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“The function of Liberalism in the past was that of putting a limit to the powers of kings. The function of true Liberalism in the future will be that of putting a limit to the powers of parliaments.”

—Herbert Spencer on The Great Political Superstition

“Nothing in the world is more pleasing to God, more agreeable to reason, more politically just, or more generally useful, than that the supreme power should be vested in the best and the wisest of men.”

—John Milton.

“Now, of man in society, the capital need is that the whole body of society shall come to live with a life worthy to be called human, and corresponding to man's true aspirations and powers. This, the humanization of man in society, is civilization. The aim for all of us is to promote it, and to promote it is above all the aim for the true politician.”

—Matthew Arnold on The Future of Liberalism

“That which all things tend to educate, which freedom, cultivation, intercourse, revolutions go to form and deliver, is character. That is the end of Nature, to reach unto this coronation of her king.”

—Emerson on Politics

“The grand, leading principle, towards which every argument unfolded in these pages directly converges, is the absolute and essential importance of human development in its richest diversity.”

—W. von Humboldt “Sphere and Duties of Government.”
Is Federation Our True Policy?
“These plutocratic delegates are fixing up an Australian constitution in favour of the plutocracy, and preparing the framework of a nation on plutocratic lines. . . . This constitution is not intended to give the people freedom. . . . This is not a movement having for its object the benefit of the worker, but is a gigantic conspiracy on the part of the plutocracy to provide an effectual set-back to the rapidly-growing democracy of these colonies. Should this proposed constitution become law, the people of Australia will live to bitterly regret their assent having been given to it. It is a class measure.”—

Queensland Worker,

29th January, 1898.

“The discussion was also notable for the instinctive way in which the delegates went to the heart of the federal problem. Sir John Forrest, in his rough-and-ready, practical way, said it was all a question of £ s. d., and so long as the smaller colonies were certain that the Senate, in which they would be equally represented, would have full power of amending all money bills except appropriation bills, and the power of rejecting even these, they did not care what else was in the federal constitution.”—

Sydney Mail,

17th April, 1897.

THese two opinions on federation go to the heart of the federal problem. It is really an attempt to reconcile the commercial interests of rival states, and not an attempt to realize a higher form of government in the proper sense of the word. For a government is properly an educating agent, by which the people rise to a higher plane of national existence. A government should be the mind and soul of the nation, expressing its highest character, and composed of its best elements. Never before, perhaps, in the history of politics has the ruler of a state so unblushingly declared the utter degradation of government as Sir John Forrest in the words above quoted. Isaiah believed that God himself would not disdain to rule His people. “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.”

Sir John Forrest, however, knows better than Isaiah or Christ, or Plato, or Dante, or Emerson, or Carlyle, or Goethe, or Mill, or Huxley, or Matthew
Arnold, who all declare that the work of the true politician is the noblest
that any man can set his hand to. Government, says Sir John Forrest, “is all
a question of £ s. d.,” and so long as monetary matters were properly
looked after “they did not care what else was in the constitution.” And did
the other members of the Convention indignantly repudiate this base and
ignoble ideal of government? Not at all! Can a better proof be desired than
this that federation is purely an affair of money, and that the object of the
Convention was simply to fix up a constitution favourable to the monetary
interests of the rival states? Now this degradation of the political ideal of
government is not peculiar to Australia. It is a world-wide fact. Anyone
who knows much of contemporary politics knows that the decadence of
parliaments is a striking feature of these latter days. It is the same in
America, in France, in Spain, and wherever representative institutions are
found. As to England a recent writer in the Westminster Review said:—
“Never, during the last two centuries, has England been brought so low in
the councils of the world, or been so false to her own traditions and the
great principles of freedom and justice, as in this vaunted year of the
Queen's Jubilee.” As to Spain, a recent writer in Blackwood (February,
1898), says that the Spanish caciques, who resemble the American “boss,”
wield the political power. They “have immense power in Spain, and they
use it for the purpose of promoting jobs for their own good and the good of
their friends. What the Spaniards call el caciquismo cannot be overlooked
in an examination of their politics. It is that which, more than anything
else, has tended to make the formation of an honest public service in Spain
impossible, and it is the want of one which is largely responsible for the
miserable failure of Spanish colonial government.” Anyone who has read
Mr. Stead's books, “If Christ Came to Chicago” and “Satan's Invisible
World Displayed,” or Lloyd's “Wealth v. Commonwealth,” knows
something of the political corruption which the worship of wealth and an
irresponsible federal government has brought upon America. But the
founders of the American state at least had worthy ideals of government
before them. It was reserved for an Australian Convention to declare to all
the world that if monetary interests are properly secured nothing else
matters. It is said that “the darkest hour precedes the dawn.” Let us hope
so! and let us also hope that the people of Australia will tell those
politicians of the Convention who so unblushingly degraded their art that
they may be good business men, but that monetary business is far from
being the most important part of the business of a government, and that
legislators who do not know this are no true nation-builders. The Worker
says the federal movement is “a gigantic conspiracy.” This, it will be said,
is only the Worker's opinion, and not the opinion of cultured and educated Australia. If this opinion is true, how comes it that cultured Australia is blind? Well, it is nothing new in the world's history to find the cultured and comfortable classes, those who have vested interests to look after, blind to the truth. That proverb, "Vox populi vox Dei," expresses a great truth—viz., that the people are often in the right when the higher classes are wrong. It is not that the classes always actually conspire against truth and freedom, but simply that selfishness blinds them. Lecky, the historian of European morals, &c., wrote:—"That the greatest religious change in the history of mankind should have taken place under the eyes of a brilliant galaxy of philosophers and historians who were profoundly conscious of the decomposition around them, that all these writers should have utterly failed to predict the issue of the movement they were observing, and that during the space of three centuries they should have treated as simply contemptible an agency which all men must now admit to have been, for good or for evil, the most powerful moral lever that has ever been applied to the affairs of men, are facts well worthy of meditation in every period of religious transition." Toulmin Smith wrote:—"It is well worthy of remark that it is not the mass of the folk and people who are insensible to sound argument and reason. The truth is that the most really ignorant classes and the most incapable of comprehending sound argument and reason are often found to be those who are commonly called the educated classes. The cause of this is very simple. What is now called education is nothing but putting a certain artificial mould upon the mind, which, instead of developing its powers, does but serve to wrap it in prejudices and bind it to conventionalisms. The artisan classes, at least equally called upon by external circumstances to exercise the native powers of mind, have fewer prejudices to block the way to the sober entertainment of argument and reason." Mr. Gladstone, writing on the county franchise, said:—"We should remember that our religion itself did not take its earlier root, or find its primitive home, in the minds of kings, philosophers, and statesmen. Not many rich, not many noble were called. The wisdom and culture were mostly plotting against our Lord, while the common people heard him gladly. Paradox it may seem to be, but fact it is, that the immense advantages which leisure and learning confer are largely neutralized, and in some cases utterly outweighed, by the blinding influences of a subtler, deeper, and more comprehensive selfishness." Hosmer, in his "Anglo-Saxon Freedom," writes:—"Nearly all great political and social causes have first made their way among the middle and humbler classes. The initiative proceeds from certain individuals, lofty and piercing minds; these
are followed by the masses, while the higher classes frown and persecute.” Stuart Mill wrote of the Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius:—“If ever anyone possessed of power had grounds for thinking himself the best and most enlightened among his contemporaries it was the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. Absolute monarch of the whole civilized world, he preserved through life not only the most unblemished justice, but, what was less to be expected from his Stoical breeding, the tenderest heart. This man, a better Christian in all but the dogmatic sense of the word than almost any of the ostensibly Christian sovereigns who have since reigned, persecuted Christianity. Placed at the summit of all the previous attainments of humanity, with an open, unfettered intellect and a character which led him of himself to embody in his moral writings the Christian ideal, he yet failed to see that Christianity was to be a good and not an evil to the world, with his duties to which he was so deeply penetrated. Existing society he knew to be in a deplorable state. But such as it was, he saw, or thought he saw, that it was held together and prevented from being worse by belief and reverence of the received divinities. As a ruler of mankind he deemed it his duty not to suffer society to fall in pieces, and saw not how, if its existing ties were removed, any others could be formed which could again knit it together. The new religion openly aimed at dissolving these ties; unless, therefore, it was his duty to adopt that religion, it seemed to be his duty to put it down.” Thus education and culture are no safeguard against gross error. And it may be that to-day in Australia the middle classes, the capitalist press, and the political professionals are “plotting against our Lord,” conspiring against the people, blinded as before by a “subtle, deep, and comprehensive selfishness.” Of nineteenth century England, B. Kidd, in his “Social Evolution,” writes:—“It has to be confessed that the educated classes, in almost all the great political changes that have been effected, have taken the side of the party afterwards admitted to have been in the wrong. This is to be noticed alike of measures which have extended education, which have emancipated trade, which have extended the franchise. The educated classes have even, it must be confessed, opposed measures which have tended to secure religious freedom and to abolish slavery. The motive force behind the long list of progressive measures carried during this period has in scarcely any appreciable measure come from the educated classes; it has come almost exclusively from the middle and lower classes, who have in turn acted, not under the stimulus of intellectual motives, but under the influence of their altruistic feeling. . . . We have come to believe that the feudal system is defunct. But the real fact, as Karl Marx realized more clearly than the older economists, is, that
the dead hand of feudalism still presses with crushing weight upon the people through almost all the forms and institutions of present-day society. A large part of the existing unregulated and uncontrolled rights of wealth and capital are in reality merely the surviving rights of feudalism adapted to new conditions. Education must in time bring us to see that their continued existence is incompatible with the attainment of the ideal which society will have set more and more clearly before it in the stage of development upon which we are entering.”

In Australia all classes, and especially the lower, still suffer from the surviving relics of feudalism which hopelessly hamper the development of the old world nations, and even the people of the United States of America. In Australia the removal of these relics is easier than elsewhere, and a great opportunity is about to occur. Never before in the world's history has a whole people had the opportunity of accepting or rejecting a constitution. The Americans had no such opportunity. Bryce, in his “American Commonwealth,” tells us:—“Had the decision been left to what is now called the ‘voice of the people’—that is, to the mass of the citizens all over the country, voting at the polls—the voice of the people would probably have pronounced against the constitution, and this would have been still more likely if the question had been voted on everywhere upon the same day. . . . The counsels of the wise prevailed over the prepossessions of the multitude. Yet these counsels would hardly have prevailed but for a cause which is apt to be now overlooked. This was the dread of foreign powers.” Federation in America was really “federation by funk,” a forced federation. And were those counsels which prevailed so very wise? Does not the state of America to-day show that there was a radical flaw in the constitution, a “little rift within the lute” which has been growing wider ever since, and which threatens the harmony of social life there to-day with utter extinction. The *Saturday Review* writes:—“The love of the American for individual liberty has indeed been pushed to madness, and has resulted in a despotism of the capitalist such as has never been known in Europe.” S. Schindler wrote in *The Arena*:—“We must establish a new system of ascertaining the public will—viz., a new system of voting. This is a first step to nationalism, which, however, must be preceded by still another one. We must stop teaching in school and from the platform the infallibility of the constitution. Is it high treason to write that? Our constitution was a glorious and excellent instrument at its time; it has ceased to be that now. Instead of grandiloquently praising the wisdom of the framers of the constitution, and presenting it as the ne plus ultra of political foresight, as the safeguard of all our economic conditions, we should teach the people—
young and old—that a measure may be wise and good at one age, and cease to be so at another; that they may revere and respect this instrument, which, indeed, broke the fetters of mediaeval thraldom, but that they must neither idolize nor deify it; that they should look at it as they look upon any other political measure, and be not afraid to recast and change it when new times and new conditions call for new measures.” Lloyd writes of America in his “Wealth v. Commonwealth”:—“We have now captains of industry with a few aids rearranging from office chairs this or that industry by mere contrivances of wit, compelling the fruit of the labour of tens of thousands of their fellows, who never saw them, never heard of them, to be every day deposited, unwilling and unwitting, to their own credit at the bank, defying, though private citizens, all the forces and authorities of a whole people by the mere mastery of compelling brain.” Again: “Syndicates by one stroke get the power of selling dear on one side and producing cheap on the other. Thus they keep themselves happy, prices high, and the people hungry.” And of the American commercial Titans he writes:—“Without restraints of culture, the experience, the pride, or even the inherited caution of class or rank, these men, intoxicated, think they are the wave instead of the float, and that they have created the business which has created them. Monopoly is business at the end of its journey. It has got there. The irrepressible conflict is now as distinctly with business as the issue so lately met was with slavery. Slavery went first only because it was the cruder form of business.” Abraham Lincoln wrote:—“I feel too keenly what a fearful price is paid by the English people in order that their splendid aristocracy, with their parks and castles, and shootings and fishings, and fox huntings, their stately and unlimited hospitality, their lettered ease and learned leisure, may grow fat, ever to be in danger of finding my judgment corrupted.” And yet America has bred a race of aristocrats, nouveaux riches, compared with whom the English aristocrats are angels. Sir John Forrest is right in a way. The problem of the proper distribution of wealth is the political problem of to-day. It is the Sphinx riddle of civilization which no nation has ever solved. Australia has a unique opportunity of solving it. The welfare of the people has always been, and still is, sacrificed to the aristocracy or to the plutocracy. But there is no good reason why it should be so for ever. The problem of the proper distribution of wealth, of the social unearned increment or profit, can be solved by Australia to-day, for herself first, and afterwards for all the world, if her people are only intelligent enough and civilized enough. But the problem cannot be solved by the adoption of any federal constitution whatsoever; for, as I shall endeavour to show, the existing state of things in America is the necessary
result of the adoption of the federal principle as the fundamental law of the
state. The radical defect of federation may be refined away by increasing
the power of the people to amend the constitution, but as long as the
federal principle is retained the defect is still there, and must in the end
produce its disastrous consequences, and bring about an eclipse of justice,
which means sooner or later the death or dissolution of the state.

