

Dep
Core
C. 154

By Neil Stanley Campbell
M. A. 1916.

SOME ASPECTS OF DEMOCRACY.

FOREWORD

The saying has been attributed to Mr. Morley: "Discussion about democracy is apt to be idle, unfruitful and certainly tiresome, unless it is connected with some live temporary issue" (1) and the author, who makes this quotation, continues: "Profitable thinking upon political, as upon other matters, usually arises from the direct compulsion of circumstance." Problems which affect in the most momentous manner the progress of the civilized world have been raised by the present European War, and the writer believes that a consideration of the development of the democratic theory as revealed in the American and British Constitutional Systems will point us to a solution of these problems; for, as Dr. Jones avers in the sentence immediately following the one just quoted: "When in the course of a nation's practical life, a problem arises, the political thinker will do well to assume that the circumstances which set the problem contain the terms of its solution," and sagely adds - "Indeed the solution of a problem is nothing but the problem itself with its elements distinguished and their relation to one another made plain." The scope of this essay will include a brief exposition of those international crises which in recent years have marked the attitude of autocracy as typified by the German Government.

While a review of the chief features of American democracy may not seem vital to our theme, it will serve to show the contrasts illustrated in the development of democracy in the United States and Great Britain and to show how these nations attained similar results by divergent methods, thus supporting the generalization: "The principles of democracy are all of a piece with the principles of modern development - the spirit without the forms." (2)

- (1) Henry Jones - "The Working Faith of a Social Reformer" p.181.
- (2) Prof. Martin's Lecture.

.....
.....
.....

ACCESSION NUMBER

75672.

In every age and in every land there have arisen literary prophets fired with the holy duty of announcing the ideal form of human government. These speculative writers include such names as Socrates, Plato, Machiavelli, Bacon, Bolingbroke, Rousseau, and in modern times, Bernhardt, Treitschke and the whole hierarchy of German professordom. In the domain of pure theory or academic research, the dicta of these Utopia-framers are harmless. When, however, through the ambition of an autocratic prince or the folly of a turbulent populace, an attempt is made forcibly to impose their doctrines upon an existing government, the effect on human progress may be disastrous. Let us take the case of Bolingbroke.

Viscount Bolingbroke lived in the reign of Good Queen Anne, and ranked as one of her leading statesmen. Incidentally, he was noted more for his ability and statesmanship than for his integrity, and no doubt deserved Macaulay's characterization of him as "a brilliant knave". During an interval of relief from the affairs of state, Bolingbroke wrote a tract in which he gave expression to his views of the ideal government. He described therein a monarch who aspired to no less than a Roman Emperor's claim to divinity and a people so resolute and yet so self-controlled that they were to permit the use of arbitrary power to this emanation of constitutional wisdom. In 1760, when the third Hanoverian George ascended the throne, he adopted as his "vade mecum" the political doctrines promulgated by Bolingbroke. Urged by the pointed exhortation of his mother "George be King" and convinced that he had divinely succeeded to the British Crown, the "Patriot King", whose subjects called him "Farmer George", proceeded to act with all the arbitrariness of Bolingbroke's model. This policy of George the Third, supported by Lord North, led to the attempt to impose upon the American Colonies the baneful system of paternalism and resulted in the Declaration of Independence.

When we consider what a mighty empire the two great Anglo-Saxon families united would form, we might well wish that Pitt, our first great Imperialist, had been allowed to replace the incompetent lieutenant of George the Third during the crisis of the American Revolution.

The American Revolution unchained a new force which during the next half century was to affect in a remarkable way the government of every civilized nation. This force was democracy. When the meaning of the term democracy is sought, it is found to be difficult to define with accuracy. It is not so much a form of government as an ideal by which governments should be guided. That ideal is that government should, as nearly as possible, express the wishes of the whole people. Lincoln defined it tersely - "Government of the people, by the people, for the people." Centuries before Lincoln's time, Marcus Aurelius, great as an emperor and greater as a man, expressed his ideal of human government in words which display a thinker's prevision of the constitutional rights for which future ages were to struggle: "The idea of a polity in which there is the same law for all, a polity administered with regard to equal rights and equal freedom of speech and the idea of a kingly government which respects most of all the freedom of the governed." (1)

Lowell said - "The real gravamen of the charge (against democracy) lies in the habit it has of making itself generally disagreeable by asking the powers that be, at the most inconvenient moment, whether they are the powers that ought to be." (1)

In America at the time of the Revolution the auspices were particularly favourable for experiments in democratic government. More than one hundred years of rule by colonial assemblies had given the people a high degree of capacity for self government. In some of the colonies the three branches of government were chosen by the people. From the first a sturdy independence was manifested by the colonial assemblies, an attitude made easier by their distance from England; at the same time this factor of distance left the colonies unaffected by the dynastic struggles and constitutional quarrels that occupied the mother country. But while these were factors favourable to the development of democratic principles there were at the same time strong counter influences. The country's leaders, confronted with the problem of devising a system of government for the thirteen colonies, were divided on the vital question of the form of that government. The majority of the framers of the Constitution had a great sense of the dangers of democracy. These were led by Hamilton and Washington and formed the Federal party, while the minority, under Jefferson, called themselves Democrats. Lord Acton tells us: "The authors of the most celebrated democracy in history esteemed that the most formidable dangers which menaced the stability of their work were the very principles of democracy itself. With them the establishment of a republican government was not the result of theory but of necessity"; and he quotes Hamilton: "As to trusting to a democracy for the preservation of our liberties, it is the merest chimera imaginable." (2) Jefferson summed up the issue between the parties: "One party feared most the ignorance of the people, the other the selfishness of rulers independent of them." (3) The struggles of these early parties can be read in the Constitution of 1778. The Democrats secured the insertion in that famous document of the Bill of Rights, while to the efforts of the Federalists must be attributed the elaborate system of checks and balances by which the forces of democracy were restricted and divided.

