church needs. But if Honours men alone were accepted as candidates for ordination, and then of them were required some knowledge of theology, philosophy, and social questions, there would be less danger of an ineffective clergy. For a time the numbers of candidates for Holy Orders might fall off. But the more capable few could do much of the work of the less capable many, and the gain to the Church in the standard of clerical efficiency would be very large.

For the great evil of the lack in the numbers of the clergy two principles of reform seem possible. One is the increase in the attractiveness of the calling. Men of all kinds are wanted. Men who need scope for great energies, men who feel a great longing to live for others, men who are saints by nature, men who have gifts of all kinds would be drawn to a calling where the test was efficiency and not a bishop's theological examination and subscription to the Articles. For the efficiency would produce the attractiveness needed in the increased influence and usefulness which would attach to the clerical office. To the clergyman once more the man perplexed with religious difficulties would come, the reformer would look for sympathy, the labour leader would go for advice, the strong man as well as the weak woman would turn for comfort. Is not this an ideal to put before the ablest men as their life's work? Is it not thus that the numbers of the clergy would increase?

3. A second remedy seems obvious. The revival of the Diaconate is surely what is wanted. For men are needed who do not spend their lives in the functions of the ministry, but who live by their ordinary avocations while they have a certain recognised place and work in the

Church. Such men as preachers, as teachers, as charged with all the business matters of the parish, as responsible for what is given in charity and the like, would be of inestimable value to the clergyman, who might thus be released for the more spiritual duties. The primitive Church found the need of them, and we feel the need to-day. If men were set apart for these offices, and formed a regular order in the Church, much of the need for more clergy would be satisfied.

Some such reorganisation as this is needed, and at once. It is in the parochial system that the strength of the English Church rests. But the ineffectiveness of the parochial system is becoming more and more obvious every day. In the parish, as in the higher parts of the system, there must be a council to give the lay element a voice in its own affairs. Week by week the clergyman needs to meet representatives of his people, and so to learn what he is doing and what there is left to be done. Beside the Diaconate the parish council is needed for the sake of the great mass of parishioners who always will be mere men of the world and men of toil. To gauge their opinions and necessities the clergyman must be dependent on the advice of men in similar circumstances to themselves. It is the principle of democracy again, that what concerns the parish is not the private concern of the parson. The council would consist of elected representatives of the parish, whatever their creed, and it should have actual power of checking the parson in all matters that came before it, except as far as limited by the orders of the Diocesan Council and the national Synod. Thus each parish would again become the living ecclesiastical unit which it once was.

It is only by increasing the adaptability of the Church by self-government, by welcoming as Churchmen all those who are working for good, by increasing the quality and the quantity of the clergy, that the Church of England can remain the Church of Englishmen.

III. There is another popular term in connection with the reform of the Church—Disendowment. This is, perhaps, more definite in the popular mind than is Disestablish-

ment. The Church is felt to possess moneys which were given to her when she performed the functions of the modern Church, Chapel, Hospital, and School Board. Why, then, should it retain the whole? It is an argument which it is hard to meet merely by the statement that all this is private property when the Church is situated as it is now. But if Disestablishment involved changes such as we have noticed, and the Church became national by welcoming back those who have been driven from her, a great part of the difficulty would vanish. The real evil lies in the possibility of suspicion. If he was right who said, "Avoid all appearance of evil," there are good grounds for inquiring into the sources and uses of the wealth to which the Church lays claim.

We live in an age of Parliamentary Committees. What we need is a similar Committee of representative men of all classes and opinions, to investigate the revenues of the Church and fearlessly draw up a report. Much might have to be given up, but what remained would at least be free from suspicion. The Church could claim it fearlessly. The Ecclesiastical Commission was created to deal with the distribution of the existing revenues of the Anglican body. What is wanted now is an inquiry into the very existence of those revenues at all. Till some such report is made the demand of Disendowment will continue. One main subject of the inquiry would be the Tithe. Now this is precisely one of those matters which does so much harm by the very appearance of evil which it produces. Surely it were better to abolish Tithe altogether and work country parishes more on the system of missionary work from a centre than to make it possible for these attacks to be made. If the clergy were voluntarily to make some such sacrifice as this it would tell more on the nation than does the ubiquitous country rectory with its appearance of domestic comfort. Even if Tithe were modified or abolished, many endowments would remain. For it is the voluntary character of the support of the clergy which should rule any inquiry. Tithe offends this principle by its involuntary nature. But given the existence of a large sum from the past together with the gifts

of the faithful to-day, there are several problems which need solution. There are the glaring inequalities of income, from that of the bishop to that of the under-paid vicar. Few things strike the mind of the critic more than the "fatal opulence of the bishops." To the working man it is a standing difficulty. To the thoughtful man it seems an enormous price to pay. Why should the income of a Cabinet Minister be given to the bishop? The services rendered are not of a nature to require this great wealth. It may be said that the income is all absorbed in the necessary expenses. Then the remedy seems to be to have fewer expenses. To give a man the standing of a peer in order that his income may be spent in heading all the subscription lists of the diocese and in maintaining a palace is wholly out of keeping with twentieth-century conceptions of sacrifice. In consequence of this, as has been well said recently, the general idea of a bishop is connected with social rather than religious importance. But the bishop to-day is not meant to be a survival of his mediæval predecessor, who was the one opponent of the reign of force. To-day religious champions are effective in proportion to their sacrifice. The episcopal incomes may ensure decorum, but they cannot call forth admiration.

At the other end of the scale there are the continual complaints of the poverty of the clergy. Fund after fund is raised, but still the complaint goes on. But the problem really seems to be that of a fair wage. The difficulty baldly stated is this—the clergy have one measure of their own value, the nation another. Demand and supply will always in the end correspond. If, therefore, the clergyman is not paid for, it means that his functions are not worth the price he puts upon them. Indeed, may not the whole standard of living among the clergy be too high? There is a good house to be maintained, the children to be sent to the best schools and the sons to the University. But the work which is to produce means enough for all this is lacking, and hence the complaints. It is merely the other side of the inefficiency which we have already noticed. Once increase the standard of clerical efficiency and the clergyman would receive a suitable salary from

those who felt the need of his ministrations. Men want help for their daily lives and sympathy in their sorrow. But they do not want the mere professional advice which lacks insight into their real needs. Those men who touch the hearts of others, and men whom the intellects of others can respect, will never lack their daily bread. And more than "daily bread" the clergyman is hardly authorised to expect. It was largely this comfortable standard of living which drove Newman from the English Church.

One suggestion on the question of Disendowment I make with all due tentativeness, lest I seem to recommend to others what I should be slow to try myself. In many of the poorer town parishes is not a strong tie between parson and people broken by the fact that the people do not feel responsible for his maintenance? It might be at the cost of great suffering and discomfort, but would it not be effectual in the end if the people in the poorer districts saw that their clergyman suffered when and as they did? If they were out of work so that they could not put any money into the plate at church, they would see that he suffered from their want of work. If it was cold and firing was expensive, he would feel the pinch because they did. If they did not go on supporting him, he must leave them or die. If this system were followed out, might not the tie between clergyman and people be far stronger than is the case now, when the parson seems to be well off in comparison with his people in all seasons, whether trade is depressed or flourishing, whether they are grave or gay? Perhaps the experience of Dissenters in this form of endowment is conclusive against it. But it certainly seems to have many possible advantages.

With all the funds which could be legitimately used for the Church more equalisation would add enormously to the effective working of the whole. If the bishops received less and the bulk of the clergy more out of the remainder; if tithes were abolished or left optional; if clergy came to rest more on the offerings of their people, and their people to feel more responsibility for their clergyman; if the standard of comfort among the clergy were lower, then there might be less wealth indeed, but

more power. Is it not the need of such changes as these that expresses itself in the clamour for Disendowment?

IV. There is another great subject for reform, and that is the Church services. What is the object at which the work of the Church aims? The idea in the minds of most people, clergy and laity alike, is that this object is church-going. The great desire of the earnest worker is to induce people to go to Church. This done, all is done. And yet when the rare case takes place in which a man, and especially a young man, is persuaded to become a church-goer, an uneasy feeling prevails as to how long he will remain. We fear that the Church services will not justify themselves to him, and that he must be continually helped towards a right attitude to them by other attractions. But is it not possible that in this lies the root of the whole difficulty? Where is the Divine authority for the Anglican service of to-day? Surely the aim of the Founder of Christianity was to institute a new form of life, and not any particular form of worship. Church-going can but be a result of a new principle of life: it cannot be an aim to be set before a man who has no desire for Christianity. The man in the street, so far as the Church is concerned, is no abstraction. And to take him at once from the street and put him into a church, or to make him feel that church-going in itself is a good thing, is almost impossible. He cannot understand the connections between the services on Sunday and his inner life during the week. To the born Churchman they may be helpful: to the born agnostic they mean nothing.

It is pathetic to see the efforts of the clergy and others to make all their philanthropic and good work centre round the Church services. Club, refreshment-rooms, billiard-tables, lectures, debates, concerts—all are but the stalking-horse under cover of which the apathetic man is to be led on insensibly to the Sunday service in the church. But the man will go as far as the clergyman likes until the question of church-going comes in, and then he stops, and in the great majority of cases refuses to go any further. Yet the principle of division between secular and sacred, Church and Dissenting philanthropy lies in this church-going as

the object. Reluctantly, then, it may be, but none the less certainly, must the question be faced as to whether our empty churches do not establish the fact that our system of Church services is at fault.

For those, again, who are well off this principle of church-going seems equally barren of results. For the Church has become, as we have seen, the substitute for personal work. So long as a clergyman of a rich parish can fill his church and obtain good collections his duty is done. Any further claim upon, at any rate, the male part of his congregation would be considered out of place. Yet this does not really touch the life of his people, for church-going becomes a means to provide a decent excuse for their lives during the week. It is the same with the one form of self-sacrifice which the Church desires to produce in the well-to-do Christian—money-giving. The subscription list or the collection is the final test of Christianity. Yet this is but a weak test. It is easy enough to be grasping or to be dishonest to those with whom the Churchman is brought in contact in his business, if he can cover the multitude of his sins by his charity.

For the wealthy the destruction of the ideal of church-going as the whole duty of man would have great effects. For it would revive the long-lost ideal of personal self-sacrifice. The question for each man would be, not What can I hear that others are doing, or pay others to do for me? but What can I do myself? The Churchman would feel that because he was a Churchman his first duty was to share in the life of those less fortunate than himself. To share in the municipal life of his town, to raise the tone of life around him by infusing the local authority with a feeling of Christian responsibility, to inquire himself into all the burning social questions of the day and take his share, in office or out of office, in solving them—this is surely a form of Church membership which is at least as likely to be fruitful as attendance at church, with no further feeling of responsibility.

There can be no positive rules for the right observance of Sunday. For if the object in view be not the emphasis

of religion on one day but the raising of the religious tone of every day alike, the desire will be rather for the free development of the whole man than the restriction of his liberty in one direction. It should be the day on which the man whose eyes are bent on his work all the week can look upward to God in the forms which He manifests Himself to him. Not the day of mere physical rest, nor the day of unacceptable church-going, but the day in which "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report" may ennoble the life of the week. But that allows of open museums and picture galleries, walks, bicycle rides, and even serious plays, as well as open churches.

To the lay mind certain changes in the existing forms of service suggest themselves. The first is to make more differences between the services. Instead of two very similar liturgies in use at the morning and evening prayer it might be possible to have different services for professing Churchmen and for those who are not. If the evening service were to be that for Churchmen, much might remain as it exists now, yet with certain important alterations. In order to make the service a living thing there needs to be less rigidity in it. The regular prayers need to be varied with others, less familiar or extempore, which may bring their wants and hopes more nearly home to all the worshippers. The need is less for a beautiful rendering by the few than for the sense of a personal share in the service by all. But this is the element which is being more and more lost as the act of worship becomes more and more confined to vocal specialisation. If certain prayers were left to the clergyman's discretion, and he were allowed to introduce others in their place, or if various prayers were printed and distributed so that they could be said together, the element of freshness and life might be revived in the service.

The psalms are a great stumbling-block to many. It is difficult to think that they are the final expressions of religious poetry, though the service contemplates nothing

else as possible. Yet there seems no inherent reason why the poetry of the ancient Jews should never be varied by the poetry of our own day. The inspiration which prompted the singer of a Jewish era has not left the singers of the twentieth century of the Christian era. And if we sang or repeated some of the best poetry of our own times and that of the past centuries we should gain as great encouragement for a holy life as did the Israelites by singing or repeating the poetry of their own day.

The same principle might well be adopted with regard to the lessons. There are inspired writers of to-day who would teach and strengthen men as much as some of the priests and chroniclers of the Old Testament. Should the words of men like Ruskin or Carlyle or Mazzini be deemed wholly secular? Writers like these bring the thoughts of men to the problems and duties of their own day more than the accounts of the measurements of the Temple or the doings of the Jewish kings, or some of the more involved passages in the Prophets.

With thoughts ennobled by these means the sermon would follow as a real appeal from one man in sympathy with the world about him to others who needed his help and encouragement. The attention would be fixed on the present with its needs and the future with its problems in the light of the lessons of the past. It would be the return of prophecy. The Church would no longer be the place separated off from the busy world outside; instead, the cares of everyday life would be transfigured with the glory of God.

If something of this kind became the service for the professed Churchman in the evening a very different procedure might be followed in the afternoon for those who came as inquirers. Is not the old dialectic method the necessary principle? The strength and the weakness of the clergy lie in the fact that they speak without the possibility of contradiction. But if an afternoon service consisted less of the time-honoured prayers and addresses and more of the extinct discussion, the layman, gentle and simple, would be far more attracted to Church than he is now. The clergy are really afraid of this system as tend-

ing to irreverence, and likely to put them on the beaten side. But if they are the champions of truth they cannot be beaten in the end. And they would be treated with far more respect by the more thoughtful among their people if they confessed themselves beaten or ignorant when this was the case. Until this element is restored the return of the layman to church seems as far off as ever.

There is one more form of service which might mean a great deal to the labouring classes. That is some short prayers and words of encouragement in the early morning before the day's work begins. Matins at eight when the day's work is two hours old is not what is needed. But a ten minutes' service, to take the place of any private prayers by the workman, would at least show him that the parson began his day when his congregation did, and wished them Godspeed in their work. If a daily service is to be continued at all for poor parishes, it may well be that this would be its most useful form.

Beyond all these lies the innermost service—the Holy Communion, hedged in now by mystery and reverence till its simplicity is lost. But if that essential simplicity were restored, and the element of communion among the guests at that feast were combined with the Roman Catholic truth of the "Host," it would become a rite which would be obvious to all. This would be the real service of the morning for the men bound together by the brotherhood which the Church involves. No High Mass, no return to mediæval renderings, no celebration by the priest alone while the scanty congregation of women look on at the mystery. But the essence of it must be as its name implies—communion. The common loaf broken by all, the cup shared by all, the consciousness of a common strength and common object—these are the basis of this innermost yet simplest service. We want the spirit that shone out in the primitive Agape, not the unthinking idolatry of the mediæval Mass.

The increased sanctity with which the Church and all that goes on in it is surrounded, has its corollary in the increased unimportance of the clergyman in the work of

the secular world outside. For busy, toiling men there is discussion, free opinion, and argument. And here the parson never comes. It is at the secularist meeting that the working man hopes to find his few religious questions answered. But the clergyman does not come there to meet him and answer him. In the workshop the problems of life are raised and solutions proposed. But there is no place for the parson in the workshop. The stronghold of the workman at leisure is the public-house. But no effort is made by the clergyman to catch him while there. The Church is a more sacred place than it ever was before. But outside the world grows more and more secular. The old truth has been forgotten that the "kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent taketh it by force."

Some such ideas, some such changes as these, seem to be in the minds of average laymen, rich and poor. Perhaps I have been too outspoken. Perhaps my desire has too often seemed to be to attack rather than defend. Yet it is only by looking at the Church with the eyes of the opponent and the apathetic that we can bring it really back to do the mighty work which is committed to it. Because I am a Churchman I long for greater efficiency and more harmony with the needs of the twentieth century. This is the longing of all who care for the Church and the people. Shall we be blamed for speaking out while it is treason to fold the arms and cry "Peace" when there is no peace?

The one thing needful is a gospel—a good news which shall go straight to the heart of every man and convince him that it supplies his need. But the Church has lost its "glad tidings." It speaks to men in a language they do not understand, with an appeal to the past that seems insufficient for those whose life is in the present. Men begin to question whether the great object is not to maintain a system in existence already rather than to find out truth and to proclaim it. The strength of the Church in each age has been its close relation to the spirit of the times, its proclamation of the eternal truth in the terms of dominant thought. And it is for this union of the Church and the laity that we look unsatisfied to-day.

But we know that we do not look in vain. Linked with

the greatness of the nation in the past, the Church must be the coheir with the nation to the greatness of the future. Its duty and its privilege are not over. Only it is waiting, dazzled by all the glare of new truth that has burst upon it in recent years, till it grows accustomed to the light. Already behind all it is discerning the form of One who has been at hand in all the years of the past. And as it sees that what seemed dreadful is but the glory which shines about Him, there will be heard the words of help, "Lo, I am with you all the days."

APPENDIX.

Possibilities of Legislative Reform.

- I. Autonomy consisting of—
 - (1) Formation of an Ecclesiastical Constitution.
 - (2) This constitution to consist of—
 - (a) A Synod elected by clergy and laity, and consisting of clergy and laity.
This Synod would reform the Prayer Book and the Church services.
 - (b) An Archiepiscopal Council or Cabinet.
Some small representation in Parliament.
 - (c) Diocesan Councils, with whose consent alone Bishop's acts valid.
 - (d) Parochial Councils to authorise acts of parochial clergy.
 - (e) Revival of Diaconate.
 - (3) Diocesan Bishops still to be appointed by Prime Minister, but Suffragans to be chosen by Diocesan Councils.
- II. Inquiry into funds of Church (*i.e.*, Partial Disendowment)
 - (1) Rejection of funds to which claim was open to question.
 - (2) Partial abolition of Tithes.
 - (3) Curtailment of unnecessary incomes of Bishops.

VIII

IMPERIALISM

TO carry out the transformation detailed in the foregoing chapters of this volume are needed time, money, and resolve. But these indispensable conditions are not at the present moment forthcoming, principally owing to the domination of certain theories of foreign policy. Until this attitude is modified, ethical democracy has little chance of asserting or establishing its claims. Of the conditions above mentioned the two former require no discussion. Have we not the authority of the Speech from the Throne for saying that "the time is not propitious for any domestic reforms which involve a large expenditure"?¹ It is to the third—namely, the lack of resolve and to its causes—that attention is directed in the following essay.

I.

During the last century and a half Great Britain has become Greater Britain; but the mind of the Mother Country has adapted itself but slowly to the change. Gibbon Wakefield explained the art of colonisation, Lord Durham applied his principles to Canada, and Joseph Hume proposed the representation of the Colonies in

¹ January 30, 1900.

Parliament. But James Mill cynically declared the principal object of the Colonies to be that of providing careers for the scions of great families, and most men thought of England as the weary Titan staggering under the too vast orb of her fate. Dr. Congreve urged the cession of Gibraltar and a retirement from India after the Mutiny. Goldwin Smith, Regius Professor of History at Oxford, wrote his famous letters on the Empire to the *Daily News*, foretelling for the Colonies a great outburst of prosperity under their own flags. Cornwall Lewis, in his classical treatise on the Government of Dependencies, spoke disparagingly of "the glory which a country is supposed to derive from an extensive colonial Empire." A Committee of the House of Commons advised the withdrawal from our West African Colonies. Sir Henry Taylor and Lord Blachford, the Permanent Secretaries of the Colonial Office, recommended the release of Canada. Mr. Disraeli wrote in 1852, "These wretched Colonies will all be independent in a few years, and are a millstone round our necks." Lord Thring drafted a Bill for cutting the Colonies adrift. How far off these jeremiads and vaticinations seem to us! The influence of W. E. Forster and Sir Charles Dilke among politicians, of Seeley among historians, the lofty exhortations of Tennyson, followed by the emergence of Lord Rosebery and Mr. Chamberlain, the enthusiasm for the Queen revealed at the Jubilees, and the change of opinion in the Colonies themselves, together with the improvement of communications, have made a gulf between the England of 1870 and the England of 1900.

The change is writ so large that he who runs may read. And while we cannot fairly be expected to approve every step in the foundation of our Colonies, we all feel a pride in the spectacle of the development of communities of our fellow-countrymen increasing in numbers and prosperity, enjoying perfect self-government and entertaining an enthusiastic affection for the Mother Country all the stronger from the knowledge that it is in their power to sever the link at any moment they choose.

"Britain's myriad voices call :
Sons, be welded each and all,
Into one Imperial whole ;
One with Britain, heart and soul—
One life, one flag, one fleet, one throne !"

During the last generation another tendency, of a widely different character, christened Jingoism by its foes and Imperialism by its friends, has revealed itself. To the Palmerstonian system of hostility to Russia and general provocation was added hunger for territory, whether in the temperate zones or the tropics, whether already occupied by settled Governments or no. The conception of aggressive Imperialism received an immense stimulus, if indeed it did not owe its origin, to Lord Beaconsfield's ministry of 1874-1880. Escaping by what seemed a miracle from the shame of a second Crimea, the country was plunged by the Premier into a war with Afghanistan ; while in South Africa, the Transvaal, a State whose independence we had solemnly guaranteed by the Sand River Convention, was "annexed" without consulting the inhabitants of the country, and the Zulu nation was broken to pieces in a war provoked by Sir Bartle Frere. Mr. Gladstone's second ministry, by its virtues no less than its errors, contributed to the growth of the new spirit, which has been fostered by Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Rhodes, and other politicians, and has become articulate in the vigorous doggerel of Rudyard Kipling. France, Germany, Belgium, Italy, and the United States have joined in the scramble, and over five million square miles of tropical territory have been taken under the control of the Great Powers in the last twenty years. Austria alone has resisted the infection of what has been termed *Kilometritis*.¹

While rejoicing in the prosperity of our Colonies, it does not follow that we feel equal satisfaction at the record or the result of our non-Colonial expansion. Indeed the very circumstances that call forth our enthusiasm in the one case compel us, in some degree, to withhold it in the other. Where our flag flies over willing subjects and the institutions of self-government our rule may count on great

¹ Novicow's "Fédération de l'Europe."

reserves of moral and material strength ; where it does not, our material strength may be great, but the moral basis is either weak or totally lacking. This vital distinction is often lost in the intellectual confusion in which we are content to live, but is essential to a sound judgment of the part which England is playing or ought to play on the stage of human affairs. The confusion has been increased by the fact that the Colonial and Imperial movements have to a great extent synchronised and have been in some cases represented by the same men. It has been only too truly remarked that patriotism, which ought to mean the love of country, has with many come to denote the love of more country.¹ The critical faculty has been thrown off its guard by the fabulous rapidity of our territorial growth in the last few years. The King rules over twelve million square miles and four hundred millions of human beings—a quarter of the human race. Though we knew of old the qualities of our race—its high spirit, its love of adventure, its perseverance, its instinct of order, its faculty of progress—we are exposed to-day to the temptations that beset a man who suddenly finds himself the master of vast possessions. The tone and temper of our public life have already deteriorated. Our danger is no longer that our greatness may fail "through craven fear of being great," but that our moral notions may become fluid, that our eyes may be blinded by the dazzling glories of Empire to the principles which can alone preserve the fabric and alone make it worth preserving. The richer the harvest, the more peremptory the duty of those who are resolved to keep their country's fame untarnished to watch that no tares grow up with the wheat.

As in other great tides of opinion, good and evil elements are blended, and among the champions of the new faith are to be found moderates no less than extremists. In the present essay, however, I desire to call attention to certain characteristics of the recent growth of the Imperialist temper by which the moral currency is debased, and

¹ Robertson's "Patriotism and Empire."

which constitute a grave danger not only to our own Empire, but to the peace and well-being of the world.