The radical defect of all federal constitutions whatsoever is the dogma of
state rights. I do not mean that either states or individuals have no rights at
all. Individuals have relative rights, and these summed up give state rights;
but state rights are not absolute—that is to say, they must give way before
national right; the welfare of the whole must be considered paramount to
all individual or state rights if a people desire to become really and truly a
nation. The Australian people do aspire to become “one nation with one
destiny.” But, if so, they must abandon the federal principle altogether. If
they are not prepared for a higher form of union such as is really suitable to
Australia, they should wait, for to adopt federation is to confirm the
existing habit of looking upon the state governments as supreme, and it
was just this national habit which, as we shall see, brought upon America
the disastrous war of secession. “No part of the Commonwealth Bill,” says
B. R. Wise, “has been more criticised in New South Wales than this equal
representation of the states in the Senate; yet very short reflection will
show that it was a practical necessity of federation.” But it is not the equal
representation of the states that is the evil, the real defect of federation. The
defect is that the will of the states is made supreme in the Commonwealth,
that there is no efficient power placed above the states, above both houses
of the Legislature—no efficient representative of the nation as a whole,
such as the constitutional sovereign of England is. This is the necessary
radical defect of every form of federation. A federation in the true sense of
the word is a collection of interdependent sovereign powers without a
single centre of unity, without a true sovereign at all. Nowhere are the
different parts brought to unity, and without a single central personal unit
the people can never act as one personality, there can be no true nation.
This is the corner-stone which the Australian nation-builders have refused;
this is the keystone of the arch, without which the political fabric is raised
in vain. There are good reasons why professional politicians, if left to
themselves, decline to add this crown and complement to the political
structure. But the people of Australia have the power to add it, and if they
are wise they will do so, for without it the results which we observe in
America to-day will infallibly be brought about; without it their liberties
are insecure, and the despotism of capital is certain; with it the best
possible safeguard for liberty and guarantee of progress are obtained. The two essential things that the people of Australia ought to add to the Commonwealth Bill are a national referendum and a national sovereign. If these two things are added nothing else matters much—all injustices in the state can be gradually and surely removed; without them their removal becomes impossible by constitutional means, and if removed at all they must be removed by civil war. In the late Convention, Australia as a whole was absolutely unrepresented; the delegates were returned by the states to look after state interests, and no one doubts that they did this to the best of their ability. But there was a palpable and painful absence of the national spirit, and this was only to be expected, since it is not the business of delegates representing states to consider the claims of the whole. It is a common saying, “What is everybody's business is nobody's business.” There was a lack of common-sense—that is, a feeling of the whole. And this was only to be expected, since that part of the nation which stands emphatically for common-sense as against culture and wealth—the Labour party—was entirely excluded from the Convention, as also was the National party, the Temperance party, &c. The inclusion of representatives of these parties might possibly have made agreement impossible, but these parties have certainly a right to some influence in the formation of a constitution. To get this influence their course is plain: they have to insist upon a national, mind you, not simply a state, referendum, and by this means elect a national head, directly responsible, not to the states, but to the nation as a whole: in a word, to introduce what Gladstone calls the greatest political device of modern times, the great contribution of England to political art, the device of constitutional monarchy. To prevent the abuse of this power they have to introduce from Switzerland the complementary devices of the initiative and referendum, which, though unsuitable to special legislation as tending to discredit representative bodies, are eminently applicable to large general questions, such as the acceptance of a constitution; constitutional amendment; the election and removal of a national head; the declaration of peace and war; the reduction of armaments; or the reduction of the size of central representative bodies, with a view to greater local self-government. Now, why did the late Convention neglect these necessary additions to representative government?—necessary, I say, because it is distinctly due to their absence that parliamentary bodies all the world over have sunk into such a low and degraded state. The reason of this neglect is simple. The Convention consisted, with only one exception, of professional politicians. Now, every class has its unconscious class bias, every class and every institution seeks
to aggrandize itself at the expense of other classes, and it is not to be expected that the political class should be free from this common failing. As a fact, we can see that this class is not free. Is it likely, then, that politicians will be magnanimous enough to put over themselves a power capable of controlling them in the national interest? The Sydney Bulletin puts the matter tersely in its caustic way:—“Queensland politician in confidence to friend: ‘You see, we elect Blunderbore as leader because he has no influence, and we can depose him whenever we choose. If we elected a man of more front-head and backbone we should have him there as a fixture, and our little jealousies couldn't stand it!’ ” This is the plain unvarnished truth about the matter. Of course, it will be said there are the Crown and the Governor-General above the Senate. But the absurdity of a nominated Governor-General becomes evident the moment we realize that the head of the national business is really just as important as the head of any other business. The success of a business depends not upon the manager entirely, but the manager is the most important factor of success, and should rise by his talents, and have the confidence of all under him, if business is to be conducted in the best manner possible. The great doctrine of democracy is “the tools to him who can handle them,” or the rule of merit of character; and the proposed constitution neglects to apply this principle where its application is of the utmost importance to the state, viz., at the summit. Character means not merely brain power —this is valued today far above its true worth— but the power to love and act as well. Character must make itself felt in the state, no matter how much rigid laws seek to rob it of its due. In America there is no constitutional recognition of the power of character. Thus, in exciting times, the President becomes a dictator. Surely it is wiser to make constitutional provision for the use of the greatest power in politics. As the great American writer, Emerson, says—“That which all things tend to educe; which freedom, cultivation, intercourse, revolutions, go to form and deliver is character: that is the end of Nature, to reach unto this coronation of her king. We think our civilization near its meridian, but we are yet only at the cock-crowing and the morning star. In our barbarous society the influence of character is in its infancy. As a political power, as the rightful lord who is to tumble all rulers from their chairs, its presence is hardly yet suspected.” But Australia, more happy than other nations, has yet a chance of raising to the chair the highest impersonation of the human ideal, the most perfect character to be found in the state. The sovereign representative of the people should be totally independent of the politicians, since it is they who want controlling at the present time— not the sovereign. As Herbert
Spencer wrote—“The function of Liberalism in the past was that of putting a limit to the power of kings. The function of true Liberalism in the future will be that of putting a limit to the powers of Parliaments.” But Herbert Spencer fails to tell us how this is to be done. It is not to be done by writing, for modern political literature is full of tirades against the politicians, and they don't care one straw. Old Samuel Smiles, though, knows the way—“The only true barrier against the despotism of public opinion, whether it be of the many or the few, is enlightened individual freedom and purity of personal character.” And this is the doctrine of Christ and Plato and Hobbes. The social troubles of modern times are directly due to the neglect of the Christian and Emersonian doctrine that character is the rightful king. This is “the stone which the builders rejected,” which “was made the head of the corner.” “Everyone that falleth on that stone shall be broken to pieces; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust.” For character, the ideal of the age or nation, always does rule, as a matter of fact. The Americans worship wealth; they are ruled by capital! The Germans worship physical force; they are ruled by the modern “Lord of Hosts.” Are the Australians going to worship the millionaire, or the German Emperor, or George Reid, or Toby Barton—i.e., the political power. Well, no doubt, all these gods must have their worshippers, but I think there are a great number of persons in Australia who are not prepared to worship any of these lesser gods, who are prepared to give their loyalty to their wholly human ideal of the artist “who ruleth all things by reason and insight,” and not by the power either of gold or of the sword. Personal loyalty is supposed to be an anachronism. “Loyalty to the state,” says “Sardonyx” in the Sydney Bulletin, “to the best interests of the community, so far from involving ‘attachment’ to any throne or person, is actually incompatible therewith, and exactly in proportion as a man loses sight of the national idea in the personal, he is apt to mistake the most contemptible of feelings for the noblest, and to fancy himself an ardent patriot when he is no more than an enthusiastic flunkey.” Pray, “Sardonyx,” what are “the best interests of the community?” Do you mean the monied interests? The man who worships wealth is certainly a flunkey, but the man who gives his loyalty to the best human being he knows really reveres the best part of his own nature. And if the “best interests” means human interests, can there be a better way of securing human interests than that of putting in the social place of honour the most perfect human to be found. I am afraid, “Sardonyx,” you are still in the “metaphysical stage” of thought in which men worship abstractions. It certainly wants the application of the “positive” common-sense of the people to bring about a
better state of political matters in Australia, for here, as in America, of
which Spencer writes in his “Study of Sociology”—“While the outside
form of free government remains, there has grown up within it a reality
which makes government not free. The body of professional politicians,
entering public life to get incomes, organizing their forces and developing
their tactics, have, in fact, come to be a ruling class quite different from
that which the constitution intended to secure, and a class having interests
by no means identical with public interests. This worship of the appliances
to liberty, in place of liberty itself, needs continually exposing. There is no
intrinsic virtue in votes. The possession of representatives is not itself a
benefit. These are but means to an end, and the end is the securing to each
citizen all such beneficial results of his activities as his activities naturally
bring.” The Americans have had a good many years of Parliamentary
Government, government by politicians on a scale vaster than the world
has ever before seen. Have these politicians secured to the American
people the beneficial results of their activities? Have they solved the
problem of the distribution of wealth, or the monetary problem? No! But
they have invented the caucus and the spoils system, and the despotism of
Tammany rules to-day in the typical city of New York. A glimpse at the
working of the federal political machine through Bryce's eyes ought to be
interesting to Australians, who are asked by their politicians to establish
another such machine in this already over-governed land. “It is hard in
America to keep one's head through the mazy whirl of offices, elections,
and nominating conventions. In America itself one finds few ordinary
citizens who can state the details of the system, though these are of course
familiar to professional politicians.” “The elective offices are so numerous
that ordinary citizens cannot watch them, and cease to care who gets them.
The minor offices are so unattractive that able men do not stand for them.
The mass of the voters are ignorant; knowing nothing about the personal
merits of the candidates, they are ready to follow their leaders like sheep.
Even the better class, however they may grumble, are swayed by the
inveterate habit of party loyalty, and prefer a bad candidate of their own
party to a candidate of the other party. It is less terrible to put up with
impure officials, costly city government, a jobbing state legislature, an
inferior sort of congressman, than to sacrifice one's own business in the
effort to set things right. Thus the machine works on, and grinds out places,
power, and opportunities for illicit gain to those who manage it.” “Nobody
supposes that merit has anything to do with promotion in America.” If
America was not so enormously rich it would have simplified its political
machine long ago. Of course, if the Americans like to play the game of
politics on a vast scale, so that everybody can hope to have a political billet some time or other, no one can prevent them, but it is simply making an end of a means, for not political activity but life is the end of life, and the energy wasted in political agitation might be much better employed. But the political habit is not easy to get rid of, and soon degenerates into disease if the force of public opinion does not constantly play upon the politicians, and confine the natural bias to exaggerate their own importance within proper bounds. In new countries it is hard to keep the politicians in order, and it is especially so in Australia, where people are widely scattered, engaged in business, and great lovers of sport. Then, too, nearly everyone who has a taste for politics becomes a professional politician. As Stuart Mill points out:—“Not only is a greater number often kept down by a less, but the greater number may have a preponderance in property, and individually in intelligence, and may yet be held in subjection, forcibly or otherwise, by a minority in both respects inferior to it. To make these various elements of power politically influential, they must be organized; and the advantage in organization is necessarily with those who are in the possession of the government.” “The power in society which has any tendency to convert itself into political power is not power quiescent, power merely passive, but active power, power actually exerted—that is to say, a very small portion of all the power in existence.” Thus it is in Australia. No one here imagines that politicians really represent the nation in its best features. There are, undoubtedly, some good men, but the general average of intelligence is certainly low. The Sydney Bulletin, whatever its faults, calls a spade a spade. Listen to it on the late Convention—“The biggest opportunity in all history is being fooled away. This is the one occasion in all the world's record, so far as we know it, when there has been a chance to take peaceful possession of a continent and place it under one government, and under the control of one nation; with a common language, with no mediaeval traditions to live down, no serious internal feuds to eradicate, and no long, horrible, blood-stained past to arise up in judgment against it. Washington and his contemporaries had no such opportunity in the United States; neither had Bolivar in South America, nor Hidalgo in Mexico, nor the makers of the Swiss Republic, nor the creators of New Italy, nor any other of the nation-builders that we knew of. And no one else will ever have such another opportunity while the world remains as it now is, for there are no more continents to be occupied, and there is no room to build another new nation anywhere, unless an old one is first butchered out of the road to make room for it. Probably the last men who had such a chance were Cain and Shem, and it
is a far cry from Shem to George Reid, and Tozer, and Forrest. There is something wildly ironical in the idea that the biggest opportunity in a few thousand years of history should have been put in the way of Henry Dobson and Tozer, and Nelson and Sandy Brunker, and Reid and Holder, and Lyne, and the other small ordinary potterers, who are busy fooling it away about a small matter of twopence in the accounts.” But, of course, correct accounts are the necessary basis of a higher life. But few men in this Convention had a soul above accounts, and the danger is that the new governing organ, instead of becoming a spiritual organ for the purposes of national amelioration, will take the character of its builders, and be merely a calculating machine, whose chief object is the creation of spoils for the benefit of the political class. For it must not be forgotten that the federal form of government is that one which the bias of politicians naturally leads them to select, for its “dual control” means a double set of fat political billets. It is worthy of remark, too, that even the Bulletin, which thinks so badly of human nature, recognizes the truth that high individual personality is necessary for nation building. And so does the Review of Reviews, which is responsible for this—“New South Wales is the one necessary colony in the federation movement, and Mr. Reid (not then Sir George, though he ‘might have been’) is the one necessary man in that colony. If New South Wales stands aloof, or falters, Australian federation will be postponed for a generation; and the policy of New South Wales is determined by Mr. Reid. No one, we think, can fail to be struck by the note of sincerity in Mr. Reid's article (contributed to Review). He is a man of frank courage, of frank speech, not given to diplomatic reserves, or to indirect courses, and he plainly means business in the matter of federation. He has an historic opportunity, such as rarely comes even to men of the first rank, and he may stamp his strong personality and vigorous intellect on the constitution and history of the Australian colonies.” Does Australia want to have George Reid written in large letters across its face? It will be remembered that another New South Welshman wanted to rob Australia of its name for the benefit of New South Wales. There is a little rhyme that comes pat here, “Taffy was a Welshman, Taffy was a thief.” New South Wales has always been the most ambitious of the states, and naturally wishes to change a name that has unpleasant associations. Pritchard Morgan, another Welshman, has a scheme, too, for appropriating the Northern Territory.

New South Wales is the natural home of federation—that form of government most favourable to politicians since, according to the Australian Field, “the cost of government is vastly higher in New South
Wales than in any other country on the face of the earth.” The Field gives a table showing the average payment in taxes by head of every family. New South Wales heads the list with £42 4s. 8d., while British India is only £1 8s. 8d., the United States £5 6s., Great Britain £8 14s., Canada £8 9s. 4d., Switzerland £6 4s. After New South Wales comes South Australia with £33 12s. 8d., Victoria £31 8s. 8d. The annual expenditure for administrative government only is given as £6,746,466 in New South Wales, while administration in Great Britain, with its 40 millions of inhabitants, costs 421/2 millions; and the United States, with its 63 millions, spends about 411/2 millions. The spoils system seems to have made a good start in New South Wales. “If, as has been proved,” remarks the Field, “federation is to add from two to three millions per annum to our taxation, what will be the cost of government per head under the sort of federation advocated by Mr. Barton and other enthusiasts?” Mr. Reid has a tough job before him in cleansing the Augean stable of New South Wales politics. Federation may help New South Wales in this matter, but it is to be hoped that Australia will not be made the dumping ground for political refuse. The political insight of the writer in the Review of Reviews may be gauged by this paragraph:— “Federation, it is clear, will tax the statesmanship of the colonies. Our public men will have to deal with large questions of principle, questions which go to the root of politics, and the experience will be a political education of the noblest sort for all the colonies. It may serve to hush that provincial note which, just now, is unhappily the dominant sound in all the colonial parliaments.” This was written in 1897. In the February number of 1898 I read—“It is open to debate, of course, whether it would not have been the wiser method of federating to have first put the simple issue of federation to a popular vote, and when a popular mandate had been delivered in its favour, then to frame a Federal Bill.” Is this the result of the disillusionment which the writer must have experienced when he followed the Convention debates? But if Australians wish to get over the pons asinorum of provincial politicians—i.e., the doctrine of state rights as superior to national, a national convention ought to be summoned, Australia as one electorate. State delegates are almost certain to choose a federal form of government. And why does not the editor of the Review of Reviews, who writes so well on “Deeds that Won the Empire,” go to the root of politics himself, and give us all “a political education of the noblest sort.” If he goes to the root of English politics, he will find character written there in unmistakable clearness, and it is just because the Imperial Parliament has lost faith in character, in human perfection, that the Empire is in a bad way to-day. For
did not this appear in the **Review of Reviews**:—“What are we to think of John Bull as revealed by the proceedings of the South African Committee? In place of the burly, bluff, straightforward old gentleman, who has been regarded for generations as typical of the national character, we have the new John Bull, the John Bull of unctuous rectitude and cunning. The outline of the figure is supplied by combining the familiar models of Mr. Pecksniff, Mr. Chadband, and Sir Richard Webster, who is a stalwart man and portly, with shoulders broad enough to bear the weight of the present scandal. In the right eye of this John Bull revised up to date is inserted the eyeglass of Mr. Chamberlain, while the other is entirely closed in a leering wink, the significance of which is emphasized by the tongue thrust conspicuously into his capacious cheek. The inscription underneath this odious embodiment of Pharisaism and cant, of mendacity and hypocrisy, is the prayer of the Pharisee who went up to the temple to pray, and thanked God that he was not as other men were.” But John Bull is still alive; were I in England I could lay hands upon him. The simple fact is that parliament has got him down. The great treasurer, Lord Burleigh, said long ago that England could only be ruined by a parliament. In Australia the national character has not yet appeared, but I can vouch for this, that it is hostile to federalism in any shape or form, just as John Bull himself is. And, further, I can assure the politicians of Australia that if they reject the “corner stone” it will, sooner or later, fall upon them, and crush them to powder.

The **Worker** spoke of a plutocratic conspiracy, and Sir John Forrest said federation is a matter of £ s. d. There are some people who will connect these two statements, and arrive at the conclusion that federation is a conspiracy, but not a plutocratic one—a conspiracy on the part of the politicians to tax the people for their own ends. The pastoralists too already feel the political pinch. The **Pastoralist Review** wrote some time ago—“Interference by government is one of the curses the Australian—the Australasian—pastoralist seems to be heir too. In almost every department of pastoralist enterprise the class is brought face to face with the meddlesome official or some Minister playing to the galleries.” The Queensland Parliament recently passed, in a moment of panic, drastic tick legislation, giving tick inspectors almost absolute powers, which they abused in the gayest and most ridiculous fashion. Again, the people of New Zealand are beginning to realize that representative government, as it exists today, is largely a sham. I read in the **Lyttelton Times**—“The strange and anomalous thing is that, theoretically, the people possess the power to do as they please in the matter of governing themselves, but that in practice they find themselves baffled and defeated by the institutions and creatures
of their own making.” But the thing is not strange and anomalous at all. The good old English custom was to make parliament responsible to the sovereign, and the sovereign responsible directly to the people, to put a person and a council above the strife of party. As Gronlund says, in his “Co-operative Commonwealth”—“Experience has shown that responsibility to many is, in ordinary cases, no responsibility at all. We therefore hold that, if the directing functionaries are to be made responsible for their work, they must be made responsible to some one person.” But since parliaments have exceeded their proper limits, and usurped the powers of the Crown, they have got careless. The Cabinet system is really government by a board, and boards, as Bentham said, are generally screens. The Premier is merely a party man. The President in America, too, is only a party man, responsible not to the people as a whole, but to Party; for, since the war of secession in America, the party organization has swamped the states. America, after the war, virtually ceased to be a federation. “The struggle with the South,” wrote Gladstone, “which for the first time, and definitely, decided that to the union, through its federal organization, and not to the state governments, were reserved all the questions not decided and disposed of by the express provisions of the constitution itself.” America got over the pons asinorum, but at what a cost! “On the Northern side,” wrote Mackenzie, “two million seven hundred thousand men bore arms at some period of the war. Of these there died in battle, or in hospital of wounds received in battle, ninety-six thousand men. There died in hospital of disease one hundred and eighty-four thousand. Many went home wounded, to die among the scenes of their infancy. Many went home stricken with lingering and mortal disease. Of these there is no record but in the sad memories which haunt nearly every Northern home. The losses on the Southern side have not been accurately ascertained. But it must be under the truth to say that one hundred and fifty thousand Southerners perished in the field or in the hospital. It has been estimated that the entire cost of the war, on both sides, was not less than eighteen hundred million pounds sterling.” And this war was the direct consequence of the ingrained habit of looking upon the state governments as sovereign powers, instead of looking to the national government as the supreme sovereign and final arbiter in all disputes. In a word, it is directly traceable to the federal principle itself. Thus Mackenzie writes:—“For three-quarters of a century the belief possessed Southern minds that they owed allegiance to their State rather than to the Union. Each State was sovereign. Having to-day united itself with certain sister sovereignties, it was free to-morrow to withdraw and enter into new combinations. America
was in this view no nation, but a mere incoherent concourse of independent powers. This question had been raised when the Constitution was framed, and it had been debated ever since. It was settled now. The blood shed in a hundred battles from Manassas to Petersburg expressed the esteem in which the Northern people held their national life. The doctrine of States' Rights was conclusively refuted by the surrender of Lee's army, and the right of America to be deemed a nation was established for ever.” And yet Australian politicians have not learnt wisdom from this gigantic sociological experiment, and propose to leave with the existing state governments all those powers not contained in the written constitution, and imagine that, by adding the word “indissoluble” to the constitution, they can make it so in reality. Herbert Spencer calls the doctrine of the absolute or divine power of parliaments “the great political superstition.”