How well the anti-democratic party succeeded can be seen by a comparison of the House of Representatives with the British Parliament. The former "is a body in which the ministers do not sit and which has no power of making or destroying a ministry. It is confronted by a Senate which can exercise a more real restraining power than the House of Lords. It is confronted also by a President who exercises an independent power vastly greater than a modern British sovereign. It is above all restricted by a written constitution under the protection of a great independent law court which makes it impossible for it to violate contracts, infringe the rights of the people or pass a constitutional amendment except when it is the clear wish of an overwhelming majority of the people." (4)

- (1) Lowell - "Democracy".
 (2) "Historical Essays and Studies" - (reviewed in Christian
 (3) Lecky - "Democracy and Liberty", Science Monitor.)
 (4) idem p. p.

(3)

On the other hand, the British Parliament is "a sovereign constituent assembly; it can make or unmake any law." (1)
"It can regulate the succession to the Crown, change the established religion, change the Constitution of the Kingdom or Parliament." (2)

Whatever were the checks which the Constitution of 1778 placed upon American democracy, there can be no doubt of the remarkable effect which that instrument has exerted upon the country's subsequent political growth. As a human document defining the duties of government and the rights of the governed it is without a parallel in the history of the world. It has become known to every American school child and, in a country where the temptations to political corruption are great, it has helped to develop a sense of the intimate relation of citizen and government and a realization of the responsibilities of citizenship. It has been said that the elements required for the effective working of democracy are "a high moral sense and a high moral sensitiveness." (3) Without doubt the lofty tone in which the Constitution is worded should inspire these qualities. Lord Bryce has summed up this document - "No wonder the Americans are proud of an instrument.....which has passed through the furnace of civil war, which has been found capable of embracing a body of commonwealths more than three times as numerous and with twentyfold the population of the original States, which has cultivated the political intelligence of the masses to a point reached in no other country, which has fostered and been found compatible with a larger measure of local self government than has existed elsewhere." (4)

Political development in the United States throughout the nineteenth century moved steadily in the line of democracy. One of the earliest steps was in connection with the election of the President. The aim of the founders of the Constitution was to keep the President outside the range of party politics - to "secure him against democratic dictation." Accordingly each state legislature was to choose a number of its leading citizens equal to the number of its representatives in Congress and these citizens, who were presumed to have no party affiliations, were to elect the President. Naturally as the party system spread this method failed and the more democratic method of choosing Presidential electors by manhood suffrage was substituted.

A further sign of the growth of democratic influences and one which was felt throughout the whole of this period is the gradual extension of the suffrage. Lecky, whose attitude, even when acknowledging the good features of democracy, is that of damning by faint praise, attributes this more to the desire of political parties to catch votes than to any "spontaneous demand" of the people for the franchise.

- (1) Bryce - "American Commonwealth" - from writer's notes.
- (2) Dicey - "Law of the Constitution" - from writer's notes.
- (3) Prof. Martin's - Lecture.
- (4) Bryce - Vol. 1, p. 311.

This is a question which would require more time to debate than we can devote to it. Probably a more magnanimous view than that taken by Lecky would be correct. Nevertheless it is indubitable that the indiscriminate and sudden opening of the suffrage to the negro population so soon after the Civil War was unwise and would seem to justify one of the leading arguments against democratic government, namely, that, under the strong impulse of temporary enthusiasm or passion, such a government will frequently authorize constitutional changes whose unforeseen results may cause grave injury to itself. This is one of the lessons to be learned from that exceptional outburst of a nation's passion, the French Revolution.

But democracy is not to be judged by the acts of particular governments at isolated periods. The true method is rather in the comparison of one period with a similar preceding period and by an analysis of the extent to which in each such epoch the wishes of the people are expressed in legislation. As has been stated above, the true principle of democratic government is to prevent divergence between the wishes of the people and the legislative authority, in other words, to keep legislation as nearly as possible in line with advancing public opinion. Two measures adopted during recent years by many states of the Union, chiefly in the west and centre, have done much to satisfy this cardinal maxim of democracy. The first of these is the opening of the franchise to women. For the general adoption of woman suffrage there was required the realization that public opinion is formed by both women and men. Its rapid growth illustrates the effective power of public opinion upon legislation. The referendum is a device by which proposed legislation is referred to the people for approval before enactment. It is based upon faith in the people and at the same time implies a want of faith in the legislatures. For efficient working it requires an enlightened electorate, upon which, indeed, the principle of democracy itself is postulated.

The British Constitution presents a marked contrast to that of the United States. It is evidenced by no one particular document or set of documents but rather by the prescriptive customs of the people which have hardened into law. The instruments by which this process of crystallization is carried on are legislation and judicial decision. Instances of the use of legislation to confirm or modify the principles of the Constitution are rare in British constitutional history. The Parliament Bill of 1911 is one important instance. By this enactment the powers of the House of Lords to hinder legislation were greatly restricted. Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights are merely confirmations of popular rights enjoyed from immemorial times. It is interesting to note how frequently the words '*secundam antiquam consuetudinem*' occur throughout Magna Charta. Bishop Stubbs has said: "The whole of the constitutional history of England is a commentary on this Charter." (1) Its sixty sections form a recapitulation of the existing common law - namely custom law - as regards the mutual relations of the King and his people.

(1) Stubbs - "Select Charters" - p. 296.

They define the rights of the subject to personal liberty and state the limits within which taxes may be imposed by virtue solely of the royal prerogative. They place the king within the common law and not above it. The great importance of the Charter is that during the long formative period of English history it supplied the common law judges with the 'ratio decidendi' for most cases affecting either the liberty of the subject or the prerogative of the Crown. This brings us to the second instrument in the modification of the constitution - judicial decision.