The first notion against which we need to be on our guard is that the territorial expansion of the dominant races is not a matter to which considerations of morality apply. The Emperor Sigismund was pronounced by his courtiers "above grammar," and the arguments used by Machiavelli to justify the maintenance of a State are employed to justify its extension. The apotheosis of national egoism, or *Realpolitik*, arose in part from a reaction against the idealism of the eighteenth century, but owes its current popularity in large measure to the influence of the life-work of Bismarck. The idea has spread into the writing of history, and the Droysens and Sybels and Treitschkes apply it to the past as readily as the journalists to the present. The man who succeeds is right. *Si possis recte, si non quocunque modo.* Like Nietzsche's *Urbemensch*, we are "beyond good and evil." Support is sometimes sought in the doctrine that certain forms of political action are not only outside morality, but are "inevitable." "Expansion," declares Professor Giddings, "is as certain as the advent of spring after winter," a part of "Cosmic law," and opposition thereto is as futile as to the trade-wind or the storm.¹ An attempt is made to force Darwin into the witness-box, and the survival of the fittest is elevated from a statement to a precept. Professor Karl Pearson² has recently presented us with the materials for a new beatitude, which may be expressed, "Blessed are the strong, for they shall prey upon the weak." We are reminded of the humiliating experiences of King Canute and Mrs. Partington, and bidden to desist from our futile protests.

A second characteristic is national conceit.³ The very persons who talk most loudly of the inevitableness of expansion attempt to monopolise for their own country

¹ "Democracy and Empire," chapter on Imperialism.

² "National Life from the Standpoint of Science."

³ A penetrating analysis of this vice will be found in Gilbert Murray's article on "National Ideals," in the *International Journal of Ethics*, October, 1900; and Malagodi's recent work, "Imperialismo: Studii Inglesi," should not be overlooked.

or race the favours of destiny. England "expands," but Russia "encroaches." The reason for this distinction is that our rule is good and that the rule of other nations is bad ; it is therefore desirable that ours should be extended, while theirs should not. Besides, the future belongs to us and not to them. Has not Mr. Chamberlain assured us that "the Anglo-Saxon stock is infallibly destined to be the predominant force in the history and civilisation of the world" ?¹ "We are apt to believe our soldiers are braver, our sailors hardier, our captains skilfuller, our statesmen wiser than those of other nations," Lord Rosebery tells us. And Captain Lambton, the special *protégé* of Lord Rosebery, informs the world that "only those who understand English know liberty and practise freedom." But perhaps we have no right to expect that the gallant Captain should understand the laws of perspective or have heard of Switzerland or Holland or Montenegro. A very curious illustration of the lengths to which this self-satisfaction has gone is supplied by the Blue Books containing the replies of our consuls all over the world to the excellent circular addressed to them by Mr. Chamberlain asking whether our trade was declining, and, if so, to what causes its decline should be attributed. The great majority replied that the decline was undoubted, and declared with remarkable unanimity that it was almost entirely owing to our persuasion that as our goods were the best the customers ought to prefer them to German and American products. To recover our position we must provide not what we think they ought to want, but what as a matter of fact they do want.

A cognate variety of the national conceit that we are now considering is the religious. We are familiar from the Old Testament and other records of primitive civilisation with the conception of a "tribal god"—a deity recognised by and responsible for a single tribe alone. When the deity was believed to bear sway over a few square miles and to be surrounded on all sides by similar but somewhat weaker deities, the belief was perfectly natural. But though we are commonly supposed to have

¹ At Toronto, 1887, "Foreign and Colonial Speeches," 6.

exchanged territorial polytheism for ethical monotheism, the conception of a tribal god still enjoys the patronage of many of our accredited spokesmen. Lord Rosebery is moved by the retrospect of English history to ask, "Do we not hail in it less the energy and fortune of a race than the supreme direction of the Almighty?"¹ Our clergy have consistently assured us of the favour of Heaven in every campaign on record; and Dean Farrar, reviewing the century on the last Sunday in 1900, included the Crimean War among those in which the Almighty had "blessed our arms." In like manner Lord Roberts calmly ascribes the qualified success of his big battalions in the Boer War to the blessing of Heaven.²

It scarcely needs to be pointed out that the attitude sketched above is rendered possible by the ignorance in which the countries of the world live with regard to one another. It is, indeed, an era of telegraphs and special correspondents; but we are still far from possessing the information and insight necessary to form a correct picture of the thoughts and doings of our neighbours. The newspapers are from one point of view obstacles to the process, not only by supplying information that is often false and incomplete, but by making their readers imagine that it is correct and complete. Unless we have access to Blue Books or other sources of information, either by travel, by the study of critical or statistical works, or the magazines of the country concerned, we are certain to be often led astray. Where a paper feels the prejudices and interests of its special patrons to some extent bound up with the fortunes of one of the contending parties of a foreign state, it will enter into the struggle with the same headlong partisanship as we expect and make allowance for in our domestic controversies. Who, for instance, that has derived his knowledge of Bryan since 1896 from Mr. Smalley's hysterical invectives in the *Times* would realise that for

¹ Rectorial Address at Glasgow.

² Farewell speech at Capetown.—Compare Henry V., after Agincourt:—

"O God! Thy arm was here,
And not to us, but to Thy arm alone,
Ascribe we all."

many of the wisest and noblest men of the United States his attack on the great financial rings and on the baser developments of Imperialism has meant the thrill of a new life ?

Bound up with, and rendering possible this ignorance, is a want of imagination. It is very curious to notice the unsuspecting readiness with which the analysis of human movement provided by newspapers is accepted, all the more because the motives that operate so powerfully with ourselves might naturally be expected to weigh with those whose conduct we are presumably seeking to understand. We vilify in others the ambitions and passions we applaud in ourselves. When a nation does precisely what in its circumstances we should do or what we actually do ourselves, we are lost in astonishment and indignation and attribute its conduct to moral obliquity. We rejoice in our nationality and would fight to the death against anything that menaced it. We repeat with heartfelt emotion—

"This precious stone set in a silver sea,
This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England ;"

but we can only explain the reluctance of other nations to part with their nationality or to humble their pride on the hypothesis of what Gladstone called a double dose of original sin. The Irish, for instance, who differ from us in race and religion, after suffering from centuries of persecution, wholesale and in detail, and repeatedly sacrificing their lives to throw off the hated yoke of the foreigner, are at last declared "united" to their hereditary enemy. And yet England expects her sister isle to regard the Act of Union, carried by wholesale corruption and without consulting the wishes of the inhabitants, as an instrument of legal and moral validity. Since then, it is true, Catholic Emancipation has been granted—when we feared to withhold it longer ; and more recently Local Government has been extended to Ireland, and certain instalments of land reform have been conceded. The fact, however, remains that the country sees the wishes of the majority overridden by the interests of the minority

—who happen to be comparatively recent immigrants—and as a consequence remains discontented. What we give them is excellent in its way, but it is not what they want ; and it is childish to expect them to be grateful when we refuse them the only things they demand. The unreasonableness of expecting Ireland to feel gratitude to us is the same whether we regard Home Rule as a desirable or a mischievous consummation. During the critical period of the struggle for Italian independence English statesmen not only approved the attack on the Austrians (whose rights had been recognised in numberless treaties), but laid down in the most unequivocal manner the doctrine that the majority of the inhabitants of a country had the right to choose their own government and expel those who prevented their obtaining it. This doctrine, however, was not allowed to apply to Ireland. Again, it was thought monstrous that a single meeting of the English was broken up in Johannesburg, while it is considered by Unionists highly meritorious to “proclaim” a district in Ireland, although in the former case the majority consisted of men who had voluntarily entered the country less than ten years before, while in the latter it is the native population that is muzzled. In the same way we should resist to the death an attempt on the part of foreign Powers to seize our Chathams and Plymouths ; but we complacently force China to give us her ports when we think she is so weak that she cannot resist, and when she forcibly protests we are beyond measure astonished, and ascribe her action to the ingrained and incalculable wickedness of the Chinese nature. It is patriotism for Englishmen to “wipe out Majuba” ; but Frenchmen who cannot forget the annexed provinces and feel sore about Fashoda are lectured on the incurable defects of the Gallic character. One more instance must suffice. Speaking to the South African League in the summer of 1900, Mr. Rhodes invited the Dutch to “drop all this business about the war and develop the country.” The utterance is characteristic of its author, and reveals in a flash the attitude of those who through sheer lack of imaginative power failed to perceive why the Boers in the service of

an ideal which cannot be weighed or measured should continue to resist the alluring prospects of material well-being under an alien rule, and should fight to the death against the annihilation of their national existence.

A corollary of the foregoing defect is the credulity which we display in reference to countries or individuals against whom we are for one reason or another incensed. The Boer War, especially at the outset, has provided a number of examples of the total suspension of the critical faculty which bid fair to become classic. Mr. Lanham was sjambokked to death, but only learned his sad fate from the Rhodesian newspapers. Mr. McLachlan, though shot at Harrismith at Christmas, appeared none the worse three weeks after. The *Evening News*¹ roused our credulous citizens to fury with the utterly baseless assertions, "Armoured Train Destroyed—Refugee Women and Children Killed—Dastardly Outrage." On the outbreak of war the *Daily Mail* informed its million readers that "Englishmen are fighting to protect their women from insult," though not even the practised mendacity of the Rhodesian Press had ever ventured to include outrage among the grievances of the Outlanders. No wonder that when Mr. Winston Churchill reached South Africa he christened it the land of lies. Every lie explodes sooner or later, but the newspapers which herald its birth with all the resources of sensational advertisement either relegate its refutation to small print many weeks after or more discreetly omit it altogether. The next lie arrives, and is believed as readily as if its fellows had taken their place among established truths. This feverish credulity arises from two sources—firstly, from the passion from which few men are free for hearing anything which tends to disparage an enemy, and, secondly, from the disinclination to examine the nature of the agencies through which the communications arrive. To realise that the reports come from a single source—namely, the network of newspaper organisations owned or controlled by Mr. Rhodes and his friends—might be disquieting; and the British public therefore continues to believe that each of the reports

¹ The evening edition of the *Daily Mail*.

which concur so closely with one another possesses a separate and independent validity before which the unprejudiced observer must bow.

The next characteristic of our present mood at which we may glance is the glorification of war and the relative disparagement of the arts and achievements of peace. Many people believe that war is still one of the indispensable conditions of progress, a competitive examination that braces the faculties of nations, that a warless world would become slovenly and plethoric, and that manhood would lose its grip and fibre. This view is tersely expressed in Moltke's dictum, "Peace is a dream, and not even a beautiful dream," and finds more detailed expression in the *Spectator*, in the writings of Professor Cramb, Baron von Stengel (whom the Kaiser characteristically selected as his representative at the Hague Conference), and other militarists. Every student of history readily admits the important and in some cases the beneficial influence of war in the earlier stages of civilisation, and few are found to declare that war is always wrong; but with those who maintain that it is in itself a good no argument is possible.

There is a far larger class, however, which entertains no definite convictions as to the place of war in the present economy of the world, but which feels stimulated rather by the military than by the civil life and pursuits of the nation. It is not only the love of the crowd for pageantry, smart uniforms, and the stirring emotions of the drum and fife; for these we naturally expect to appeal to the Philistinism of an imperfectly-developed civilisation. It extends also to the exaltation of military achievements and the relative disparagement of the more humdrum pursuits of civil life. Have we not the authority of the defender of Mafeking for the statement, "Better than football, better than any other game, is man-hunting" ?¹ A striking example of the failure of our present stage of civilisation to effect a revision of moral values was presented by the sudden leap of Lord Kitchener into popularity after the

¹ "Aids to Scouting," p. 124.

battle of Omdurman, where an army equipped with the latest resources of scientific warfare mowed down many thousands of brave but ill-armed savages with trifling loss to itself. The whole world readily admitted the admirable talent of organisation displayed by Lord Kitchener in his long preparations for the final coup ; but nobody seriously believes that anything but the great *battue* could have evoked the instantaneous outburst of admiration for the victor in perhaps the most unequal struggle of modern history. On his return to England the conqueror found the streets blocked with his admirers and his photograph in the place of honour in ladies' drawing-rooms. It may be reasonably maintained that he deserved an ovation ; but will any one who has followed the regeneration of Egypt pit the achievement of Lord Kitchener against the patient statesmanship of Lord Cromer, who has given the best twenty years of his life to the country, and has made it what it is to-day, the model of English dependencies ? When Lord Cromer comes to London, who goes to the station to meet him ? The explanation is of course simple ; but it is not flattering. Long immunity from the realities of warfare has blunted our imaginations. We love excitement not a whit less than the Latin races ; our lives are dull ; a victory is a thing the meanest of us can understand. When we read on the bills, "Boers sabred by moonlight," we are supplied with a novel and striking image, which for a time relieves the monotony of life. The Romans clamoured for *panem et circenses*. We have changed our religion, and two thousand years have slipped by ; but the cry is the same to-day, and may be translated, "Good times, and occasionally a Mafeking day !" The extraordinary reception given to Cleveland's utterance on the Venezuelan Question surprised even close observers of the United States, and can only be explained in this way. A further illustration of the abeyance of the critical faculty is found in the glorification of the physical courage revealed in war. Nobody would dream of contesting the magnificent courage displayed by our troops on countless hard-fought fields ; but two points need to be borne in mind. Firstly, military courage is as old as mankind, and

has been at least as conspicuous among the worst as among the best of men. Alva's soldiers have left a rather sorry reputation behind them ; but their dauntless courage has never been surpassed. The Dervishes, again, who were denounced in our newspapers as the most cruel and degraded of men, displayed a courage which no British army has ever rivalled or is ever likely to have the opportunity of rivalling, since we cannot anticipate a battle in which we shall have to face an enemy enjoying the scientific advantages we enjoyed at Omdurman. In a word, military courage is in itself no surety for moral excellence, and often exists in company with utter moral degradation. And, secondly, the chances and occasions of civil life give rise to exhibitions of moral courage that receive but scanty recognition when placed in competition with the task of a soldier. Hundreds of instances of quiet, unobtrusive self-sacrifice and devotion, without the excitement of battle and without the supervision of a newspaper correspondent, take place among us year by year, and prove that the manhood of the nation does not flourish solely or chiefly by war. If we were less hypnotised by the pomp and pageantry of war, we should recognise in its true light the far higher quality of the courage displayed by men of science in their struggle to eradicate malaria and other scourges, and by individuals daring to tell excited multitudes of men that they may be wrong, as Fox in the American and French wars, Bright and Cobden in the Crimea, Lloyd Garrison in the Anti-Slavery struggle, Zola in the Dreyfus Case, and Mr. Morley, Mr. Courtney, and Sir Edward Clarke in the South African War. Why, again, should the soldier who serves his country in one capacity receive a pension, whereas another man who also contributes to the wealth and strength of his land by a life of honest industry receives none? The answer is, of course, that the soldier's pension is part of the bait by which we fill our ranks ; but we do not say so, and it is in consequence commonly believed that the soldier receives a pension owing to the inherent superiority of the service he renders to his country.

With these presuppositions it is almost inevitable that the

Neo-Imperialist should have a leaning to what are called "strong measures." To men who take short views it seems so much quicker and more effective to cut the knot instead of untying it. Foresight is scouted as the badge of doctrinaires and prudence as the mask of cowards. We in England ought to know something of the results of a policy of "thorough"; but the cry is still for "strong men" who are prepared to hew Agag in pieces. The infatuation which this doctrine produces was illustrated by Lord Salisbury's declaration, at the Academy dinner in 1900, that the South African problem was no longer in the hands of the Cabinet, but in those of the generals in the field. Immediately after the decisive battles of the Franco-German war, and before the idea of surrender had been broached, Bismarck established relations with Jules Favre and began to discuss terms. Had he remained at Berlin and told Moltke to let him know when the enemy had unconditionally surrendered the war would have lasted for years, and the victor would have suffered scarcely less than the vanquished. Our plan in South Africa, on the other hand, has been to demand what no nation and no army, however small, ought to accept. After our loud talk and our enormous armaments it might have appeared humiliating to seek to abridge the war by following Bismarck's methods; but events have shown it would have been far less damaging to our prestige than the continued spectacle of a population smaller than Sheffield, with half its fighting-men prisoners, maintaining its resistance for month after month to the greatest Empire the world has ever seen. We firmly believed in 1899 that loud talk would solve the South African problem, and in 1900 that wholesale farm-burning would cow the burghers. We are learning that short cuts are the longest ways; but when a crisis arises elsewhere our political instructors will doubtless once more insist on the sovereign virtues of the sledge-hammer. The meanest side of this spirit is, however, that the policy of *thorough* is only invoked against nations which are, or are believed to be, weak, and that when there is a formidable foe in the path the very men who blustered loudest against

the weak are found descanting on the importance of patience and compromise.

The belief in summary methods carries with it as a corollary an impatience of criticism. The vein of religious persecution is pretty well worked out; but its methods and stock-in-trade have been taken over by our self-styled patriots. The tyranny of the majority in politics is scarcely less formidable than in religion. The doctrine that all who canvass the doings of those in power or of the majority are traitors is as old as social life; and we have in quiet times in great measure outgrown it. It is, however, in times of stress and excitement that the sacred privilege of free speech is most valuable and most in jeopardy. A safety-valve is needed precisely when the fires are hot. Bismarck consistently maintained that critics of his policy were enemies of the unity and greatness of the German race (*Reichsfeindlich*), and his pupil has thought fit to style the largest party in the Empire a treacherous rabble (*hochverrätherische Schaar*); but this style of warfare has found its nemesis, and the German workers are steadily making good their claim to free criticism. In France we all remember the struggle of the little band of Intellectuals, who, undismayed by the taunt of *sans-patrie*, steadily accomplished a revolution in opinion and vindicated their patriotism by freeing the name of their country from the stain of a barbarous sentence. In our own land we recall with pride how Chatham, Burke, Fox, Rockingham, Shelburne, and a handful of followers in and out of Parliament waged unceasing warfare with an infatuated king and nation in a struggle which the younger Pitt described as "a most accursed, wicked, barbarous, cruel, unnatural, unjust, and diabolical war." Two generations later Greville's barometer records the state of the atmosphere at the time of the Crimea. "The rage for this war gets every day more vehement. The few sober people who have courage enough to hint at its being impolitic and uncalled-for are almost hooted down, and their warnings and scruples treated with indignation and contempt. . . . While the war fever is raging with undiminished violence, all appeals

to truth and reason will be totally unavailing. Those who entertain such opinions do not dare to avow them. I do not dare to avow them myself ; and even for holding my tongue, and because I do not join in the senseless clamour which everywhere resounds, I am called a Russian.”¹

Yet Bright and Cobden were right and the many were wrong, and the country could and would have been saved from a hideous blunder by listening to its “traitors” instead of burning them in effigy. “Give me,” said Milton—“give me liberty to know, to utter and to argue freely according to conscience above all other liberties.” So disgusted was Cobden at the behaviour of his countrymen, that he declared it was as useless to talk to them of reason as to mad dogs, and that next time he should step aside when the first shot was fired.

History, then, both past and present, affords no presumption that the majority in moments of national excitement is right. Majority-making is a very simple operation. A large number of men, in the imperfect stage of civilisation we have reached, look favourably on violent solutions, especially if they consider they have a reasonable certainty of victory. At the first sound of the tocsin of war the vast majority of the ignorant and the indifferent go over *en bloc* to the war party, and a “majority” is secured. The majority is then declared synonymous with the nation. Its belief becomes the standard of patriotism, and the patriot is he who consents to shout with the largest crowd.² Those who refuse to follow in the footsteps of Dr. Pangloss, who attempt to show that the conduct of the leaders of the majority has been unwise or unrighteous, who make an effort to understand the point of view of an opponent, are denounced as traitors who care nought for their country. No student of history or of the psychology of the crowd can retain illusions as to the wisdom of

¹ February 25, and December 11, 1854.

² Even those to whom the reputation of the Conservative party is not a matter of direct concern may be permitted to express a hope that in calmer days it may yet blush for the tactics of many of its members during the General Election of 1900. Some instructive specimens of the manners of the “gentlemanly party” may be found in the *Liberal Magazine*.

multitudes. Bishop Butler one day surprised his chaplain by inquiring if nations could go mad. Matthew Arnold has analysed with his usual penetration the idea of Numbers.¹ Carlyle speaks in his picturesque way of delusions "which sometimes seize on whole communities of men, everybody adopting them, everybody finding the whole world in agreement with him, and accepting them as axioms of Euclid, and in the universal repetition and reverberation taking all contradiction as an insult and a sign of malicious insanity, hardly to be borne with patience." Philip has been drunk before, and he may well be drunk again. Walpole could not stop the nation from an insane and unnecessary war with Spain when Jenkins produced his (or somebody else's) ear in the House of Commons; and from Jenkins's ear to the death of the murderer Edgar is not a very far cry. Approbation of Sir A. Milner's policy is made a touchstone of loyalty, and Mr. Brodrick tells us that those who criticise it are "enemies of the Queen." Meetings held to express views contrary to those of the majority are broken up, with the avowed approval of the majority. But the time will come when the assault on the Rowntrees at Scarborough will receive the same condemnation as the destruction of Priestley's house at Birmingham.

This conduct is defended to-day on two grounds. There are many who adopt consciously and avowedly the principle of "My country, right or wrong." "Patriotism," says Spencer, "is nationally what egoism is individually, and both are necessary; but while excess of egoism is everywhere regarded as a fault, excess of patriotism is nowhere so regarded. For a man to confess he has been wrong is thought praiseworthy; but to admit that our country is wrong is 'unpatriotic,' and the blameworthiness lies with those who try to restrain it."² This attitude, it is unnecessary to point out, gives a hot-headed and incapable politician *carte blanche* to commit the country to any crime or blunder with the assurance that the people will obediently flock to his support when the

¹ Discourses in America.

² "Study of Sociology" (The Patriotic Bias).

decisive step is once taken. What little progress has been made from international savagery is due to the efforts of individuals to take an unprejudiced view of questions at issue, and to think not only of the supposed interest of one's country but of the larger interests of the peace and well-being of the world. To say that while a stream of denunciation is poured forth on platforms and in the Press against the enemy, not a voice or a pen is to correct mis-statements and exaggerations is to deny the fair-play to which we all render lip service, and for which we clamoured in the Dreyfus Case. But as the formula, "My country, right or wrong," implies that the speaker deliberately sets aside the appeal to moral principles, it is impossible to argue, since all argument rests on an appeal to principle.

The second defence is set up by those who in theory strongly reject this immoral doctrine, but advocate or tolerate the muzzling of dissentients on the ground that they have no case worth listening to. The argument runs somewhat as follows: "I am quite aware that the minority have often been right, and the majority were in these cases very gravely to blame for refusing to listen to them; but in the present case it is different, the rightness of our conduct being obvious and indisputable." This form of intolerance is yet more insidious and unworthy, since it ends by flouting the very principles the existence of which it recognises. Nobody contends that the minority are always right, nor is the assumption necessary; for intolerance is as great a sin whether the minority are proved by history to be right or wrong. Outrage is committed against opinions which may turn out to be right, and which cannot be proved to be wrong. "The first appearance of truth to our eyes," so we read in the "Areopagitica," "bleared and dimmed with prejudice and custom, is more unsightly and unpalatable than many errors." Again, as Mill has clearly shown in his "Essay on Liberty," it may often happen that though the minority may not be wholly or even in a large degree right, they may nevertheless possess valuable elements of truth, the recognition of which would save the majority from

mistakes. The same process of boycotting is carried on in the greater number of newspapers and reviews. Journals must live, and to retain their circulation they must convey to their readers what they like to hear, and withhold from them, as far as possible, what they do not like, and thus we have the eviction of editors representing the minority, the silent addition of their papers to the ranks of the majority, and the virtual closing of these papers to communications from those who disagree with their attitude. And thus a fictitious unanimity is created which serves to gull simple and ignorant people who do not know how it is produced into the belief that there really are practically no dissentients. The correspondence columns of the *Times* during the days following Professor Dicey's letter on free speech in the spring of 1900, reveal plainly enough what free argument has to expect from the new Imperialism. When the dissentient is too powerful to be boycotted the majority fall back on a second line of defence, and attack his character and motives. The classical example provided by the war has been that of Mr. Bryce. The member for Aberdeen knows more about the politics and the nations of the world than any man in the House of Commons except Sir C. Dilke, and has written a book which has become classic in the lifetime of its author. He also happens to possess a closer acquaintance with the forces and tendencies of South African life than anybody in English public life. He is, further, the author of a work which does for South Africa of our own day what Theal has done for its past, and owing to its information, its fairness and its insight was greeted on its appearance by a chorus of approval from all parties at home and the Cape, and, though jealously scrutinised ever since, has never been convicted of error either in fact or judgment. But when he declares that the war might have been avoided he is described as a doctrinaire, his new preface is declared inconsistent with his book—though the inconsistency, for an obvious reason, has never been pointed out—and an attempt is made by Mr. Smalley (who lives in New York) to lessen his influence by assuring the readers of the *Times* that Mr.