Here is an instance of the great superstition thriving under the Australian sun. As Garran writes, quoting Freeman, “a federation, though legally perpetual, is something which is, in its own nature, essentially voluntary; there is a sort of inconsistency in retaining members against their will.” The term indissoluble, then, either means nothing, or it means that physical force is to be used in preventing the states leaving the union if it proves unsatisfactory. Thus the unwisdom of politicians lays up trouble for future generations. It would be ridiculous to see men repeating the same old political blunders time after time were it not so saddening. Men continually exclaim:—“We want a new Moses to lead us out of bondage;” but God speaks to men to-day just as He did in the times of old. If men would take up Dante, or Plato, or Hobbes, or Goethe, or Emerson, or Carlyle, or even Huxley, they would find the political truth which they profess to desire expressed in no uncertain manner. But the truth is that men are in bondage to themselves, to their own jealousies and passions. Though one rose from the dead they would not believe. Federation is born in distrust and ends in despotism and despair, or in the roar of cannon and the tread of armed hosts. Men are free agents, and therefore even God cannot help them. Thus they have to work out their own salvation by conflict, until they have learnt wisdom, learnt to believe in the possibility of human perfection, learnt to trust those who in every age proclaim eternal truths.

Let us glance again at the war of secession in the United States; we shall see that the same causes that led to the war are operating at this moment in Australia, though in a less intense form, and unless we take warning from the past are certain to lead to a like result. It is curious how history repeats itself. “South Carolina was the least loyal to the Union of all the States,” writes Mackenzie. “She estimated very highly her own dignity as a
sovereign State. She held in small account the allegiance which she owed to the Federal Government. Twenty-eight years ago Congress had enacted a highly protective tariff. South Carolina, disapproving of this measure, decreed that it was not binding on her. . . . President Jackson believed firmly that the men who then held the destiny of South Carolina in their hands wished to secede. The tariff, he said, was but a pretext. The next will be the slavery question.” It will be remembered in this connection that New South Wales held aloof from the Federal Council. Again, Premier Reid spoke of an anti-federal conspiracy in Brisbane at a public meeting in Sydney. Now, in the first place, the Australian colonies are loyal to the English Crown, and are, therefore, not independent sovereign powers. Federation, then, in the strict sense of the word, is impossible. The American states could federate, because they had thrown off their allegiance. Federation, then, means simply a closer union under the Crown. But under the proposed Commonwealth Bill, while certain definite powers are given to the Federal Government, the residue of power is reserved to the states. Dr. Quick says—“In the Senate they will be represented as sovereign states.” But as they never were sovereign states, how can federation under the Crown make them so? In plain English federation is an attempt to throw off the allegiance to the English Crown. No amount of quibbling can get the federalist out of this dilemma. It is a deliberate attempt to give the states of Australia powers they have not got at present. It is a deliberate attempt to substitute the imperfect bond of a written constitution for the human living bond which at present unites the scattered portions of the British empire. If there is a conspiracy then at all, federation is the conspiracy, and Premier Reid is the arch-conspirator. It is well that the people of Australia should understand this matter. Garran is an acknowledged authority on federation. He writes, in his “Coming Commonwealth”:—“The constitution of the Commonwealth being an imperial statute, will, technically speaking, be (like the Canadian constitution) amendable by the British Parliament. We may, however, rest assured that, once passed, it will never again be meddled with by the British Parliament, except at the urgent request of the Commonwealth and the States.” Again: “When a federal government is interposed between the Empire and the colony . . . there will be no further need for even a nominal control by the Imperial Government over the individual states, seeing that the imperial interests will be fully protected by the control exercised, through the Governor-General over the Commonwealth.” Unless the Crown explicitly resigns its rights, its sovereign power, the sovereign power remains vested in the Governor-General, and therefore the states are
not independent sovereigns.

But to return to slavery in America. Mackenzie wrote:—“In the Convention which met to frame a Constitution for America, the feeling of antagonism to slavery was supreme. Had the majority followed their own course, provision would have been made for the gradual extinction of slavery. But there arose here a necessity for one of those compromises by which the history of America has been so sadly marked.” Federation is essentially a compromise, it must be remembered. “When it was proposed to prohibit the importation of slaves, all the Northern and most of the Southern States favoured the proposal. But South Carolina and Georgia were insatiable in their thirst for African labour. They decisively refused to become parties to a Union in which there was to be no importation of slaves. The other States yielded.” Out of this compromise sprang the war of secession. “But for the Southern love and the Northern antipathy to slavery, no war could have occurred.” Of the American constitution, Bryce writes:—“It was and remains what its authors styled it, eminently an instrument of compromises. It is perhaps the most successful instance in history of what a judicious system of compromise may effect. Yet, out of the points which it was for this reason obliged to leave unsettled there arose fierce controversies, which after two generations, when accumulated irritation and incurable misunderstandings had been added to the force of material interests, burst into flame in the war of secession.” Now, in Australia, those resident in the northern parts declare that development of the country is impossible without coloured labour. Here, then, is a case similar to that of the negro in America. If the northern colonies join an indissoluble federation, the southern colonies, which can be developed without coloured labour, may object to its introduction, and may resist, by force of arms, the secession of the northern colonies if rather than give up what is necessary to their development they determine to leave the federation. The northern colonies are not likely to join an indissoluble federation, for this reason. As things are, the southern colonies have no right to object to receive alien races, subjects of the Empire. No power, however, is likely to force these races upon them, but, at the same time, they have no right to dictate to the north, where the conditions of life are very different. And other matters are certain to arise which no written constitution can provide for. An indissoluble federation is really an absurdity. Is there no way out of the difficulty? Certainly there is. Abandon the idea of a written constitution as supreme, and trust to the wisdom of a national government to deal with matters as they arise, and preclude this government from ever using physical force to attain its ends. Under these
conditions no state, however small, would have anything to fear from the tyranny of a majority. This is simply the application of the Christian idea to politics. No stable state can be founded upon force; the use of physical force provokes reaction. If it be clearly laid down from the first that the national government has no right to use other than intellectual weapons, including ridicule and satire if necessary, no state ought to be jealous of a national government. And this is simply the application of the device of constitutional sovereignty to Australian politics. The state constitution need not be interfered with, or their lands or institutions. But the national government should have the right to denounce what it deems wrong, and to point out the right course in any difficulty, as also to indicate the direction of true progress. All that it is necessary to do to enable the central government to use its influence is to establish a national newspaper, with subordinate organs in the different states, for the collection of information and the dissemination of truth. To a concentration of power there are many objections; to a concentration of knowledge or wisdom, dissociated entirely from power, there are none. The really best persons, those who are best fitted to rule, hate to have to use physical force to attain their ends, even in a right cause; the use of force should be left to the state governments as at present. No standing army is needed in Australia, merely a defence force against invasion, and there is not the slightest doubt that against an invader all the colonies would willingly unite. The national territory and city should be in the centre of Australia, and thus defended by the states its inhabitants could devote themselves entirely to peaceful pursuits—pastoral, horticultural, and artistic. In this national domain, which would also be a great educational centre, would be collected the best and wisest persons, and to such the people always do look up, let modern sophists say what they please. The rights which a government of this sort would possess would be simply those of a constitutional monarch, as described by Bagehot in his “English Constitution”:—“The sovereign has, under a constitutional monarchy such as ours, three rights—the right to be consulted, the right to encourage, the right to warn. And a king of great sense and sagacity would want no others. He would find that his having no others would enable him to use these with singular effect. He would say to his minister—'The responsibility of these measures is upon you. Whatever you think best must be done. Whatever you think best shall have my full and effectual support. But you will observe that for this reason and that reason what you propose to do is bad; for this reason and that reason what you do not propose is better. I do not oppose, but I warn.' Supposing the king to be right, and to have what kings often have—the gift of effectual
expression—he could not help moving his minister. He might not always
turn his course, but he would always trouble his mind."

Now it is curious to observe that this highly civilized and Christian form
of government has already been born into Australia. I allude to the Federal
Council, which only wants to be complemented by the personal influence
of a strong character capable of sympathizing with all classes to make it
into an instrument of national government such as is suited to Australia,
where the people are civilized enough to dispense with government by
force, and reasonable enough to be controlled by a purely spiritual
influence. It is only domineering politicians who despise the Federal
Council, and it is only natural to find New South Wales, as the most
ambitious and domineering of the colonies, treating it with the greatest
scorn and contumely. Besides, with a government of this kind, purely
deliberative in nature, there would be no occasion for a cumbrous
representative assembly—that is to say, there would be no creation of a
large number of new political billets for the political class. Naturally
politicians on the look-out for spoils, and anxious to domineer, decline to
look upon such a form of government as practicable. But when the people
once understand the matter they are not likely to be deluded by their
political masters. Mr. Alfred Deakin once thought well of the Federal
Council, and wrote an interesting account of it, from which I take that
which follows. We shall see that the Federal Council exhibits just those
features which are the usual accompaniments of a higher and more
civilized individuality:—“The Federal Council of Australasia is a political
phenomenon, almost unclassifiable, and so entirely local in character and
origin that it may be termed indigenous. Unique as the platypus, it is a
perfectly original development, compounded from familiar but previously
unassociated types. The elective principle is set aside in the Council, all of
whose delegates, as they are sometimes termed, are at present nominees.
Its first vital distinction is that it has no fellow chamber. Its second
distinctive feature is that the right of secession is expressly reserved to
every colony. Its members are unpaid. It is purely legislative. It has more
rigorous constitutional limitations than any of the bodies to which it has
been compared. Its sphere of independent legislation is small, and upon
most of the subjects with which it is empowered to deal by statute its
authority remains dormant until after the receipt of a request for its
exercise upon one or more of those subjects from two or more of the
colonies. The legislation then passed applies, not to the whole federation,
but only to the constituencies from which the request has come. Another
singularity is that the Council has included, and can still include, colonies
such as Fiji, which, not having attained responsible government, are still in leading strings to London, receiving their officers and taking their instructions from the Colonial Office. The money powers of the Council are practically nil; it has no means of raising revenue, and is absolutely dependent for its funds upon the colonies included within its boundaries, who are required to find the necessary expenses connected with its business in sums proportionate to population. . . . The Federal Council has been endowed with an extra-territorial sphere of legislation wider than that conceded to Canada, or, indeed, to any other local government under the Crown. It has other possibilities which, so far, its career has not unfolded, though they exist in germ, in its constitution. Meanwhile the misconceptions engendered by its novel character afford plenty of matter for the scoffer, for it is at once influential and feeble, dependent and independent, simple and complex, definite in many details, and yet extremely indefinite in jurisdiction. How far it has travelled from the customary British model may be gathered from the circumstance that it transacts its business without a ministry or a department, without a leader or an opposition, without a party or a programme; that there is no necessary continuity of representation, or similarity in the mode of appointment of representatives, or fixed area within which its legislation has force; that it is vagrant in domicile, and without a roof to shelter it, without a foot of territory to rest upon, without a ship or soldier to protect it, without a single man in its service, or a shilling of its own to pay one.”

A higher human personality always comes into the world in this way, is misunderstood and scoffed at by those very persons whose influence it is destined to supersede. The self-restraint is looked upon as weakness; its preference for the use of persuasion instead of force is called pusillanimity. Christ himself came into the world in a similar manner to the Federal Council. He disappointed his adherents who were anxious to use force, and yet anyone can see to-day that Christianity has prevailed in so far as it did not use force, because it claimed only a willing obedience.

Everyone knows how the Federal Council came into existence. The Colonial Office failed to do its duty to the colonies, and the colonies found in Sir Thomas M‘Ilwraith, not a Blunderbore, but a man capable of rising to a great occasion, a man who, whatever his faults, is the strongest statesman Queensland has had. As Goldwin Smith said of Canada:—“The amending power is not in the Canadian people, but on the other side of the Atlantic, and it might just as well be in another planet.” The Colonial Office does not understand our needs; it is too far away. How ignorant Englishmen are of Australian affairs may be gathered from this, which
appeared in Burke's “Peerage and Knightage” for 1898:—“Right Hon. Sir Hugh Muir Nelson (P.C.) 1897, K.C.M.G. (1896), Premier, Chief Secretary, and Colonial Treasurer, Colony of Queensland; succeeded Sir Thomas M’Ilwraith as Premier and Vice-President of Council, 1893; was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia, 8th of February, 1887, which appointment he resigned in 1892.” And if anyone likes to look up the account of the Mount Morgan gold mine in the “Encyclopaedia Britannica,” he will see that it is full of gross errors. Evidently England fails as a centre of intelligence, such as is wanted in Australia. If Australian politicians will only let the Council develop naturally it can be made into such a centre. But they are determined, like the American statesmen, to have a forced union, which is sure to bring about reaction and perhaps war. The absurdity of the thing is evident. Queenslanders are told that they will have to come into the federal union later on.

The Federal Council is really a reproduction of the Cabinet a fourth form of government, which has arisen in modern times, in response to complex social necessities. But in England the Cabinet is not independent of the parliamentary system, of party government. “The fourth power is parasitical to the three others, and lives upon their life, without any separate existence,” wrote Gladstone. But a further development of it must make it independent of the party system—make it an organ of national life—and we see the tendency to this in the Federal Council. Of the Cabinet, Gladstone wrote:—“It is perhaps the most curious formation in the political world of modern times, not for its dignity, but for its subtlety, its elasticity, and its many-sided diversity of power. It is the complement of the entire system—a system which appears to want nothing but a through loyalty in the persons comprising its several parts, with a reasonable intelligence, to insure its bearing, without fatal damage, the wear and tear of ages yet to come.” It is the complement we want in Australia to unite the different states. But it must be made national, not federal, and also brought into touch with the people. The party system is out of place in national affairs. The Australian states wish to retain their own individuality unimpaired. But if a central parliament is established in accordance with the Commonwealth Bill, the central government is sure in time to absorb the state governments, as in Canada and America it is doing. The revival, however, of the Federal Council, and its transformation into a National Council, will preserve the individuality of the states, so that they can develop themselves unimPed by undue centralization.

Each state should elect one member, the best man it can find, to the National Council, and the people of all the states—Australia as one
electorate—should elect one President, who would be thus directly responsible to the nation. This would prevent that irresponsibility which is at present a feature of Cabinet government. In England the King was for a long time the head of the Cabinet, so that this is no innovation. The people should always have the right of appealing to the President, and the President the right of appealing directly to the people. This would be equivalent to the referendum and initiative, which are, after all, but imperfect substitutes (rendered necessary by the radical defects of federal government) for the right of petition on the part of the people, and the right of veto on the part of the monarch. The National Council would thus contain the highest wisdom of Australia, and be at the same time animated by the popular impulse, to the lack of which its impotence is largely due. And the Council should have a continuous existence; its members might be changed, but it should never be dissolved, while the President should hold office for life, elected by a majority of the whole people, and removable by the same means. Thus the inconveniences attending the American system would be avoided. The members of the Council should be nominated by the President and approved of by the people of the states. The President should not have political offices in his gift. “In every country statesmen find the dispensing of patronage the most disagreeable part of their work, and the more conscientious they are the more does it worry them.” Thus writes Bryce. “The American President,” he says, “is hampered at every turn by the necessity of humouring his party. He is so much engrossed by the trivial and mechanical parts of his work as to have little leisure for framing large schemes of policy.”

It may be objected, “Why should not every state be represented by two persons?” But this would simply be to introduce the party system into national affairs, in which party should have no place. Ability, character must always produce its due effect. If a small state can produce a finer form of character than a large one, it is because it as a community is better than the larger community, and as rule rightly belongs to character and not to mere magnitude, the smaller state should in such a case have a larger influence in national affairs. When this is understood every state will take care to send its very best man, whereas if two men were sent to the Council it might happen, as in America—“whereas,” says Bryce, “a man may be, and has been, elected President by a minority of popular votes.” For national purposes a consensus of opinion is necessary, and this is impossible under the party system. And why should the President nominate members to the Council? Simply because intuitive knowledge of character is a natural gift of great men. If this nomination is subject to the approval
of the people the great objection to nomination is removed. And every member of the Council might hold office until either the people of the states or the President desired his removal.

To return to the question of slavery in America. Was the North altogether in the right when it forced the South to admit the negro to full political equality? The result shows that it was not; the negro is not equal in character to the white man, and no legislation can make him so. Kidd, in his “Social Evolution,” says of the negro:—“His position in the United States to-day is one of absolute subordination, under all the forms of freedom, to the race amongst whom he lives.” He quotes Laird Clowes to the effect “that the white man rules as supremely as he did in the days of slavery. The black man is permitted to have little or nothing to say; he is simply thrust on one side. At every political crisis the cry of the minority is—‘This is a white man's question,’ and the cry is generally uttered in such a tone as to effectually warn off the black man from meddling with the matter.” In the midst of democratic civilization, and under its forms and cover, the war of races is waged as effectively and with practically the same results as in any other state of society. Says Mr. Clowes:—“Throughout the South the social position of the man in whose veins negro blood courses is unalterably fixed at birth. The child always bears with him the visible marks of his origin, and those marks condemn him to remain for ever at the bottom of the social ladder.” The negro has not the force of character to rise, and no legislation can make him do so in a free country. Had he the character he should be allowed to rise. But colour, as science knows, is not an accident; it indicates character. The white races need never fear the coloured as long as they have faith in themselves. The federal government in America is unable to do justice to, or to protect the negro, and “many thoughtful and earnest persons are so impressed with the gravity of the problem that they recommend and seriously advocate the deportation of the 7,000,000 of the coloured race back to their original home in Africa as the only effective solution.” In other words, America confesses its impotence to solve the question. But it is the duty of the ruling races to use and educate the coloured. The coloured races are necessary to them, and it is only because our governments are so feeble and unwise, and so mercenary, that the people object to coloured labour. The Federal Council has already obtained from its constituencies the references required prior to legislation upon the question of the naturalization of aliens from an intercolonial point of view.

The matter of coloured labour and the organization of labour generally must be left to the states; the duty of the national government would be to
point out the right way of treating the matter and to denounce abuses. The pure wages system might be applied to the north of Australia, the profit-sharing system to the centre, the co-operative system to the south, and the communistic to the national state. For as Mill says:—"The élite of mankind, and only the élite, are civilized enough to live together as one family, enjoying all things in common."