In countries with written constitutions as France, United States and Belgium, individuals depend on the constitution and in most cases more attention is paid to defining these rights than to providing adequate machinery for enforcing them. On the other hand, "In England", says Prof. Dicey, "the principles of the constitution are inductions from particular decisions of the Courts." Broom has written a weighty volume in which he traces constitutional development in England solely by reference to such decisions. For example there is Bates' Case (1606) in which the right of the Crown to levy a tax on imports additional to the statutory grant was disputed. While the decision rendered by an obsequious court was adverse to popular rights, the case was of considerable constitutional importance because of the discussion it provoked in the House of Commons. The facts were these: a ship, laden with currants, entered the Port of London and was met by royal customs officials demanding a tax of 5 shillings per 100 pounds on the cargo. The levy was disputed as being 2 shillings in excess of the statutory rate. The case was called in the Exchequer Court where a decision was rendered in favor of the King, the judges declaring that the customs rate was "to be referred to the wisdom of the King and not to be disputed by a subject." (1) This decision was vigorously attacked in the House of Commons and Magna Charta referred to to prove that the levy was not within the royal prerogative. In the following reign the same Charter was relied upon in the famous ship-money case to prove the illegality of the arbitrary exactions of Charles I.

British democracy has many critics but none who dare to attack the theory of democratic government in toto. Lecky condemns the system of government ownership which in recent years has replaced to so great an extent the individual's right of free contract. His argument of course is that the extension of state control necessarily causes a restriction of the sphere of individual action. The fallacy of this argument is that it is based upon the hypothesis that the sphere of the individual and the sphere of the state are mutually exclusive, that what one gains the other loses. Prof. Henry James has stated the argument: "The State cannot do more and more for its members and at the same time enable them to do more and more for themselves." And he answers: "And yet this apparent impossibility is precisely what has taken place. The history of the growth of civilized society is one continuous illustration of the concomitant increase of social organization and of individual freedom." (2) To this eminent thinker the rapid widening of the scope of individual activities is perfectly consistent with the increase of state control.

(1) Broom - "Constitutional Law" - p. 248.

(2) "The Working Faith of a Social Reformer" - p. 103.

He finds these two spheres complementary and asserts:
 "The student who comes to the facts will find that freedom and order grow together and that where citizens and state are at their best the functions of each are at their highest." (1)

Another denunciatory critic of democracy is Mr. L. T. Hobhouse, author of "Democracy and Reaction", a work in which the title words are used throughout in opposition. He insists that the trend of British imperialism has been inconsistent with democracy, that our colonial expansion has been too aggressive. His sweeping denunciations remind one of Carlyle: "The central principle of democracy whatever words may be used to cloak it, is the subordination of self government to Empire." (2) Britain has fallen a prey to the invidious policy of self deception. While declaring vigorously for non-interference she has pursued the baneful system of expansion with its consequent exploitation of weaker peoples. Her lofty tone of altruism is no more than cant. In summing up, Mr. Hobhouse is obliged to admit that by the gift of self government to South Africa, "freedom is vindicated" (3) Taking a view of British imperialism in broad perspective we may be able not only to arrive at this conclusion but also to show that "the central principle of imperialism" is not "subordination of self government to Empire", but subordination of Empire to self government.

One of the leading criticisms of British colonial policy is that it changes with every change in the government. This is quite true of the minor changes of policy, but over long periods the general theory of colonial expansion remains unaltered, being deduced as a rule from the prevailing doctrines of national welfare. For instance from the founding of Virginia in 1609 to the outbreak of the American Revolution, British colonial expansion, like that of the other colonizing powers of Europe, was based upon the doctrine of mercantilism. Under the Mercantile System national self sufficiency was the great aim. The balance of trade, measured by the excess of exports over imports, formed the criterion by which to judge the nation's prosperity. She must sell more and buy less; but she will sell more if she has colonies to which to send her surplus manufactures and at the same time she will need to buy less if her colonies can be induced to cultivate those products which she is herself obliged to buy from other nations. "Thus we arrive at a body of government regulation of commerce and industry directed toward securing a large net profit for the state as a trader." (4) Trade with the colonies was therefore rigidly restricted to the mother country and the restriction enforced by confiscation of all cargoes destined to other than English ports. At the same time efforts were made to stimulate the production of wine, silk and spices in Virginia and the West Indies, to replace the imports to England from France and the East Indies, while it was hoped that the Northern colonies of the American sea-board would release England from dependence on the Baltic countries for naval stores; moreover the heavy exportation of fish from Newfoundland to European countries by way of England would divert to England a part of that flow of gold which Holland secured from her predominance in the fishing trade.

- (1) "The Working Faith of a Social Reformer" - p. 213.
- (2) "Democracy and Reaction" - p. 49.
- (3) " idem p. 45.
- (4) Haney - "Growth of Economic Thought" - p. 110.

Such was the theory of the utility of colonies to the metropolis. In practice results were far from corresponding with the anticipations of the Mercantilists. The growing of tobacco became from the first the sole occupation of the colonists in Virginia and the West Indies, while attempts to stimulate the cultivation of more 'useful' products proved abortive. At the same time the great distance from England and the consequent heavy freight rates prevented colonial lumber from competing with the Baltic trade. The Newfoundland fishing industry was the only branch of colonial trade which fulfilled the requisites of this view of colonial policy. Beer tells us: "From the purely economic standpoint,.....Newfoundland conformed most closely to the canons of the mercantile system and was the most valuable of the English dominions beyond the seas." (1)