Bryce fails to respond to the legitimate financial expectations of his constituents (in Aberdeen). Future historians may have difficulty in judging of the South African War ; but one does not need much prophetic power to guess how they will characterise the pettiness, the meanness, the unworthiness of the treatment accorded to an illustrious Englishman. A scarcely less humiliating scene was the savage attack on Sir William Butler, who was prevented by military etiquette from defending himself, and whose offence consisted in having cautioned the Government against the exaggerations of the South African League, and deprecated a "surgical operation."

Another characteristic of Neo-Imperialism is the exploitation and maltreatment of native races.¹ No one denies that the earlier record of the pioneers of civilisation in this respect is a hideous story of oppression and cruelty. Americans, Belgians, Dutch, English, French, Germans, Portuguese, Russians, Spaniards have all stained their history. And recent history, scarcely if at all less than remote, proves that when men are far from civilised society and can do what they like, they tend to do their worst rather than their best. Those who shirk a prolonged inquiry may learn something of the lesson from Stevenson's vivid stories of Samoan life ; and another witness, not justly chargeable with maligning the bearers of the British flag in the far places of the earth, makes Tommy exclaim—

"Ship me somewhere east of Suez, where the best is as the worst,
Where there ain't no Ten Commandments and a man can raise a
thirst."

Though slavery and the Slave Trade have been formally abolished by the Powers, the spirit which produced them is still among us and requires constant vigilance. This spirit takes two forms. In the first place, native races are frankly declared to belong to a lower order of humanity, and to have no claim to the ordinary privileges

¹ No one should fail to read in this connection Mr. Gilbert Murray's able and temperate essay on *The Exploitation of Inferior Races in "Liberalism and the Empire."*

of white men. The Dum-Dum bullet, for instance, was condemned at the Hague Conference by all the Powers except England and the United States, which declared that they could not forego their use in native wars. But while we think it perfectly right and proper to inflict horrible wounds on men who do not possess a white skin, it is regarded as a crime that the bullets should be used against ourselves. Of course it is said that the savage can only be stopped by an expanding bullet. There may, perhaps, be a difference in degree; but the testimony of men who have been in desperate charges—"I felt as if I had got hell fire inside me"—makes it clear that the distance between the black and the white man in moments of intense excitement is too small on which to found any such distinction. It is noteworthy, too, that other Powers who are liable to war with dark races regarded the precaution as needless. Mr. Rhodes, again, a "personification of Imperialism," according to the *Times* (which ought to know), voted in the Cape Colony Assembly for the Strap Act, giving the master right to flog natives, with reference to a magistrate. Sir Arthur Hardinge sneers at "the anti-slavery faction" in Zanzibar; and it is very doubtful whether Governor Eyre would have been brought to book if he had hung Gordon in 1901 instead of 1865. The destruction of natives is both the business and pleasure of life to Mr. Kipling's heroes. When Blind Dick Heldar in the Sudan hears the fire of a gun he exclaims rapturously, "Give 'em hell! Oh, give 'em hell!" and we are told with gusto how the hacking and hewing of Afghans makes a noise like the cutting of beef on a block. Other nations are no better. Dr. Peters, the father of German Imperialism and the founder of German East Africa, has recorded in his own book his murders and his immoralities, and was treated like a hero till Bebel denounced him in the Reichstag.

Not only are native races denied the personal rights recognised at least in theory as the privilege of the white man; they are denied national rights as well. Here, again, all nations are, we fear, equally, or almost equally, to blame. Many years ago Lowell described with the insight

of genius the feelings of Hosea Bigelow in reference to the Mexican War. And in 1899 we find Mr. Lecky writing : " No one can fail to notice with what levity the causes of war with barbarous or semi-civilised nations are scrutinised if only these wars are crowned with success, and how strongly the present commercial policy of Europe is stimulating the passion for aggression."¹ The descendants of the men who fought and died for the right to live their own national life under their own flag now explain that when the authors of the Declaration of Independence declared government to derive its authority from the consent of the governed, they only meant " the probable consent of the governed at some future time," the governors themselves being judges of the probability.² And the politics are worthy of the logic. The Philippine War goes far to cancel the debt of liberty that the world owes to the United States. The Filipinos, unable to bear patiently the Spanish yoke with its political and ecclesiastical tyranny, broke into revolt in 1896. Two years later the States determined to intervene in Cuba, and gave Spain notice to quit. She refused, and Dewey at once destroyed the Spanish fleet at Manila as an incident in the campaign. The destruction of the fleet, however, was very far from involving the conquest of the islands. In April Dewey and Pratt, the American agent, had had conferences with Aguinaldo, and had arranged to act together against Spain, on condition that the Filipinos should be independent under an American protectorate. Having made this alliance, the States offer a price to Spain for the islands, which are sold like merchandise across the counter in defiance both of their claim to an independent life and of the express provisions of the contract. The Filipinos very properly resisted, and an episode of naked brigandage is still in progress.

Another variety of attitude towards the native question is that in which a country professes the full recognition of the rights and privileges of natives, but takes on itself the

¹ "Map of Life," p. 180.

² Giddings' "Democracy and Empire," chapter on Consent of the Governed.

duty of guardian. "Take up the white man's burden." The classic example is the Congo Free State. The King of the Belgians, in whose hands the exclusive control of this vast tract of tropical Africa has been vested, solemnly declares, "our only programme is that of the moral and material regeneration of the country." The full story of that "regeneration" has never been told, and perhaps never will be; but enough has leaked out to let us see what an orgy of wickedness it has been. The administration of the country has been entrusted to men who are certainly not selected for their exemplary moral character, and who leave behind them the restraining influences of civilised society. The massacres, the extortions, the exploitation form an impressive commentary on the programme of the king and the eulogies of those who are financially interested in the scheme.

Another crowned head has been more frank, if no better inspired. Speaking to the recruits about to start for China the Emperor William urged them to take the Huns for their model, and to give no quarter. His War Minister defended this diabolical utterance by explaining to the Reichstag that it was only what the Huns had done to Europe some fifteen hundred years before. His commands have been carried out to the letter. The allied troops have not encumbered themselves with prisoners. The Ten Commandments have been suspended. "Looting," telegraphed Dr. Morrison from Peking, "is proceeding systematically." The soldiery—the Russians and French apparently in the van—fell upon the women with the same bestial fury as the Turks and Kurds on the Armenians. Dr. Dillon's article¹ is unhappily confirmed by other eye-witnesses, and we can no longer doubt that non-combatants were subject to murder and outrage, and that where anything was found worth stealing it was stolen. The wholesale slaughter at Blagovestchensk on the Amur was a crime greater in magnitude, not in degree, than the numberless unnoticed atrocities perpetrated in village and city. "Foreign devils" Europeans were, in name, before; foreign devils they have now proved

¹ *Contemporary Review*, January, 1901.

themselves to be. The year 1900 will live in history no less for the conduct of the standard-bearers of Christianity than for the conduct of the Chinese.

II.

My attitude has been, to a large extent, negatively defined in the above review of the elements of weakness and danger in the current conception of Imperialism. I shall now fill in the picture by a few positive touches, and lay down the plain rules that are vital to the moral health of great and small nations alike.

The first rule is that progress towards civilisation owes its triumphs to the recognition of the principle that moral causes determine the standing and falling of nations no less than of individuals ; that the spirit of Machiavelli is as disastrous in international as in domestic affairs ; that the end of statesmanship is to raise the standard of political and international conduct to the level which obtains in private relations. "The principle of true politics," said our greatest political teacher, Burke, "are those of morality enlarged, and I neither now do, nor ever will, admit of any other." ¹ What, we may ask, does it profit a State if it gain the whole world and lose its own soul ? *Jam seges est ubi Troja fuit.* Sir John Seeley, who would be called a Little Englander if he were alive to-day, is sufficiently explicit : "If by remaining in the second rank of magnitude we can hold the first rank morally and intellectually, let us sacrifice mere material magnitude." ² To demand that statesmen will in all cases act on strict moral principles may be as unreasonable as to expect a perfectly straight course in the sphere of individual conduct. The important point is that the existence and authority of the moral standard should be recognised in public as it has long been recognised in private relations. The excuse that while other nations recognise no moral obligations we cannot fairly be expected to do so is equally relevant in private affairs, where its cogency is no longer admitted,

¹ Letter to the Bishop of Chester. "Correspondence," i. p. 332.

² "Expansion of England," p. 16.

the rights of self-protection being, of course, reserved in both cases. To enforce the recognition of a moral standard we need to watch every move on the political chess-board, and must not hesitate to proclaim where a country, even if it be our own, has broken the rules of the game. The most learned of living historians declares his chief message to be "never to debase the moral currency nor lower the standard of rectitude, but to try others by the final maxim that governs our own lives, and suffer no man and no cause to escape the penalty which history has power to inflict on wrong."¹

The doctrines of political materialism receive no more countenance from Science than from Ethics. The principle of causation applies in the political and moral no less than in the physical world, but in a different way; for in the former our wills and ideals themselves form part of the determining conditions. Machiavellianism "puts aside the living forces by which societies subsist." "L'histoire," said Guizot, "soutient les longues espérances;" and the little encouragement that history can offer us is derived from the gradual, if often almost imperceptible, advance of justice, conscience, and humanity in their eternal struggle with violence. Machiavelli was wrong, not in saying that the means are to be judged by the end, but in making the end itself too narrow; for instance, the maintenance of a particular dynasty or the aggrandisement of a particular state. The end must be what the scholastics term an universal end, and must contribute to the general well-being.² The falsity of seeking an analogy in biological science is exposed by the two greatest interpreters of the evolutionary doctrine. Professor Huxley's latest utterance, the Romanes Lecture, stated categorically that the ethical process, so far from working along the lines of the physical process, only existed by combating it; and Mr. Spencer's "Study of Sociology" is an eloquent commentary on the text that our judgments, no less than our conduct, must be referred to and tested by principles. The

¹ Acton's "Study of History."

² Nobody should omit to study Morley's Romanes Lecture on Machiavelli, and the late Henry Sidgwick's address on Public Morality, published in his "Practical Ethics."

principle of mutual toleration and mutual support is the exact antithesis of the struggle for existence, and it is the development of this principle that differentiates civilisation from nature and from savagery. The true "decadents" are they who throw to the winds the conquests that have been wearily won by the century that has closed. "Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control—these three alone lead men (and nations) to sovereign power." Gladstone's words, spoken twenty years ago, will bear quoting to-day: "It is a common reproach to us Liberals that we are indifferent to the greatness of the Empire. One thing I will say—I hope we shall never seek to extend the Empire by either violently wresting, or fraudulently obtaining, the territories of other people."

Scarcely less necessary, as an abiding source of our greatness, than the recognition of a moral standard in international affairs is the cultivation of a saner estimate of the position we hold in the world. Our certainty that we are the finest flower of civilisation and that the future rests with us may be well grounded; but we need to bear in mind that a precisely similar conviction is entertained by other nations in regard to themselves. At the zenith of the Spanish dominion Campanella wrote a famous work asserting the moral and political right of Spain to the supremacy over mankind. In our own day Victor Hugo declares France "the saviour of nations," and bursts out, "Non, France, l'univers a besoin que tu vives! Je le redis, la France est un besoin des hommes." Villari, echoing the illustrious Gioberti, claims for Italy the primacy among nations. The Kaiser tells his people "Der alte gute Gott has always been on our side." M. Pobyedonostseff points to the freedom of Russia from the shibboleths of a decadent civilisation, and looks to the young and vigorous Slavonic stock as the reverent legatee of the treasures and conquests of the past. The Americans are not less confident than in the days of Martin Chuzzlewit that it is their mission to "run this globe." The Boers, as we are so often told, regard themselves as the Chosen People. Nor is this belief confined to the white Powers, for we find it in undiminished

intensity among the Chinese, to name no others. We cannot all be right, and yet none of us are wholly wrong. There is no such thing as abstract goodness of type ; for in pronouncing judgment on a government, a people, or an era, we have to take into account a multitude of factors, political, economic, moral, intellectual. It is sufficient for each of us to claim and to deserve a place in the van of civilisation.

In the same way no sane and reflective Imperialism will arrogate to itself the special protection of the Almighty. How do we know? Is the growth of our Empire more remarkable than the rise of the Hohenzollerns to the Imperial throne, or of the Princes of Savoy—a non-Italian power—to the kingdom of Italy, than the change from Ruric to the Great White Tsar, from the struggling boatload of the *Mayflower* to the United States, or the age-long defence of the Black Rock against the Turk? The rise of our fortunes is certainly neither more rapid nor more thrilling than that of others ; nor are the methods by which it has been accomplished of a higher order than those employed by our rivals. Lord Rosebery's claim, if it has any point, means that we are under the peculiar protection of the Deity. If he did not mean to claim any special favour, but only a share of that which is vouchsafed to others as well, the claim is not worth making. We have even less right to appropriate the lion's share in the graces of the Almighty than in the virtues and privileges of the world of man. No nation and no individual will do anything worth doing unless they feel they have a mission—a duty to perform and the power to fulfil it. But whatever beliefs we may entertain as to the share of the Deity in the affairs of man, we must start from the assumption that there is no favouritism in the Divine economy.

In the next place, we cannot afford to overlook the claims of other nations. One of the primary articles in the faith which is at once the cause and the consequence of progress is the recognition of the community of moral interests among nations. We can no more stand alone in the international family than the citizen in the State.

Indeed, the highest ideals can only be accomplished by an ungrudging recognition of the solidarity of human interests. No nation can afford to despise or neglect the opinion held of it or its conduct by other nations. This fundamental truth was eloquently stated by Gladstone in the Don Pacifico debate, in which Palmerston attempted to justify himself for bullying a tiny Power over a trumpety grievance and alienating the respect and goodwill of Europe. "There is an appeal from the people of England to the general sentiment of the civilised world, and I, for my part, am of opinion that England will stand shorn of a chief part of her glory and pride if she shall be found to have separated herself, through the policy she pursues abroad, from the moral support which the general and fixed convictions of mankind afford, if the day shall come when she may continue to excite the wonder and fear of other nations, but in which she shall have no part in their affection and regard." And elsewhere he speaks of "the sound and sacred principle that Christendom is formed of a band of nations who are united to one another in the bonds of right; they are without distinction of great and small; there is an absolute equality between them. I hold that he who by act or word brings that principle into peril or disparagement, however honest his intention may be, places himself in the position of one inflicting injury upon his own country and endangering the peace and the most fundamental interests of Christian society." It was the enunciation of these and similar principles which gained their author the honour of Bismarck's sneer at "Professor Gladstone." The claims of this principle have been recognised by Imperialists on occasions when they are able to apply it to other peoples. Thus in the Dreyfus Case the *Times* invited France to bow to the unanimous and disinterested voice of Europe. When, however, the voice of Europe is against ourselves it ceases to be the voice of God and becomes the shriek of jealousy, ignorance, and hatred. It is absurd to say that Europe understood the Dreyfus Affair and did not understand the African imbroglio. The former was at least as complicated as the latter, Europe was not acquainted

with all the details in either matter, and judged by the main outlines. In the one case it saw that a man had been unfairly tried ; in the other, that a large nation interfered in the internal affairs of a small nation, which happened to possess the richest goldfields in the world, in defiance of Convention and International Law. The forfeiture of a nation's life is an altogether disproportionate penalty to pay for the badness of a Government ; and in any case it is not for us to exact the forfeit. M. Brunetière summed up the matter in an article written at the request of the editor of the *Edinburgh Review*. " L'opinion française ne veut voir et ne voit en effet qu'une chose. À la fin d'un siècle qui s'appellera dans l'histoire le siècle du réveil des nationalités, et, par conséquent, où le grand crime politique, le grand crime international, est de détruire une nationalité, c'est ce que les Anglais n'ont pas craint d'entreprendre " (April, 1900). If we recognise a tribunal at all it is not dignified to bow to it when it echoes our views and revile it as a packed bench when it decides against us. The unanimity of the decision was fully recognised by Lord Salisbury (April 30, 1900). " Nothing is more remarkable than the way other nations have joined in denouncing our action, even where we had no ground for believing there was any antipathy or hatred before," and, we may add, where there was little or no antipathy or hatred before. Mr. Chamberlain, however, sees in this condition of affairs a cause not for searching of heart but for congratulation. He explains to us that the hatred of Europe is a testimony to our strength, and that we were " less hated " before his advent to power only because we were " less feared." To which the answer is that the novelty of the present situation lies in the fact that whereas in former decades the despotic Governments of the Continent have often been against us, it is to-day for the first time that the Socialists and the masses are hostile. Mr. Chamberlain would do well to meditate on the emphatic utterance of his fellow-Unionist, Mr. Lecky : " Of all forms of prestige, moral prestige is the most valuable, and no statesman should forget that one of the chief elements of British power is the moral weight that is behind it " (" Map of Life").

It follows from the acceptance of the principle of the community of moral interests that our diplomatic relations with foreign Powers should be carried on with courtesy and consideration. This axiom is in danger of being forgotten. The irreducible equipment of a diplomatist is the character and manners of a gentleman. Courtesy is recommended by obvious considerations in dealing with a powerful nation ; but men who are not courteous by nature allow their deficiency to appear in negotiating with a power which they consider weak. It would be difficult, for instance, to find any one, whatever he thinks of the South African War, to approve of certain famous references to "squeezed sponges" and "hour-glasses." Mr. Chamberlain has also shown us what to avoid in public references to friendly Powers. When our relations with the Kaiser were strained, he took occasion to remark that Queensland was three times the size of Germany. When the successful handling of the Chinese problem depended on harmonious relations with the Tsar, he quoted the adage of the devil and the long spoon. When a few French caricaturists, reprobated by the majority of their countrymen as strongly as by ourselves, insulted the Queen, he declared that the French must mend their manners. When our relations with the United States were becoming cordial, he offended them in their most susceptible point by declaring them our allies.

The true Imperialism, in the next place, makes a serious effort to rate the glories and uses of war at their real value. No one who conceives of history as an evolution denies that civilisation, in Lowell's phrase, has sometimes "moved forward on the powder-cart"; but the very doctrine of evolution that recognises its value in the early stages of the long ascent demands other instruments for other times. General Sheridan's dictum, "War is hell," becomes increasingly true as the civilisation of the combatants rises. When the whole of the community is organised for war, and the arts of peace are in a rudimentary stage of development, the inconvenience caused by war is little felt ; but with the organisation of society on the assumption that peace is the normal condi-

tion of life, war dislocates and disintegrates the entire fabric.

The Great War with France retarded political and social reform for forty years, and brought England to the verge of revolution. This is the answer to those who argue from the value of war in the past to its value in the present. We do not affirm that war is now in all cases wrong; it is not wrong to resist an attack on the life of a nation, or to revolt against an intolerable *régime* of rapine and slaughter. Fox supported Pitt in his resistance to French aggression on Holland in 1787; Cobden approved the position taken by the North in the Civil War; Gladstone applied coercion to Turkey in reference to Greece and Montenegro, and was prepared to apply it again in the case of Armenia and Crete. Our contention is merely that most wars in our own time are unnecessary, and owe their origin to the deliberate purposes or the inexcusable blundering of a handful of men. Emerson has quaintly remarked, "To some men war begins to look like an epidemic insanity, breaking out here and there, like the cholera, infecting men's brains instead of their bowels." The riper judgment of the world has determined to regard war as a disease to be combated and, if possible, eradicated. And the best way of decreasing wars is to ceaselessly counter-work the instinct to elevate the achievements of war above those of peace, and to point out that in the stage we have reached any wars save those of defence or of revolt against Turkish standards of government do more harm than good.

This education cannot be successfully carried out while many of the natural teachers of the people use their position to inculcate doctrines on the emphatic rejection of which progress depends. Mr. Morley was abundantly justified in singling out the militarism of the pulpit as one of the most distressing features of our plight. It is, of course, nothing new. Wise old Fuller records in his "Church History" the tendency he had observed for "the pulpit to be of the same wood as the council-table." But it is distressing that our clergy, the official representatives of a gospel of peace on earth and goodwill towards men,

show themselves, with a few honourable exceptions, as much as ever to be made of the same common clay as their flocks. The mediæval Church at least attempted to enforce the Truce of God ; but where is the war which our clergy have done anything to avert? We remember how the Archbishop of Canterbury encouraged Henry V. to undertake a wanton attack on France—

“With blood and sword and fire to win your right.”

Two bishops alone denounced the American War ; and the opposition to the Crimean came from laymen, not clergy. Unless on the assumption that all England's wars have been just, have they not failed in one of their elementary duties ?

We need still more a change in the Press. What instructed person will say that our papers are better than those of our neighbours, or that the last decade has seen an improvement in their moral atmosphere? They have, indeed, money behind them, and their network of special correspondents in many parts of the world has no counterpart. But, as regards the moral level, wherein is the *Daily Mail* superior to the *Petit Journal*? The *Times* no longer wields the power described in a famous passage by Kinglake ; but its character is the same as when O'Connell said that when praised by that paper he always examined his conscience, as when Cobden said you might be sure you were right when the *Times* was against you, as when Emerson noticed its skill in avoiding the society of minorities. Except in price, quality of paper, volume of news, and a less rhetorical style, is the standard of the *Times* greatly superior to that of the *Daily Mail*? In both we find the same crude spread-eagleism, the same contempt for moral ideals, the same unquestioning confidence in the efficacy of force. In times of excitement the pressmen hold the conscience of the country in their keeping. Democracy, as applied to foreign affairs, has largely come to mean government by newspaper. A wealthy ring can get at the Press, not because it is corrupt, but because it is ignorant. The British public and the leader-writers in our

newspaper offices do not follow the intricacies of foreign affairs in ordinary times ; and when a crisis arises they become the prey of any carefully planned propaganda.

Equally alarming has been the conduct of some of our poets. Who will say, after a few years have elapsed, that the reputation of England has been raised by the Laureate's eulogies of the Jameson Raid, by Swinburne's comparison of our brave and humane foes to "dogs," by Rudyard Kipling's delight at the "satisfactory killing" at Paardeberg, by Mr. Henley's wild rejoicing at the tardy victory of 250,000 men over an army one-fifth its size? George Meredith, William Watson, Stephen Phillips have struck a higher note ; but we have so few poets that we cannot but feel concern when any of them sell their talents for the applause of the market-place.

If our clergy, our Press, and our poets will not help us, we must help ourselves. The remedy lies in the spread of political education. In proportion as the attention of the electorate is turned away from the questions of domestic politics, which they understand, to foreign questions, which they judge by newspaper evidence, the need for vigilance, for a wide and independent outlook, increases. Foreign politics, like Science or History, only yield their secrets to prolonged and disinterested study. But the ignorance of the self-styled Imperialist is as profound as his passions are undisciplined. The French peasant who only reads his *Petit Journal* naturally believes the Dreyfusards were prepared to sell their country ; the Englishman who only reads his *Times* or *Daily Mail* naturally imagines that those who believe the war might and ought to have been avoided are traitors. Nobody's opinions can therefore claim any weight who does not habitually read at least one paper, either daily or weekly, representing the view opposite to that which he holds ; and no thoughtful citizen, with a reasonable amount of leisure, ought to rest till he has gained such information as to the great political problems of the hour as will enable him to check and correct the misrepresentations of the newspapers of all parties. Nothing deserves the name of public opinion which is not supported by a majority of

citizens each of whom has from the beginning of a dispute taken pains to keep himself acquainted with everything the other side has to urge.