Now, if the Commonwealth Bill is carried, and another cumbrous parliament is added to already overgoverned Australia, what is almost certain to happen? There are not men enough to work so much political machinery. Either the state governments will lose power, or the central government will gain despotic control, or there will be a deadlock, a balance. But those who believe in the law of evolution know that a stationary balance is an impossible state of things, is liable to be upset at any moment by a feather weight, by even a tick. As Dr. Quick says:—"The Senate will be overshadowed by the House of Representatives, in which the principle of responsible government will operate to magnify that House at the expense of the Senate." In other words the Australian House of Commons will rule the roost. The decadence of parliaments, however, is an acknowledged fact by nearly all political thinkers, and the people themselves are becoming generally disgusted with their tyranny and incompetency. Parliaments have had plenty of time to put social matters in order; they have miserably failed, and the reason is simple. Houses of Commons represent the average intelligence of a community, i.e., mediocrity, and not wisdom. The English House of Commons is admittedly the best in the world. Augustine Birrell, M.P., writes:—"There is nothing noble or exalted in the House of Commons. Indeed, a devil's advocate, had he the requisite talent, could easily deliver an oration as long and as eloquent as any of Burke's or Sheridan's, taking as his subject the stupidity, cowardice, and, until quite recent times, the corruption of the House of Commons. I confess I cannot call to mind a single occasion in its long and remarkable history when the House of Commons, as a whole, played a part either obviously heroic or conspicuously wise; but we all of us can recall hundreds of occasions when, heroism and wisdom being greatly needed, the House of Commons exhibited either selfish indifference, crass ignorance, or the vulgarest passion. Nor can it be honestly said that our parliamentary heroes have been the noblest of our race." Is the Australian House of Commons likely to be better than the English? To judge by the existing parliaments, it is likely to be far worse. There is one party in our existing parliaments that exercises a healthy criticism, and that is the Labour party. But that party was excluded from
the Convention, and is also likely, it will be said, to be excluded from the House of Representatives while representatives are elected on a state basis. But here, as in America, the parties are certain to swamp the states. As Bryce says, the Americans have reproduced the party system in spite of themselves. So the Labour party is certain to be strongly represented in the Federal House. Well, what will happen? The politicians and the Labour party will play into one another's hands; the spoils system will come into full operation, with disastrous results to the community at large, and eventually to the politicians themselves, but they will be the last to suffer. Now, New South Wales, it is admitted, is federation, and Mr. Reid, it is admitted, is New South Wales. Therefore Mr. Reid is likely to be Governor-General, and he is not a Blunderbore; on the contrary, a man of strong, though not high, character. He has lately imbibed Imperialism, but that will soon work off. This is what the Australian Star wrote about him some time ago:—“The Premier has shown an adaptability to humour the Labour party that has delighted these gentlemen. He has withdrawn from any position if he found that his proposals were distasteful to Mr. M‘Gowan and his followers, and by this means he has succeeded in controlling a majority ready at all times to pass anything submitted, on the unwritten understanding that the demands of the Labour party should be duly respected when they were advanced. The squeezing process was in this manner indulged in the most liberal fashion. Backed up by a majority the like of which has not for many years stood behind a government, the Premier has never hesitated to use his power.” Can the leopard change his spots?

Now let us turn to the history of the Roman Empire, and we shall see this same squeezing process in operation and its results. In the Contemporary Review of January, 1898, there is an article on “The Fall of the Roman Empire and its Lessons for Us,” by Thomas Hodgkin, D.C.L. “Of the causes of her ruin,” he writes, “first and foremost, I think, we must place the fact that the imperial diadem was in the gift of the soldiery. The Emperor, as I have said, had become an absolute necessity to the Roman state, but his name, Imperator, meant General, and it was as the master of thirty legions, and in defiance of all the maxims of the constitution, that Caesar had won supreme power. Could his dynasty have settled down into a regular, time-hallowed succession of sovereigns, from father to son, the empire might have lasted till modern times. From the causes at which I have already hinted this was impossible. In less than a century after Augustus became sole sovereign the last of his descendants perished by his own hand. In the civil wars which followed, the legions discovered that
emperors could be made elsewhere than in Rome, and from that time onward this thought was always more or less in the mind of every ambitious general: ‘Who knows what may be the turn of Fortune's wheel. Who knows but I may one day be lord of all.’ ”

Now, to make this applicable to our case, we have simply to substitute for soldiers politicians, and for generals premiers. According to the English Constitution, the sovereign, the only national person or representative in the state, is the final authority, the person who is above all law, and has the right to amend law in response to national needs when other constituted authorities fail to do their duty. Mr. Gladstone, e.g., secured the abolition of purchase in the army by invoking the powers of the sovereign, and anyone who wishes to know the powers of the sovereign can refer to Bagehot's “English Constitution.” Our politicians do not seem to be aware of the constitutional power of the Crown, and the reason is that, as a matter of fact, the English House of Commons has usurped the powers of the Crown, with disastrous consequences to the nation. Disastrous, since the people—e.g., in the recent engineers' strike—cease to look to the Crown as the constitutional power to be appealed to in the last resort; the consequence is civil war. In the recent engineers' strike the Government could have brought the employers to reason by insisting on the fulfilment of Admiralty contracts, but it did not do so, although the employers declared they would have no independent chairman, as such a person would give the men something, whereas they had the men at their mercy. The men did not look to the Queen to help them, because, thanks to parliamentary usurpation, they have lost the habit of doing so. Parliamentary premiers thus resemble the Roman generals in their practical defiance of the maxims of the constitution. Each politician aspires to be premier or emperor, but as to attain this prize he has to flatter and intrigue, and as when he does get the prize his position is not permanent, and as he is not above party, like the sovereign, general irresponsibility, demoralization, and corruption spreads through society from the top downwards. There is this much sense in hereditary monarchy, that rulers of men are born and not made; no number of votes can make a ruler, and where, as in America, real natural distinctions of character are ignored, then presidential government generally becomes, as Bagehot says, “government by an unknown quantity”—in other words, by a nonentity. In the case of Australia the Governor-General is to be nominated by the Queen. So far good, but the nomination ought to be approved of by the whole nation. What does nomination by the Queen mean, as a matter of fact? Sir George Grey, in the Convention debates of 1891, said:— “The
terms used are ‘the Queen shall appoint,’ but we all know perfectly well that that means that the minister for the time being shall appoint such person as he pleases, whilst such appointment might be absolutely obnoxious to Her Majesty herself. The meaning of the thing is that a friend or any other person chosen by the minister may be appointed without the people of this great confederacy being in any way consulted.” The people of Australia should clearly understand that appointment by the Queen really means appointment by those very politicians who have usurped the sovereign power, and the absurdity of the thing is patent when we consider that the chief duty of the sovereign is to make the politicians understand that they are responsible to the people. Is it not evident that at this moment in Australia the chief politicians in many cases do just as they please?

Hodgkin writes:—“A second great cause of the decay of the Roman empire was undoubtedly the fact that it was founded on slavery, which was accepted as part of the necessary and eternal order of things. . . . As has been seen over and over again in the history of the world, slave labour drove out free labour; the very fact that labour is performed by slaves makes labour dishonourable. So the delusion is fostered that only war and politics are the fitting business of the free man. The happy life of honourable toil is abandoned, and there are left only a dissolute and turbulent mob in the cities, gangs of miserable, despairing, vengeance-brooding slaves in the country. And this process, the replacement of the noble free population of Italy by gangs of slaves, was powerfully helped by a measure which seemed at first sight fair and reasonable—the distribution of cheap corn to the citizens of Rome. While the senator was adorning his villa with pictures and statues, the plunder of the conquered provinces, was it not reasonable that the poor plebeian should have the battle of life made a little easier for him, by paying seventeen pence instead of three shillings for his monthly flour bill? And yet, practically, no measure tended more than this to the degradation and ruin of the Roman commonalty, to the destruction of that very class from which had been drawn the stout soldiers of the Punic and Macedonian wars. The cheap purchase was gradually turned into a free gift; the bushels of corn were turned into readybaked loaves of bread, distributed to the mob as they sat upon steps lining the seven hills of Rome. The provinces, especially Egypt and Africa, were put under contribution in order to supply the annona or corn largesse of the Roman people. It came to be recognized as one of the first duties of the ruler, whether he were called Consul, Emperor, or Praetorian Prefect, to keep up this dole of corn to its full amount—if possible, to increase it. Thus the fabric of the Roman empire became a crowned socialism—
outdoor relief for the mass of the city dwellers at the bottom of the fabric; absolute, irresponsible power and unchecked extravagance at the top. Certainly, as far as the experience of the Roman empire goes, it seems to show that socialism cannot be co-existent with liberty. All this deluge of cheap corn—nay, of absolutely gratuitous corn—poured into Italy, meant ruin to the Italian farmer. The petty farmers of Italy as a class rapidly disappeared. Arable land was turned into pasture. The great latifundia passed into the hands of senators and publicani, enriched by the plunder of the provinces. There, where once had been the happy homesteads of men who could wield the pilum or drive the plough with equal patient courage, were now vast plains, grazed over by flocks of sheep, tilled, as far as tilth was necessary, by gangs of slaves, whose chains clanked as they moved, while afar off rose the walls of the ergartulum, not their home, but their nightly prison.” These are the beautiful results of unscientific philanthropy. When unwise rulers give way to unwise popular demands they bring a common ruin upon all.

To apply all this to our own case: The pure wages system is merely slavery upon a higher plane. The delusion with us to-day is not that politics and war are the only fitting business of a free man. The delusion is, however, that commerce, merely a higher kind of war, and politics are the only proper business of gentlemen. Hence the immense congestion in Australian towns, and the constant bleeding of the country to enrich the towns. W. Epps, writing on the land systems of Australia, says of New South Wales:— “There is outside of Australasia no instance in the history of new countries to compare with this tadpole growth, which, if permitted to continue for another hundred years, would result in the total population of the colony being over 60 millions of souls, with a population in the metropolis alone of some 45 millions. Such a prospect is appalling. It possibly is a reductio ad absurdum, but it is the natural sequence to the present progress of settlement.” The Hon. B. R. Wise writes:—“Mr. Carruthers thinks the federal capital should be near Sydney; others would prefer it inland; but there can be little doubt that it will be situated within the territory of New South Wales. Not only was this the general feeling among members of the Convention, but no other colony is able to offer the Commonwealth suitable areas of Crown lands.” The members of the Convention, as they represent states, thought of nothing else, and completely forgot Central Australia and the Northern Territory. The federal city then, if it is left to the Federal Parliament to decide, is likely to be in New South Wales. There the politicians will build up the cumbrous federal machine, over which Premier Reid will preside and dole out his “corn
largesse” to the mob of Welshmen as they sit upon steps around the political temple, for the thin end of the wedge has already been introduced for this corn largesse. “The Federal Parliament is authorized to legislate for pensions to the aged and crippled.” This is the modern form of corn largesse. Thus Australia will gradually be converted into a crowned socialism with Reid as Caesar.

In the Contemporary Review of June, 1894, H. W. Wolff gives an account of “Old Age Pensions in Practice” in Germany. A few extracts will be instructive. He conducted a personal inquiry, embracing many different districts, had introductions to the officials, and got independent evidence from different classes. “To the official mind at Berlin the practical results thus far obtained appear to stamp the measure a grand success. At the central office I heard little but self-congratulation upon what was thought a very satisfactory achievement indeed. . . . The Old Age Pension Bill when first brought forward was most unpopular; all classes protested; but the Emperor William pressed acceptance, and his all-powerful minister insisted upon it with all the force of his unbending will. I attended a gathering of Conservative electors convened to hear an explanation of the measure by Count A——, the member. Every man of influence in the district was there. Everyone spoke most warmly for the bill as the one measure needed. The scene changed. All these same country gentlemen were assembled in a private room waiting for their carriages. And not a man was there among them all who did not vigorously curse what a moment before he had unctuously blessed.” Thus we see the measure was forced by the Government on the country. And now for some of the results. “At Munich the leader of the ‘Bauernbund’ complained to me that his peasants now have actually to contribute more in insurance money than they pay in rates and taxes. And for industrial employers insurance tells up to such figures as these:—One establishment in Essen paid in 1892 £23,000 in insurance money and rates, equal to 17.39 per cent. of the dividend; a third company has actually been made to pay in 1891 nearly 18 per cent., and in 1892 22 per cent. of its share capital. Herr Krupp alone pays, for old age and disablement insurance only, £12,500 a year, to which his men have to find another £12,500.” It may be said this is only bleeding the “fat man” in the interest of the people. But it is not. It is bleeding fat man and people alike to keep a cumbrous administrative machinery going, and a class of officials in prime condition. “All political and social parties, I was assured, were reconciled to the Act. It must have been rather a rude awakening for administrators to find a coalition of Conservatives and Ultramontanes leading a fierce attack against the measure in Parliament. The working
classes, as will be shown, were as unreconciled as ever. And the socialists were quiescent really only because they held the Government to be playing their game. The Act has broken down because of the importation into its administration of the representative system which we hold so dear, but which in the present instance rendered the measure unwieldy and inefficient. ‘Here am I,’ complained to me one of the ablest administrators under the Act, the head of a large provincial department ‘with an army of some four thousand voluntary officers, not one of whom does his duty. They might be suppressed to-morrow without the work being any the worse.’ The Government will have it in Germany that voluntary insurance has failed, and that the attempts to put it in practice have proved that German working men, left to their own discretion, will not insure. The first principle accepted was that of compulsion. Yet here are, in spite of fines, and of control, and of penal processes mounting up, some months ago, to something like 10,000 out of about 15,500,000 persons liable in the empire only 11,200,000 actually insured. I have been made to hear from officials in charge of the administration of the Act the same sad tale of shirking and elusion. The entire mechanism of the measure was so contrived as in theory to make failure of insurance an impossibility. Only in some particularly well-administered districts, such as the Kingdom of Saxony, has control proved really effective, thanks to a larger staff of officers employed, of course at additional cost. A larger staff as controllers is to be brought into the field to drive labourers to the insurance offices. That will add to the expense, but somehow insurance is to be enforced. Here is a plain confession of failure, traceable not to a miscarriage of method only. The unsatisfactory result means that whatever they may do or fail to do under the voluntary principle—a question not yet fairly tested—under compulsion the labouring classes will have to be driven into insurance by sheer irresistible force. What keeps the labourers back is their aversion to the principle of compulsion. The introduction of compulsion has already very seriously, dangerously, impaired the disposition to self-help and the provident spirit among these same labouring classes. Even zealous administrators of the Act have made no secret of this to me. It remains to note a rather serious incidental drawback in the effects of the Act. All this huge sum of money amassed, which makes such a splendid show in the returns, is really withdrawn from productive employment, in a country which does not suffer from a plethora of capital. In the main, the insurance reserve remains idle—a standing temptation to governments to lay their hands upon, as the French Government under Napoleon III. laid its hands upon the Savings Banks' moneys. It is a temptation to the raising of
popular demands to be turned to account in the game of politics for larger concessions. The large employers demand that the divided, half self-governed administrations should be absorbed in one great Government office. But the federated governments would never listen to such a proposal. Here is a source of danger of a fresh kind. There are some who recommend a return to the purely voluntary principle. But is that possible? Most people think not. The State has entered into millions of engagements; it has concluded millions of contracts; it is tied down to the Act. ‘Your criticism may be perfectly just,’ remarked to me one high official in the south of Germany, ‘but we cannot now repeal the Act. For better, for worse, we are pledged to it.’ That avowal should be enough to make other nations pause before committing themselves to a course so irreversible. Once Government adopted the principle of compulsion, it deliberately put the end of a powerful lever into the hands of those who claim insurance for all. Advance is really possible only in one direction, and that the direction which the Government and Parliament at the outset distinctly repudiated—away from providence, away from self-help, away from individual effort, to wholesale state pay.” Thus Germany is following the same course as Rome did, and tends to become a crowned socialism. Perhaps Australians can see now why politicians like old age pensions—it gives a chance of billets and power for their class. Is Australia prepared for socialism, with George Reid as emperor? The essence of socialism, as commonly understood, is state compulsion, force. Christian socialism is a voluntary co-operation. And the federation the colonies are asked to form is to be indissoluble. That, as I said before, either means nothing or means the use of physical force. Australians, have nothing to do with any indissoluble federation, if you value your liberty! Tasmanians, do you think you could escape the clutches of a vast centralized Australia? The thin end of the wedge of the pension system once introduced, the state machine, as we have seen, goes on gathering momentum, grinding out place and pay for sleek officials. This is what comes of unintelligent philanthropy.

And there is another utterly unscientific proviso in the Commonwealth Bill—the granting of bounties.

But let us return to the Roman empire. Hodgkin writes:—“A fourth and most potent cause of the ruin of the empire was the financial oppression of the middle classes. I have said that the state tended more and more to become a crowned socialism. Caesar in his stately house on the Palatine might lord it as he pleased over the lives of the senators and the treasures of the state, so long as he kept the soldiers in good humour by sufficient donations, and the mob of Rome, and the other big cities, happy with bread
and beast shows. But this tacit compact of the highest and lowest meant ruin to all the classes between them. Upon the middle classes all over the empire was thrown the burden of taxation, a burden which became absolutely crushing as the years rolled on.” I must remind my readers here of the “squeezing process” the Australian Star alluded to as put in force by Premier Reid. Apparently the Australian middle classes think the governing machine of New South Wales is not a powerful enough pair of pincers, and so they want a bigger federal pair to complete the process. For the politicians in modern times are simply taking the place of the soldiers of the Roman empire, and their supremacy spells ruin to all classes of the community, and the destruction of all healthy individuality.

The Australian people have now a splendid opportunity of putting an end to parliamentary tyranny by constitutional means, but once the federal machine starts grinding, nothing but bloodshed and revolution will remove it—unless, indeed, it can be killed by ridicule. But I am afraid the Australian people have not got much sense of humour, or the ridiculous aspect of some of the recent sayings of the leaders of the Convention would have provoked their mirth. “This bill,” says Mr. Deakin, “is absolutely more liberal than any other constitution in the world.” And yet the people have not even the right to approve of their own national head, really the sole safeguard they have against the tyranny of a parliamentary majority. “This is the nearest approach to the perfection of representative democracy that can be found in any federal constitution in the world, or in any imperial constitution,” says Mr. Glynn. And yet Stuart Mill wrote:—“The ideally perfect constitution of a public office is that in which the interest of the functionary is entirely coincident with his duty. No mere system will make it so, but still less can it be made so without a system aptly devised for the purpose.” And the system devised by the Convention is one calculated to give the supreme power to a politician trained in party intrigue, saturated with the oil of the machine. Is he a likely person to simplify the machinery and reduce the number of politicians whenever possible? Politicians always forget that government is a necessary evil, and not a good, and is only necessary at all because men are imperfectly civilized.