The decline of the mercantile system had already begun before the eighteenth century opened, but it was not until the outbreak of the American Revolution that the turning point was reached. Many of the doctrines of that system had been found unsuited to the exceptional conditions raised by the industrial progress of England during the latter half of the eighteenth century. With the publication in 1776 of Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" the remaining vestiges of mercantilist theories were discarded. Adam Smith proved that much of the argument that national wealth could be increased by artificial aids was unsound. Henceforth Adam Smith's theory of 'Natural liberty' became more and more to be accepted by economists until, embodied in the catch phrase 'laissez faire' it became the ruling policy of the nineteenth century. This doctrine of natural liberty was adapted to all forms of individual and national enterprise and was to exert a great influence on colonial policy. To Adam Smith the granting of self-government to the colonies would have meant separation from the mother country, but even this he advocated in preference to the existing system which involved heavy expenditures for the protection of the colonies and whose rigid trade monopoly prevented the full development of colonial enterprise. He suggested therefore that if "Great Britain" should voluntarily give up all authority over her colonies and leave them to enact their own laws,.....to make peace and war as they might think proper, she would not only be freed from the whole annual expense of the peace establishment of the colonies, but might settle with them such a treaty of commerce as would effectually secure to her a free trade more advantageous to the great body of the people than the monopoly which she at present enjoys. By thus parting good friends the natural affection of the colonies to the mother country, which, perhaps, our late dissensions have well-nigh extinguished, would quickly revive!" (2) These words are prophetic of the changes which during the next fifty years were to take place in the theory of British colonial policy. Many of the later statesmen and chief among them, Disraeli and Cobden, looked upon separation of the colonies and the mother country as inevitable and resistance therefore useless. But the course of political growth in Canada and the measures taken by the British government to meet conditions there were to provide a solution of the problem.

(1) Beer - "The Origins of the British Colonial System" - p.294
 (2) "Wealth of Nations" - Vol. 1, p. 225.

Lord Durham, who, in the words of Dr. Garnett, "might be compared to Saul, son of Kish; hunting the strayed asses of disaffection, he found the kingdom of responsible government", faced this problem of separation and met it with the assertion in substance: If the granting of self government to Canada means separation, let us provide her with a form of government so stable that she may be able to stand alone among the nations and be an object of pride to the mother country. But this gift which Great Britain was prepared to make to her growing daughter in the face of impending dissolution and which, in legal phrasing, might be called a 'donatio mortis causa', proved to be the very device which was to preserve the solidarity of the imperial family. Mr. Lucas observes: "The policy which produced existing conditions in the self governing half of the British Empire originated in Lord Durham's Report and the essence of that Report was that self government is, in British or Anglicized communities the basis of content." (1) And Lord Durham writes: "It is not by weakening but strengthening the influence of the people on its government; by confining within much narrower limits than those hitherto allotted to it, and not by extending the interference of the imperial authorities in the details of colonial affairs, that I believe that harmony is to be restored, where dissension has so long prevailed.....It needs no change in the principles of government, no invention of a new constitutional theory..... It needs but to follow out consistently the principles of the British Constitution." (2) It was upon the recommendations contained in Lord Durham's Report that self government was granted to the United Canadas.

It is this gradual emancipation of the grown up members of the imperial family from maternal control which is the typical feature of British imperialism. The policy was first adopted with respect to Canada and was in due time applied in the cases of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa when the political development of these countries warranted it. Lucas aptly describes the movement: "The gradual growth of younger peoples within, and not without, the Empire; the maintenance of the connection between the young and the old, coupled with the continuous development from terms of subordination to terms of practical independence is peculiar to the British race." (3) The indirect result of Durham's work was to bring Canada within little more than half a century from the status of crown colony to that of an independent nation.

That this is her present status it is impossible to doubt. Mr. J. S. Ewart, ^{one of our leading imperialists,} quotes Mr. Chamberlain in a speech now ten years old: "They are self-governing nations. They are sister states. They are our equals in everything except population and wealth." (4) Moreover Canada exercises the right of dealing independently with foreign nations - the final distinguishing mark of an independent nation. This is clear from a quotation made by Mr. Ewart from a speech by Mr. Balfour in 1910, when on the subject of Canada's negotiations with France, he said: "I do not believe that His Majesty's government has ever been consulted at a single stage of these negotiations. How great is the change and how inevitable. It is a matter of common knowledge, and, may I add, not a matter of regret but a matter of pride and rejoicing that the great dominions beyond the seas are becoming great nations in themselves." (5)

(1) Lucas: "Greater Rome and Greater Britain."

(2) Lord Durham's "Report" - p. 204.

(3) Lucas = "Greater Rome and Greater Britain"

(4) Ewart = "Kingdom Papers" No. 10 (5) Idem p. 195

The political development of the self governing dominions which we have just traced may be likened to the development which takes place in a normal Anglo-Saxon family. The son grows to maturity and in due time establishes a home of his own in which he alone is master. But his allegiance to the paternal home and family remains as loyal as ever. Nor does the parent make any effort to hinder the enfranchisement of his son. In fact he is willing to make considerable sacrifices that the son may get a good start in life, well knowing that, should a crisis at any time threaten the existence of the parent home that the son will rally to its aid. The crisis through which the British Empire is passing affords a striking example of the truth suggested in our simile.

We have traced at some length the constitutional growth of the self governing half of the British Empire. It remains to observe the difference between the self governing dominions and the Empire proper and to notice briefly the development which is taking place in those countries which make up the latter. As applied to the self governing dominions the word Empire is inexact. For them there is no Empire. The 'imperium', the sovereign power of issuing commands which must be obeyed does not exist for them; they form with the mother country a collection of states bound together by nothing more than mere sentiment. "Britain has an Empire; Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand have nothing but themselves!"⁽¹⁾ The self governing dominions, with a population of about twenty million people, comprise something over half the portions of the globe colored red; the balance is made up of the Crown colonies, dependencies and protectorates with a population of nearly four hundred million.