We need also to hold inviolate the principle of free discussion, which has been well defined as the struggle for existence on the intellectual plane. It alone can save us from the tyranny of the majority as from the tyranny of the individual ruler. Not often in our recent political life has a heavier blow been dealt at the higher interests of the country than Mr. Balfour's declaration that the expression of certain views passes "the limits of human endurance." It is not only that it is the recrudescence of the old excuse for every form of tyranny; it also encourages the unhealthy tendency to shift responsibility for right conduct on to events or to the primeval instincts of savage man. The principle has been invoked by an aristocrat; but it will serve many purposes and may yet be applied by bands of hungry men.

The Native Question will meet us more than once in later parts of this essay; but a few simple principles may be summarily presented at this point. Firstly, we must disabuse our minds of the too common idea that all "natives" are on the same rung of the ladder of civilisation. The Parsi is far higher than the Hottentot, and the Matabele is lower than the Maori. No two races require precisely the same treatment. Our next principle must be to fight against the unworthy colour-prejudice which everywhere poisons our social relations, forbidding the native to walk on the pavement or to travel first or second class, though allowing us, by a most unfortunate inconsistency, to rob native women of their honour. Competent witnesses tell us that natives realise the difference between justice and injustice no whit less clearly than ourselves, and they are capable of the most chivalrous devotion to men who, like Bishop Colenso, endeavour to understand them and treat them kindly. Thirdly, we must respect their customs and habits in all cases, except those which involve actual cruelty. To break up their social organisation and force them by hut taxes or by kidnapping to undertake work, at the mines or elsewhere, which they

detest, is both wrong and altogether unwise. Fourthly, it is desirable that the government of natives should, wherever possible, be in the control of the Imperial Government. It is utterly impossible to trust the white colonist on the spot, and equally impossible to effectively supervise his doings. The history of Basutoland under Cape Colony Government and after its transfer to the beneficent rule of Sir Marshal Clarke is an object-lesson worth careful study. Finally, we must do our best to keep the standard to which we have slowly worked our way at the centre of the Empire from being depraved by the standard prevailing at the circumference. No saint in history shines with a purer light than Las Casas ; and it is to Burke's immortal honour that neither the distance of India nor the triumphs of Hastings daunted his resolution to know and to redress what had been done amiss.

It need scarcely be said that this view of the Native Question in no wise rests on the assumption that the native is best off when left alone. In such a case as that of Khama native rule is admirable and should on no consideration be interfered with ; in San Domingo it is practically a failure, and in Liberia but a very partial success. There are many advantages in white control, if that control is exercised in the right way. No episode in Sir George Grey's glorious career is more honourable and more eloquent than the petition of the chiefs of the Pacific Islands to be taken under his protection.

III.

No State was ever saved by the repetition of copybook headings ; and it is only fair that those who disapprove of certain features of our recent history should point out where, in their opinion, mistakes have been made, and how the pilot should guide the ship through the rocks and shoals.

It is pleasant to think that men of every school of political thought are agreed as to our policy in regard to the Colonies. And similarly, in reference to Colonial Federation, we may say that, if not the "grandest idea that ever entered the mind of English statesmen," it is none the less a project in the hearty support of which men

of all parties may join. The Colonies owe the self-government they enjoy to Liberal statesmen, and Liberals rejoice to observe the triumph of a progressive social policy in communities happily free from many of the obstacles which delay its advance at home. The bonds of sentiment have been growing tighter so rapidly that to many it appears that without the creation of any new machinery England and her daughter nations may be trusted to work together in common accord. If, however, machinery is employed, of what character should it be? The idea of federation takes three forms—military, political, and commercial. Military federation is already, to some extent, an accomplished reality. As all the world knows, the Colonies have spontaneously sent contingents to the aid of the Mother Country in the Sudan and South African Wars, and would do so again in similar circumstances. This presumption increases our strength, and the gradual growth of population in the Colonies will provide us with an almost inexhaustible supply of human material on which to draw at need. But the parent must be careful not to use her new accession of strength to do anything she would not do without it. The duty of moderation and strict recognition of the rights of other communities becomes even more urgent than before.

"Oh! it is glorious
To have a giant's strength, but it is tyrannous
To use it like a giant."

We must take care that a sectional view of Imperial interests does not lightly obtain the backing of the whole Empire. Our defence against war and danger must, in fact, lie with an honourable and conciliatory diplomacy just as much when some federative Military Board sits at Whitehall. With this proviso there is no objection to accepting voluntary contributions of men or money from the Colonies in return for the benefit they derive from the security of the seas and the use of our consuls, harbours, and coaling stations.

The second variety of Colonial federation stands in a very different category. Every one knows how the hopes

of the Free Traders that England's example would be rapidly followed by the world has been falsified. In some cases, indeed, there has been loss of ground, and the substitution of Thiers for Louis Napoleon was followed by the abrogation of Cobden's treaty of 1860. And even our Colonies, with the exception of New South Wales, have raised a tariff wall against the goods of our own and other foreign nations. Canada alone has made a slight abatement in our favour. The idea has been broached by Mr. Chamberlain¹ that our trade might be increased and a step forward taken on the road to federation by the adoption of a Zollverein, which, as he truly points out, formed one of the starting-points for the development of German unity. According to this plan, the English-speaking world, except the United States of America, is to be treated as a single country, all goods produced in any part being admitted free into every other part. But while the Colonies are in this respect to follow the example of the Mother Country, the latter is to follow the example of her daughters in regard to the products of all other countries. Free Trade within the Empire and Protection against all outside is a perfectly intelligible plan. But is it wise? Is it commercially desirable, and is it calculated to add to the real strength of the Empire? The flaw in the theory is to be found in what may be called the philosophy on which the proposal is based—the stereotyping of the division between the British Empire and the rest of the world. From this it follows logically that we are prepared to endanger our trade with foreign countries in order to develop the trade with our own brethren.² The reasonableness of the plan depends on the ratio between the two parts of our trade, the Imperial and the foreign. If the former were the greater there might be something to say for the proposal, though even then the wisdom of discouraging any portion of our trade does not seem very obvious. But, as a matter of fact, our Colonial trade, which was one-third of our foreign trade at the accession

¹ Foreign and Colonial Speeches.

² A penetrating discussion of the theories underlying Commercial Imperialism will be found in Bérard's "Impérialisme en Angleterre."

of Victoria, held the same proportion at the end of the century, though the Colonies have grown so enormously in the interval. In other words, trade, as a rule, follows not the flag but the price list and the quality of the article. Our trade with the United States, despite their tariff, is immensely greater than with all our Colonies put together ; and the tariffs of France, Germany, and Russia have not prevented the growth of an enormous trade with Great Britain.¹ The policy of inviting retaliation from the countries with which we carry on by far the greater portion of our trade, and of accentuating existing political antagonisms, stands in need of further demonstration before we can reasonably be asked to adopt it. To safeguard and extend our trade other means must be employed. Our consular service, for instance, should be transformed into a body of commercial experts for the advising of the British trader and his agents, who, in their turn, must study the wants and prejudices and learn the language of potential customers with the same attention that is displayed by our rivals.

The third plan by which federation may be brought about is by the creation of new political machinery, whether by allowing representatives of the Colonies to sit in one or other of the Houses of Parliament, as in France, or by constituting the Agents-General a sort of standing Colonial Committee, with right of access to the Cabinet whenever Imperial affairs are discussed. This class of schemes suggests the remark that, though the ideas that underlie them are in every way praiseworthy, the time has not come for the formation of an Imperial Constitution ; nor does it appear essential to the realisation of the dream of uniting the Colonies. "England will retain her Empire by just and sympathetic dealing to her children and subjects, leaving the rest to time."² The

¹ The figures may be found in Farrar's "Free Trade and Protection," and *Contemporary Review*, December, 1898, "Does Trade follow the Flag?" Flux's "Trade and the Flag," *Journal of the Statistical Society*, September, 1899, &c.

² Mr. Lucas in his admirable Introduction to Lewis' "Government of Dependencies." The discussion in Dilke's "Problems of Greater Britain" should also be read in correction of the schemes of Mr. Parkin and others.

verdict on political federation, at any rate for the present, may be given in the old adage, "More haste, less speed."

In passing from Colonies to dependencies we enter a different world, to which different principles must be applied. In the former the British flag waves over self-governing communities of our own race; in the latter over men for the most part of different race, language, religion, and stage of civilisation, who have not become our subjects by their own choice, and who cannot throw off our rule if they wish to do so. The two cases are so fundamentally different that it is clear that the same person may regard the one as the source of strength and the other as a source of weakness, or, at any rate, as nothing more than an experiment which may sometimes succeed and sometimes fail. The matter appeared in this light to Seeley, who is commonly believed by people who have not read his book to pronounce a blessing on both forms of expansion. "When a State advances beyond the limits of nationality, its power becomes precarious and artificial. This is the condition of most empires, and it is the condition of our own. When a nation extends itself into other territories the chances are that it will there meet with other nationalities which it cannot destroy or completely drive out, even if it succeeds in conquering them. When this happens it has a great and permanent difficulty to contend with; for the subject or rival nationalities cannot be perfectly assimilated and remain as a permanent cause of weakness and danger."¹ These remarkable words enshrine one of the greatest lessons that history teaches, and it is in their spirit alone that a fruitful investigation of the nature and value of the component parts of the British Empire can be undertaken.

The dependency which bulks largest in area, population, and importance is India. Though the conquest of the peninsula has been not unfairly described as "the greatest and strangest of our achievements," the attention paid to it by England is disproportionately small. The Indian Estimates are presented in Parliament to a handful of members, and passed after the most perfunctory discussion,

¹ "Expansion of England," Lecture III., "The Empire."

in which any independent suggestions, either critical or constructive, are confronted by the whole weight of consecrated precedent. No men have had harder battles to fight than Bright, Fawcett, Bradlaugh, Wedderburn, and the little band of men, in and out of Parliament, who have warred against apathy and ignorance in regard to our great dependency. What parliamentary candidate is ever asked for his views on the question, and how many candidates have any views on the matter? During the most prolonged and widespread famine of the century, not a single London newspaper thought it worth while to send out a special correspondent. The managers of the great papers know by long experience what their readers want; and they were no doubt perfectly correct in assuming that there was no demand for an account of what was going on in India. We leave the government of India to the officials in the serene assurance that our administrators must by this time have learned all the secrets of statescraft, and that suggestions of far-reaching change arise either from ignorance or disloyalty. The writers who, thirty or forty years ago, advocated our retirement have left no successors. Men of all schools, not only at home but in India itself, agree that the good of the country demands our continued presence. The discussion of what needs doing is therefore limited to improving, not removing the existing *régime*. No instructed man can be expected to feel very proud of the record by which we won our Asiatic Empire; but though we have shed torrents of native blood we have put a stop to further slaughter, now that the country is ours, and we have brought to an end the open strife of creed. These two far-reaching changes are unalloyed blessings.

Speaking on the assumption of the Imperial title in 1877, Mr. Gladstone expressed his conviction that our rule must not only be for the good of Indians, but that it must also appear to them to be for their good. Let us see, then, how our rule appears to Indians themselves. There are certain grievances which loom very large in the eyes of our subjects—large enough in many cases to outweigh a sense of the benefits of our rule. These grievances may

be broadly classified as economic and political ; the former affecting the poor and ignorant, the latter the well-to-do and educated.

To take the economic grievances first. India is an agricultural country, the population of which has been from time immemorial engaged in work on the land. In order to reach the mass of the people a land tax has at all times been levied on the produce of the soil. Nothing could be more just ; and the grievance consists not in the principle, but in the method of taxation. In earlier times the peasants paid their tax in kind ; under English rule the produce of the soil is no longer legal tender. In former times the contribution rose and fell with the crop, and when there was no crop there was no taxation. Under British rule the land is compelled to pay a regular sum, fixed for a definite period of twenty or thirty years, for an irregular yield. The result is the same as in Russia. A large number of the peasantry is getting taxed off the land. In a bad year the *bunya*, or money-lender, is called in, and the cattle, next year's crop, and finally the land itself is mortgaged ; for the yearly tribute must be paid. The official says quite truly that the bad years have been reckoned on in fixing the yearly tax ; but few peasants possess enough land to make the surplus of a good year do duty for the deficit of a bad one. The peasants, though industrious and thrifty, live from hand to mouth. The extent to which this practice of levying money is carried was shown in the resolution of the Government to collect full tribute for 1898, which happened to be a good year, thus preventing the peasantry from recovering from the terrible famine of 1897, and preparing for the still worse visitation of 1899-1900. The third grievance in connection with the land tax is that it is as a rule excessive in quantity. The land systems of India are legion, and no general statement would be true of every part. Bengal has enjoyed the blessing of a Permanent Settlement for over a century ; in other words, it has been exempt from the continual rising of the demand, and has in consequence been virtually immune from famine. But outside Bengal and the North-West Provinces it would not be untrue to

say that the British demand is on the whole higher than the peasantry can meet—work as hard as they will—without getting into debt. Even the Secretary of State had to admit it had been excessive in the Central Provinces.¹ It is true enough that the land revenue demanded—we do not know whether it was obtained—by the Moghuls may have been as great as ours ; but in the Moghul era the people were not wholly dependent on the crops. The introduction of European goods and the facilities afforded by railways to compete in the remotest parts of the peninsula have crushed the greater number of native industries—hand-loom, leather and metal work, and the manufacture of dyes. The official mind is satisfied that they are “the lightest taxed people in the world,”² forgetting that the lightness of the tax is relative to taxable capacity. The land and the land alone has now to bear the strain, and there is hardly a village outside Bengal throughout the length and breadth of India which has not sunk into debt in its attempt to bear it. The wide extent and the fatal character of this canker is but faintly realised in England. The evil has been intensified by the permission, introduced by English law, to alienate land ; and under this law a vast quantity of land has passed out of the hands of its hereditary owners. The Government at last seems to be waking up to the fatal consequences of this law, and has passed a Bill to prevent further alienation of land in the Punjab. The measure, however, is little more than the locking of the stable door when the horse is gone, and cannot be expected to accomplish any good until the causes that produce the money-lender are themselves modified. A lighter rent alone can free the cultivators from the grip of the *bunya*. The two great famines coming in three years have revealed the utter lack of staying-power in the Indian peasant, and may bring a tardy blessing with them if they force the administration to consider whether it is wise to compel taxpayers to go on living on the edge of a precipice. The common

¹ April 4, 1900.

² Danvers' paper on Indian Statistics, Royal Statistical Society, January, 1901.

explanation of famines by the improvidence of the people and the increase of population is utterly inadequate. No people in the world are more industrious or less extravagant (except in regard to funerals); and the increase of population is less than in England. The Famine Commissioners of 1898 declare of the labouring classes that their "liability to succumb, instead of diminishing, is possibly becoming more accentuated."

Voluntary contributions of a few hundred thousands in a bad famine, or even a grant from the Imperial Exchequer (which was refused when urgently needed in 1900), are utterly inadequate to compensate for the starvation level on which the peasantry live. Irrigation, too, even to the extent dreamed of by Cotton, would be but a palliative, not a remedy. After the famine of 1860 Lord Canning urged the extension of the Permanent Settlement to every part of India; and his plea was supported by Lord Lawrence, Sir Stafford Northcote, and others. The proposal was rejected, and a like fate overtook Lord Ripon's compromise, by which the Government demand should not rise except on the occasion of a permanent rise in prices. In the Central Provinces the recent settlements have raised the demand in most districts between 50 and 100 per cent. We find accordingly that famines have been most frequent and most destructive where the assessment has been highest. The Bengal famine of 1874 caused no loss of life; the Madras famine of 1877 swept away five millions. The great famine of 1897 claimed its holocausts in the Central Provinces, while the Bengal death-rate remained stationary.

A second economic grievance is the expense of our administration. Since the Mutiny the Indian debt has doubled in a time of unbroken internal peace, and this despite the fact that the revenue is now thrice as great as in 1858. The taxpayers cannot understand why public money should be spent in decorative memorials to Civil servants, nor can they be made to see the necessity for so many special trains and heavy expenditure on official banquets. Again, they recognise that they benefit by many of the railways in time of famine; but they are by

no means reconciled to the Government's policy in pledging the national credit to keep up the dividends of certain lines that seem to them more for the benefit of the promoters than of the community at large. The railways involve a loss of two millions a year, and the Famine Committee of 1898 declared that their further extension would be of no value as a precaution against famine. The greatest expense is, of course, involved in the maintenance of the existing military system, and all the more since England appears to regard the Indian army as a sort of reserve on which she draws when she requires aid in any part of the world. An army of a quarter of a million men naturally imposes an enormous additional burden on the resources of the people. It is generally admitted that the army of India is greater than is needed for internal security; in other words, it has an Imperial as well as a local value.¹ This being so—the poverty of India apart—it seems fair that the Empire should pay for that portion of the force which is not needed for purely local purposes. It need scarcely be pointed out, too, that the squandering of millions in military adventures beyond the frontier, such as the Afghan Wars and the campaigns necessitated by the establishment of forts in distant positions—such as Chitral—provokes widespread indignation. And it is difficult to speak with due moderation of the decision of Lord's Salisbury's Cabinet to throw the cost of the employment of Indian troops in the Sudan campaign of 1896 on the Indian taxpayer, despite the protest of the Viceroy, and in the teeth of the declaration of 1858 that Indian money should not be used for campaigns outside the country. The drain on the resources of the country would be bad enough if the money thus raised was spent in the country itself. But nearly a third of the total revenue is remitted to England in the form of Home Charges, dividends, pensions, &c., and part of the fifteen millions paid in salaries to European officials is sent as savings to Europe.²

¹ See evidence of Lord Lansdowne and many other civil and military officials in Dutt's "Famines in India," Appendix U.

² The recent decision to transfer charges amounting to a quarter of a million to the English Exchequer is a step in the right direction.

The second or political class of grievances is felt by a small but influential class, namely, the educated and well-to-do. India is, with certain reservations, very well governed; but it is a government by aliens, a political system in which the natives have no share. This disability is the more keenly felt because the guarantee of equal opportunity is among the title-deeds of our rule. "The public service is open to all," declared Parliament when taking over the dominion after the Mutiny. "The public service is open to all," solemnly repeats each successive Viceroy on taking the oaths of office. The slight instalments of the fulfilment of this promise exists rather on paper than in reality. District Boards and municipal government have been introduced; but it is not long since Calcutta was deprived of its civic autonomy. The Cross Act of 1892 authorises the election of native representatives on the Legislative Councils—which possess no power at all. A few native judges have been placed upon the bench; but the Ilbert Bill, the boldest of Lord Ripon's attempts, had to be withdrawn in consequence of a fierce and discreditable outburst of race passion. Not only is the power of directly sharing in the control of events withheld, but the privilege of newspaper discussion is largely curtailed. In England we have long ago given up the idea of political censorship, both in practice and theory; and our institutions have grown, not decreased in strength. In India the so-called Gag Act, which Lord Lytton introduced and Lord Ripon repealed, has been recently re-imposed. We know the abuses to which the free Press is everywhere liable, and we realise that there are additional dangers in India; but we believe, on the whole, that it is safer to allow discontent to reveal itself than to drive it beneath the surface and turn leader-writers into conspirators. No Gag Act has ever prevented men from talking politics.

To discuss and amend this condition of things the National Congress, consisting of representatives of every

The £40,000 charged to India for consular services in Persia and China, and at least half of the expenses of the India Office, should be similarly transferred.

province and every sect, has come into existence. The activities of this body are known to the readers of most English newspapers, if known at all, by a short paragraph recording the opening of the annual session, the locality at which it is held, and the name of its president. What, however, the delegates say, what grievances are complained of, what remedies are proposed, not one man among us in ten thousand is at pains to learn. As a necessary consequence, wide misconceptions exist in regard to its character and aims. In the first place it is often supposed to be hostile to the British occupation of India. In the second it is widely believed to desire that India should be governed by a single representative assembly. Neither of these notions has the slightest foundation. There is probably not a delegate who is not convinced that the continued presence of England in India is essential to the preservation of internal peace and religious liberty. What they desire is a share in the responsibilities of government, in shaping the policy of the land in which they dwell. That certain matters, such as the assessment of the land, the cost of the army, the salt tax, touch men of every province and every sect, does not make India a nation. By history and by geography the peninsula is designed for a federation. What the Congress looks to in the immediate future is the reorganisation of the finances and the admission of natives to the higher ranks of the army and administration. What its members look forward to in the ultimate future is the extension of native governments combined with the control by Great Britain of the army and of foreign policy. The question of thus opening the door of office did not arise till by the provision of education we stirred the ambition and developed the capacity of our fellow-subjects. Nobody who has known Indian gentlemen, whether Mohammedan or Hindu, with their European culture, their perfect command of English, their capacity for work, and their loyalty to the British connection, but feels that their permanent exclusion from public life is the one thing in India that may be safely pronounced impossible. A Government which attempts to do everything has been aptly compared

to a schoolmaster who does all the pupils' tasks for them ; he may be a first-rate scholar, but he will teach them very little. The best Government is that which teaches men to govern themselves. The Babu is often said to be the most difficult problem that India presents. But the inference we should draw is not that we should cease to educate, but that we should begin to employ. The decisive step was taken when we determined to place a Western education at the disposal of our subjects. Now that tens of thousands take advantage of it, and are able to satisfy any conditions, either of character or capacity, that we care to impose, there can be no equilibrium short of admitting those who thus qualify to share in the service of the State. If men with dark skins are able enough to represent English constituencies in the House of Commons, and honest enough to occupy a place on the bench of Indian judges, what valid objection can be brought forward to their employment in political and administrative work? If we disqualify them on account of their colour, let us be honest enough to say so ; if for any other reason let us be informed what that reason is.

General Gordon used to say that there would be no reform in India till we had a revolution. Such a statement will naturally stagger those who have been taught to believe that we have developed a system which admits of no structural improvement, and which will suit the rapidly changing circumstances with which we have to deal. If, however, we act with ordinary foresight there will be no need of a revolution. We should, without delay, reorganise the system of taxation, reducing the assessment to one-sixth, or at most one-fifth of the produce, and keeping a strict watch on the *bunya* ; we should reduce the salt tax to moderate dimensions ; we should reach the rich merchants who now enjoy almost complete immunity, the income tax producing less than a hundredth part of the revenue ; we should admit native representatives to the discussion of every problem that affects the local or collective well-being, and allot them one or more seats on the Executive Council of the Viceroy, and on the Council of the Secretary of State for India ; and we

should contribute a large sum towards the support of the army.