E. Haeckel says, and all scientists agree with him, “that one of the organic transformations progress exhibits is the numerical diminution of identical parts. The numerical diminution of pairs of legs is a progress in the organization of articulated animals.” The pairing of members of parliament is a temporary illustration of this law of progress. Unfortunately, however, the members only pair to the refreshment room
and get attached again. But with the progress of society there ought to be a reduction in the number of controllers. A politician pure and simple is as little likely to reduce the numbers of officials as he is to pare away his own legs.

“The people of Australia,” says Mr. Wise, “gave a clear answer to the question, ‘Which offers the greater advantages and the fewer disadvantages to Australia—to continue to be governed as six separate colonies or to unite in a federal union for the common purposes of trade and defence?” when they selected ten delegates for each colony to frame a federal constitution.” Mr. Wise is apparently not aware that Queensland is part of Australia, and that people live there.

And if free trade and defence are all that federation means, where is the necessity for another parliament in already over-policed Australia? Cannot the question of free trade between the colonies be put directly to the people? And as to the question of defence, surely a National Council ought to be able to appoint a military adviser, an instructor in drill and the use of firearms, &c. If there is to be a standing national army at all, the intention must be to use it to force the authority of the Federal Parliament on the people whether they like it or not.

“Once concede,” says Mr. Wise, “that the Federal Executive must spend money, and, according to British ideas, money must be granted by a representative body, which is a parliament.” But there are already a lot of representative bodies quite capable of voting money without establishing another central parliament.
And as England is not a federation but a union, British ideas are not applicable here in their entirety. And a national council would be probably more representative than an assembly. If there was only one government for all Australia, then a central representative assembly or House of Commons would be necessary; but as the federalists profess not to desire unification, a national council meets all necessary requirements. And it is simply the bias of politicians towards increase of governing structures and self-aggrandizement that leads them to propose another house of assembly. As to the people demanding federation, this is all nonsense. Not half the people in Australia know what federation means or entails. The ideas of even educated men are quite hazy on the subject. There has never been any popular enthusiasm in the matter except in a few towns where opinion has largely been manufactured by the politicians themselves. The assumption that federation is the only form of union possible was made by the politicians themselves. King Demos, which they talk so much about, is a fiction of their own imaginations, useful for keeping them in power and place. As a matter of fact, the people are far more ready to follow leaders they can trust than the middle classes are, and are much more easily ruled if they are convinced of a man's honesty.

But the inadequacy of any federal form of government to meet Australian needs is perhaps more plainly disclosed by the clause relating to the formation of new states. Garran, in his “Coming Commonwealth,” writes:—“The most fundamental and essential of state rights is the right of each state to its own territory, and its own organic identity. Nor, on the other hand, ought the states to be allowed, without the consent of the Federal Parliament, to split up or coalesce, or even to alter their boundaries—a process which might seriously change the character of the federation. But the Federal Parliament should have power, with the consent of the parliaments of the states directly concerned, to effect any alteration of the kind.”

Now, in the first place it may be remarked that the Australian states, not being independent sovereigns, have no absolute ownership of their territory. Sir F. Pollock, in his “Land Laws,” writes:—“It is commonly supposed that land belongs to its owner in the same way as money or a watch. This has not been the theory of English law since the Norman conquest, nor has it been so in its full significance at any time. No absolute ownership of land is recognized by our law books, except in the Crown,
though no rent or services may be payable, and no grant from the Crown on record.” Federation here again is a deliberate attempt to deprive the Crown of its rights to land and give them to a number of states. It does not transfer these rights bodily, be it observed, to the Crown's representative in Australia, but gives them to the states, and as absolute territorial right is a cardinal doctrine of federation, it must do so as long as federation is federation. But establish a national government instead, and it at once becomes possible to transfer the whole right of the English Crown to land, unimpaired, to the national representative in Australia. Is it to the interest of the people of Australia that the existing state governments should have absolute control of land matters? Dealing with the statistics of land tenure in New South Wales, New Zealand, and South Australia, W. Epps wrote in his “Land Systems of Australia”:—“Such results can hardly be regarded as otherwise than appalling. That the operation of the land systems of these three provinces, for 65 years in one colony and a little over 50 years in two others, should have resulted in 1,250 persons securing almost one-half the total alienated area, while 105,000 others between them possess only just about one-fourth of the total extent alienated, is a striking commentary on the methods adopted. The unquestionable verdict must be that the systems have failed to produce true settlement. They have resulted largely in the building up of great freehold estates; the consequent locking up of capital in land which, leased under a secure tenure, would probably have shown vastly increased productive power; and the alienation from the Crown of huge areas of the most valuable country, which in the next generation or two would have supported some millions of people.” Of Australia as a whole Epps writes:—“There is no country in the world with a similar population in which such immense areas are held by private individuals. It is here made manifest beyond doubt that the existing land systems in the colonies, as a whole, have not resulted in bringing about genuine settlement. The present systems have failed miserably. The time has come for the people of Australia, if they desire that the remaining portion of their territory adapted for close settlement shall not pass entirely into a small number of great private holdings, to bestir themselves and face the position.”

The land question is thus emphatically one that a higher form of government, such as federalists claim that the federal is, should face and deal with intelligently. But, instead of this, what do we see? Federalists propose to leave the lands entirely at the discretion of those very parliaments which have failed so miserably. And not only this. By depriving the Crown of its acknowledged absolute legal rights to deal with
all lands for the good of the community, they take away the only effective lever by which those who have established a vast land monopoly can be moved. And, mind you, this is not an accident of federation but is of its very essence. If the absolute right of the Crown as the only national representative be allowed, there can be no federation. Here again we find federalists in a dilemma. Either they want to be independent of the Crown, or, when they speak of “federation under the Crown,” they are talking pure nonsense. The reassertion, and not the removal, of the rights of the Crown in respect to land is the first step in land reform. And federation means the absolute removal of those rights.

The truth really is that the first step of social reform in Australia is the removal of Australia's incubus, the doctrine of state rights as absolute and superior to national rights. And it is this incubus, this “Old Man of the Sea,” that federalists are endeavouring to fix upon the shoulders of Australia for all time, as is evidenced by these words of Garran in his “Coming Commonwealth,” on general amendment:—“There is precedent as well as reason in favour of safeguarding certain fundamental state rights by forbidding amendments directed against them unless with the consent of the states concerned. If, however, the territory of each state, its basis of representation in each House of the Federal Parliament, and perhaps a few other important state rights, are protected in this way against the possibility of infringement, there will be no need of an excessively stringent process in respect of other constitutional amendments.” Now, what is Garran's reason for “safeguarding state rights?” His reason is a pure fallacy. “Fundamental,” if it means anything, means absolute right, unalienable right; in respect to land no such right exists in Australia, nor does intelligence, whether religious, scientific, or political, recognize any such rights. “The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof,” says religion. The law of England, as we have seen, recognizes no absolute right to the land except in the Crown, and therefore the rights of the governments of the provinces of the empire are limited. Let Huxley speak in the name of Science:—“It is obvious that all the arguments which Rousseau uses against individual land ownership apply to corporate land ownership. If the rights of A, B, and C are individually nil, you cannot make any more of your 0 by multiplying it by three (A, B, C). The corporation must be an usurper if A, B, C, taken each by himself, is so.” The colonial states are really corporations, provinces of the empire. If federalists wish to “cut the painter,” let them say so openly, and not try to do it in this sneaking fashion. Thus, Garran's “reason” is an irrational assumption, a pure sophism; and neither are the precedents he quotes (German and American)
applicable to our case, as the American and German states were independent sovereign powers; our states are not. It is perfectly true, however, as he says, that if these fundamental state rights are protected “against the possibility of infringement, there will be no need of an excessively stringent process in respect of other amendments,” for when the horse is stolen there is really little use in locking up the stable. He virtually says—“If we federalists manage to secure the horse as our private property, we are quite safe in letting the people play with the saddle and bridle.” It really appears as if there was some truth in the Worker's assertion that federation is a plutocratic conspiracy to defraud the people.

But the state of land matters in Australia discloses the fact that there is at present no efficient representative of the Crown in Australia—of the Crown as the defender of the rights of the people. Were there such a representative, with a national council, it would meet the necessities of Australia, and realize the aspiration of the people for a higher national life in a much better way than the federal, which simply means putting additional obstacles in the way of justice and progress. But any representative of the Crown in Australia must be in touch with the people; approved by them; trusted by them; and empowered to use the personal influence of high character to its utmost extent. In a word Australia must revive the functions of the sovereign as the defender of the people, as the sole and single governing organ which is above, and unbiased by, that party strife which renders parliament an inadequate organ of government. And by doing this Australia can help England; help the English people; help every worthy sovereign of Europe; for it is precisely the dominance of parliaments and the money power in England and Europe that are endangering the British empire, and making European war inevitable. Federationists, as I have said, are in an underhand way trying to “cut the painter,” or at any rate their action inevitably tends to this, and if the “brightest jewel of the Crown” is torn away, other jewels are likely to be snatched away too, and the disruption of the British empire is not a consummation to be desired by those who are interested in the higher civilization of the world. There is no occasion whatever to cut the painter. Australians have simply to ask the Queen to nominate a person to whom she is prepared to delegate her constitutional powers, and to let her nomination be subject to the approval of the Australian people as a whole by means of a national referendum.

The crass ignorance of Australian political teachers, the extent to which they are blinded by “The Great Political Superstition” to which Spencer alludes, is shown by this sentence of Garran's—“The possibility of
deadlock is inherent in every constitutional government under the sun.” It is not inherent in the English constitution, by which the sovereign can always put an end to the deadlock of the houses. As Mr. Stead says:—“The royal prerogative, and the royal prerogative alone, can cut the Gordian knot of the rival authority of Lords and Commons.” To make the Crown a democratic institution it is only necessary to introduce the national referendum and initiative. Mr. Stead wrote:—“The perversity of the House of Lords suddenly compelled Mr. Gladstone to resort to the royal prerogative for the purpose of abolishing purchase in the army. Then it was discovered by our democracy, almost for the first time, that the power of the Crown is a great latent force at the command of the people.”

Now suppose a real, and not a figurehead, Governor-General be placed at the head of affairs in Australia, with a National Council, what would he have to do in this matter of land? In the first place to find out the true facts as to land-ownership. The result of this inquiry would, no doubt, be that much land is held by absentee owners. The facts with regard to national land-ownership in Australia have only to be made public to make land reform inevitable; public opinion would demand it. For every great political writer admits that the land of a country should belong to those resident in that country, and not to absentees. “The soil of the nation,” writes Sir Robert Giffen in his “Essays in Finance,” “is primarily the property of the whole nation—the common inheritance of all, regarding which the State, according to its lights, cannot help laying down rules from time to time for the common advantage. There is no other final authority, and if the action of that authority is to be limited by so-called rights, if in cause shown it may not destine the whole land, or any part of it, to any use it pleases, then we have this anomaly—that the most vital necessity of national existence is to be held, not under the direction of the State, but subject to some arbitrary limitations in favour of individuals or classes, based on a superstition of right. In point of fact, as well as theory, no such limitation has ever been admitted by English law. Year after year the national parliament exercises in innumerable cases the right of diverting some part of the ‘common inheritance’ from one use to another. If it so acts in part and detail, it has clearly a right to take a wider range and exercise its discretion upon the whole or a large part of the soil of the country. The only question would be whether the particular regulations or uses proposed to it are wise.” Federation in Australia would simply perpetuate the anomaly to which Giffen alludes, and it is to use his words “based on a superstition of right” not acknowledged by the English law. Federalists are, as I said, conspirators. They are trying to persuade the Australian people to
accept a constitution based on a “superstition of right” to substitute this for the rational principle of English law. Naturally, being federalists, the Convention shirked the land question altogether. And every Federal Convention is bound to do the same. It is not the Convention only, but every federalist who really understands what federation means, that is a conspirator against the law of right reason. To do the Convention justice, I do not believe there was a single member in it who understood thoroughly what disastrous consequences federation is certain to entail, not only on Australians, but on the people of the British empire. But when the late poet laureate of England imagined that a federation of the world—a parliament of man—could still the throbbing of the war drum and furl the flag of battle, it is not to be wondered at that many fall away from the true political faith. Tennyson was, however, an aristocrat, who despised the people, and was by no means free from superstitions, political and other. If Tennyson had opened his New Testament or his Old Testament he would have discovered that the federal idea is just as un-Biblical and un-Christian as it is un-English and irrational.

Federation is, as Freeman said, a highly civilized form of government, but then civilization has by no means reached its perfection. Modern civilization is not even Christian yet. Federation is simply political polytheism, necessary only because no human political individuality yet exists perfect enough, wide enough in human sympathies, to attract the loyalty and merit the trust of the whole people even of a single nation. And until such a personality appears the world must remain in the federal stage of development.

Europe is a federation. Huxley writes:—“Independent states stand in the same relation to one another as men in a state of nature or unlimited freedom. Each endeavours to get all it can, until the inconvenience of the state of war suggests either the formation of those express contracts we call treaties, or mutual consent to those implied contracts which are expressed by international law. The moral rights of a state rest upon the same basis as those of an individual. If any number of states agree to observe a common set of international laws, they have in fact set up a sovereign authority or supra-national government, the end of which, like that of all governments, is (?) the good of mankind, and the possession of as much freedom by each state as is consistent with the attainment of that end. But there is this difference, that the government thus set up over nations is ideal, and has no concrete representative of the sovereign power; whence the only way of settling any dispute finally is to fight it out. Thus the supra-national society is continually in danger of returning to the state of nature, in which
contracts are void; and the possibility of this contingency justifies a
government in restricting the liberty of its subjects in many ways that
would otherwise be unjustifiable.” Europe is thus a federation in a state of
nature; not, however, as Huxley says, in a state of unlimited freedom, since
the freedom of each nation is limited by all other nations. The common
aspiration, however, is to leave the federal stage, and every treaty
witnesses to the fact of this common desire. The European nations seek to
establish a “balance of power,” but this, as science teaches, is an
impossible state, as it is not in accordance with the fundamental fact of
progress, the ultimate law of the universe. Australian politicians are not
“up to date,” since they seek to establish another impossible state of
balance in the Pacific. The only rational or up-to-date method is to
establish a “consensus” of power, not a balance. A consensus of power
means the bringing of all political powers or forces to a point in a concrete
personality or “representative of the sovereign power” of nations and
states. Thus monarchy is the ultimate and only stable form of government,
as every great religious teacher, every great scientist, every great
philosopher, and every great poet has declared alike in ancient, mediaeval,
and modern times.

Human history begins with Patriarchal rule. This rule then takes the form
of religion, of ancestor worship, which culminated in Christianity, the rule
of faith; but the progressive nations, the protestant nations, do not stop
here, but pass on to the rule of reason. And the law of reason, before it can
become an effective bond of union, has, like the law of faith, to be realized
in a single personality. But these three great social bonds—the family
bond, the religious bond, and the rational bond—are not opposed; on the
contrary, they, though distinct, enforce and complement one another. And
whether we look to the beginning, not, indeed, of the making of man, but
to the beginning of history in Adam, or to the middle term of human
history in Christ, we see that the bond was sympathy or love, a voluntary
and not a forced union. Have we not, then, a right to declare that when the
third bond is evolved as a concrete fact the law of love shall still prevail,
and that unless a sufficient number of persons can be found to unite in the
voluntary principle for political purposes, no true commonwealth can
possibly arise?