On what principle has this vast territory which we may call Britain's real Empire been extended so as to encompass half the world? The assertion of one writer that this great expansion has taken place "almost in a fit of absent-mindedness" contains much truth. Territorial expansion has never in modern times been the cornerstone of Britain's external policy. Generally it has been quite the reverse. The regime of Gladstone marks the period of greatest expansion and yet this great leader was a vigorous anti-imperialist throughout his long career. How, then, has this anti-climax been attained? Briefly, it is the result of Britain's efforts to bring British law and British justice to her traders in distant lands. In the case of the Roman Empire trade followed the flag; with the British Empire the flag follows trade. In 1857 when Napoleon III proposed the partition of northern Africa, England to have Egypt, and France, Morocco, Lord Lansdowne replied: "We do not want Egypt. We want to trade with Egypt, to travel through Egypt, but we do not want the burden of governing Egypt."⁽²⁾ In 1882, Cromer tells us, England's policy was unchanged and yet Gladstone found the country on his hands with England obliged to become official assignee to administer the affairs of a bankrupt government.

(1) Kingdom Papers No. 5, p. 136.

(2) Cromer - "Modern Egypt" Vol. 1. Ch. 1. - from writer's notes.

Lord Cromer, writing recently, asserts: "Answering the question 'quo vadis' the English Imperialist should, as regards Egypt, reply without hesitation that he would be very glad to shake off the Imperial burden but that at present he does not see much prospect of being able to do so." (1) Since 1882 the Egyptian government has been virtually administered by the British Consul General at Cairo.

The difficulties of trying to impose western civilization upon an effete eastern people, of trying, as Bagehot says, "to put new wine into old bottles", are clearly explained in Lord Cromer's admirable work. We have not the space to discuss them here. They are a result of ages-old difference between East and West. In the words of Kipling it is a case of:

"Take up the white man's burden
And reap his old reward:
The blame of those ye better,
The hate of those ye guard,
The cry of those ye humour
(Ah, slowly!) towards the light:-
Why brought ye us from bondage,
Our loved Egyptian night?"

Lord Cromer asserts: "It is indeed, one of the inevitable incidents of the execution of an Imperial policy that, as a political force, the gratitude shown to the foreigner who relieves oppression is of a very ephemeral character." (2)

We think however that in Egypt at the present time the benefits of British rule are being acknowledged for what they are. The first two decades of British administration were devoted to weeding out the abuses of the local and central governments chiefly with respect to taxation, and to acquainting the Egyptian officials and successive wayward Khedives with western administrative methods. Towards the end of the century the period of reconstruction began. The galling yoke of the twin tyrants, the tax gatherer and the money lender, had been lifted, taxation was equal and light and the country once again becoming prosperous. This process of betterment, starting at the bottom and working upwards, has strongly attached the Egyptian fellaheen to the cause of England. The Declaration of December 1914 proclaiming England a British Protectorate states: "His Majesty's Government regard themselves as trustees for the inhabitants of Egypt." This is the attitude which has won the loyalty of the Egyptian peasant and which will retain that loyalty throughout the present unsettled times. This is the attitude which we may expect to result in England's extending to Egypt in due time such measures of self government as she proves herself capable of exercising.

In India the problems of government are similar to those met with in Egypt except that in India the complexity of races and religions is much greater and the difficulties are proportionably increased. India with her three hundred million people speaking one hundred and fifty different dialects is the main branch of the British Imperial tree and the great test of British Imperial policy will be in the effort to qualify these diverse races for self government.

(1) Cromer - "Ancient and Modern Imperialism" - p. 118
(2) idem p. 28.

Lord Cromer says: "The great imperial problem of the future is to what an extent some three hundred and fifty millions of British subjects, who are aliens to us in race, religion, language, manners and customs are to govern themselves or at to be governed by us." (1) Self government is at present out of the question for India for she is not a homogeneous nation but a vast continent whose three hundred million people are made up of two hundred and seven million Hindoos, sixty-two and a half million Mohammadans, and a sprinkling of Christians, Parsees and Buddhists. Out of all these probably less than one million have any conception of what responsible government means. Strange as it may seem there are radicals among the popular leaders of the country who claim that India is ready for self government but the more thoughtful ones can see how long is the road to be travelled before the country can control its own affairs. Sir S.P.Sinha, President of the Indian National Council (Hindoo) declared at the recent Congress: "that nations like individuals must grow into freedom and that even if the British nation were willing to make India an immediate and free gift of full self government, the boon would hardly be worth having owing to the backward condition of the masses." (2) It is by working upwards from the people and not by enduing the higher classes with powers out of all proportion to their numbers and their importance in the scheme of society that that question of Indian government will be solved.

This is precisely the work which the British Government is undertaking at the present time. "In Bengal a scheme of bringing self government into the villages has been adopted. In one district alone forty-three self governing ~~villages~~ ^{unions} have been established. These methods are causing the ryots to give their active support to education and sanitation and are arousing new hopes and aspirations among the tillers of the soil. A system of co-operative credit societies, operated by the villagers among themselves has done away with the usurers - a scourge of India." (3) Thus we see the traditional methods of British government being worked out in India as in Egypt on lines favorable to self government.

So far we have traced some of the aspects of democratic growth as exhibited in the governments of the United States and Great Britain. It remains introspectively to examine the contribution which democracy may be expected to make towards a guarantee of future world peace. Lecky tells us: "No one who considers the force and universality of the movement towards democracy can doubt that this conception of government will prevail in all civilized countries." And Hobhouse in his book "Democracy and Reaction" expresses the same opinion. In Prussia, the autocratic heart of Germany, similar statements are being made at every session of the Diet by the Social Democrats. But as yet they fall upon deaf ears. In the February session a declaration was tabled by the Social Democratic party which stated: "It is not the creation of an imperialist greater Germany or of a central Europe that is a prime condition of the continued existence but the building up of democracy, the abolition of secret diplomacy and the doing away of customs barriers.....Our enemies will only be ready for peace if they are guaranteed the same security and respect for their rights as we Social Democrats claim for Germany. Especially do we demand the restoration of the complete freedom and independence of Belgium and the indemnification of that country for the wrong that the Chancellor himself has admitted was committed against it on August 4th, 1914." (4)

(1) "Ancient and Modern Imperialism" - p.18

(2) News Item, Christian Science Monitor February 12, 1916.