In the future we may well have to go a step further. The King, as we all know, is Emperor of India; but English rule is represented, not by a gracious Sovereign, but by a huge impersonal machine. The "Collector," the unit, and we may even say the pivot of our system, is rather a thing than a person—a machine for the control of the revenue and the compilation of statistical reports. Mr. Theodore Morison's suggestive works explain very clearly the craving of the Indian mind for concrete personalities, and the gulf between the governor and the governed. Unlike his educated brethren, the peasant has no ambition to take a personal share in the labours of government; but he prefers to be ruled over by a man of his own colour and creed. The future of India is by no means unlikely to witness the gradual transference of the machinery of administration to native hands, retaining only the supreme direction in our own—and this not less on the ground of economy than policy. Lord Curzon and many provincial governors have heartily praised the ability, patriotism, and sense of responsibility with which native members of the Council have discussed the questions that come up for treatment. We shall have the cry of "India by the Indians" no less than "India for the Indians." The native states, which cover one-third of the peninsula, may not be as successful as they are painted by Mr. Wilfrid Blunt; but they possess compensations which escape the eyes of Mr. Kipling. They are, as a whole, marked by lighter taxation, less poverty, and less discontent than Madras, Bombay, and the Central Provinces. The principle of annexation has reached its limit, and a precedent of far-reaching importance has been set in the restitution of native government in Mysore. If self-sacrificing devotion were sufficient to make a strong state, our Indian administrators would have made one of the strongest states in history; for never has a dependency been ruled by men of higher character and ability. The reason why their strenuous and devoted lives do not achieve their natural reward is simply that they represent

an alien rule. If we are in very truth unselfish it should be reward enough for us to see the triumph of our ideas, even when carried out in part by other hands. English rule over men with dark skins tends to dislocate the structure of society by substituting contract for status; and our duty is to reduce such dislocation to a minimum. With English ideas, English supervision, and native agents, we can draw the lightning harmlessly from the clouds. Our rule is efficient and progressive; but it is not, and in its present form never will be, economical or popular. The almost passionate attachment that Lord Ripon inspired showed the response that could be evoked by the mere knowledge that the native point of view was, to some extent, seized by the holders of power. Nothing but the combination of the brains and resources of India can secure the full realisation of the ideals that we all cherish, and ensure the fulfilment of the gigantic task that we have inherited.

The next in importance of our dependencies is Egypt; and our task here is of greater simplicity, since the natives are less advanced, and the whole problem is on a far smaller scale. Egypt is the model dependency, largely owing to the personality of Lord Cromer, the ablest administrator in the Empire, who has chosen the better part by keeping taxation light. He sees—what many of our Indian officials fail to perceive—that it is no good increasing the material prosperity with one hand and decreasing it with the other. The English staff, too, is so small that the money sent out of the country for pensions is scarcely missed. For the time, the question of native co-operation hardly arises; but as the country becomes more settled and the schools make their effect felt, the share of the natives in the work of government will have to be extended beyond the point at which it was fixed nearly twenty years ago by Lord Dufferin, and at which Sir Alfred Milner seems to imagine it must always remain.

The problem of the Sudan is much more difficult. The destruction of the Dervish power was defended on various grounds—as a measure of security for Egypt, in revenge for

Gordon, in order to remove a cruel despotism ; but its real object was to prevent France from establishing herself on the Upper Nile. The wisdom of the step of bringing a vast expanse, chiefly desert, under Anglo-Egyptian rule can only be proved by time. A military danger lies in the unquenchable religious fanaticism of many of the tribes ; an economic danger lies in the nature of the soil ; and a political temptation is not unlikely to be found in the neighbourhood of Abyssinia, should she cease to be formidable and united under a single rule. It is, however, too early to judge, and we must await the march of events.

A similar attitude of reserve must be maintained towards our other tropical possessions in Africa. The pioneer company in Uganda quickly recognised its position to be hopeless, and shifted its responsibility to the shoulders of the Imperial Government. Assuming it was wise to accept the burden—the doctrine of *vestigia nulla retrorsum* seems to have become a principle—it is obviously necessary to make a railway and give the dependency a fair chance. Whether the country proves fertile, whether the tribes are docile, whether the climate is tolerable for white men, are questions that must answer themselves before we can congratulate ourselves on the acquisition. At present the outlook is far from encouraging. Central Africa, in the next place, may be necessary as a link in the chain from Cape Town to Cairo ; but its climate seems likely to prevent any really effective occupation. Of the Niger district, taken over recently by the Crown, it is also too early to speak, for we do not yet know whether the expectations of mineral wealth are likely to be fulfilled. We may hope, in any case, that the excellent traditions of Sir George Goldie will be maintained. Ashanti has a longer history and one little calculated to excite enthusiasm. We have abolished human sacrifices ; but we have utterly failed to conciliate the natives, and by the unhappily inspired quest of the Golden Stool have provoked them to war. The urgent necessity of a careful and conciliatory policy is also shown by the attempt to enforce the hut tax in Sierra Leone, resulting in a revolt and the destruction of the huts it was proposed to tax.

If Miss Kingsley is to be trusted, our West African possessions as a whole are in a parlous condition. Though the climate renders it impossible for white men to settle, we have committed the blunder of proclaiming *Landes Hoheit* instead of *Ober Hoheit*. That is to say, instead of declaring a general paramountcy, we have turned the natives into tax-paying tenants of land of which they regard themselves as freeholders. We have, further, broken up their society, and are powerless to reconstruct it. And so far from elevating the character of the natives, we have produced a deterioration, and the girls now swarm down to the coast for immoral purposes. Miss Kingsley attributes the failure exclusively to the Crown Colony system, and believes that if the merchants were allowed a controlling influence, if direct taxation was abolished, and if we were to confine ourselves to trade, the natives would regain confidence and a happier era would begin. But if she is correct in declaring that it might be possible to convert Africans into practical Christians, but it is impossible so to convert Europeans, something more than a mere change of system seems to be necessary before Englishmen can speak with pride of this portion of their Empire. Despite the high spirits and charm of the author, Miss Kingsley's *West African Studies* form one of the most depressing volumes in the political literature of our time.

In a word, our settlements in the Central Belt of Africa are in the experimental stage, and present as yet no decisive grounds for assuming that they are commercially advantageous, or add to the moral and material strength of the Empire. Meanwhile, whatever the ultimate result, our immediate duty is clear enough. Our officials must be kept in direct contact with the standards of civilisation at its best, and the acts of the governments must be subjected to a close and continual scrutiny—irksome, perhaps, occasionally misinformed, but always indispensable.¹

While we can only speak with hesitation in regard to our Central African possessions under Imperial rule, we

¹ Cf. Kidd's thoughtful remarks in his "Control of the Tropics."

have abundant grounds for the formation of an opinion in reference to Rhodesia. While fully recognising the important part played by companies in the extension of the Empire, we cannot, in the light of experience, admit it to be desirable that territories swarming with natives should any longer be annexed or administered except by the Imperial Government.

Mr. Rhodes, as he has told us so often, conceived the plan of gaining the vast tracts of South Central Africa for the British flag while working at the Kimberley mines in the later seventies. He piled up money, and in 1888 amalgamated the diamond companies into De Beers, of which he became the life chairman. Soon after he obtained a controlling interest in the Consolidated Goldfields Company at the Witwatersrand mines; and throughout the eighties he steadily acquired political influence in Cape Colony, the Assembly of which he had entered in 1881. Seeing the importance of securing the interior before a move was made by Germany, Portugal, or the Transvaal, Mr. Rhodes obtained the concession of mining rights from Lobengula, King of the Matabele, and persuaded Lord Salisbury to grant a Charter to a British South African Company in 1889. A pioneer expedition to Mashonaland was led by Mr. Selous in 1890, and a few settlers entered the country. The Mashonas greeted the newcomers as protectors from the Matabele; but the Matabele impis still made their annual raids, and, according to Mr. Rhodes, forced the settlers to fight. There were, of course, faults on both sides; and the Matabele were a powerful and warlike tribe. But Mr. Rhodes had long ago made up his mind to break the neck of every independent ruler between the Transvaal and the Zambesi; and in 1893 Dr. Jameson declared that the time had come "to make an end of the Matabele question." Lobengula, who was not used to the ways of white men, plaintively remarked,¹ "I thought you came to dig gold, but it seems you have come to rob me of my people and country as well." The war came, the power of the Matabele seemed crushed, Lobengula died, and Buluwayo became an English town.

¹ July, 1893.

Had the native question been dealt with by men of humanity and insight it is highly improbable that any more bloodshed would have taken place. Ugly things, however, occurred, and the natives lost all confidence in the rule of the Company. In 1896 the second struggle took place; and even the comparatively unwarlike Mashonas, who had welcomed the Company as a deliverer, fought to the death to free themselves from the yoke which further acquaintance had taught them to hate, and were only brought to surrender by the dynamiting of their caves. Though the witch-doctors, the rinderpest, the slaughter of cattle, and the absence of fighting-men at the Raid were the occasion of the revolt, its chief cause was the treatment the natives had received. Outrages on women appear to have been relatively uncommon; but many of the white settlers treated their servants like brutes, in some cases forcing them to run away a day or two before the payment of wages. The war was brought to an end by Mr. Rhodes's famous indaba in the Matoppos; but elsewhere hostilities were stained by the treacherous murder of Mashoni, after offer of pardon, and by frequent shooting of suspects without proof of complicity.¹ The natives as a rule acquit Mr. Rhodes of a share in the atrocities which they suffered, and attribute them to his subordinates; but the whole chapter of events has followed logically enough from the principle on which Mr. Rhodes's public life has been based. In one of his earliest speeches he declared, "History has taught me that expansion is everything."² It sounds a little primitive; but it is at any rate a perfectly intelligible position. Expansion being everything, the duty of the imperial jerry-builder was obviously to obtain as much territory as possible, without waiting to see whether it was of any value, or whether he was in a position to deal with it when he had got it. But territory was of little use while independent native potentates remained; and mineral wealth could not be realised without a plentiful supply of cheap labour. If the natives disliked work in the mines, as they did, they must be forced to labour; and

¹ See Thomson's "Rhodesia."

² "Political Life and Speeches," ed. Vindex, p. 9.

forced they accordingly were. Again, a vast territory being taken, administrators must be supplied ; and if the right kind was not forthcoming others must be appointed. If we admit and approve the underlying principle that "expansion is everything," we have no logical right to boggle at the native wars and the forced labour. The Company acquired more land than they could govern ; and instead of properly administering what they possess they have taken territory beyond the Zambesi. Mr. Chamberlain has very truly said, "Our rule over the territories (native) can only be justified if we can show that it adds to the happiness and prosperity of the people." Nobody can study the Report of Sir R. Martin, sent out by Mr. Chamberlain to examine the conduct of the Company, without feeling that the government of Rhodesia does not fulfil these conditions. The morality of the natives is said to be worse than before, and they have been taught by events to regard the Company as a *régime* of force and fraud. "The natives practically said," Sir R. Martin informs us, "our country is gone and our cattle, we have nothing to live for ; our women are deserting us, the white man does as he likes with them ; we are the slaves of the white man, we are nobody, and have no rights or laws of any kind."¹ Civilisation is humanisation, or it has no meaning. It is absurd to talk as if justice and kindness were unnecessary in dealing with natives ; on the contrary, there is abundant evidence that justice and sympathy win and retain the confidence of these impressionable children of nature. It is grievous to think that the work of Livingstone and Moffat has been to a large extent undone by men who had the benefit of their noble example before their eyes. De Tocqueville was right in pointing out the depressing and numbing effect of "profound insignificance," political and social, on character. It was the recognition of this that induced Khama, whose rule has been so highly praised by Randolph Churchill and other travellers, to resist Mr. Rhodes's effort to add his dominions to those of the Company.

After the Raid the Dutch throughout South Africa

¹ C. 8547.

begged that the Company might be dissolved and its dominions transferred to the Crown; and we may say unhesitatingly that such a step would have been a blessing for Rhodesia. Adam Smith long ago remarked that "the government of an exclusive company of merchants is perhaps the worst of all governments for any country whatever." And the British Government had two legal grounds for such action—firstly, that the promise in the Charter to ameliorate the condition of the natives had not been fulfilled; and, secondly, that the undertaking that the armed forces of the Company should not act outside the borders without leave had been broken by the Jameson Raid. The natives prefer Imperial rule. The Bechuanas and Basutos fought against Cape Colony rule, and are prospering now that they are restored to the direct rule of the Crown. It is not too late to revoke a Charter which has lowered the prestige of the English name; and when the transfer is effected we must see to it that the owners of this sham El Dorado do not obtain the price they would have deserved had they been faithful to their trust. It is absurd to say that Mr. Rhodes is moved solely by the love of money, though his conduct in the affair of the Wesselton mine, and his sale of Chartered shares immediately before the Raid sent them down, prove that he is not without a certain taint. But his theory of civilisation is so crude and his ethical standard so low that he is utterly unfit to control the destinies of any country, new or old, white or black. One of Mr. Rhodes's enthusiastic biographers ("Imperialist") tells us that his sneer about the "unctuous rectitude" found in England was aimed at the Lord Chief Justice when he had occasion, in fulfilment of his duty, to condemn the Jameson Raiders. The Duke of Abercorn informed the South African Committee that "Mr. Rhodes had received a power of attorney to do precisely what he liked without consultation with the Board, he simply notifying what was done." Such power is too great for any man; and with Mr. Rhodes it has spelt disaster.

IV.

In a class different both from Colonial and dependency problems comes the South African question; and its history offers such striking object-lessons that we must glance at it with some care.

It is unnecessary for our purpose, that, namely, of exhibiting in operation the methods discussed above, to go back many years in the history of South Africa. It is enough to say that till the advent of Krugerism the balance of evil-doing lay with us. We seized the Cape from the Dutch, who had held it for 150 years, on the ground that Holland was an (unwilling) ally of our enemy, France. At the Peace of Vienna the South African Boers were bought like so much merchandise without the option of making their voices heard. In those days we had not yet learned how to govern Colonies and dependencies, and we treated our new subjects like a subject race. After a generation many of the Boers trekked north and east to be free of our rule. The causes, which may be studied at large in Theal's great history, were, briefly, deprivation of political privileges, absence of defence against Kaffir inroads (their own system of defence being broken up), and inadequate compensation for the abolition of slavery. If the seizure of the Cape may be regarded merely as one of the normal incidents in the strife of races, the failure to govern justly admits of no excuse. With a little care there would have been no Great Trek. The virtual expulsion from Cape Colony and the actual expulsion from Natal where they had settled come next in the list of grievances; and even when a settlement had been made north of the Orange River we could not leave them alone, and made the Free Staters our subjects once more by the battle of Boomplats. The Transvaalers were not attacked, since they were too far away to be reached. A year or two later, however, the pendulum of Colonial opinion in Downing Street swung violently back, and the full independence of both States was recognised. In the succeeding generation the only episode of importance in the relations of the Governments

was our seizure, nominally on behalf of the Griqua chief, Waterboer (who, needless to say, was never heard of again), of the diamond mines, now known as Kimberley, from the Free State, which was too weak to resist, and to which, owing to the persistent efforts of President Brand, we paid £90,000 some years after. The output of the mines now stands at four millions a year.

In 1876 the pendulum swung back once again, and Lord Carnarvon took up Sir G. Grey's plan of federation. But while Grey, a true statesman, understood that federation could only be accomplished by the voluntary union of the states, Lord Carnarvon determined to obtain it by force, if necessary, and Shepstone was instructed to declare the annexation of the Transvaal on the ground that it was threatened by native hordes and was bankrupt. The extent of the native danger was, and is, differently assessed; but the Transvaalers had founded and preserved their state without our aid and could have procured aid from the Free Staters if in extremities. The bankruptcy of the treasury was real enough, owing to the ambitious railway and education schemes and unbusinesslike habits of President Burgers; but there was never much cash in the country, the wealth of which consisted chiefly in stock. At their worst, neither of these two grounds constituted any justification whatever for the annexation of the country during the recess of the Volksraad, and without consulting the inhabitants. The petitions for annexation received by Shepstone came from English settlers and tradespeople in the towns. As an outrage on international law (for the Transvaal was as independent as France) the annexation cannot be easily rivalled.

The only hope of making annexation palatable to the burghers, who at once began to petition for its reversal, was the introduction of the free institutions which were promised by Shepstone at the time. But not one of the promises was kept, and British rule was presented in its least conciliatory form in the person of Sir Owen Lanyon. The national spirit was still in its infancy, and the annexation did not affect all the burghers in an equal degree;

but the complete supersession of their political rights was felt by all. The only ray of hope lay in Gladstone's return to power. But when the Liberal leader became Premier in 1880 he refused to reverse the annexation against which he had protested so strongly. He was told by Lanyon and Frere that many English had settled in the country and that the Boers were content with our rule, and he believed their assertions. True, he only did what other ministers would do in listening to the reports of our officials on the spot. But nothing can excuse him for not investigating the problem more thoroughly and either reversing the annexation or insisting on the immediate execution of the promises of liberal institutions. He did neither, and the Boers very naturally revolted. Their readiness to fight for their independence proved that the assurances of their content were baseless, and the ministry at once opened negotiations, which they very properly refused to allow the repulses to interrupt. President Brand cabled that he could not hold back his Free Staters from rendering aid, and the Dutch in Cape Colony made no secret of their sympathies. To continue the war, as Lord Randolph Churchill declared some years after, would have lost South Africa. The fault was not in coming to terms, but in producing the revolt, the responsibility for which lies at the door of Lord Carnarvon for annexing the country, Frere and Lanyon for withholding liberal institutions and bearing false testimony to Gladstone, and Gladstone for allowing himself to be misled.

The war of independence made the Transvaal a nation, taught the Dutch throughout South Africa to feel at one, and led to a depreciation of the fighting qualities of the British soldier. These new elements were full of danger to peace, and needed careful statesmanship to control. But the headstrong Anglo-Indian Frere,¹ a fitting agent of Lord Beaconsfield's policy, had been replaced by the conciliatory Sir Hercules Robinson; President Brand was supreme in the Orange Free State; and Mr. Rhodes was

¹ Martineau's uncritical eulogy needs to be checked by Cox's *Life of Colenso*, and Mr. Percy Molteno's biography of his father.

His external policy had been no more successful. When Rhodes had begun to dream of a British interior almost everybody else thought of the northern territories as "Kruger's heritage." A struggle between the two men ensued, and step by step Kruger was hemmed in. Bechuanaland was annexed by the Imperial Government, the North was secured by the Chartered Company, and Lord Ripon proclaimed a protectorate over the strip of land joining Swaziland and the sea, through which the Boers had obtained leave in 1890 from Lord Salisbury's Government to build a railway to Kosi Bay. In their race for territory neither English nor Dutch observed their treaty promises. It was a competition in which we won by superior strength and skill. Rhodes's work was all the more remarkable in that while he was winning every point in the game against Kruger he managed to carry the greater number of the Cape Dutch with him. When he became Prime Minister in 1890 he asked for and received the support of the Bond, with whom he agreed in regard to the tariff and native matters; the parties worked loyally together, and the process of race conciliation went quietly forward.

This, then, was the condition of South Africa when Lord Salisbury's Government took office in the summer of 1895. Kruger had alienated half his own burghers by his illiberal domestic policy; he was hemmed in on every frontier; his great rival had the support of the majority of the Cape Dutch; and the Free State had in 1887 rejected his proposal for an alliance. In a word, his power was steadily declining; but it was precisely at this moment that we rehabilitated him.

The source of irritation was the Rand. The same conditions have produced similar results in West Australia, where the Outlanders' indictment against the Government is identical with that of the Johannesburgers against Kruger. But the quarrel which in Australia was purely industrial, expressed itself in terms of race in the Transvaal. The problem, nevertheless, was not insoluble. The irritation was purely local. No race feud existed in Cape Colony or the Free State. In

both the Dutch desired to see the quarrel with the Outlanders healed. Moreover, Kruger had no resources or strength to compensate for his lack of moral support. The forts at Pretoria and Johannesburg were begun in the face of the disturbances consequent on Lord Loch's visit in 1880, and the "piling up of armaments long before the outbreak" is not only unsupported by any shred of evidence, but is contradicted by the express testimony of the Intelligence Department, by the report of Major Venter, by the plan of the Reformers to seize Pretoria, by the witness of Captain Younghusband, the special correspondent of the *Times*, and quite recently by the testimony of Dr. Jameson. "The whole armoury of the Orange-Freestate of Transvaal was contained in the so-called Pretoria Fort, guarded by three Staats artillerymen, and its sole protection was a broken-down corrugated iron fence." Moreover, General Joubert was censured by the British Government for neglecting the defences of the country.

The policy of 1881 produced certain temporary effects, but the years that succeeded it proved the essential wisdom of conciliation. Under the leadership of Mr. Rhodes the two races worked in comparative harmony, and the paramountcy of Great Britain was established by his great expansionist schemes. The theory of a conspiracy slowly maturing ever since 1881 requires us to believe that Mr. Rhodes worked for years with these disloyal Dutchmen without suspecting their designs and to explain why they supported the expansionist policy of the Premier. That there was a certain amount of Pan-Africander talk in the early years of the Bond is true; that there was anything more than the nonsense of South African history.

In an evil moment Mr. Rhodes resolved to desert the policy which had achieved so much and to plunge the country into the devious ways of intrigue and revolution.³ The

¹ The emissary of Rhodes.

² Speech at Kimberley, 1900.

³ "The *Times* History of the War" employs its introductory chapter in exhibiting a connection between Dr. Jameson and John Bull. Whatever the merits or demerits of the hero of Harper's Fable cannot be said that "the trail of finance" was over the entire

of the Raid may be stated in a single phrase—it made the Transvaal question a South African question. It shattered the alliance between the Dutch and Mr. Rhodes ; it reinstated Kruger as the champion of Transvaal independence ; it annihilated the Progressive party among the Transvaal burghers ; it revived the sentiment of Dutch unity throughout South Africa ; it destroyed the chances of Mr. Fraser, the English candidate in the election then pending for the Presidency of the Free State ; it converted the Free State to the policy of alliance with the Transvaal which it had refused in 1887 as unnecessary ; and it caused Kruger to send large orders for artillery and ammunition to Europe.

At the time of their accession to office in 1895 Lord Salisbury's Government had a very promising situation before them ; and even after the Raid the problem, though immeasurably more difficult, was not incapable of solution. Unfortunately the man in whose control lay the policy of Great Britain was utterly unfitted by training or temperament for the difficult task before him. On January 7th, immediately after the Raid, the Colonial Secretary proposed the despatch of an army to South Africa, but was dissuaded by the vigorous remonstrances of Sir H. Robinson. A few days later he drew up a scheme for the neutralisation of the Rand, but committed a breach of diplomatic etiquette by publishing the terms before they were received at Pretoria. We could not undo the Raid, but we could at least minimise its effects by probing the affair to the bottom and proving to the world that we were not connected with it and that we strongly disapproved the entire episode. The actual Raiders were, as we all know, handed over to the Imperial Government to punish, and punished they were ; but the evidence of the troopers showed that they had been informed by Dr. Jameson that the enterprise was supported by the Government, and the Raiders entered the territory of the Transvaal under the British flag. The High Commissioner cabled to Mr. Chamberlain, "The Boers generally believe the recent Raid was, if not instigated, at all events connived at by Her Majesty's

Government, and that an attack on their independence will be renewed at the first favourable opportunity.”¹ It was clear that a searching investigation must be held into the origin of the Raid. Nothing of the sort was done. The South African Committee, which met in 1897, represents perhaps the low-water mark of moral influences in the recent history of England. The “New Diplomacy,” which consisted, as Mr. Balfour explained, of “feeding the public appetite,” departed from this evil practice on the only occasion where it was desirable to employ it. The Committee worked in a haze of mystery and suspicion that recalls the trial of Sir Thomas Overbury. When something important was within sight the room was cleared ; when the public were readmitted the subject was changed and the witness was gone. No attempts were made to obtain correspondence which was admitted to be in existence. When Mr. Hawksley refused to produce the missing telegrams the Committee respected his scruples, and did not even invite any of the persons who had read them to describe their contents. All that was known was that Mr. Rhodes had used them “to support his action in South Africa,” which could only mean to encourage people to participate in the scheme on the ground that the Imperial Government was behind him. Moreover, some of the telegrams produced were undoubtedly compromising, all the more since Mr. Rhodes’s confidential agents confessed to being constantly in and out of the Colonial Office in the weeks immediately before the Raid. On December 17th, for instance, Flora Shaw wired to her employer, “Chamberlain sound in case of interference European Powers, but have special reason to believe wishes you must do it immediately.” The Report itself was hurried through without calling Lord Grey and other important witnesses. Finally the effect of the Committee’s censure on Mr. Rhodes was completely cancelled by the testimonial which the Colonial Secretary paid to him on the night when the Report was discussed in Parliament. The conduct of the Committee and the speech of Mr. Cham-

¹ C. 8063.

berlain merely served to deepen the suspicions that had been created by the Raid. The world knew already that the Chartered Company had obtained from Mr. Chamberlain a few weeks before the Raid the Bechuanaland Police and the strip of Bechuanaland whence the Raiders set out, and that the Raiders went in under the Imperial flag. It now knew that the Committee had refused to demand the telegrams which had passed between London and Cape Town, and that the chief criminal had received a public testimonial of character from the Colonial Secretary and remained a member of the Privy Council, while Sir Graham Bower, the only member of the High Commissioner's *entourage* who was aware of the plot, was promoted. And these suspicions have themselves been deepened by the letters stolen from Mr. Hawksley and published in the *Indépendance Belge*,¹ which threw new light on the flutter of anxiety in which Mr. Chamberlain's friends lived through the critical time. Mr. Chamberlain and his admirers often maintain that Gladstone degraded the name of England. On what occasion in his life did he strike such a deadly blow at the moral authority that England holds in the world? The retort that in blaming the South African Committee we are blaming both political parties is irrelevant except to a blind partisan. The matter is an affair not of party but of national honour, and England will continue to lie under the suspicions of the world till Mr. Chamberlain allows the truth to appear. If it is as favourable to us as we hope and as he asserts, it is difficult to understand why we are forbidden to vindicate ourselves.