What are we to think, then, of Australian politicians who fail to see that
the greatest opportunity of all history is before them and the Australian
people, the chance of establishing on earth that human commonwealth
which has been the dream and aspiration of all earth's noblest sons; that
absolute or indissoluble state which is the legitimate, and mathematically
certain, outcome of social development? What are we to think of them when they propose to found a state here, not upon the Rock of Ages, but upon the shifting sands of a federal compromise; on an obsolete superstition of state right as paramount to human right; on an obsolete doctrine which those who read history with any profit know was proved inadequate for purposes of human development by the thunder of American cannon and “the bloodshed in a hundred battles from Manassas to Petersburg?” And, as if to crown their ineptitude, they propose that this federal union shall be indissoluble, which means, if it means anything, that it shall be maintained by force. These blind guides are not aware that to this earth of ours the surplus forces of the universe gravitate; they are not aware that the matter which we here see undergoing continuous transformation is surplus matter derived from a universe of worlds; they are not aware that to this continent of Australia the surplus elements of the old and new worlds of Europe and America have already largely come, and that, therefore, here are gathered revolutionary and progressive forces, such as exist nowhere else in the world, since they think to bind us down with a paper constitution, presided over and protected by a court of lawyers—lawyers, who are the least progressive, the most conservative, class to be found in the state. For on Australian shores in times past a criminal population was landed—criminal often only because of unjust laws and because possessed of a daring and adventurous spirit. To this continent has also come a number of the really best elements of Europe and England; men who were there “cribbed, cabined, and confined;” men who declined to have undigested information—miscalled knowledge, since it is largely the relics of “little systems that have had their day”—forced into their heads. These highest and lowest elements must be utilized and directed by the Government, or history will repeat itself again, and the squeezing process before alluded to end only by bringing ruin upon all. Hunger and love, Schiller said, really govern the world, and it is because no state of society has hitherto satisfied these great needs for all its members that no existing society is stable. Progress and poverty have always accompanied one another; excessive destitution and excessive wealth have hitherto always gone hand in hand. But it is the duty of Government to make these two excesses cancel one another. “The distribution of wealth,” wrote Stuart Mill, “is a matter of human institution solely.” There are a number of socialists in Australia, as there are a vast number in Europe. We have already observed how the German Government is bringing on state socialism in spite of itself. But state socialism is forced co-operation. We do not want that sort of thing in Australia. Nevertheless the tendency of
civilization is towards Christian socialism, or voluntary co-operation. If socialism is brought about without force there can be no loss of individual freedom. But if the progressive forces of society are held back by artificial barriers, such as federalists propose to erect, there is certain to be a reaction in the direction of state socialism. This we do not want, but we are certain to have it unless we provide a healthy outlet for the progressive elements of society. Fortunately in Australia we can do this. If there are a sufficient number of people who believe in voluntary co-operation to form the nucleus of a co-operative commonwealth, a national state could be set apart in the heart of Australia for this purpose. There the elements which now endanger the vested interests of the Australian provinces could be collected; there land could be nationalized, and profit socialized, and labour completely enfranchised, to the immense benefit of Australia first, and afterwards of the world at large. There is nothing impracticable or even new in this proposal. Why did not the Convention entertain it? Simply because they were state and not national delegates. Each state wanted to have the federal territory and capital within its own borders. And, as we have seen, there is every probability, if the present bill—it does not deserve the name of Commonwealth—is passed, of the strongest state, New South Wales, having its way in this matter. Of course, if a Federal Parliament is elected, the old squabble about the capital will begin over again. Mr. Reid admits as much. He recently said that “he thought the federal capital should be in New South Wales, in view of the sacrifice that would be made by this colony. But, after what had happened in the Convention, he told them plainly he did not expect the federal capital would be in New South Wales. Each colony would try to secure the capital, and in the event of their not being able to accomplish that, they would endeavour to get it as near as possible, so that New South Wales would be out of it, especially if Queensland held aloof.” The Australian people should take this matter out of the hands of the politicians altogether, and consider what previous writers have said on the subject. Thus J. G. Drake wrote in a pamphlet on “Federation”:—“One of the chief stumbling-blocks in the way of federation hitherto has been the localization of the capital. That would be removed by constituting, as soon as might be after the federal body had been formed, a new and separate federal state, to be under the entire government and control of the Federal Government. It should be in the interior, and, as nearly as circumstances would permit, equidistant from the capitals of the several provinces. There is room between E. lat. 26 deg. and 30 deg. and S. long. 140 deg. and 146 deg. to carve out an inland state of any size up to 100,000 square miles. I should think that 50,000 square
miles would be a convenient size, being less than the area of any present or contemplated province, except Tasmania. The area I have mentioned comprises a portion each of New South Wales, South Australia, and Queensland. The country, with the exception of the towns of Cunnamulla and Thargomindah, is entirely under pastoral occupation; and as some of the pastoralists on the Queensland side are now complaining that their industry is not sufficiently profitable to enable them to pay the low rent collected by the Queensland Government, they would probably accept gladly moderate compensation for disturbance. A federal capital situated about equally distant from Bourke and Charleville would be fairly accessible from Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Rockhampton, and Townsville, and in point of distance it would not be very much further from the Gulf than from our northern capitals. With improvements in railway communication, which would instantly follow the adoption of such a scheme, the journey from each of the capitals, with the exception of Hobart and Perth, would mean no more than one night on wheels, the utmost achievement that can be hoped for in this land of magnificent distances. No legitimate objection can be made to the locality mentioned on the score of heat. The heat of the interior, marvellous to relate, becomes less and less with the progress of science and investigation, and one is not over rash in anticipating the time when the warm, dry climate of the interior will be more highly esteemed than the cooler but moister regions of the sea-board. Coghlan, speaking of Bourke, which almost touches the 30th parallel, says:—‘Bourke has the same latitude as Cairo, yet its mean summer temperature is 1.3 less, and its mean annual temperature is 4 deg. less than is the case in the Egyptian city. New Orleans also lies on the same parallel, but the American city is 4 deg. hotter in summer. As regards winter temperature, Bourke leaves little to be desired. The mean winter reading of the thermometer is 54.5, and, accompanied as this is by clear skies and an absence of snow, the season is both refreshing and enjoyable.’ And in this district the supply of artesian water is, according to present knowledge, inexhaustible, the bore at Charleville (on the border of the district indicated) yielding no less than 3,000,000 gallons per day. With a scientific system of water storage and distribution, there is no reason why the country should not become a perfect garden; and in the midst of it, in a climate like that of Cairo and Thebes, would arise, as if by magic, the federal metropolis of Australia, a city of stone and marble, beautiful to the eye, and more enduring than any city built upon the sea-board.” Mr. Drake's pamphlet is, of course, full of the word federal, which I would were banished from the Australian language, full as it is with unpleasant
suggestions of human distrust, of war, of the spoils system. Better
suggestions as to a site have, I think, been made. Thus the Sydney
Bulletin, commenting on Drake's suggestion, says:—“There are at least
eight good reasons for building the federal capital in the farthest interior,
say in the M'Donnell Ranges of South Australia, which is probably the
most promising site yet suggested:—(1) It is almost the exact centre of
Australia, and, when the railway systems are completed, the site would be
more accessible from all parts of the country than any other. (2) It would
place the Government treasury, arsenals, ammunition factories, military
department, and probably the headquarters of the banks, which would most
likely move there in course of time, beyond the reach of invasion and
sudden loot. (3) It would offer a chance for the biggest and grandest
experiment in land nationalization attempted in modern times. The
Government could acquire that stretch of wilderness at its prairie value,
which is almost nil, and be the ground landlord of the city and its
surroundings for ever, and realize a handsome income thereby. (4) It would
draw population to the interior, where it is most wanted—not to the coast,
where it is wanted least. No other scheme would open up the interior, as
the phrase goes, half so quickly or effectively. (5) The building of the new
city would afford a vast amount of employment, while the land values it
would create would do a great deal towards paying the cost. (6) The
gathering of population on the new site would make it possible to finish the
South Australian transcontinental railway as a paying spec, and it would
also make it profitable and feasible to extend the Central Queensland line
west-ward to the new capital. (7) It would definitely secure the Northern
Territory as part of Australia, whereas the territory is now British property,
and liable, if the British Government pleases, to be jobbed away to black-
labour syndicates. In other words, the scheme would help to make a United
Australia, whereas now there is an ugly weak spot in the scheme of unity.
(8) The proposed site is a plateau, some 2,000 feet high, with a beautiful
climate, and is the best watered part of the far interior. And for these
reasons all single-taxers, land nationalizers, land and other boomers, jerry
builders, patriots, pick-and-shovel men, railway contractors, and
unemployed; also, all Hergott Springs, Oodnadatta and Boulia, and their
joint and several dogs, should howl for this project, and all provincialists
who don't want the rival capital to become the seat of government should
do likewise; and Adelaide, Port Darwin, and Rockhampton should howl
loudest of all, for they would be the nearest and most accessible ports, and
the trade of the capital should make them boom exceedingly. The Bulletin
has said all this before, but it is necessary to keep saying the same thing
over and over again with dreadful iteration to make it soak into the public comprehension."

Now, there is a good deal to object to in the Bulletin's "good reasons"—e.g., there should be no militarism whatsoever, or arsenals, or ammunition factories in the central state; and in a co-operative commonwealth land boomers, sharebrokers, jerry builders, manipulators of all sorts are quite out of place. And so with politicians, for though most people seem to imagine that liberty is impossible without politicians and policemen, both are really evils, necessary solely because of our imperfect industrial conditions, our imperfectly civilized natures. And really the formation of a national centre ought not to be looked upon as a commercial speculation. But there can be little doubt that somewhere about the M'Donnell Ranges, which rise to a height of 5,000 ft., there could be found a place for a city of Art. "The climate of the M'Donnells in winter is simply perfect, with warm, clear days and bright, cold nights. Day succeeds day without a cloud." Art and science and artesian water are quite capable of turning much of the central desert of Australia into a land flowing with milk and honey, to the immense benefit of the whole continent, putting an end to the extremes both of flood and drought from which we now suffer. Here is a legitimate field for the employment of English capital—that is, when a national council has consolidated colonial debts, and made an arrangement fair both to Australians and their foreign creditors. Surely Australia ought to be a better place than China to invest surplus wealth! If the Australians once made up their minds to give the higher civilization a chance, capital would not be lacking, for in all parts of the world the best, the most civilized people are sick and tired of the internecine struggle of modern times. If they saw a fair chance of realizing their ideals in Australia we should soon receive the most desirable class of immigrants—immigrants with capital, men and women of high character, scientists, artists of all kinds would flock to become members of a true co-operative Commonwealth. And surely it is time to realize the Christian state. Australians have the chance. The proper distribution of wealth is really a very simple matter once men agree to give up the millionaire ideal and strive to realize a higher and better one. I have little doubt that our own millionaire, James Tyson, would give his help; and there are large sums of money left by will to those who do most to promote peace in the world. Tyson is a great believer in Central Australia; he believes that a higher race of men is likely to spring up there. It is quite possible for Australia to establish a great intellectual and artistic centre, immensely to her own profit, for as the world gets civilized it will long more and more for artistic
products, and be willing to pay a high price for them. And it is impossible for art to flourish in military Europe. And pastoral industry and art go well together.

But before anything can be done to realize a better social state we must rise above the chrysalis money-grubbing stage, and put federation out of court, or leave it to New South Wales, where Mr. Reid can be left to shine like the star Algol, periodically eclipsed by the dark globe of Toby Barton. There really have been politicians who had higher ideas of the state than Sir John Forrest, and nations who agreed with them. Let me call in Professor Butcher to help to kill federation, who wrote on “Some Aspects of the Greek Genius” as follows:—“To the common consciousness of Greece, the state or the city was not an organization, but an organism; no lifeless machine of government, no alien force imposing itself upon the citizens, but a living whole, which took up into itself all individual wills; not impeding spontaneous energies or crushing individual growth, but enriching and completing the individualities which it embraced. It was the individual on his ideal side; his true and spiritual self; the glorified expression and embodiment of his noblest aims and faculties; the higher unity in which he merged his separate or selfish self; the enduring substance which outlived his transient existence. From it were derived and back into it flowed all the currents of individual life. The Man versus the State was a phrase unknown. The man was complete in the state; apart from it he was not only incomplete—he had no rational existence. Only through the social organism could each part, by adaptation to the others, develop its inherent powers. To the Greeks, society and the state were one and indivisible.”

Surely we, without slavery, and with Christianity, can do better than the Greeks! It is said that the English are not an artistic nation. However, they produced Chaucer and Spenser, and Shakespeare and Milton, and Byron and Wordsworth, and Shelley. And poetry is the greatest of the arts, always excepting the great art of life, of making social existence itself a poem—an art that we have yet to learn.

Bishop Butler, the author of the “Analogy of Religion to the Course of Nature,” is probably an unknown author to most Australians, but his idea of a Commonwealth is well worth consideration by them. “Let us return to the earth,” he wrote, “our habitation, and we shall see this happy tendency of virtue, by imagining an instance not so vast and remote; by supposing a kingdom or society of men upon it perfectly virtuous for a succession of many ages, to which, if you please, may be given a situation advantageous for universal monarchy. In such a state there would be no such thing as
faction; but men of the greatest capacity would of course all along have the
chief direction of affairs willingly yielded to them, and they would share it
among themselves without envy. Each of these would have the part
assigned him to which his genius was peculiarly adapted; and others, who
had not any distinguished genius, would be safe, and think themselves very
happy, by being under the protection and guidance of those who had.
Public determinations would really be the result of the united wisdom of
the community, and they would faithfully be executed by the united
strength of it. Some would in a higher way contribute, but all would in
some way contribute to the public prosperity, and in it each would enjoy
the fruits of his own virtue. And as injustice, whether by fraud or force,
would be unknown among themselves, so they would be sufficiently
secured from it in their neighbours. For cunning and false self-interest,
confederacies in injustice, ever slight, and accompanied with faction and
intestine treachery; these, on one hand, would be found mere childish folly
and weakness when set in opposition against wisdom, public spirit, union
inviolable, and fidelity on the other, allowing both a sufficient length of
years to try their force. Add the general influence which such a kingdom
would have over the face of the earth, by way of example particularly, and
the reverence which would be paid it. It would plainly be superior to all
others, and the world must gradually come under its empire, not by means
of lawless violence, but partly by what must be allowed to be just conquest,
and partly by other kingdoms submitting themselves voluntarily to it,
throughout a course of ages, and claiming its protection, one after another,
in successive exigencies. The head of it would be an universal monarch, in
another sense than any mortal has yet been; and the Eastern style would be
literally applicable to him, that ‘all people, nations, and languages should
serve him.’ And though, indeed, our knowledge of human nature, and the
whole history of mankind, show an impossibility, without some miraculous
interposition, that a number of men here on earth should unite in one
society or government, in the fear of God and universal practice of virtue,
and that such a government should continue so united for a succession of
ages, yet admitting or supposing this, the effect would be as now drawn
out. And thus, for instance, the wonderful power and prosperity promised
to the Jewish nation in the Scriptures would be in a great measure the
consequence of what is predicted of them, that the ‘people should be all
righteous and inherit the land for ever,’ were we to understand the latter
phrase of a long continuance, only sufficient to give things time to work.
The predictions of this kind—for there are many of them— cannot come to
pass in the present known course of nature. but suppose them to come to
pass, and then the dominion and pre-eminence promised must naturally follow to a very considerable degree.”

Of course the late Convention would go into shrieks of laughter if this was read to it; but there is not the least doubt that the nation that strives to realize such an ideal must take the lead in the future, and there is no nation more favourably circumstanced than the Australian. Sir Henry Parkes said, in the Convention of 1891:—“Now, our country is fashioned by nature in a remarkable manner, in a manner which distinguishes it from all other countries in the wide world, for unification, for family life;” and Garran writes in his “Coming Commonwealth”:—“Union is stamped upon the face of the land, and upon the hearts of the people. We have one origin, one history, one blood; we have kindred laws and institutions, and we have the sole possession of a continent in which our greatest distance from one another is small compared with our distance from any part of the civilized world. How can we fail to have political interests in common against the world—interests which need the protection of united law, united policy, and united action.”

If everything thus points to unity, why in the name of fortune is federalism inevitable, as Garran says it is, “the fundamental meaning of the word federal” being, says Garran, “a twofold sovereignty?”

The only explanation of the necessity of federation I can give is that “two great sexes animate the world.” But yet the late Convention said nothing about a woman's parliament. But this is the logical outcome of universal suffrage. And really it is worth considering whether we ought not to have a woman's parliament as well. For all the civilized world is troubled to-day with a new eruptive fever called politics. The analogy is really complete; for in a fever, like the measles, waste products of the organism, poisonous matters, rise to the surface, so in the social organism politicians carry grievances to the representative chamber, these are considered by the higher authorities, a remedy propounded and applied.

But now suppose there are no grievances to remedy; suppose that people have become so civilized that they cease to quarrel; suppose that they have learnt to manage their own industrial affairs; or suppose that they have all become so much in debt that they are all practically wage-earners—of what use, then, in either of these cases, are representative chambers or houses of commons? The politicians can go to and fro amongst the people, but in the first case there are no grievances to report; in the second case it is true the politicians can collect grievances and talk about them, but they can do nothing if the authorities above them are paralyzed by the invisible power of money. But the politicians are paid; they are not going to tell the people
that they are useless; and the people have acquired the habit of looking up to them. So to keep the game up all they have to do is to seem busy, and if there are no grievances to be found they have simply to manufacture them.

And we find, as a matter of fact, that most of the wars of modern times are got up by Jingo politicians, assisted by the pressmen, who want sensational matter for their columns.

But the politicians are here, and are not going to abolish themselves. How are they to be got rid of? I think the establishment of a woman's parliament is the right way out of the difficulty. For in an age of credit, like this nineteenth century of ours, the man who can talk best is sure to be elected, and he is almost certain to be a lawyer, of the town or bush species. Thus the male house will be composed of lawyers; but the female house—what ladies shall we find there? It is clear that, as the representative house exists for the statement of grievances, the women—ladies, I mean—who have the worst grievances and who can talk best will be found there. And these are those who have no husbands or boys—i.e., windows and virgins. Now, women have an hereditary grievance against men, and more particularly against lawyers, for the law has always treated them badly. Thus Greek will meet Greek; windows will meet lawyers; the long-prophesied battle of Armageddon is certain to take place.

Now, in Europe they have two professional classes quite superfluous in modern times, both a drain upon the people, and both quite beyond the control of the sovereigns. I mean the politicians and the soldiers. And both classes are determined not to abolish themselves, and both must have work to do. Champion called the Australian labourers “lions led by asses.” Lecky, the historian of European morals, more complimentary, as beseems a grave and responsible writer, calls the European politicians “parrots,” and the soldiers “eagles.” This is what he says:—“While parliamentary government is everywhere showing signs of growing inefficiency and discredit, the armies of Europe are steadily strengthening, absorbing more and more the force and manhood of Christendom. Some observers are beginning to ask themselves whether these two things are likely always to go on together, and always to maintain their present relation—whether the eagles will always be governed by the parrots.”

But Lecky does not see the true remedy for Europe, which is to rouse all the women in England, get up a monster petition to the Queen. The Queen will then communicate with the other sovereigns of Europe, who will rouse their women-folk against both the political and military classes. Both these classes are bound to be polite to ladies. Thus a power fully equal to the combined parliaments and armies of Europe will be brought to bear, and
that balance of power which is suitable to Europe, as it has ceased to progress, will be established.

Then the Queen, as independent chairwoman, will appoint her grandson of Germany Chief Justice of Europe. He will then proceed to pick from the armies of Europe the best regiments—e.g., the Greek Evzoni and Junes Effendi's division of the Turkish army—to form an international police, since those poor Europeans are too turbulent to dispense with a police force, and disband the rest. Then the call to arms will be heard and Junes Effendi will raise his battle-cry: “Those who love Allah will advance to the attack of the infidel!”

And who is the infidel? Well, the first infidel is that “agnostic parliament”—agnostic not only because it has lost faith in God, but also because, as the result of a long training in distrust, it has lost faith in the possible perfection of human nature; that agnostic parliament against which Cardinal Manning hurled “An Englishman's Protest.” But there is a worse infidel behind—the Jew—who believes Jehovah to be a myth, and, as in the days of old, worships the golden calf.