(3) *idem* (4) *idem* February 24, 1916.

This is the light shining in the darkness and which it is hoped will some day triumph over that darkness. Only so can world peace be assured. During the same session the Minister of the Interior declared: "We Prussians are proud of the fact that the spirit of militarism, so much maligned, has grown up in the school of the Prussian State, to the terror of the enemy and the benefit of the Fatherland." (1) Thus is the issue joined between autocracy and democracy - the opposing forces in this "war of baffled irredentism".

Par.- A consideration of the evils which precipitated the present struggle is necessary before the path of future development can be pointed out. First and above all is the spirit of selfish nationalism which has dominated the powers of Europe - a spirit which has been manifested in two extreme forms in Germany and England. In Germany it took the form of ignoring any obligation to respect the rights or liberties of other nations; in Great Britain a studied policy of isolation, a reluctance to admit responsibility for the welfare of other nations, a determination to "revolve in her own orbit." One writer has said: "The moment that Great Britain decided to 'revolve in her own orbit' the harmonious cohesion of the European system became impossible." (2) It may be said, then, that the direct cause of the war was the refusal of the Teutonic powers to respect the liberties of other nations and the indirect cause follows as a corollary - the failure of the other powers to take joint precautionary measures to prevent Germany breaking the peace. If the entente powers had been able to declare before the war that each would support the other in repelling an attack upon it, the war would not have taken place.

This policy of non-intervention so persistently followed by England has afforded Germany opportunities to pursue her policy of development by force. Prior to 1871 the Bismarckian doctrine of might was used to consolidate and unify the German Empire under Prussia. The three successful wars which accomplished this, gave to the German people a sense of unity never known before. They were now a mighty people, a new race, destined to rule Europe and surprise the world. At the same time they were taught to believe that this result was the work of an all powerful institution, the crowning emanation of German wisdom, the State. Thus was Kultur first announced. Willing and implicit obedience was readily accorded this exalted creation of the composite German brain. But it was clear to the autocrat who replaced Bismarck at the helm of state that the first requisite to continued support of the policy of Kultur was success. Like the subjects of another Caesar they must have frequent parades of imperial trophies. Imperial expansion therefore became the first sop to popular ambition. Having reached the conclusion that Germany needed 'more room to expand' the only question was whither. Europe and Asia presented no opportunities, the Americas were protected by the Monroe doctrine, Africa alone remained.

England had been colonizing in South West Africa for some time prior to 1884 but had made no definitive statement of her area of settlement. Germany was represented solely by a trading factory on the West Coast founded by a loyal subject. In that year this private business was converted into a national enterprise and a very generous slice of the neighboring territory was officially declared to be set aside for the German nation. This action was typical of Germany's new attitude towards the world.

- (1) News Item - Christian Science Monitor, February 24, 1916.
 (2) W. A. Phillips - "Confederation of Europe" p. 292.

During the next twenty years German ambition devoted itself with great success to building up a powerful army and navy. Urged by this growing menace, France and Russia drew together in 1896 and formed a Dual Alliance. Ten years later the same impulse led Britain to desert her "splendid isolation" and join these two powers to form the Triple Entente. One step in this rapprochement was the Agreement of 1904 by which France and Britain came to an understanding of their respective spheres in Morocco and Egypt. At the time Germany made no protest. Von Buelow assured the Reichstag that Germany's 'purely economic' interests in Morocco would be protected. By the end of the year Germany's policy was reversed. After the overthrow of Russia by Japan in the East, Germany saw clearly her destiny as leader of Europe. But before this leadership could be asserted the growing cordiality of the entente powers must be disrupted. The method chosen was typical. An ultimatum was presented to France. At the same time its purport was explained by a special envoy to Paris. "It was, he said, clear to the Imperial German Government that the Anglo-French entente had been framed to isolate and humiliate Germany. Let France think better of it, give up her Minister (Delcasse, framer of the entente) and adopt towards Germany an open and loyal policy such as would guarantee peace - in other words, break off relations with England." (1) Delcasse urged resistance but the French Cabinet was not behind him and he was forced to resign. This was the first use of ~~the~~ mailed fist diplomacy in Europe after the entrance of Germany into Welt-politik.

Four years later this policy was again in evidence. The annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria in 1908 brought out Russia as a champion of the little Slav states. A long dispute ensued which was abruptly terminated by Germany's ultimatum to Russia declaring that she would at once mobilize unless ^{better} existing conditions were accepted. Russia was little ^{better} prepared to take her own part than she had been three years previously to help France and was forced to agree.

Germany having now proved her supremacy in Europe, it was not long before she again turned to the larger sphere. Things had not been going well in Morocco. France had found it necessary to occupy certain parts of the country to restore order. Germany saw in this occupation a menace to her commercial interests but, more important still, she realized that an opportunity had come for a final effort to break up the Triple Entente. Accordingly she dispatched the Panther to Agadir and from the gun turrets of that boat it was announced that, in consideration for her consent to the occupation of Morocco, Germany would accept the whole of French Congo. At the same time it was intimated to Britain, whose mercantile interests in Morocco were no less valuable than Germany's, that the Moroccan question was one for the sole consideration of Germany, France and Spain. Sir Edward Grey replied that England was behind France to support the Agreement of 1904 and, as an ally, would support France against Germany's outrageous claim for 'compensation'.