It almost seems as if some malign influence has dogged our steps in dealing with South Africa, for we appear unable to perform the simplest acts of justice. The Transvaal very rightly asked for compensation for the expenses incurred in repulsing the Raid and for the support of the families of the burghers who had been killed. The demand was extravagant, and no one wished us to pay the whole; but no excuse can be put forward for the failure on the part of the Government to compel

¹ January 5, 1900.

the Company to pay some moderate sum. At the outbreak of war not a farthing had been paid.

Only a few weeks after the scene in the House of Commons Mr. Chamberlain lighted another fuse by reviving the claim of suzerainty, the threefold mention of which in the Convention of 1881 disappeared in that of 1884, and to the existence of which in the many despatches and speeches of English statesmen during the following thirteen years no reference was ever made. The question whether the preamble of 1881 must be considered to have been tacitly retained in that of 1884 is one as to which lawyers disagree. But even assuming that it was retained—and such an assumption is purely a matter of opinion, the document itself being ambiguous,—it was clearly most unwise to suddenly appeal to it after thirteen years' silence as an excuse for rejecting arbitration in reference to the Aliens' Expulsion Bill, and at a moment when the whole atmosphere of South Africa was charged with suspicions as to the designs of England or Englishmen on the independence of the Transvaal. Mr. Chamberlain was perfectly justified in denying the claim of the Republic to be a sovereign international State; but for its refutation he did not need to go beyond Article 4 of the Convention of 1884, reserving a veto on treaties. No excuse, again, has yet been given for Mr. Chamberlain's refusal to submit the interpretation of the disputed point of suzerainty to arbitration. The very vagueness of the claim increased its terrors, and a clear judgment pronounced on a matter on which the majority of English jurists themselves differed from the Colonial Secretary would have done much to restore confidence.

The course of our South African policy since Mr. Chamberlain's accession to office is a record of mistakes committed and opportunities neglected. But the record of Kruger, who should have taken the ferment in Johannesburg as a sign that he must mend his ways, was no better. For the accumulation of armaments he had the best possible excuse in our conduct. Indeed Mr. Balfour has frankly admitted that we had no ground to protest. "Our

hands were tied and our mouths were closed by the Raid. How could we say, 'You disarm, you have nothing to fear from us'?'¹ The argument would have been perfectly valid if we had dissociated ourselves from the Raid and its authors; but as we did not Mr. Balfour's admission is quite correct. On the other hand, by his failure to modify his corrupt and reactionary *régime*, Kruger merits the severest condemnation and incurs a large share in the guilt of producing the war.

In 1898 Kruger was elected by an overwhelming majority, the conduct of the English Government having left no standing-ground for the Progressives. Many Boers who had voted for Joubert in 1893 voted for Kruger in 1898. Though detesting his domestic methods, the Progressive Dutch saw that they must stand by Kruger so long as England stood by Rhodes.² In the same year Mr. Schreiner obtained power at the Cape; the South African League was formed by the supporters of Mr. Rhodes, and the Outlander petition was drawn up. A crisis was approaching, and could only be averted by great wisdom and moderation on both sides. On the return of Sir A. Milner, early in 1899, it was determined to take strong measures and to demand a five years' franchise. Such a demand was, of course, a violation of the Convention, and had no support from international law; and its one chance of success was to abstain from menace. The Bloemfontein Conference might have been more successful if it had been a conference in the proper sense of the word. Mr. Chamberlain, in his dispatch of May 10th, had suggested a meeting "for the purpose of discussing the situation in a conciliatory spirit." Sir A. Milner, however, showed himself singularly ill-acquainted with human nature in general and Boer nature in particular by demanding an irreducible minimum. Successful diplomacy proceeds by the method of *quid pro quo*, rarely along the lines of unconditional surrender. The next mistake was in publishing the High Commissioner's

¹ January 9, 1900.

² "The Raid made Rhodes doubly popular with the English loyalists." Vindex, "Life and Speeches of Rhodes."

heated dispatch, not on its receipt, but after the failure of the Conference. The grievances of the Outlanders were considerable, but very far from "intolerable." The taxation was badly distributed and badly spent but moderate in amount, and the government of the Transvaal was vexatious and in some respects exasperating; but it was a grotesque perversion of history—inexcusable in "the finest flower of Oxford culture"—to describe the Outlanders as helots, since they entered and remained in the country solely for their own pleasure and interest in thousands and lived prosperous lives. The plain dictate of prudence after the Conference was to obtain instalments of reform, and to use the good offices of the Cape Dutch as mediators. As Sir E. Clarke pointedly remarked, "The best garrison we could have established would have been a faith in the perfect straightforwardness and honour of the diplomacy of this country."¹ But Mr. Chamberlain, misled by the South African League into believing that Kruger only needed a little bluff, began to move troops and to threaten the Boers with war if they did not do as they were bidden. Few people believe that our Government either desired or contemplated war; the indictment against them is that their conduct contributed to make it probable. Again, though it is quite unnecessary to believe that the financiers were the sole cause of the war, they were certainly impelled by the *auri sacra fames* to work hard for war by methods not always very honourable, and witnessed a sudden rise in the value of their shares on the outbreak of the struggle.

Whether Kruger determined early in the summer to fight we do not know. In any case it was incumbent upon us to act with prudence and care, not only for our own satisfaction, but for our reputation in the eyes of the world. But the negotiations of the next two months were of a piece with the whole of Mr. Chamberlain's South African record. Except to those rigid "Predestinarians" who reject the theory of causation, our menaces, both rhetorical and military, must be held to

¹ October 19, 1899.

constitute one of the main causes of the struggle. The Johannesburg branch of the South African League and the Rhodesian Press openly declared that nothing short of a majority in the Volksraad would satisfy them, and fought vigorously against every compromise;² and the Government made no attempt to dissociate itself from them.

Assuming that a party in the Transvaal, as in England, contemplated war, it was our duty and our interest to attempt to strengthen the hands of the party that opposed it. But Mr. Chamberlain was bent on playing his game of bluff. The threads are complicated, but one matter stands out clearly. When we proposed a Commission of Inquiry into the new seven years' Franchise Law the Transvaal at first hesitated to admit such an interference in its domestic affairs, and determined to propose another scheme. Before doing so, however, they obtained an assurance from Mr. Chamberlain that any new proposal would "not be regarded as a refusal" of the Commission. They then offered more than Milner had asked, on condition "that the present intervention shall not form a precedent for future similar action, and that in the future no interference in the internal affairs of the Republic shall take place"—the right to interfere under the Convention of 1884 and under international law being, of course, as heretofore, recognised. Mr. Chamberlain's reply to this and to the two other less important conditions of arbitration and of dropping the assertion of the suzerainty was described by him later as an acceptance of nine-tenths; but the careful student of the dispatch is more likely to agree with the *Standard's* description of it as an "emphatic negative." Moreover, two days before it reached Pretoria, the Highbury speech was cabled out, and the feelings of the Boers were exasperated by the "squeezed sponge" and the "hour-glass" metaphors. As the conditions were not accepted, the offer was of course withdrawn, and the Transvaal at once accepted the Commission. Mr. Chamberlain promptly replied that the offer was withdrawn, despite the express promise quoted above that

² Address to Milner, July 11th, &c.

it would be kept open. From this moment war was recognised on both sides as inevitable. On September 24th the move to Glencoe was begun and the Natal Volunteers called out (September 28th), steps which the Premier and Governor of the Colony had both declared would be regarded by the Boers as tantamount to a declaration of war.¹ The Ultimatum followed on October 9th.

Since the war broke out we have been informed that it was rendered inevitable by a Pan-Africander conspiracy against British rule. That there was a party among the Dutch that looked forward to an Africander State is as certain as that there was a party among the English that looked forward to the removal of the "nebulous republics."² But not only is there no reason to believe that an "irrepressible conflict" existed between the races; there is abundant evidence that until the Raid the Moderates held any Extremists that there were well in hand. Mr. Rhodes, as we saw, worked harmoniously with the Dutch for many years, and the alliance was broken by him, not by them. The Schreiner ministry rested on Dutch votes; but it only contained one Dutchman, and, as we all know, it unanimously contributed £30,000 a year to the Imperial navy, and handed over Simon's Bay for a naval station. The loyalty of the Dutch was warmly recognised by the High Commissioner at the time of the Jubilee rejoicings of 1897; and Mr. Hofmeyr, the leader of the Bond, has shown his desire to tighten the links between England and her Colonies by his proposal of an all-British cable and his support of an Imperial Zollverein. In the Free State, again, we find Mr. Reitz, when elected President, refusing to accept the office until it had been offered to his old friend Sir George Grey; and though the Raid and the South African Committee induced the Free State to conclude the alliance with the Transvaal that it had rejected as needless in 1887, the alliance did not prevent its entry

¹ See the important correspondence in Cd. 44.

² Rhodes to Flora Shaw, December 30, 1895: "To-day, the crux is, I will win and South Africa will belong to England."

into the Customs and Railway Union. So little sign was there of hostility that Mr. Balfour declared himself as surprised at its action as he would have been to have found us in conflict with Switzerland. The telegrams published in the "*Times History of the War*" show that President Steyn, so far from being determined on war from the beginning, hesitated till the last moment before making up his mind. His share in the Bloemfontein Conference is explained in this voluminous pamphlet by "vanity"; but a more honourable explanation seems legitimate. As to the Transvaal, it has been pointed out above that not a particle of evidence has yet been produced to prove the existence of armaments before the shadow of the Raid fell across the scene. The Boers, as Captain Younghusband wrote to his journal, the *Times*, in 1896, were "nearly caught napping," and acted as every householder acts when burglars who have entered his house are still at large. Moreover, it is difficult to read carefully through Kruger's speeches at the Bloemfontein Conference without feeling that he had not at that time determined to fight. Nobody, of course, can prove that the most faultless conduct on the part of ourselves and the colonists would have prevented war; but judging by the ordinary canons of probability it seems, to say the least, an equally reasonable hypothesis to believe that the Moderates in the republics might have kept the Extremists in hand if it had not been for the violence of the Rhodesian Press, the tactlessness of the High Commissioner, the movement of troops early in the summer, and the record and conduct of the Colonial Secretary. "Nations whose conscience is clear, statesmen who have foresight and insight, do not throw the blame for their failures upon Destiny."

The plan of this essay does not include a discussion of the actual course of the war; but our blind trust in the power of the sword has led us into two disastrous blunders. The first was the policy of wholesale destruction of farms, not only of those which were found to contain ammunition or were used for attacks, but of those where no such excuse existed. Lord Roberts's famous proclamation of

September 2nd, ordering the destruction of farms within ten miles of any point of the railway that was attacked, was contrary to the Hague Convention, and proved scarcely a less colossal blunder than Brunswick's proclamation to the French. The result of this policy of devastation has been to turn the countries, which according to our proclamation are now British territory, into ash-heaps, to strengthen the determination of the enemy to fight to the last, to alienate still further the Dutch of Cape Colony, and to augment the sum which we shall have to pay at the conclusion of the war to make the conquered territories habitable. It is but a poor consolation that the folly of such conduct has been to some extent recognised when the mischief is done.

The second capital blunder has been the determination to annihilate the national existence of our enemies. To some the idea of blotting out a nation from the map of the world has nothing repugnant about it; and it is therefore useless to argue the matter from the point of view of right or wrong. It is enough to recall the fact that history speaks with no uncertain voice of the last destruction of a white nationality—the partition of Poland—despite the fact that the government of the robbers was in many respects better than had been that of the victims. We can argue it only from the point of view of expediency. Mr. Rhodes declared, after being released from Kimberley, that the war was not against the Dutch, but against Krugerism. Would that it were so! But Lord Salisbury's announcement that the Boers would not be left "a shred of independence," effectually disposed of that view of the struggle. Our thoughts turn back to Carrier's terrible words: "Let us make France a cemetery rather than not regenerate her in our own fashion." We imagined that the Boers would never fight a losing battle; nor indeed would they have done so were it not for that overmastering impulse to save some shred of national life which, despite the hourly exhibition of its power, we cannot or will not understand. What is a "nationality"? We will let Mill reply. "A portion of mankind may be said to constitute a nation if they are united among themselves by common sympathies

which do not exist between them and others. This feeling of nationality may have been generated by various causes. Sometimes it is the effect of identity of race and descent. Community of language and community of religion greatly contribute to it. Geographical limits are one of the causes. But the strongest of all is identity of political antecedents, the possession of a national history and consequent community of recollections, collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, connected with the same incidents in the past."¹ Are not these words an exact description of the inhabitants of the Dutch States?

Another blunder of a slightly different character has been the abuse of martial law in Cape Colony. Nobody has disputed the right and duty to proclaim martial law in the disturbed districts; but care should have been taken that it was fairly carried out, and that the terrible strain to which the loyalty of the Cape Dutch was exposed should not be increased in any way that could be avoided. We find, however, cases where men who had taken a prominent part in the agitation that preceded the war were sent to administer martial law, and men thrown into prison, kept there for months without being informed of the nature of their offence, and finally released without apology or compensation.²

In looking ahead we are dealing with a problem several of the principal factors of which are unknown. The smoke rising from that "black cauldron of confusion" effectually hides the future from our eyes. The new territories are promised representative institutions when they are ripe for them, a period which Lord Salisbury believes may extend to "generations." The example of other recent annexations certainly lends support to the Prime Minister's discouraging forecast. Speaking in 1890, Caprivi declared that the attempt to conciliate the annexed provinces (not a nation but only a part of a nation) had been a failure; and in

¹ "Representative Government," chap. xvi., Nationality.

² Full details of the maladministration of martial law may be found in Mackarness's article in the *Contemporary Review*, September, 1900, and Robertson's "Wrecking the Empire."

1900 Hohenlohe resisted the abolition of the Dictatorship, roundly declaring that what had been won by the sword must be held by the sword. Equally little strength do the Hohenzollerns derive from their unwilling subjects in Schleswig and Prussian Poland. The analogy of the French in Canada is often cited on the other side ; but the circumstances differ in two important particulars. The French in Canada were governed from France and were never a nation ; and they are in the proportion of one to four. So far as recent history has a lesson for us, it is that we are sowing dragon's teeth. In fact, one of the weightiest objections to the war in South Africa is that it is far from certain that it will permanently solve the problem of Dutch or English supremacy. We all look forward to an era of "equal rights." If these rights are more than a phrase, if they mean the same as in our other Colonies, they mean that not only the ministers but the form of government shall be determined by the wishes of the majority of voters. To attempt to override the wishes, whatever they may be, of the majority in the Federal Assembly to which we look forward would be not only against the traditions, but in the long run beyond the power of our Empire. Our other Colonies possess the supreme political privilege of free men—that of choosing any form of government they like ; and if they determine to hoist an independent flag the Mother Country would regret their action but would not say them nay. In the same way a Dutch majority, desiring but forbidden to choose their flag, could by purely constitutional means make constitutional government impossible. The future turns above all on the question of population. If the Dutch, now in a majority of about 20 per cent. in South Africa south of the Zambesi, retain and increase their majority, and if they hold together they must sooner or later get whatever they want, unless we are prepared to hold them down by force. If, on the other hand, the English increase rapidly and gain a permanent majority we shall hold the country. It is less a matter of guns than of cradles. The editor of the *Spectator* and other Conservative journalists talk confidently of the Dutch being

rapidly and permanently outnumbered ; but the Witswatersrand mines will be worked out, according to the experts, in one or two generations, and the diamond industry employs but a handful of white men. The remaining mineral wealth of the Transvaal is probably very considerable and has yet to be measured. Rhodesia, on the other hand, has failed of its promises. The natives, too, with their growth in education, are rapidly becoming able to undertake duties on the railways and elsewhere now performed by white men. The English, again, have so far failed to settle on the land. Our standard of comfort is high, and our hatred of the utter solitude of life on the veldt is ingrained. Above all, the Dutch are one of the most prolific races in the world. For these reasons it is possible, and even probable, that they will retain their majority.

Another alternative, almost too good to hope for, is the fusion of the races by marriage. This alone would solve the problem of race ; but there is no instance of such a complete blending of race in modern times.

The ultimate future of South Africa will settle itself without regard to our prophecies or our hopes ; but in the immediate future several definite and urgent duties lie before us.

The first is to attempt to conciliate the Dutch. But though most people agree to this in theory, they oppose the steps that are most likely to carry it into effect. Rightly or wrongly, the Dutch throughout South Africa share General Botha's "strong objection" to Sir Alfred Milner, and regard him as the enemy of their race. The new order would have a better chance of success if the more prominent leaders of both parties should give way to others. On the one side, Kruger and his satellites have gone. On the other, the High Commissioner should retire, and the leaders of the South African League, who appear to believe in race equality as little as Kruger himself, should be removed from the posts to which they have been appointed with indecent haste. "The spoil to the victors" may suit the victors, but it is not calculated to promote the good of the country or the contentment of

the people. In the next place, Mr. Rhodes should be at last officially disclaimed by the British Empire. In the rearrangement of the political map of South Africa, the Chartered Company should terminate its dishonoured existence, and the luckless Matabele and Mashona pass under the direct rule of the Crown. Further, if we are in earnest about conciliation, the man whom the Dutch regard as the patron and accomplice of Rhodes and the prime author of their national extinction should give place to a Colonial Secretary who, if he cannot rival Mr. Chamberlain's abilities, would at least possess a more satisfactory record and be free from his infirmities of temper. And, finally, it is but little use to remove the principal actors in the tragedy unless we ourselves undergo a radical change of temper. It is in any case doubtful whether the Boers will become or the Cape Colony Dutch remain willing subjects of the King; if our present mood continues they certainly will not. The spirit of fanatical wrong-headedness manifested in the attack of the *Times* on Messrs. Merriman and Sauer (March 26th), to name only one instance, leads nowhere but to the speedy wrecking of the Empire.

The second urgent need for us, on the conclusion of the war, is to obtain a firm grasp over the great capitalists, to defend Dutch and English alike from the speculators who regard South Africa as a land to be exploited, not to be lived in. The capitalists in Johannesburg are not widely different from elsewhere, but they are the only wealthy men in a poor community; they hang together, they know precisely what they want, and they stick at nothing to obtain it. It is generally admitted that the consolidation of the Diamond Companies under De Beers has reacted prejudicially on the life of Kimberley. The city has but half its population, and what remains is owned body and soul by Mr. Rhodes. Independent trade, independent newspapers, independent thought have disappeared—in a word, Kimberley is the least free of the towns of South Africa. A similar danger threatens Johannesburg. The Consolidated Goldfields already dominates the Rand, and it is by no means beyond the ability of Mr. Rhodes, its

moving spirit, to do for it what he did for De Beers. That the danger is not exaggerated is strikingly shown by the pamphlet issued at Cape Town last autumn by the less wealthy Outlanders¹ who adopt the view of the economic situation in the Transvaal explained in Hobson's well-known work on the war.

The third urgent duty is to safeguard the interests of the natives. We know that one of the chief gravamina of the mine owners against the Transvaal Government was that it did not assist in procuring a supply of cheap native labour for the mines. Mr. Rhodes declared, in his blunt way, some weeks before the war, "We are not going to war for the amusement of the Royal families as in the past, but we mean practical business."² His meaning was explained more fully at the meeting of the Consolidated Goldfields Company, November 14, 1899, when Mr. Hays Hammond, the consulting engineer, declared "there will be no difficulty in cutting down wages," and Mr. Rudd urged that "they should try some cogent form of inducement and practically compel the native to work." At the meeting of the Chartered Company, December 14th, Earl Grey declared for a hut tax or a labour tax. Mr. Hammond and Mr. Fitzpatrick (of Eckstein's) agreed that the overthrow of the Transvaal would add over two millions net profit to the mine owners; and it is significant that the Rand shares shot up on the outbreak of war. This profit was of course largely to come from "practically compelling" native miners to work, reducing their wages, and increasing their hours.

The great capitalists deserve our gratitude for warning us of their intentions, and it will be our own fault if we refuse to act on their hint. A careful Factory and Labour Code must be drawn up without delay, and its supervision entrusted to highly paid and trustworthy men. "Unless great changes are made in British policy," declares Mr. Fox Bourne, Secretary of the Aborigines Protection Society, "the transference from Dutch to English will

¹ "The Uitlander Refugees and the Transvaal Capitalists."

² *Daily Mail*, August 14th.

not benefit the native." ¹ Mr. Selous and other witnesses assure us that the difference in treatment of natives by Dutch and English was in recent years purely imaginary; and Mr. Fox Bourne very rightly points out that the attitude differed not as between races but as between states, Rhodesia being the worst of all. That the native regards the great capitalist as a more dangerous foe than the Dutch farmer is shown by the consistent support given by the native vote and the native Press in Cape Colony to the candidates of the Bond and anti-Rhodes party. We must also jealously resist the extension of the Glen Grey Act, which, with a view to increasing the number of labourers at the Kimberley mines, substitutes individual for communal ownership, and forces the Kaffir who does not possess land to leave his home and work for the white man in order to pay a money tax to the State. We have abundant proof that it is easy to rule the natives with results satisfactory to themselves and to ourselves, and that it is equally easy to stir them to madness and revolt by forced labour and injudicious taxation. Mr. Chamberlain has unfortunately lent his name to the purposes of the capitalists, and declared "an inducement, stimulus, and pressure absolutely necessary if you are to secure a result desirable in the interests of humanity and civilisation." ²

A suggestion worth considering is that the High Commissioner should become in a special degree responsible for the welfare of the natives all over South Africa; and in any case it is our duty to see that native policy should not fall below the standard demanded by opinion in England—a standard to which the Boer farmer and the English mine owner are not likely, without constant pressure, to rise.

V.

Turning to what is strictly called foreign policy, we may deal first with the Far East. Our policy in China as a whole has been singularly discreditable, commencing with the opium wars and the seizure of the lorcha *Arrow*. After

¹ "Blacks and Whites in South Africa."