Those who have read Hall Caine's “Christian” know that the fiat of the novelist of Man has gone forth against the modern Babylon, the giant city of the west. He wrote:—“God was about to punish London for its sins. The dishonour lay at its door of being the wickedest city in the world. Side by side with the developments of mechanical science, lifting men to the power and position of angels, there was a moral degeneration degrading them to the level of beasts. With an apparent aspiration after social and humanitarian reform, there was a corruption of the public conscience and a hardening of the public heart. London was the living picture of this startling contrast. Impiety, iniquity, impurity, and injustice were at their height here, and either England must forfeit her position among the nations or the Almighty would interpose. The Almighty was about to interpose, and the consummation of London's wickedness was near. Concerning the time of the event, the popular imagination had attained to a more definite idea. It was to occur on the great day of the Epsom races. Derby day was the national day. More than any day associated with political independence, or with victory in battle, or yet with religious sanctity, the day devoted to sport and gambling and intemperance and immorality was England's day. Therefore, the Almighty had selected that day for the awful revelation by which He would make His power known to man. Thus the heart of London was once more stormed, and shame and panic ran through it like an epidemic. The consequences were the usual ones. In vain the newspapers published articles in derision of the madness, with accounts of
similar frenzies which had laid hold of London before. There was a run on the banks, men sold their businesses, dissolved their partnerships, transferred their stocks, and removed to houses outside the suburbs. Great losses were sustained in all ranks of society, and the only class known to escape were the Jews on the Exchange, who held their peace and profited by their infidelity." The novelist of Man, however, does not say whether it was the Jew who got up the panic. But suppose the Almighty was about to punish London for its sins. Professor Huxley tells us that “the Sun is the primordial capitalist, so far as we are concerned.” Whether this be the case or no, the Jew is certainly the final capitalist. We may suppose, then, that the Sun has been dissipating all his capital and the Jew has got it all. And we may suppose also that the primordial capitalist is angry because the ultimate capitalist does not redistribute this capital properly for the good of the people.

A paragraph appeared in a Queensland journal on 1st April, entitled “Birth of a New World”:—“The enormous black spots on the face of the sun are causing great interest among scientists. The entire spot area covers the enormous space of from 125,000 miles to 50,000 miles in width.” (It is curious that this area corresponds roughly with the area of the proposed new Australian state.) “Each of the black spots is really an enormous hole, and, seen through a good telescope, they show gigantic heaving and turmoil, grand beyond the power of imagination to grasp. Professor Soverinus J. Corrigan, of Good-sell University, a few months ago declared that he believed a wonderful upheaval of the sun to be imminent—an upheaval that would detach a great part of its bulk, hurling it into space, forming a new planet, and destroying the earth. Professor Garrett P. Lewiss, of Brooklyn, says Professor Corrigan is probably right in recalling us to a realization of the fact that, just as we depend upon the sun for light, heat, and life itself, so we should look to the sun only when we try to lift the curtain that hides the future fate of the globe we live on. The idea which he suggests, that the birth of a new world should have the effect of destroying the life of an older one, has a peculiar significance. Grant that a planet may be born from the sun in the way he points out, the consequences indicated might well result. Professor W. R. Brooks, of the South Observatory of Geneva, New York, says this new world has been expected by wise men since the time of Christ, almost 2,000 years ago. No one knows just where the new planet will strike the earth. Astronomers all over the world are watching the baby planet with interest, and may within a day or two be able to tell at what rate and in what direction it is travelling to find its home.”
Now it is curious that all this disturbance in the Sun, and the birth of a new world, should coincide with the sittings of the late Federal Convention. While Joshua fought the sun was said to stand still; when Christ was crucified the sun was said to be darkened; when Adam left Paradise he saw a flaming sword, possibly the hydrogen flames of the sun. Tennyson sang quite recently:

“Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs, And the thoughts of men are widen'd with the process of the suns.”

Carlyle told us that the sun had his imperfections, his spots; and were not the delegates at the Convention trying to work off the federal incubus—i.e., the fear of the monied power. Now, as the above-quoted paragraph appeared on 1st April it may be a bimetallic hoax got up in America to frighten Lombard-street. But one can hardly suspect such grave and reverend seigneurs as these professors of playing such a practical joke upon the world; and as the Queensland journal in which the paragraph appeared has certainly not got the wit to invent such an account, the conclusion is forced upon one that there must be something up.

Scientists know that there is some connection between storms on the sun and the magnetism of the earth, and Sir Robert Ball suspects that the relation is not one of cause and effect, but of “concomitant variation.” We have all heard of personal magnetism—a strange power by which men influence one another even without speech. There may possibly be a similar sympathetic relation between the sun as a whole and the earth as a whole—a vibration or wave that passes between them. And, as Bacon said “Man is the interpreter of nature,” man might be able to transform this vibration into speech. With this a priori justification I will venture to interpret this riddle.

The connection between the birth of a new nation in Australia and the abovementioned solar phenomena being established, I interpret the riddle thus:—If federation becomes an accomplished fact, and Premier Reid becomes Governor-General, the bottom will fall out of Lombard-street; the credit system, on which England's supremacy at present rests, will collapse, and with it the present prosperity of Australia, and its chances of greater prosperity in the future. In this connection the following paragraph from the Sydney Bulletin is suggestive (19th March, 1898):—“A few days ago, in the absence of Premier Reid, the Convention decided to federalize the public debts. There were 25 delegates in favour, and only 8 against, and as there are just 49 votes in the Convention, the man in the chair only coming in when parties are evenly divided, this meant that an absolute majority had
been secured. But Reid came back and heaved the old threat that New South Wales might feel called upon to stand out unless the vote was rescinded, and owing to that unlucky clause which provides that there shall be no federation unless New South Wales is included, this meant breaking up the whole movement. So nine members—four Westralians, two Tasmanians, and three from South Australia—weakly changed sides, and one of the few sensible things the Convention has done went overboard.”

Now, it must be evident to sensible men that unless the financial position of Australia, the enormous indebtedness which politicians have burdened the country with, is honestly faced, a total collapse of credit in Australia, another financial crisis, is certain to sooner or later occur. The lands, mines, herds, and flocks already belong to a great extent to others, and if our great indebtedness is considered, really belong altogether to the absentee money-owner. As the Australian people are vigorous, free, and fearless, and as they are not going to be deluded by their politicians for ever, another financial crisis might mean, and probably would mean, total repudiation of debts, and the effect this would have on England's supremacy may be judged by these words of Mr. Wilson's in the Investors' Review:—“Our weakness lies in the position we have assumed not only as the most voracious ‘land-grabbers’ on earth, but as the world's greatest creditors. More than any other people we hold mankind at large in pawn, and we simply dare not make any move which involves the danger of such an upset to the equilibrium the usurer has established as might threaten the profitableness of our security. So completely are the comfort and means of livelihood of our home population bound up with the capacity of our debtors abroad to go on paying us what they are pledged to pay, even when they have to borrow more to do it, that our warlike engineies and capacities would be at once paralyzed were default to occur at any important point. Default at one, indeed, would probably mean partial or total default at all points, for the whole web of debt by which the world is enmeshed radiates from London, where the spiders are; and its strands are interwoven with each other and interdependent to such an extent, that whatever stopped the functioning at one point would probably stop it for a time at all points. If a war with Turkey, or even the Turkish empire's remains, made it impossible for India to borrow in London, it would be equally impossible for Australia and New Zealand, or for Canada; there is no knowing where the paralysis would stop. And where should we be then? Whence would come the means wherewith to pursue a great conflict in the supremely costly fashion of modern warfare? There are no internal resources to fall back upon, because almost everything we possess is
pledged up to the hilt. From top to bottom our system of business is the pawnbroker's one.”

The Jew, the money-owner, has thus completely paralyzed England. She can no longer act according to the dictates of humanity and justice; she has to sit still and watch Armenian massacres; she cannot do justice even to such provinces of her empire as Central Queensland, where the financial institutions controlled by the money-owner set their faces against separation.

Lord Charles Beresford endorses what Wilson says. He recently made quite a sensation by bluntly expressing his opinions at the New Vagabond Club in London. “Money, he declared, was now everything among us. Money would buy access to what was known as the very best society; and let anybody come to England with enough money, no matter whether it had been gained honourably or disgracefully, there was no door which he could not hope to enter. In old days, he averred, it was not so, but money was destroying our old pride and old chivalry. When a man in the best society committed a dishonourable act—indeed, a crime—that society banded itself together to screen him, instead of hanging him to a tree and casting his body into a ditch. He prophesied the ruin of the empire unless the dominion of money could be made to cease. The Vagabonds were at first aghast, but their subsequent cheers showed their appreciation of such outspoken truths.”

Now, there is only one way to prevent the disruption of the British empire, and that is to honestly face the facts. Australians have a unique opportunity of doing this, as they are about to become a nation. Any business man will admit that as we are about to assume control of our own financial affairs—for in fact we have never done so yet—the full facts should be placed before a national council. Mr. Reid is evidently determined to set his face against this. Why? Because he knows very well that a full disclosure of the facts would mean a reduction in the number of political billets, and a decrease in the expenses of government. We have seen that New South Wales is the chief sinner in this respect. The politician's interest lies in creating more billets, in increasing the expenses of government, in aggrandizing his own class and power. But we have already to borrow to enable us to carry on at all, and a continuance in this course must mean financial ruin, revolution, and repudiation. “This,” as Mr. Wilson says, “would so disorganize the whole system of credit as to involve England in ruin.” And if England went down, where should we Australians be? We should become the prey of any invader, as we are not prepared for defence; and not only this, if we did repel invasion, we should
have to arm ourselves after the expensive manner of Europe. All chance of a higher and better civilization would be gone, not only for us, but for all the world, for art cannot flourish where militarism prevails. Thus Australia really holds the future of the world in its hands. What we have to do is to brush these dim-sighted, and often dishonest, politicians of ours aside, and put men in their place who are prepared honestly to face the position and determined to put matters on a better footing at whatever cost. If we have not got the men here we could get men with wide financial knowledge, like Mr. Wilson, to help us. But with a Federal Government, which simply means the supremacy of party intrigues, no good can possibly be done. We Australians owe a great deal to England, and we have to save her in order to save ourselves. We have to help the best elements of English society—and there are plenty of good men there yet—to get the upper hand. We have to help England to put the Jew down—put him into his proper place, which is the second, not the first. And if we fail at this critical moment to do what we are called upon to do in the name of humanity, we stand confessed before all the world as cowards and poltroons. And we shall condemn our children and the future generations of Australia to such a depth of financial servitude, under the arrogant rule of the Jew, that even the Chinaman will despise us. For if we fail to face the music now, and let a Federal Parliament establish its tyrannous rule, it will never be done. The Commonwealth Bill, it may be objected, provides that the State debts may be taken over. Yes! but won't George Reid be in the Federal Parliament to overawe the timorous state delegates, as he did in the Convention, by the threat that New South Wales will secede from the Union if he does not have his way? And as this would mean loss of place and pay to the federal politicians, Reid is sure to carry his point. Australians imagine that they pay their representatives, but their salaries really come out of the pocket of the money-owner. And that little incident in the Convention above referred to ought to open the eyes of the smaller Australian states to the absurdity of the idea that equal representation in a Senate is any safeguard for their liberties. Character must rule there as elsewhere, and no mechanical contrivance such as equal representation can prevent it. “The State of Delaware is not equal,” wrote Bagehot, “in power or influence to the State of New York, and you cannot make it so by giving it an equal veto in an Upper Chamber.”

This equality of state representation is simply the outcome of that American delusion that all men are equally fitted to rule. As Huxley wrote:—“The doctrine that all men are, in any sense, or have been at any time, free and equal, is an utterly baseless fiction.” But the proper aim of
Government is to free men. Parliaments have tried to do it—and have landed us all in debt to the Jew. So that the Jew has simply to pay the politician to keep up the farce of free government in the eyes of a deluded people.

But to return to our Jew, with whom Australia is so intimately connected: There are Jews and Jews—Jews who still have some kind of faith in Jehovah, if it be only as a “fetish stone.” Well, suppose the primordial capitalist, the Sun, the god which modern science worships exclusively, made up his mind to take his cue from the novelist of Man, and hurl the baby planet before alluded to at Lombard-street, as a lesson to agnostic England, in that case the “Jews on the Exchange” would not profit by their infidelity. And even supposing that this new comet is only gas from which the sun has purified his atmosphere, well! ethylene, or carburetted hydrogen, when mixed with three times its bulk of oxygen and fired, detonates very powerfully, and such an explosion might have disastrous effects both upon moneybags and windbags. So the faithful Jews had better leave Lombard-street, and the loyal subjects of Her Majesty had better leave Westminster, and as comets sometimes create a popular panic, the loyal gentlemen of England had better gather round England's ideal, not in the prison-fortress of the Tower, but in the royal keep of Windsor. And Her Majesty ought to consider the advice Disraeli’s Emir gave in ‘Tancred’ relating to—India—ships, gold, and treasures, and “the embarrassment of Her chambers.” And it is known that changes in solar conditions are accompanied by “glacial epochs,” and when the bimetallists cut the Nicaragua Canal and divert the Gulf Stream England will not be half such a pleasant place to live in as it now is.

And, as chemists know, when one or more substances are transformed into a new kind of matter, the process is frequently accompanied by striking physical, phenomena, such as the development of electricity light, or heat. And social transformations are also accompanied by striking physical phenomena. As Tennyson sings:—

“For all the past of Time reveals
A bridal dawn of thunder-peals;
Wherever Thought hath wedded Fact.
Ev'n now we hear with inward strife
A motion toiling in the gloom—
The Spirit of the years to come
Yearning to mix himself with Life.
A slow-develop'd strength awaits
Completion in a painful school;
Phantoms of other forms of rule,
New Majesties of mighty States—
The warders of the growing hour,
But vague in vapour, hard to mark;
And round them sea and air are dark
With great contrivances of Power.”

“The very essence of a chemical process,” scientists tell us, consists of the conversion of the substances we call the factors into new substances we call the products; and it now appears that all such changes imply a destruction of the original molecules, and the formation of new molecules from the same materials. The original molecules are destroyed, therefore the original substances disappear. Tennyson sang:—

“So let the change which comes be free
To ingroove itself with that which flies,
And work, a joint of state, that plies
Its office, moved with sympathy.”

Would that an evolutionary change were possible in Europe! I am afraid it is not. The evil humours of a corrupt civilization must, I fear, work themselves out in thunder and lightning.

As Lecky writes in his “Liberty and Democracy”: —“Never before, in the history of mankind, have explosive elements of such tremendous potency been accumulated in Europe, and, with all our boasted democracy, the issues of peace and war have seldom rested so largely with three or four men. In the present condition of the world it would be quite possible for the folly of a single ruler to bring down calamities upon Europe that might transfer the sceptre of civilization to the other side of the Atlantic.”

“Germanicus,” writing on the Germans and their Kaiser, in the Contemporary Review of June, 1897, says:—“The Emperor, the captain and pilot of the ship of State, sees that there are rocks ahead, and his proposed way of getting out of danger consists in screwing down the safety-valve. Whether by this method the port can be reached is somewhat doubtful. Prudent people in Germany, men who have rendered service to their country, look with grave anxiety upon the present state of affairs. They know that the headstrong monarch who at this moment guides the destinies of the Fatherland constitutes a danger to their country, that what he considers to be energy is generally only fussiness, that he possesses neither wisdom nor patience, and that his efforts to put back the clock of Germany to the time of the dark ages can but end in ruin for the crown and for the country. A violent conflict between this autocratic, headstrong
monarch and the people seems unavoidable. The social democratic party is gradually approaching the point when it will be eager to measure swords with the ‘divine right’ king, and to fight for the people's rights against the monarch by the grace of God. The army, as a machine for the purpose of mowing down ‘rebellious subjects,’ is expected to do its duty, should the occasion arise and the order be given to shoot. But suppose the soldiers, the sons and brothers of social democrats, should hesitate to obey?"

Thus there is still a hope of peace by rousing the German women. But the Emperor possesses one fatal defect as a ruler suitable for modern times. He has no sense of humour, cannot stand the chaff of *Simplicissimus* and *Kladderadatsch*, and hence seeks to restrict the freedom of the Press. And, as a matter of fact, the only hope of salvation to-day lies in the ascendancy of humour. It is just this defect which makes the control of labour by the Jew impossible, for with all his wit he does not possess a particle of loving humour. And this lack of humour is a general feature of German officialdom. An Englishman in Germany the other day, who remarked in conversation that the Emperor was a ----fool, was overheard by an official—result, prompt arrest for the crime of lese majesté. To avoid European complications, the Englishman explained that he was alluding to the Russian emperor, who was a good deal further off. But it was no good. The official replied—"You can't get out of it in that way, for there is only one emperor in the world who is a ----fool, and that is our Kaiser." How the affair ended I never heard, but probably both the Englishman and the official are under arrest and awaiting sentence for high treason, and meanwhile debating which European sovereign is the biggest ----fool, since they all fail to see the simple solution of their difficulties—viz., the emancipation of woman, universal suffrage, the referendum, the revival of the functions of the constitutional sovereign, the disbandment of armies, the abolition of agnostic parliaments, and the substitution of *Mr. Punch*, *Figaro, Simplicissimus*, &c., in their place, so that the cant, hypocrisy, unctuous piety, ignorant jabber, and philosophic delusion of modern society may be killed by unsparing ridicule.

The Emperor of Germany has been dubbed Chief Justice of Europe by an ambitious journalist, who wishes to establish government by newspaper, and remove the Papacy to the bank of the Thames, there to co-operate with Lombard-street, and thus weld the British empire into “an organism of irrefragable and resistless unity,” with corrupt, overgrown, foggy, hideous, inhuman London, where the spiders sit and weave the web of debt that enmeshes the world, as its centre of unity. “Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any (colonial) bird,” for the day of government by force is
well nigh over, and the only possible future bond for free nations is loyalty to individual excellence of human character. London is impossible as a centre of humanism. It is not even likely to remain long as a monetary centre.