(1) "Schism of Europe" Round Table, March 1915, p. 368.

Germany was further reminded that Agadir was not to become a German naval base. Von Buelow decided that his country was not ready to cope with three of the leading powers of Europe and withdrew all his demands with good grace. The third attempt to use the mailed fist in Europe proved abortive.

The humiliation of this last diplomatic rencontre might conceivably have given Germany pause, but it served only to turn her restless ambition towards improving the national organization in preparation for "THE DAY". Stupendous increases were made in the army and navy. Moreover a nation-wide campaign of Kultur was begun and in every village and hamlet in the country Chauvinist organizations sprang up whose articles of faith were these: "War is the noblest and holiest expression of human activity. War is beautiful, its august sublimity elevates the human heart above the earthly and the common" - and so on. (1) What more could an ambitious autocracy ask than that its own doctrine of power should be spontaneously and enthusiastically adopted by the nation's millions.

It is one of the characteristics of an advanced democracy that public opinion is not thus easily organized by political partisans or propagandists. Three times in six years the German sword had been swung against the shield of Europe's peace. The warnings could not have been plainer. In England they meant more dreadnoughts, in France universal service; in both countries and in Russia a demand for coalition. In July, 1914, the German sword rang a fourth time on the shield of Europe. Britain had not yet learned the lesson of international co-operation. Instead of declaring categorically in support of France and Russia, Sir Edward Grey refused to commit the country. His action was misinterpreted and war followed.

We have seen that two forms of extreme nationalism are behind the present struggle and we might therefore ask if the spirit of nationalism is not the source of the universal discord. Let us examine the nature of the state. It is a composite unit in which the individuals are highly organized for mutual service. Each subordinates his own will to that of the whole as expressed in the law of the land. The reign of law is the first condition of a national life and there can be no reign of law without the sacrifice on the part of the individual of the right to do as he pleases. This right the citizen surrenders for the good of the whole and, in return, finds that his individual liberties are more securely guaranteed than when he was obliged to resort to his own right arm to enforce his rights. How can this principle upon which the state is founded be carried into the sphere of international conduct?

Each state is a co-operative organization in which the citizen is highly fitted to perform his duties to his neighbor. But as between separate states there is no such organization and the people of each state are therefore accustomed to regard all international questions solely as they affect themselves, and with little consideration of their responsibility for the welfare of the inhabitants of the other states concerned. As Prof. Jones observes: "Cosmopolitan

(1) "Schism of Europe" - Round Table March 1915 - p. 396.

and humanitarian ideals are far less articulated into systems of definite duties than those of patriotism. But to represent the good of a state as antagonistic to that of humanity, or to set patriotism and cosmopolitanism against each other, is as wrong in theory and as mischievous in practice as it is to oppose the good of the individual citizen to that of his state."⁽¹⁾ The policy of one state may be based upon the belief that it is entitled to a fuller share in the government of the world, even though such a policy may involve the destruction of other independent states. That of another state may be based upon the belief that it is sufficient unto itself and that, so long as it goes about its own business, it can remain unaffected by the rivalry of its neighboring states. The policy of each is inimical to the welfare of humanity. What is required is the conception of a community of mankind. The national slogan must no longer be "Deutschland uber alles" or "England for herself" but "Over all is humanity".

This can be attained only by carrying to its logical conclusion the principle upon which the state is based, by the creation of a world-state. The right of individual states to act as they please in matters affecting other states will be surrendered to a representative political authority which will consider all interstate questions from the viewpoint of humanity and, once such questions are decided and become part of the universal law, will call upon all mankind to obey them and, if necessary, compel obedience by force. The independence of each state will be sacrificed to the extent that all external affairs will be controlled by a body in which it has only proportional representation. Separate armies and navies will be surrendered to the new government to be used in the interests of mankind. Each state will retain complete sovereignty in matters of internal administration and will leave for the arbitrament of the representative world government all questions affecting its external relations. Only by the establishment of such a government can universal peace be guaranteed.

The constitution of the United States is admirably fitted to serve as a model upon which to frame such a government. Under the American Constitution there is complete autonomy of the separate states; there is, at the same time, perfect and comprehensive sovereignty of the great Federal State within its own sphere of action; and there is, moreover, a permanent court for the settlement of all disputes arising between the states of the Union and any such states. These are the three requisites for the foundation of a world state.

Furthermore the great British Commonwealth is a perfect type of the world state. Within its vast extent one law is supreme. It contains people of all races, of every creed, and in every stage of political development. It has been able to harmonize the principles of local autonomy and empire, and at the same time to provide for the development within the same state of different races. The French and English in Canada, the Dutch and English in South Africa, have been able to get along together much better under one government than under two separate governments; while the self governing dominions have each developed a vigorous nationalism and found it consistent with allegiance to a greater state.

(1) "The Working Faith of a Social Reformer" - p. 145.

There are two main difficulties which will have to be overcome before the dream of world peace can be realized. The first is the spirit of national bigotry which dominates the "Great Powers. Before this consummation can be reached England must forego her policy of isolation, Germany her dream of world power; all must feel themselves primarily human beings. What a relinquishment of passion, pride, hatred, suspicion, does this involve! And yet when one considers the great moral awakening which has taken place in all the belligerent countries, can he say that this is impossible. It would seem that it remained for the test of war to bring out all the noble qualities inherent in mankind. Apart from the great sacrifices which the war itself directly entails, there is the indirect evidence of increased industry, frugality, and sobriety. In Russia the sale of vodka is prohibited; so is the sale of absynthe in France; in England the hours during which liquor may be sold are restricted. That eminent satirist, James Russell Lowell observes:

Es fer the war, I go agin it -
 I mean to say I kind o'du -
 That is, I mean that, bein in it,
 The best way was to fight it thru,
 Not but wot abstract war is horrid,
 I sign to that with all my heart,-
 But civlization does git ferrid
 Sometimes upon a powder-cart."