² *Anglice*, mining profits. May 7, 1898. This is what Taine meant when he said that Pecksniff "talked like a prospectus."

the latter war we enjoyed peaceful relations for a generation, during which we quietly developed our trade ; and it was not till the scramble for territory induced by the revelations of the Japanese War that we reverted to our older traditions. It is difficult to see in what way our policy, in regard both to other European Powers in China and to the Chinese themselves, could have been more unskillfully managed. The German Emperor saw in the body of a murdered missionary an article of considerable commercial value, and seized Kiao-Chau. We acquiesced in the seizure, though Germany had no political and scarcely any commercial interests in the Far East, and we could not therefore logically refuse a similar privilege to the Power that owned the whole of the northern half of Asia. Though the demand on the part of Russia for an ice-free port must have been foreseen since the conquest of the Amur, and was certain from the commencement of the Siberian Railway, our Government had settled on no line of conduct when the demand actually came. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach had talked grandly about maintaining the "open door" even at the cost of war, but we obediently removed our ships from Port Arthur. We then tacked again, and straightway began to hurl invectives against Russia for doing what we approved when done by Germany, thus contriving not only to lower our prestige by leaving Port Arthur without protest or compensation, but also to offend Russia by the bad temper we displayed after doing so. Our second great mistake was in at once proceeding to perform the very same act which we had denounced in Russia, and seizing Wei-hai-Wei, after talking loudly of our determination to respect the integrity of China. Rarely has any step been taken with such slight cause. Sir Charles Dilke's hypothesis that the place was seized in view of an approaching debate in Parliament holds the field until some other is suggested. It cannot have been for commercial purposes, as Mr. Balfour declared that anybody who went there for such reasons "would be a fool for his pains." If we study a map the uselessness of the site for military purposes becomes equally apparent. Wei-hai-Wei is too far east to have

any control over the entrance to the Gulf of Pechi-li. The total upshot of our policy has been to alienate Russia by censuring in her what we allowed to Germany; to join in the game of grab, after denouncing it in others; to lose prestige by using lofty language and obediently doing as we were bid; and to cumber ourselves with a useless and expensive station. It is certainly a remarkable record, but our relations with the Chinese themselves are still more unsatisfactory. Our true policy is to confine ourselves to commercial relations. We have an impregnable *place d'armes* at Hong-Kong, and we practically control Shanghai. In China, at all events, trade does not necessarily follow the flag; for when the flag is forced on to the mainland the Chinaman will fight, and the war, largely owing to the policy of grab in which we have shared, has cost us more than the profit of many years' trade. So long as Europe treats China as a shop to be looted the anti-foreign party will be supreme. In reference to missionary effort, it is enough to say that its one chance of success consists in being absolutely severed from politics.¹ The "avenging" of one missionary involves the death of a hundred of his fellows and the sterility of the efforts of the survivors. And Christianity will never gain a foothold while the conduct of "Christian" Powers is one long story of robbery, outrage, and murder.

If an attempt was made by one or more foreign Power to seize our best ports—our Chatham and Portsmouths and Southampton and Bristol—we should witness a national outburst of indignation at the affront to our national honour, and a wave of patriotism would sweep through the country. But while this would not only be inevitable, but would everywhere be recognised as reasonable and indeed creditable, few seem to have thought that men with a yellow skin might perhaps be influenced by similar feelings. The utter falsity of this dual standard was instantly revealed. A vigorous national movement arose, of which the Empress took advantage to seize the reins of power. The Boxers, a patriotic society with a

¹ Cf. the interesting study in Lord Curzon's "Problems of the Far East."

programme of "China for the Chinese," sprang into existence to repel the alien invasion, and Italy's demand for Sommun Bay was met with a decisive rebuff. All these ominous signs failed to shake the confidence of our diplomatists in the truth of the theory that yellow men did not feel and would not act like other human beings. The preparations, however, went steadily forward till the moment was thought to be ripe in the early summer of 1900. The English are instructed to remember and avenge Majuba twenty years after, but the Chinese must not be allowed to wipe out the disgrace of Kiao-Chau, Port Arthur, and Wei-hai-Wei, extorted at the point of the pistol from the most populous Empire in the world. The inhuman attack on innocent women and children cannot be defended, but it must be kept carefully distinct from the opposition to exploitation of the Powers. When Sir R. Hart pointed out, in his statesmanlike articles in the *Fortnightly Review*, that we could not explain the episode by the "wickedness" of the Chinese and the hypothesis of original sin, but that we were face to face with a national and patriotic movement, perfectly reasonable and justifiable in its aims, though not in certain of its methods, his diagnosis was explained by the Conservative Press on the assumption that he was the paid agent of the Chinese Government. While our newspapers and public speakers were neglecting the obvious and seeking for imaginary causes of the crisis, Sir Robert had the moral courage to tell the simple truth, namely, that Europe was reaping the natural fruits of its own aggressive and unscrupulous policy. We sowed the wind, and we are reaping the whirlwind.¹ Of the prolonged tragedy of loot, lust, and murder enacted by the Allied troops in China in 1900 we have already spoken.

The Far Eastern question has for the time diverted our attention from the Eastern Question, but the latter is ever with us. After Lord Salisbury's admission that we put our money on the wrong horse, it has become easier for our

¹ The most illuminating recent discussion of the wider aspects of the Chinese Question is to be found in Reinsch's "World Politics."

national pride to confess that the policy suggested by the younger Pitt and carried out by Palmerston and Beaconsfield, namely, that of treating Turkey as a member of the comity of civilised nations, with the same rights of possession as others, has been a costly failure. Here again, however, we are only locking the stable door when the steed is stolen. The Russo-Turkish War was ended by the Treaty of San Stefano, which was promptly torn up by Beaconsfield. The Treaty of Berlin committed two fatal mistakes. It left Macedonia under Turkish control, and transferred the guarantee of Armenian faith and freedom from Russia to the Powers. The result was that Russia determined never again to intervene in the rescue of Christian subjects of the Porte. As if this was not mischief enough, Lord Beaconsfield concluded the secret treaty of Cyprus, by which he promised to defend Turkey against Russian attack, receiving in return the occupation of the island and a promise of reform for the Christians. The tragic history of the Armenian massacres does not need retelling, though in these crowded days we have short memories, and seem to be less squeamish about blood than of old. Certain Armenians were encouraged by the emancipation of the Balkan States to entertain hopes of a national life. The Sultan, however, who remembered how a revolt in Bulgaria had led to intervention and finally to the loss of the province, determined to stifle the Armenian movement in blood before there was time for intervention. When the massacres began Prince Lobanoff refused to join in coercion, but Lord Salisbury solemnly threatened that the Sultan would not escape the ruin that misgovernment brought in its train. Abdul Hamid is never frightened by words, least of all when Lord Salisbury is the speaker, and our inaction confirmed his belief that he could exterminate his Christian subjects with impunity. Two alternatives were open. The first was to threaten the Sultan with our fleet, as Gladstone did when he compelled the surrender of Dulcigno and the Thessalian frontier in accordance with the Berlin decrees of 1878. To some such effort we were pledged not only by Article 61 of the Berlin Treaty, but in a special degree by Article 1 of the

Convention of Cyprus.¹ Above all, it is owing to England more than to any other country that Turkey has lived on to do its hideous work, and it was England, as we have seen, that deprived the Armenians of the protection which Russia was ready to afford in 1878. If, however, it was considered dangerous to fulfil the duties solemnly undertaken in two treaties, another choice was open, namely, that of giving Russia a mandate or even a special inducement to terminate the crime and to assume the Protectorate of the hapless victims. For the sake of Lord Salisbury's reputation in history we hope that the archives may furnish us with some explanation of his conduct. All that we know is that during the "Year of Shame," for want of a Cromwell or a Canning, the greatest and strongest Empire in the world stood idly by, gazing on the massacre of 100,000 unarmed men, women, and children, not venturing to run the slightest risk in fulfilling her own solemn treaty engagements. The moral weakness of the New Imperialism is revealed not more in what it does than in what it leaves undone.

An excuse was made for our inactivity in Armenia on the ground that our ships could not cross mountains. But our record in the next chapter of the Eastern Question was even worse, for that excuse, such as it was, could not be put forward. In Armenia we did nothing at all; in Crete we rendered immense assistance to Turkey in her struggle with Greece. The island, one of the latest of Ottoman conquests, is almost wholly Greek, but was exploited by a handful of Turkish officials and a Turkish garrison, whose usual methods of murder and outrage had already provoked a dozen revolts. The Greek population, too, had repeatedly expressed their desire for union with Greece, and in 1897 a Greek force was sent to their aid. Our ships joined those of other countries in bombarding the Christian insurgents because they preferred to trust to their own right arms than to the promises of the Powers, knowing how similar promises of protection against the Turk had been fulfilled in Armenia and elsewhere. After

¹ Our treaty obligations are stated in full in Bryce's "Transcaucasia and Ararat."

many months of anarchy, the Turks tried their methods on English soldiers, and what Lord Salisbury and his brother-diplomats had not the courage or the wit to do was done by Admiral Noel and his colleagues, and Turkish rule was expelled from the island. The next and final step, if the inhabitants so desire, must be the union of Crete with the Greek kingdom.

The fear and suspicion of Russia have been described by Lord Salisbury, in the evening of his days, as an antiquated superstition. But antiquated superstitions have a disagreeable vitality, and this one in particular is not yet on its last legs. A strong party among us, represented perhaps more by Navy Leaguers, journalists, and Mr. Kipling than by our foremost statesmen, still believes that Russia's gain is necessarily England's loss, and that Russia must be stopped in Northern China, on the Persian Gulf, and on the borders of Afghanistan. It is unnecessary, undesirable, and impossible. The Allies won a Pyrrhic victory in the Crimea ; but Russia, which can afford to wait for the opportunity that is never long in coming, quietly announced the abrogation of the Black Sea clauses during the turmoil of the Franco-German War. Our policy is not to fight her nor insult her, but to deal with her. If she attacked India we should resist and resist successfully ; but she knows it is not worth her while to make the attempt. Our policy on the North-West frontier is to avoid a repetition of the disastrous blunders of the Afghan War, and to scrupulously respect the independence of Afghanistan. Gladstone's wisdom in evacuating Candahar is generally recognised. To have kept the province would infallibly have thrown the Ameer into the arms of Russia. Afghanistan has not the slightest desire to part with her independence either to Russia or anybody else. She is a buffer state and strengthens our position more than an army corps, provided we do not revert to Lord Beaconsfield's policy of serving her with Ultimatums.

In relation to France it is satisfactory to think that the possible causes of conflict have been reduced in the last few years. The valley of the Nile is not likely to be

challenged again, and France has plenty to keep her busy in North-West Africa. The break-up of Morocco no longer causes the apprehension that was felt by Bismarck ; whatever occurs we shall not attempt to thwart the plans of France. We shall not interfere with her in Indo-China, and she will not attack us in Burma. The disputed fishery rights in Newfoundland are of too little value to greatly excite the imagination or passions of either people ; and if it is left to competent statesmen it can be compromised in several ways. We have submitted to the virtual exclusion of our commerce from Madagascar ; and we are not likely to have another *épreuve* like that of the Tahiti Isles. The difficulty of the Dual Control could and should be settled by a frank explanation of our intentions and an offer to recognise the position of France in Tunis. The sole real danger therefore lies in the journalists and jingoes of both countries, and in the ignorance which alone gives them their power ; and it is one of the most urgent duties of all who are in earnest about peace to restore the *entente cordiale* which existed between Walpole and Fleury, Aberdeen and Guizot, and was preached and practised throughout life by Gladstone.

The only other Power with which there seems any possibility of coming into conflict is Germany, whose Emperor, throwing aside the Bismarckian caution, has plunged wildly into the mazes of *Welt-politik*. This ambition of an oversea dominion could only affect us if South America, whose anarchy and bankruptcy appeal forcibly to the cupidity of stronger and richer nations, were one of the points chosen for operations. The United States would appeal to the Monroe doctrine, which Germany does not recognise, and a quarrel might ensue.¹ Attempts would then almost certainly be made to turn the Anglo-Saxon brotherhood into a fighting alliance. If this happens, and it is far from impossible, England's course would be perfectly clear. If she could not prevent a struggle, she should certainly not join in it. It is by no means clear that the absorption of South America by the United States would be an advantage either to one or the

¹ Cf. Reinsch's "World Politics," Part iv. chap. iii.

other. We should, however, give the United States every proof of our good feeling, and our statesmen should do their utmost to revive the scheme for a permanent arbitration treaty. Everybody is heartily ashamed of the explosion in connection with Venezuela, and Cleveland has had leisure to regret the deplorable want of temper that turned a petty question of frontiers in South America into an acrid dispute between the two countries. The movement for the union of Canada with the States is equally weak in both countries; and the only threatening difficulty is that of the Alaska boundary, complicated as it is by the presence of gold, which, like the Nibelung's ring, brings curses with it. The fortification of the Nicaragua Canal need cause no apprehensions. If the Americans make the canal, it is only natural that they should retain the power of extracting all possible advantage from it.

Though not strictly part of foreign politics, the Irish Question holds an important place in the theory and practice of Imperialism. By common consent Ireland is the one part of the British Empire which gives us the least cause for satisfaction. But here the agreement ends, one party attributing the unsatisfactory results to the nature of the people, the other to the system which has been and is still in some degree employed. No better example could be found of the truth on the recognition of which the permanence of our Empire depends, that willing subjects make for strength and unwilling subjects for weakness. We have for centuries ridden roughshod over the rights and aspirations of a whole people, and one hundred years ago effected what was called a Union by means of wholesale corruption. Since then the vast majority of the Irish people has used the ballot-box and so much of the right of free speech as Dublin Castle chooses to allow them to demand the repeal of a Union to which they never consented. The demand that the majority, not the minority, should govern is refused, and the natural result is seen in the addresses to Mr. Kruger. Why should they love us? Why should a nation cherish friendly feelings for another nation which by reason of its superior strength resists the demands put forward at

every election by four-fifths of its elected representatives? If the Home Rule movement is at bottom economic, not political, if it is capable of being "killed by kindness," by land purchase and by co-operation, so much the better. If it is not, the demand will in some shape have to be granted. There is ground for hope that in federation in one of its many forms may be found a compromise between separatism and an inorganic unity.

The problem of defence may be dismissed in a few words. The question is usually argued abstractly; but as a matter of fact it is in large measure relative to the policy we pursue. With a Chamberlain ministry, for instance, permanently in power conscription would be unavoidable. This point was firmly seized by Lord Randolph Churchill alone among recent Conservative statesmen,¹ but is a commonplace with reflective Liberals. The hysterical alarms of the Navy League, as baseless as those pilloried by Cobden in his famous pamphlet, "The Three Panics," weaken the country instead of strengthening it, since they provide rival Governments with the excuse they need for forcing huge naval programmes through reluctant chambers. Cobden himself was in favour of a large navy, but the old rule of surpassing the fleets of any two Powers must sooner or later be abandoned. We shall be safe enough with a fleet larger than any other single country and with a conciliatory diplomacy. The same holds good with regard to military defence. If we pursue a careful and honourable course, conscription, now openly advocated by many Conservatives, is as unnecessary to-day as it has always been. Compulsory service perhaps tends to make the nation that adopts it less jingo than when one section of the population can shout for war and another section wage it; but this is its only advantage. It decreases the volume of individuality in a nation by forcing all men into the same mould; and it is only too certain that the barracks play havoc with the moral character. A system by which barrack life is avoided and every young man is

¹ "Effective retrenchment is perfectly feasible; increased expenditure is quite unnecessary if the foreign policy of the country is conducted with skill and judgment."

taught to shoot would be less objectionable, less expensive, and perhaps equally effective.

CONCLUSION.

Writing forty years ago about the Middle Classes and the State, Matthew Arnold prophesied that they would "rule it by their energy, but deteriorate it by their low ideals and want of culture." The predominance of the personality and methods of the Colonial Secretary at the present time has verified this forecast with remarkable accuracy. It singles out precisely the two evils from which we are chiefly suffering—our ignorance, and our worship of material prosperity. The power of wealth seems to judges usually so far apart as Mr. Bryce and Lord Charles Beresford our greatest enemy. "The enemy of liberty," says the former, "is not monarchy but money." "British society," says the latter, "has been eaten into by the canker of money. The plutocracy is gaining power on each side of the Atlantic, and the democracy is likely to be crushed under the heel of a worse tyrant than king or pope."¹ We have won the battle of political democracy and have now to face a subtler foe—the power of organised money, secularising our ideals and poisoning the wells of our knowledge.

Burke once declared that when the people went wrong, it was their misfortune rather than their fault; and if we did not believe in the essential correctness of this view, no one would have courage to grapple with the evils of the time. In connection with the subjects discussed in this essay, the duties that lie to hand are definite political instruction and a ceaseless propaganda against the philosophy that lies at the root of our political materialism and against its several manifestations. If it is too much to say that ideas rule the world, they are at any rate more important than any other factor. The Midlothian Campaign will stand for ever as a trumpet-call to the champions of the moral idea in international politics. True, the old Campaigner is gone and there is none to

¹ *North American Review*, December, 1900, "Future of the Anglo-Saxon Race."

fill his place. But though the number of those who have learned their political faith in the school of Fox and Canning and Gladstone does not constitute a majority in our own or perhaps any country, they, nevertheless, gather strength from the fact that while the Chamberlains and Déroulèdes of every land necessarily contradict each other, we plead for the same cause and uphold the authority of the same tribunal—the voice not of a class nor even a nation, but of the civilised world. The Jingoës, the Chauvinists, the German Colonials, the Panslavists, the Irredentists—how absurd they seem in every country but their own! Their critics, few as they are, have grown steadily in numbers and influence since Grotius was moved by the horrors of the Thirty Years' War to claim a footing for moral principles in international affairs. And it is from this band that Penn, the Abbé Saint-Pierre, Bentham, Görres, Kant, and other dreamers have come—men who realised quite as clearly as their critics the Utopian character of their dreams at the moment, but felt it worth while to bear testimony to certain truths till the fulness of time should come. The Hague Conference, though the achievements fell short of the wishes and hopes of the Tsar, marks the beginning of a new epoch. The first step towards liberty is to complain of your chains.

In quite recent times the internationalists have received reinforcements from the Socialists and labour leaders of all countries. The inadequacy as it seems to many of their sociology does not diminish the importance of the fact that in every country there is a growing body of men who refuse to hate or even to despise other countries, resolutely oppose every manifestation of the war-spirit, and proclaim in season and out of season the community of interests of the workers of the world. It is to the German Socialists that we look, and do not look in vain, to give utterance to the better mind of their land when the Emperor forbids his soldiers to give quarter to the Chinese and holds up the Huns for their imitation, or when Carl Peters is to be brought to the bar of public opinion. It is to them, too, that we look for the expression of the simple but forgotten truth that the strength and

influence of Germany lies more in a free and prosperous people at home than in securing the deserts of Damaraland and the tropical swamps of the Cameroons—still waiting for the colonists who will never come. In England, too, the Boer War has had the effect of banding the labour leaders together to issue a manifesto—the first issued by English labour in reference to a question outside domestic affairs.

In addition to the growing number of men, both thinkers and workers, who refuse any longer to bound their patriotism by their frontiers, and who recognise that the nationalist ideal must be supplemented by the internationalist, there is a second cause for hope. John Bright once remarked that the only good thing he could see of war was that you could have a very little of it for a great deal of money. If Bright spoke to-day, he would apply his test equally to the armed peace. The German Emperor has expressed his contentment with the drill-sergeant's millennium ; but the German worker agrees on this matter with the Tsar. The words of the famous Encyclical contain the simple truth : "The financial charges strike at public prosperity at its very source. The intelligence and physical strength of the nations, labour and capital, are for the major part diverted from their natural application and unproductively expended. The armed peace of our days is becoming a crushing burden, which the peoples have more and more difficulty in bearing."

England is the richest country in Europe ; but at the present rate our expenses, leaving war altogether out of account, are increasing far more rapidly than our wealth. This process can nowhere go on indefinitely ; and long before the limit of taxable capacity is arrived at the limit of taxable patience will be reached. This line of reasoning applies, of course, still more strongly to wars than to armed peace. M. Bloch has not proved nor attempted to prove that war is impossible. His object has been to show that a struggle between nations or alliances of approximately equal strength are impossible save at a price in blood and money that no nation would be able to afford.

To-day the hope of progress at home and of tranquillity abroad lies in the recognition, in theory and practice, of the supreme claim of the moral ideal, not less in our dealings with our own dependencies and with other nations than in the social transformation through which England must pass in her progress towards a healthier and a happier life.

IX

PAST AND FUTURE

A wanderer is man from his birth,
He was born in a ship
On the breast of the river of Time ;
Brimming with wonder and joy
He spreads out his arms to the light,
Rivets his gaze on the banks of the stream.

As what he sees is, so have his thoughts been.
Whether he wakes
Where the snowy mountainous pass,
Echoing the screams of the eagles,
Hems in its gorges the bed
Of the new-born clear-flowing stream ;
Whether he first sees light
Where the river in gleaming rings
Sluggishly winds through the plain ;
Whether in sound of the swallowing sea—
As is the world on the banks,
So is the mind of the man.

This tract which the river of Time
Now flows through with us, is the plain.
Gone is the calm of its earlier shore.
Border'd by cities and hoarse
With a thousand cries is its stream.
And we on its breast, our minds
Are confused as the cries which we hear,
Changing and shot as the sights which we see.

The Future, MATTHEW ARNOLD.

I. **S**UCH was the allegory by which the regretful and unwilling herald of our latter-day era delineated the power of external circumstance to give to each generation its peculiar quality.

In order to extract the kernel of positive warning from the husk of vague pessimism, we must ask what is the difference between the banks of Time which the English used to see and those which they see to-day. The difference is this : in the past life was naturally—that is, by the process of existing social and economic conditions—beautiful and instructive ; while to-day life moves in conditions which tend to make it ugly and trivial. It can still be made more beautiful and instructive than ever, but if so it will be by artificial means and by conscious effort of our own. The world on the banks, having become naturally ugly, must be made artificially beautiful. This formula baldly stated may easily be misunderstood and so needs to be illustrated by a few examples.

Alike in the range of known history and in the dim patriarchal days, three great forces are seen to preside over the work of transformation, three that have power to form the intelligence and the character, making nations and, what is better, making men. In these three all history is summed up. The mutual affections of human beings towards each other constitute the first. The second is external sight and sound and feeling. The third is the instruction of the mind—the direct act of education, whether spiritual or scientific.

(a) Of these three powers that form, the first may be considered stable or possibly, an optimist may be allowed to hope, progressive. If the world has improved upon the whole, which the present writer would be unwilling categorically to deny, the chief improvement will be found in the greater freedom, strength, and subtlety of the communion of persons. Under this head, too, may be included humanitarianism, or the dislike of obvious cruelty to others.

(b) But whatever may be the mutual relations of the fellow travellers on the deck of the ship, the banks of the stream have changed for the worse. The second of the great moulding forces—the surroundings of life that strike the

by their touch. but the chance of Economy, habitual sway of the
to live where he can never
of our forefathers, nine out of ten
the pavement, or the breadth of heaven
the earth for the poorest, and the remainder, the busiest and
the chimney-tops; and the remainder, the busiest and
of English humanity, in towns whose darkest
best title of a mile from the orchards round the town,
Lane was never a recreation of the city dweller was by the
so that the recreation of the city dweller was by the
hedgerous and river-banks, riding or hunting if he was
rich; if he was poor, walking, fishing and joining in games
and sports. The spring and the winter came unsought
into every man's life, not as they come to-day, wayfarers
bewandered among the house-tops, feebly whispering of
unknown things in far salubrious lands, but fresh with
bursting boughs, or strong in glowing frost. The thoughts of
the "Allegro" and "Il Penseroso" are indeed the thoughts of
a rare mind, but the most vulgar slave of custom enjoyed in
the days of King Charles the conditions of daily life which
Milton there described; the sweet influences of the seasons
had their effect on the "son of Belial" as he swaggered
home along the lonely road from the alehouse, and on the
presbyter when he went forth to meditate the causes
of the wrath of God. Whether they knew it or not, the
Cavaliers drew their charm from the fields, and the
Puritans their strength from the earth.

Then, too, economy, in the strict pursuit of its material ends, made the countryside more beautiful than it had been in the primeval days. For not only did man, driven by need, leave the hills studded with wild woods, wrecks of the old English forest, bramble and oak and hawthorn; but what man himself erected in accordance with that law of need was no less lovely than what he found. For in strictly economic use of the cheapest materials nearest to his hand, the Englishman built among his orchards, houses of stone, of white plaster and oak beams, or of fair red brick, according to the natural properties of the district in which he lived. And as the Tudor and Hanoverian

epochs rolled on he enclosed the naked fields of the Middle Ages with green hedgerows and shaded them with lines of trees, so that England when the wars of the French Revolution began was more beautiful than it had ever been before. What this old England was can still be seen and felt in the combes and on the round hilltops of Somerset and Devon, in the wooded lands over which Malvern looks to the west, and in the broken valleys that lead the Lake Mountains down towards the sea.