(1)

The second difficulty is one of machinery. We have seen that a constitution similar to that of the United States would make a practicable bond to connect the nations. The difficulty would be to convince the autocratic governments of the practicability of such a model. We must admit that our ideal of a world state assumes the existence of a highly developed democracy among its federating members. It must therefore remain an ideal until democracy comes to be more generally accepted by the national governments.

But in the meantime there is much that can be done towards making possible the realization of this ideal. First of all, the red dragon of Prussianism must be crushed. Every ounce of energy of which Great Britain and her Allies are capable must be devoted to stamping out the heresy that one nation can override all the laws of nations and of humanity in pursuit of the will to power. This doctrine is the greatest foe to universal peace. Until it is discredited there can be no peace for Germany or the world. And the surest way of doing this is by proving to the German people that the fatal promises of autocracy will never be fulfilled.

There is likewise a great change required on the part of the British people. We must renounce once and for all the fatal policy of isolation, whether it be cloaked under the catch phrases 'non-interference', 'laissez-faire', or 'national liberty'. The shibboleth liberty has too long been used by both the British and American halves of the Anglo-Saxon race as if liberty were an end in itself. It is not. It is only a means for the better service of humanity. The lesson of co-operation in the cause of weaker nations is being learned now by England and her allies and must not be lost sight of when the present struggle is over.

(1) "Biglow Papers".

Indeed, one of the conditions of a lasting peace is that the Great Powers shall continue this policy of co-operation which the Allies have learned in the bitter times of adversity. If the entente allies and the United States can organize a permanent international congress after the war, much will have been done to make possible the end of war. But such an organization would be useless unless the leading powers could agree to the use of force to compel obedience to the wishes of the whole. The remaining powers would find it to their advantage to be represented in such a congress and all would begin to learn the value of co-operation for the benefit of mankind. Only thus can national ignorance, mistrust and suspicion, which are the breeders of war, be destroyed. Only thus can the vision of Mrs. Browning be realized:

"No more Jew nor Greek then, - taunting
Nor taunted; no more England nor France!
But one confederate brotherhood planting
One flag only, to mark the advance,
Onward and upward, of all humanity.

.....

And Heptarchy patriotism must follow,
National voices, distinct, yet dependent,
Enspiring each other, as swallow doth swallow,
With circles still widening and ever ascendant,
In multiform life to united progression, -

These shall remain. And when in the session
Of nations, the separate language is heard,
Each shall aspire, in sublime indiscretion,
To help with a thought or exalt with a word,
Less her own than her rival's honor."

England has yet improvements to make in her national organization before she will be fitted to do her share in the international sphere. We have seen that the indecision of the British Cabinet was a contributory cause of the war. This was due not to the inefficiency of the particular Cabinet in power but to the impossibility of one Cabinet handling all the work which is required to be done. The Cabinet must conduct foreign affairs, keep up the efficiency of the army and navy, superintend the government of India and the Colonies and at the same time look after all the details of home government. If it is unable in times of peace to cope with the work assigned to it, how shall it succeed when the war is over in solving all the domestic as well as international problems arising from the war? The people, moreover, under our system of government, have no opportunity either of forming an opinion on foreign problems or of expressing that opinion when formed. The conduct of foreign affairs never comes before the people at election time and they remain uninformed until the time of crisis arrives. These two factors explain why England was caught unprepared for war with Germany and why, before the crisis arrived, she had settled upon no clear policy towards either France or Belgium.

There is one remedy for both these evils and that is, to divide Parliament into two bodies, one for the work of domestic government and the other for the conduct of foreign affairs with a Cabinet responsible to each. By this method the growing demand of the British people for the democratic control of foreign policy can be satisfied and at the same time foreign affairs will receive the attention which their importance demands. The present tendency of democracy is against secret diplomacy. Lord Cromer admits that much harm has been done and many wars brought about by false diplomatic traditions, and asserts: "There have never been any important secrets in diplomacy which could not unobjectionably have been proclaimed on the house-tops." A righteous policy needs no justification. It contains within it the seeds of success. Hope for the future lies in the growth of this movement in England, for, when one great nation adopts the policy of communicating all its obligations to its people every other must.

Another factor which calls for a separate deliberating body for foreign affairs is the growing demand of the self governing dominions for a voice in Britain's external policy. Mr. Borden has said: "If Canada and any other Dominions of the Empire are to take their part as nations of this Empire in the defence of the Empire as a whole, shall it be that we, contributing to that defence of the whole Empire, shall have absolutely, as citizens of this country, no voice whatever in the Councils of the Empire touching the issues of peace or war throughout the Empire? I do not think that such would be a tolerable condition. I do not think the people of Canada would for one moment submit to such a condition." (1) This is the view not only of all Canadians but of the British Government. The autonomy of Canada must remain incomplete so long as she has no voice in the making of peace or war. That the Dominions will be given a share in the settlement of this war has already been announced by leading British statesmen. And that some means will later be provided for their representation in an Imperial body for the consideration of foreign affairs is also certain.

These are the steps then, which Britain must take before she will be fitted to play her part in the councils of the nations. We must first demonstrate that we can live up to the principles of the state within our own borders before we shall be qualified to uphold those principles for the world. When we have done this, when we have shown that freedom and self-abnegation can exist together, when we approximate to the perfect state because we are united, peaceful and happy in mutual service in a Commonwealth covering half the globe, we shall be able to speak with authority to other nations and by our example prove that universal peace and the federation of mankind in one state is within our grasp.

(1) "Kingdom Papers" No. 19 - p. 231.