Such were the visible results, not so much of our ancestors' artistic instinct, as of the economic dispensation under which it was their fortune to live. But in our day the law of economy ropes the fields and valleys across with wire instead of hedgerows, builds the houses of grey brick and roofs them with blue slate. And whereas then the cheaper the bargain with the mason, the more curious the twists and angles of the cottage; now, the cheaper the contract with the jerry-builder, the more regular are the endless rows of little prisons each with its tiny gaol-yard. The fact that man's mind is unconsciously affected by the sights and sounds that lie about him is, in short, so comfortless a doctrine to our generation that it is frequently denied, merely because men are unwilling to despair. The doctrine is none the less true, and though it does not make the situation desperate, it makes it far more grave than those will admit who consider that George Stephenson's work has brought an unmixed blessing.

The examples we have given demonstrate that what is ugly in modern life is natural, that unloveliness comes of following the law of need as it is written to-day. *Laissez-faire* and mere competition are fast building "a hell in heaven's despite." But here steps in the guardian angel of the modern world — Artifice or Conscious Effort. "No," we say; "since the ordinary process of economic law makes our houses ugly, we will deliberately break that law, will in utter defiance of it spend money on costlier materials than grey bricks and blue slates, and will erect artificial houses after antique models." Already the effects

are to be seen. In the last few years some of the wealthier London streets are beginning to present a little the appearance of an old Dutch town, but on the colossal scale and in the towering bulks that mark our mammoth age. The "lines of stately hotels" are no longer always an offence to the eye. The villas of the middle class in the country are begging to add to the beauty of the landscape, because the architects consciously set themselves to achieve that picturesque confusion of gables which two centuries ago the village masons achieved unawares. But the houses of the workmen, whether in town or village, are still growing daily more hideous, because in their case no conscious effort is made to escape from the modern economic law of natural ugliness.

So it is with the ear as with the eye. Since for the once natural music of bird and stream and rustling leaf the nature of things to-day gives us the perpetual but irregular roar of traffic, it is well for the soul of man that Artifice, in its most developed form, presents the vexed ear with modern music, and "builds a heaven in hell's despite."

The way back to Nature herself lies now through dexterous use of Artifice and modern inventions towards that end. Although for most men the country can never again be brought to their doors every evening, it can be brought into their lives every holiday by the train, the tram, and the bicycle. And if the dwellers in the smithy of Lancashire are ever again to see the stars in heaven or to feel the joys of cleanliness on earth, it will not be by reviving the old life of manor-house and village green, but by using the pure electric current in place of the forces that are fed on smoke, and rearing through the cleansed air into the recovered sky warehouse and workshop, no longer sordid as poverty, but worthy of the world's new wealth and strength.

Such is the law of our modern era. Economy and natural process, unguided, work for evil. But to check them we have in our hands the new powers of science and industry; Titan forces, themselves neutral in the warfare between gods and demons; but infinitely strong for good, whenever we take the pains to use them for

ideal ends. We have shown this law applying to those influences which attack the mind through bodily sense.¹ But we shall find that it applies no less to instruction by direct intellectual process.

(c) Among the old English who lived in the country, whether in town or village, the natural course of economy and society supplied the instruction of the mind. The ordinary craftsman received during his period of apprenticeship, not merely technical education, but mental training; the tradition of the trade and the skill demanded of him, made him not merely a manufacturer but an artist.

¹ That form of optimism which holds progress to be absolute and certain, no less than pessimism and all other doctrines of the inevitable, injures the true prospects of progress by removing the incitement to activity. Those who hold this comfortable doctrine of certain progress assert the superiority of the modern life withdrawn from nature, on the alleged ground that our ancestors, though they lived in the country, were unconscious of its beauties, and therefore, it is argued, uninfluenced by its touch. To this there are two answers:—

1. First, our ancestors *were* conscious of the beauties of nature. Sufficient evidence of this will be found in the writers of old English verse, whether poetry, ballad, or song, good or bad, refined or popular, from the contemporaries of Chaucer, through those of Shakespeare and Milton to those of Cowper and Gray; their love of the country is a continuous tradition that was not changed, but only glorified by the philosophic nature-worship of Wordsworth. Writers of genuine English verse, high or low, for manor, cottage, or tavern, perpetually dwell upon the charm of the country. Only Pope's artificial school which imitated classical and French models and scorned anything except the life of the court and "the town," forms an exception that proves the rule. The strange idea that our ancestors did not appreciate nature is an illogical deduction from the fact that they did not admire wild mountain scenery; here they failed because they did not live among mountains, had fewer opportunities of visiting them than we, and associated any such visits with discomfort and danger. But their own country of stream and hedgerow, lawn and bower, song of bird and fall of mill-stream, they loved; and the object of their love was with them always.

2. Secondly, even if we grant, for the sake of argument, that this conscious love of the country was confined, then as now, to a certain percentage of the population, the *unconscious* effect of contact with nature was at work on all. It was this that, in spite of many other disadvantages, made the old English so fine a race; and it is the absence of nature that makes the decadence of the city-bred possible, in spite of the higher standard of comfort and the greater accumulation of wealth; this decadence can in fact only now be prevented by more deliberate effort and more artificial arrangement to construct the healthy and the beautiful, which under the old dispensation needed no construction.

The chairmaker had not merely to watch a machine but to make a chair ; so long as he abode by the rules he had learnt as apprentice he exercised within those limits free choice of the sort of chair he should make. This apprentice training and this liberty of choice, together, gave real instruction to the mind ; it made every tiler and mason and manufacturer of knick-knacks an artist and a craftsman. To-day the apprentice system is fast disappearing, and the necessary artificial substitute, education, has not yet taken its place. This evil is to some slight degree recognised by our generation ; but only because other nations are accredited with the possession of superior systems of education ; fear of commercial defeat opens our eyes to an evil, which in its mere capacity as evil would pass unnoticed. Few would care that Englishmen are becoming stupid, if they were not thereby incurring the more fearful danger of becoming poor. But whatever the true reason for desiring quick wits, it is clear that, in the future, activity of mind must be developed by a scheme of artificial education growing ever more and more *elaborate*, consciously constructed at great pains and expense ; for we have lost by the introduction of machinery the old natural school of craftsmanship and art, that quickened and instructed the mind of him who laboured with his hands. Only when we have tried the new way will it be time to pronounce it worse than the old.

~~But in England of the past, not only the intelligence but the character received instruction by the ordinary working of society.~~ Each shire, each town, each village, had its own local piety, its customs, its anniversaries, its songs, its ethics, the indefinable but peculiar tone that marked it off from its neighbour. No one knew when or how these things had arisen, but their influence was for that reason all the more complete ; undisturbed and unspoiled by imperfect knowledge of other codes and customs, the life of the village realised a limited ideal. The agricultural labourer, though he did not share with the craftsman the benefit of an intelligent training and profession, shared with him in these traditions of a simple life.

The agricultural labourer is now fast disappearing. He

has suffered city change into something poor and strange. Rumours coming thick and fast from the great cities have destroyed for him the traditional piety and the honest customs of the countryside. He apes what he does not understand,—what indeed no one can understand, for it has no meaning,—the variegated, flaunting vulgarity of the modern town. In villages where town influence has spread most strongly, the inhabitants already show the knowing cockney manners and frivolity produced by cockney songs and literature, that contrast most unfavourably with the humanities of any village still truly rural. There are indeed many of these survivals, of which excellent types will be found in the south-western counties; but the cockney village is the type to which all must approximate in ordinary process of change, if it continues on the present lines.

Such is the fate of the agricultural labourer. His brother of the town, whose influence is now spreading so strongly and so far, is equally without loadstar of local piety or healthy reverence. Omnivorous inquisitiveness into the trivial and the important alike, destroying all sense of proportion and all chance of real knowledge, is taught him by the respectable papers and magazines. The lower class of prints teach him what is worse, a low cunning in the latest conventions of folly, which is termed “knowing” or “up to date.” The music-halls proclaim those ideals so loud on the housetops that even the well educated of late years have to listen, and even the proud man to bow the head. The music-hall devotee would be bored or ashamed to hear the old songs to which his ancestors listened with reverence or merriment in the alehouse; such songs are now only heard in drawing-rooms or at concerts. The difference between the “Leathern Bottel” or “One Morning in May” and the music-hall song is the difference between the influences that formed the old English and those that are forming the new. Our ancestors were coarse but they were not vulgar. Vulgarity—that indefinable essence and spirit of the very mean and foolish—is a creature of the nineteenth-century conditions. It came in gradually as the old natural education, limited in

area and knowledge, gave way to the present chaotic turmoil of everything under heaven. Such has been the most important achievement, so far, of the new powers of rapid locomotion and reproduction ; instead of being chained to the chariot of virtue and intelligence they have been let loose on the world—the blind foolish Titans. And yet it is by these same foolish Titans, which as yet have wrought in many ways harm to the soul of man, that the better future must be built up.

There is no cause for despair, though much for alarm. The old life was so narrow and sluggish that we may improve upon it yet. The modern city man is better than his conditions, and better than his teachers—or rather caterers—who supply him with what they think he wants. The inanities of the Jingo and Little England press have forced the nation to become silly on an occasion when it might otherwise have kept its head. The public-house, the cheap newspaper, the outward aspect of city life are viler than the city-bred man himself. The danger is that they are making him vile. They are certainly making him vulgar. But, as human beings go, he is not brutal ; the conduct of the average soldier in South Africa has been more kind than the conduct of the Cavaliers and Roundheads to each other, in the most humane war ever fought by a population brought up under the old type of civilisation. In the matters of orderliness, industry, and the domestic virtues there are no data on which to base a comparison of present with past. At any rate there is no cause for despair, if only men will use the forces of machinery and industry to combat those grave evils which these very forces are now creating by process of economic law.

The spiritual instruction of the future will more and more be through books and printed matter. The old view of life seen through piety and tradition was narrow, and in many ways both false and bad ; the new views of life seen through printed matter will be infinitely broad and various ; they may, therefore, be either infinitely better or infinitely worse. So the first duty of our age is to treat seriously the relation of the ordinary man to his

newly acquired art of reading. The State, in its high folly, having given primary education to teach people to read and so to become vulgar, refuses to set up secondary education to teach them how to read, and so to become educated. Whatever secondary education may be established in the near future is likely to be technical or scientific, so that we can beat the Germans (although the Germans themselves do not attribute their recent commercial success to their technical as much as to their general education). But the religion of the future, the good choice and reading of books and papers, is to be left to chance as a thing of no account. The choice and reading of books is mere culture, a thing negligible, or even despicable; and the choice of papers is an affair of politics. For these reasons, it seems, men are to go on reading the *Daily Mail*, *Ally Sloper*, and Marie Corelli according as they are politicians, observers of life, or idealists. Machinery and organisation will daily place in their hands larger and worse stacks of such reading, since the law of economy so ordains; but will machinery and organisation never be used to help a man to find out what it is good for him to read? The capability of the city-bred man, with his undoubtedly keen intellect and brain, subtler perhaps than his ancestors', to understand good literature and complex ideas when presented to him, is a fact insufficiently recognised by those who abuse the modern man instead of his modern surroundings. The hope of the future is very great, if only pains are taken to present good intellectual food for habitual consumption, to meet this terrible free trade in garbage.

We have now sufficiently illustrated the main thesis, the rule that will be found to govern modern life in almost every branch. The natural process of modern economy is on the whole towards evil rather than good, but the way of salvation does not lie backwards in vain regret; it consists in deflecting the Titan forces with which the modern world is armed from purely economic to partly ideal ends. We have shown how this rule applies first to the influences affecting the outward senses in daily life, and

secondly to the direct instruction of the mind. These two, together with the affections of human beings towards each other, are the three forces which still in the last age as in the first, alone have power to form man and his soul. We must then make the new world ourselves, its very outward aspect as well as its inner life. In the future nothing will take care of itself, and no nation will ever again "muddle through," or succeed in "a fit of absence of mind," either in material things or in things of higher import. This is the theoretic basis of that cry for more strenuous common action, for more interference by the State with the organs of society, for the increased efforts of individuals in the common cause and in the work of mutual rescue lately begun by the friendly contact of rich and poor. Greater benevolent activity will be the creed alike of the Socialist and individualist of the future. Individual action is quickened not deadened by this creed of interference. For Individualism, like Socialism, is perennial and never dies except with the coming of universal death.

But while individualism is of eternity, *laissez-faire* was of the day, and that day has gone. The spirit of *laissez-faire*, once the salvation, is now the bane of England. For example, in old England the liquor laws looked well enough after themselves. The local ale-wife was ducked by her neighbours if she sold bad ale, and the local gentry were continually suppressing public-houses that they considered disreputable or merely superfluous. But to-day the progress of locomotion and machinery has put behind every village publican an organisation richer than many nations and more persuasive than many Churches—a force by which the rulers of England hold their power unchallenged, and teach the world in the name of common sense and even of philosophy to scoff at the name of reform. The political brewers, whose "trade is their politics," have not believed in *laissez-faire*, but have acted like men and bound themselves together making themselves strong for evil. Evil is busily enlisting the neutral Titans of machinery and organisation for pay under its banners, while Good sits singing the old false song of "An excellent world if you leave it alone."

II. There is, then, need for greater activity both of State and of individual than there ever was in the past, not only to meet the momentary needs of the present but to fulfil new permanent conditions of the future. Yet in England for several years past the output of effort has been growing steadily smaller. A sense not only of second rate capacity but of uncertain will and want of enthusiasm pervades most branches of life.

The first cause of this most untimely stagnation is the Conservative Party. The long-winded retrospective tale of abuse which is poured upon that body by the village Cobbett from every Liberal platform is often bad history as well as bad electioneering. But at the present day the Conservative Party is, what it seldom has been, almost wholly a force for evil; this is owing to three causes: (1) the greatness of its strength, (2) the prevalence of its ideas, (3) and the strictness of its discipline. (1) The greatness of its latter-day strength prevents not only the passage but the agitation of reform; there is something hollow in all Commissions on Drink or Housing as long as the majority stands at one hundred and fifty. (2) The prevalence of Conservative ideas amongst the young men of the upper and middle classes in no less an evil, for it supplies conscientious grounds for the easy doctrine of doing nothing. (3) The strictness of party discipline deprives these same men of moral initiative and of the habit of forming individual views. The party that pretends to stand against Socialism is murdering true Individualism; it is stifling the free play of thought, which is action.

If these evil influences were confined to politics the matter would be serious but not fatal. But by altering the theories they modify the character of men.

(a) Hatred of evil, the virtue most useful to society, and not the least healthful to the soul, must needs be at a discount in the party whose candidates are returned by the political publicans. Shame at that personal alliance with vice and ruin, strong perhaps at first with the young Conservative, grows weaker every year by custom, and

just in proportion as this happens the whole moral nature unconsciously deteriorates.

(b) Similarly indignation at injustice is a thing often greatly endangered by party discipline as strict as that which holds together the ruling party to-day. When in the summer of 1900 the danger of the war was over and the last arguable reason for suppressing fair discussion had been removed, a series of riots and a campaign of social insults was instituted in numerous towns and villages against isolated men, most of them poor in friends and social standing; their crime was in many cases only this—they were known to express in private views highly condemnatory of the Government action. Their treatment corresponded very closely to the treatment of the supporters of Dreyfus in the French provinces. Nor was this the mere act of the mob. It was encouraged by the Conservative Party in the constituencies and by the open or secret goodwill of the upper classes. Many respectable persons who took no part in it refused to express hearty disapproval of the persecution in its moral aspect, and only deprecated breaches of the peace. The ethical standard of modern Conservatism lays but little value on indignation at injustice. A close adherent of that party, however exalted his other virtues, *pro tanto* is less likely to warm at the sight of oppression. It is therefore a grave danger that so large a percentage of men enjoying power and position in the various spheres of life are strict party Conservatives.

(c) This slow, subtle but seldom failing influence of the Conservative political atmosphere on the habit of the mind, fatal as it is to any deep indignation at injustice, in no less fatal to that still rarer plant, reforming activity. The part of Conservative reformer seems in our generation to last, in the case of a really strong-minded man, for a period ranging between two and five years. The spirit of *laissez-faire* is not preached in vain by the Conservatives. The spirit of that theory in its latter-day application of "no reform," diminishes the activity of thought and of private action for many good citizens, who at first joined the Great Party only out of reasoned contempt or distrust for

the Liberals of the day, or a feeling, not wholly ungenerous, for the Protestant minority in Ireland. But the days of generous enthusiasm among Unionists have gone by.

The Great Party is no longer, as in 1886, a collection of individuals acting together for the time in pursuit of a common purpose; it has become a highly disciplined army, whose soldiers fear the penalties of mutiny, or have learnt, unawares, the habit of obedience. And its ranks have developed a unity of spirit as well as of discipline; they are held together by a common belief. Our Conservative friends believe that social reform will not be accomplished by legislation or by combined action of individuals towards an ideal end; they hold rather that a good state of society will grow up of itself in England, in the ordinary process of unimpeded wealth-making and by the free play of great material interests. It follows that the work done on a public body is generally in inverse ratio to the element of strict party Conservatism represented in its counsels. It follows, too, that as long as the Conservative party remains absolute master of England, so long will it be before any combined effort is made, with the help of modern machinery and organised power, to improve the life of man.

But while the absolute power of the Conservative Party accounts for the stagnation of public life, we must seek other causes for the lack of conspicuous achievement which characterises all English effort to-day. Literature, religion, social work, education, although in a political country like England they are affected by the condition and tone of parties (and are so to-day most disastrously), yet have their own sources in purer fields. But these sources, too, seem running dry in our generation. "Enthusiasm" has less place in the twentieth century than it had in the eighteenth, when England was conquered by Wesleyanism and the Continent by the philosophic crusade. To-day the absurdities and failures of the reformer rather than his noble design and heroic action are the favourite theme of history, literature, and conversation. The language of idealism is regarded

rather as an amusement for the mind of the highly educated than as a truth to be realised in fact by strenuous action.

Besides the important condition that nearly all the youth of the upper classes adhere to the Conservative party and creed, two general causes for the abatement of the vigorous type of character may be detected.

First the problems, social or speculative, that present themselves to us to-day are more difficult to answer by Yes or No than those that lay materially across Cobden's path or presented themselves to the mind of Clifford and Huxley. We moderns find—

"A subtler sphinx renew
Riddles of death Thebes never knew."

The greater difficulty of perceiving what should be done is a cause, but not an excuse, for our temperamental dislike of strenuous action. The probability of failure is more clearly understood and more continually preached than is the chance of success, the value of experiment, the nobility of even fruitless effort. So fear of failure has become too strong a motive.

Secondly—and here, perhaps, we touch the root of the matter—no man of genius properly belonging to this age handles the problems of life and of society in a new way that can move the new generation to strenuous action. One such writer would soon revolutionise the conduct of some score or hundred of the best men scattered throughout the various classes and districts of England. These scattered individuals, each acting in his own sphere and his own locality in the direction indicated by such a master, would by their actions interpret his meaning to the world, and so draw on the flood tide. It was in this way that Carlyle and Ruskin by their writings, F. D. Maurice by his personality (wherein his influence lay), set foot those movements for the mutual improvement of classes which distinguish the middle of the last century in England.

Whatever be the cause assigned, particular or general, accidental or inevitable, we have to regret the lethargy of the natural leaders of the social body, the few score or

few thousand men who, by force of brain and character combined, can when they will drag along with them the "average sensual man" towards ideal ends. It is only so that great things are accomplished. This is what Carlyle meant when, with godlike scorn and eloquence, he reiterated the truth that he so often marred by clumsy illustration, that hero-worship, not democracy, must always guide the affairs of men. Whenever a good thing is accomplished it is not in the first instance because the people wish it to be done, but because a few men will to do it. The slave trade was abolished because the Clapham Sect willed it. Protection was abolished because Cobden willed it. And so it is with every municipal and village scandal in England to-day, according as there is or is not found the man to bell the cat.

And just as it is the men more than the masses who are wanted to strike at an abuse, so it is the men who are wanted to initiate a constructive reform, to found a new institution, or even to carry on existing societies with vigour. The success of a nation, the greatness of an age, the work done by a body or a group of persons, is always in ratio to the percentage of men of this quality. In the various ranks of English life and branches of English activity to-day the percentage of such men is unusually low. The absence of natural leadership is worst in the most obvious case, that of the central government. The reason why legislation and administration are alike crippled is not because the people like inefficient government, but because the principal ministers, being Conservatives of some standing, have each grown physically incapable of introducing real measures of social reform.

III. In the FIRST PART of this essay we showed that the life of man could no longer be left to depend on fortuitous or natural influences, once so beneficent; that left to the guidance of economic law as it is to-day, life is fast degenerating into squalid vulgarity. But, on the other

hand, that modern machine power might deliberately be turned to work for good as it is now allowed to work for evil ; that strenuous social and individual effort could still lead life into pleasant pastures of wider aspect and more various colour than were known in the ages of a simpler and more natural dispensation. THEREFORE MORE ENERGY IS NEEDED THAN IN THE PAST.

In the SECOND PART we showed (a) that the Conservative party as it has become in the last few years, tends to prevent all such effort in politics, and insensibly discourages it in other fields ; (b) that the spirit of the age and (c) the absence of master minds dulls the energy of the natural leaders of mankind and prevents them from undertaking the pursuit of ideal or beneficent objects. THEREFORE LESS ENERGY IS FORTHCOMING THAN IN THE PAST.

If we put those results together we shall draw two conclusions. THAT THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IS THE ENEMY, and that THE TONE OF LATTER-DAY THOUGHT IS AN EVIL, in so far as it discourages individual effort.

For the good new world MUST BE MADE, IT CANNOT GROW. It must be artificial, not natural. And it can only be made on two conditions now conspicuously absent. First, a POLITICAL PARTY that believes not in *laissez-faire* but in action—a party led by men who are reformers themselves and have lived in at atmosphere of social endeavour. Secondly, by the enthusiastic EFFORT OF INDIVIDUALS in the spheres of economy, social work, religion, science, education, literature, journalism, and art, all parts of the variegated whole out of which the glorious world of the future will be built up, if man will be true to himself. If he will not, life will become a dingy chaos of distraction and meaningless vulgarity, where rich and poor will be equally far from blessedness or perception of any real value in life.

“ And we say that repose has fled
For ever the course of the river of Time.
That cities will crowd to its edge
In a blacker, incessanter line ;
That the din will be more on its banks,

Denser the trade on its stream,
Flatter the plain where it flows,
Fiercer the sun overhead.
That never will those on its breast
See an ennobling sight,
Drink of the feeling of quiet again.
But what was before us we know not,
And we know not what shall succeed.

Haply, the river of Time—
As it grows, as the towns on its marge
Fling their wavering lights
On a wider, statelier stream—
May acquire, if not the calm
Of its early mountainous shore,
Yet a solemn peace of its own.

And the width of the waters, the hush
Of the grey expanse where he floats,
Freshening its current and spotted with foam
As it draws to the Ocean, may strike
Peace to the soul of the man on its breast—
As the pale waste widens around him,
As the banks fade dimmer away,
As the stars come out, and the night-wind
Brings up the stream
Murmurs and scents of the infinite sea."

This last fine picture only gives one of the aspects of the "good time coming," if it comes at all. The broader view and the more contemplative life of the soul will indeed, as Arnold here suggests, be the great boon for many; but for others the new age will also bring greater and more variegated activity, more spheres of life open, more choice of ideal aims, more leisure both for the study of conduct and of beauty, and for their active realisation, whether with or instead of the money-making business of life.

But the grim alternative of the world growing ever blacker, uglier, noisier, more meaningless, must be faced if it is to be prevented.

For which ever of these prophetic pictures shall prove most nearly true, the decision lies no longer with Nature, but with man himself. And if he achieves the good, he must achieve it, not by hoping, but by acting, not by his wish, but by his will.