But the Emperor might well take the “uncrowned journalistic king’s” advice to heart, and become Chief Justice. He has the most efficient fighting machine that ever existed, and the Saturday Review says:— “There are leaders for the Turks now, thanks to the creator of the modern Turkish army, His Imperial Majesty the German Emperor, who has done more for the prophesied ‘Mohammedan revival’ than any other man. Captain Lebrun Renaud, of the French army, who has made the military power of Turkey a study, says of it:—’Every day the Ottoman army is making serious progress; it is recruited with regularity; it is well armed; its manoeuvres are based upon correct rules; new railways enable its rapid mobilization; it is in a condition to meet eventualities from without.’ Eventualities from without—in plain English, the possible partition of the Turkish empire.”

Thus while the federation of Europe has been deliberating, and letting things drift, as federations everywhere do, the modern Caesar has been making good use of his time. While the parliamentary parrots have been prating of the sick man, the sick man, who still believes in Allah, has become a splendid military power. Now, in connection with the late Graeco-Turkish war, it is curious that the Turkish soldier seemed to have lost his old brutal and savage character. There is, however, a simple explanation of the fact—viz., that the soldiers, or at any rate the officers, were well paid. When the soldier is ill-paid, or not paid at all, as used to be the case with the Turks, he is certain to make up for forced privation by loot and outrage, just as our blacks take a big feed when they can get it, or as Nansen, after crossing Greenland on scientific ration, had to make a beast of himself when he reached civilization again.

The transformation of the Turk is due, then, to a better distribution of wealth. The monied power may be building up the Turkish army to enforce its “spoils system” on debtor nations, such as Greece, Japan, Australia, &c. But what if Turk and Greek alike should discover that they can do better by combining against their paymaster. They have, it is said, one natural taste in common; and the picked corps of both armies are splendid soldiers, and brave men honour one another.

Plainly the ambitious powers of Europe must give up the idea of partitioning the Turkish empire, and give young and old Turkey a chance of putting an end to the rotten government which hinders the development
of Turkey, and is kept in place by the federated powers of Europe, lest the “equilibrium established by the usurer” should be overturned. And plainly also the European powers must give up the stale old dodge of fomenting war in the East in order to divert the attention of the European people from unjust social conditions there, or they will provoke a great Mohammedan revival in the East. If they continue their present policy, Australia in self-defence will be compelled to strike the detonator which will explode the powder magazine of Europe, and bring ruin and combustion on the whole civilized world.

Sir Charles Dilke, forty years ago or thereabouts, made an excellent suggestion, which, though the “unco guid” run him down, is well worthy of consideration to-day. He wrote:—“Shall I be accused of dreaming dreams if I ask whether it would not be a happy thing that the Pacific should be neutralized? The states at present bordering upon that ocean, or wholly situated within its limits, have not yet followed those of Europe into reckless military expenditure. Japan is entering upon that course; and can we blame her, when we remember the perpetual presence of a Russian squadron upon her coasts? Australia has no army, America desires no triumph of the sword, and Russia alone of all the Pacific powers is suspected of ambitious designs. Would it not be possible to induce the European powers to agree to support the status quo in the Pacific, and to recommend the island powers of that ocean to put down their armies and apply their revenues to public works and purposes of trade, of art and civilization.”

But to-day Japan has become a great naval power, with the result that the Japanese Budget shows a deficit of £8,000,000 for the past year; America is about to begin the game of territorial aggrandizement; Russia is despatching 20,000 soldiers to the East; and federal politicians intend to create an army in Australia. Dilke, however, is still under the shadow of the great political superstition, and looks upon the Japanese Mikado as an anachronism. However, those who know the true state of contemporary politics know that in the case of Japan, America, Greece, Spain, and even England, political Jingoists and irresponsible journalists are at the bottom of all this disturbance and increase of armaments. The true remedy in Japan, as elsewhere, is, however, to bring the Mikado, whose power the Parliament has usurped, into relation with the people, who love him, and are spoiled, taxed, and crushed by the Parliaments. In a word, hunger and love are about to take the government of the world into their own hands at last. The political suns must be brought into relation with the stars. As Tennyson wrote:
“The thoughts of men are widen'd with the process of the suns.”

If England, Germany, Russia, Canada, America, Japan, and Australia unite, and agree to the peaceful development of the world, and the neutralization of the Pacific, disarmament can be brought about. If Russia and Germany, &c., decline, if America and Canada stand out, then let England, Australia, and Japan unite. Let the Queen and the best elements of England abandon an impossible position. Let the Queen take her army, fleet, gold, and treasures—and she has the constitutional right to do so—and ascend the throne of India, and abandon Europe to its fate.

England, Australia, and Japan can then dominate the Pacific and repel the invader, while Australia could easily be made an impregnable stronghold and home, in which the higher civilization of the future shall spring up. For, as Pearson wrote in his “National Life and Character:”—“The truth surely is that we may extend Bacon’s axiom that ‘no nation which doth not directly profess arms may look to have greatness fall into their laps,’ by saying that if the nation which cultivates war absorbingly is bound to achieve great success, it is bound also to do it at the cost, within measurable time, of its place among the nations of the world. The first great step in constructing political society has always been to substitute the arbitration of the state for the blood feud.”

As an Australian he wrote:—“We are guarding the last part of the world, in which the higher races can live and increase freely, for the higher civilization.” If we can save our liberties peacefully, so much the better; if not, we are justified in resisting to the death those who would deprive us of them by every means in our power. The stars in their courses fight with us; the voices of the sages of all time call to us to stand firm, and put to shame those old world Titans of commerce, which correspond in modern times to the old Titans of the Greek mythology, which were relegated to the limbus of the world by Zeus and Apollo, as embodiments of a new and higher power. The law of development is the same, whether embodied as in the old mythologies or expressed in modern abstract terms, and the victory in the end always is to those who follow the true line of progress.

If England will not or cannot help us, we must save ourselves at whatever cost. For humanity is greater than England, and for humanity we stand. And poor humanity has generally to be saved in spite of itself. But before we can do any good for ourselves or others, we must put federation down, and reduce the political incubus to its smallest possible limits. And if the world will only leave us alone we can amend it by the influence of reason and the magnetic power of a higher national character, in the fashion described by Bishop Butler.
How to get rid of the parliamentary incubus is the pressing practical problem. To return to the suggestion of a man and woman's parliament composed of widows or spinsters. As Garran says, federation is inevitable, and as federation means dual control, and as a divided responsibility is proverbially weak, and as the dual control of Reid and Toby Barton is for various reasons undesirable, and by no means fair to the ladies, I think this suggestion of a male and female house is better than the Convention scheme. As the great fault of every federal scheme hitherto is insufficient amending power, especially its failure to reduce by pairs the size of the machine, in accordance with the law of progress, as stated by Ernest Haeckel in his “History of Creation,” I can best recommend my scheme by showing how this reduction can be gradually brought about until the governing body is reduced to the “minimum visible.”

But first I must make several suppositions, which are, however, quite justified by the experience of the late Convention. The late Convention said it represented the nation. We find, however, that it was composed entirely of professional politicians, with one exception. I have good grounds for supposing, then, that the Australian nation wishes to have in the Federal Parliament one person, and one only, who is not a politician, one national representative—i.e., one man who is fully human, and not, therefore, a lawyer, since the essence of man is that he is a progressive animal, and lawyers are well known to be nonprogressive, as the existing state of the law abundantly proves. I shall make the same supposition as to the female house, viz., that there is one and one woman only who represents the female sex as a whole, and who is therefore “neither maid, wife, nor widow.” To err is human and national, and a federal people is always guilty of more aberrations than any other; therefore it is perfectly evident that the two who represent a federal nation as a whole must, at some time or other, have erred from the strict path of rectitude. This is a sine quânon of federal representation.

To say that lawyers are non-progressive is the same thing as to say they are non-procreative, since creation consists in producing something entirely new, and not in the mere multiplication of the species. The widows also are rather destroyers than creators, since they have killed their husbands by over-kindness; and the spinsters are ex hypothesi non-creative. Thus it is perfectly clear that the amending or creative power in this dual parliament is confined to the two national representatives.

I ignore the Senate, as proposed by the Convention, altogether, because, as Dr. Quick says, “it will be overshadowed by the House of Representatives, in which the principle of responsible government will
operate to magnify that house at the expense of the Senate.”

It is evident again that, as according to the approved parrot-formula the people is the true sovereign, and as the amending power is the true sovereign according to Garran, the representative of the amending power must be in the House of Representatives; that is to say, the real sovereign is in the lower house. This makes a Governor-General totally superfluous. The Senate, in the Convention's scheme, must be there to maintain a dignified balance, while the Governor-General must be there to see-saw the Senate up and down on the fulcrum of the Premier's head, so as to make the people imagine that the Premier is responsible, and that the upper chamber is doing something for its money. There can be no doubt that this is the true function of the Governor-General, because as the essence of federation is a twofold sovereignty, unitary control must be superfluous and a sham. All the Governor-General has to do is to say yes or no as the board on which the rival parties of the Senate sit sways up and down. But as the board is perfectly balanced, and as “action and reaction are equal and opposite,” it is evident that if the Governor says no when one side swings up, the other side must come up as it goes down. But when the other side goes up the law of reaction must bring it down again; so in the end it matters little whether the Governor says yes or no. The result is much the same in the end; the board gradually settles to its position of equilibrium, from which it would never move were it not for the impulse of the house below.

I think, then, I am quite justified in leaving out the Senate and Governor from my federal scheme as quite superfluous, especially as I have two representative houses.

And I can bring about a deadlock much more quickly than is possible under the Convention scheme. And this is really desirable, contrary to the general notion, for as men form societies with a view to the enjoyment of the higher good or profit such association brings, government in its perfect parliamentary form is an organ for the distribution of social profit according to just principles, and the members of parliament are there simply to protest against an undue retention of social profit by the higher classes. The members state the grievances of the people, and insist on their removal before they grant supplies; this, as Spencer tells us, is the original, as it is the final, function of a House of Commons. But why do these grievances exist at all? Simply because the higher authorities do not distribute according to a just principle. Again, why have they failed to distribute properly? Simply because the just principle has not been discovered or applied—i.e., the ruling person or power is either not gifted
with the creative genius to discover the right method, or not intelligent enough to apply it when discovered. Suppose it discovered, parliamentary representation at once becomes unnecessary.

As the Hon. B. R. Wise says:—“As nothing in nature stands still, so with nations; there must be either progress or decadence.” Societies then progress, but if their governing institutions do not advance at a similar rate of change—\( i.e. \), amend themselves—they become more and more useless and obstructive. The amending power, however, being in the people as a whole, and these people being scattered and many, unless they can concentrate their respective desires for individual amendment upon one person, the sovereign—\( i.e. \), establish a “consensus” of desire—the lower governing structures are not amended quick enough to meet the popular demand. If party government still exists, it is because the people have not made up their minds, do not demand the same thing—\( i.e. \), they are not civilized enough to agree, to be satisfied to sink individual differences for the common welfare; it is simply a case of the Darwinian struggle, not for existence, but for profit; and that is really what the Darwinian struggle is from beginning to end. Evidently the struggle must go on until someone can propose a scheme satisfactory to all—\( i.e. \), the survival of the fittest. The tendency of society then is to evolve, as Emerson said, a representative individual or character who shall respond to all needs—\( i.e. \), a universal person. But until men agree to look to this universal person for a solution of their difficulties, a universal person may be there but unheeded. So people have to be left to experiment in all kinds of ways, and until these experiments are all proved unsuccessful, no one is likely to pay attention to such a person as Christ, who tells them the right way.

But as the principle of dualism or balance is an essential condition of progress, a perfect balance or deadlock has to be arrived at before the pure and unadulterated principle and person of progress is produced or heeded. Thus Naquet, in his “Collectivism,” says:—“The rule of the antinomy is that every time a given order of phenomena develops its consequences in two opposed and contradictory series, there is reason to anticipate a higher principle, a synthesis (\( i.e. \), consensus), which will cause the contradiction to disappear, and will solve the antinomy.” But the character of humanity is not twofold, but threefold. Thus, besides individualism and socialism there is humanism, and when the opposition between socialism and individualism has arrived at the perfectly balanced state, then the principle of humanism must arise into prominence as the only perfectly satisfactory solution of the difficulty. Thus when labour and capital become completely opposed, a better state of things can arise, but only if physical force is not
brought into play.

Now, if it be a fact that Australia as a whole is so much in debt to the absentee money-owner, through the action of her state governments in borrowing so largely, then all Australians are virtually wage-earners, and the cut-throat competition that at present exists among all individuals and classes is a rank absurdity, for by competition amongst ourselves we virtually deplete ourselves—lower our prices solely for the benefit of the absentee money-owner. If this be the case the benefits that have in the past undoubtedly arisen from free competition have ceased. Competition in this case becomes a pure evil, and it is to the interest of all Australians to cease to compete with one another and combine against all the rest of the world. As the power to which we are in debt is foreign and absent, force cannot be used against us with the ease with which it could if we were in debt to resident money-owners. It is, however, evident that unless we hold a full inquiry upon the state of our indebtedness we cannot be sure that competition amongst ourselves has ceased to have any value for us. If we can get full statistics of our financial state, and if we find the case is as I suspect it is; if we find that as long as we compete with one another we simply get deeper into debt, and if the people can be made to see that this is really the case, then the socialization of all our industries and the total banishment of individual competition is really the best course for every one of us to follow.

It is evident, also, that it is to the interest of the absentee money-lender to keep the real facts of the case from our knowledge. Thus it is possible to give a simple explanation of Mr. Reid's opposition to the federalization of our debts. I don't think he is clever enough to understand the true state of financial affairs in Australia; if he did, I think he is patriotic enough to insist on the unification of our debts into one fund. But I do think the Jew is clever enough to understand how matters lie, and possibly Mr. Reid may have been influenced in London, for he is certainly not as democratic as he was before the Jubilee.

Now, as balance must precede consensus, and as the business of the Government is to subserve human and not only commercial interests, and as the state is composed of men and women, I claim that my federal scheme is much better than the Convention's as only by equalizing the claims of the sexes can we hope to get a consensus of opinion in favour of the higher socialistic principle, the adoption of which as the law of the State will enable us to rise to the shining table-lands of art and perfect freedom.

Socialism, properly understood, is after all the Christian doctrine.
only objection to it is that the world is not ripe for it, and that to bring it about prematurely by force would be disastrous to individual liberty. As J. A. Hobson says, in his “Evolution of Modern Capitalism”:—“All progress, from primitive savagedom to modern civilization, consists in the progressive socialization of the lower functions, the stoppage of lower forms of competition and of the education of the more brutal qualities, in order that a larger and larger proportion of individual activity may be engaged in the exercise of higher functions, the practice of competition upon higher planes, and the education of higher forms of fitness. If the history of past civilization shows us this, there is an a priori presumption that each further step in the repression of individual enterprise, and in the extension of state control (local self-government, not state control, is the proper expression to be used here) does not mean a net diminution in individual activity or any relaxation of effort in self-assertion, but merely an elevation of the plane of competition, and of the kind of human qualities engaged. This is, in fact, the philosophical defence of progressive socialism, that human progress requires that one after another the lower material animal functions shall be reduced to routine, in order that a larger amount of individual effort may be devoted to the exercise of higher functions and the cultivation by strife of higher qualities.” Thus, if we socialized all our industries and gave up individual competition, we should resemble a number of musicians who have been for a long time learning the technique of their instruments, and who, having acquired each one a perfect mastery, at last agree to co-operate, the result being a new and wonderful orchestral harmony. By co-operation we should so economize our labours that we should have ample time to spare for the higher forms of competition—athletics, racing, music, sculpture, painting, science—and not only this, the organization of our industries in a perfect manner would give us an immense advantage over other nations who are not civilized enough to co-operate.

This organization would be immensely to our profit for another reason—viz., that all the world would willingly pay for artistic products, which they must increasingly desire, and which, owing to their imperfect social organization, they cannot themselves produce on a large scale. We should be able to adopt free trade as our policy with all the world, instead of protection as proposed, simply because we should have learnt the secret of producing a higher kind of goods than other nations. It was to the advantage of England to adopt free trade while she had the secret of manufacturing what the other nations could not manufacture and yet keenly desired; but now as other nations have learnt the secret the
advantage has gone from England, and she is reverting to protection again, as her commercial glory is departing. But if we Australians learn a new secret, free trade is advantageous to us and we can carry on the free commercial tradition of England without fear.

No doubt many people will deny what I have said about our Australian indebtedness, but even the most selfish and interested persons, as long as they are residents, must see that if there is a possibility of my assertion being true a full inquiry by capable and trustworthy persons should be made into our financial condition before any constitution is adopted for Australia as a whole. For if our indebtedness be, as I suspect it is, so great that we are really sinking deeper into debt every day, and national cooperation be therefore advisable, parliamentary representation as it exists to-day is totally superfluous, and to establish another elaborate form of government would be simply to tax the people here as well as the absentee money-owner without any good result whatever; and as the proposed constitution is to be indissoluble, the government once established would resist with all its might and influence its own sudden or gradual removal, and would certainly be tempted to use physical force, not to promote progress, but to prevent it, thus totally reversing the proper function of government.

But, as I said before, if the people of Australia are determined to have federation in some shape or form, let us have it in the form I am proposing, which is the only logical one, as it is calculated to amend itself as social grievances are removed. I will proceed with the scheme.

W. E. Gladstone, who, as a political pathologist, ought to know, said that “suspicion is the most obstinate among the besetting sins of politicians, even in men of upright nature.” The reason of this is plain. As the special business of politicians is to root out grievances, carry them in their heads, discourse about them in the chamber, and demand redress from the higher powers, they acquire the habit of distrusting everybody and everything, and in the end completely lose faith in human nature, so the doctrine that the individual is utterly insignificant, that no particular man is of any consequence, becomes the rooted belief of politicians—quite an unscientific creed, of course, but then they don't study science in parliament. The result of this political habit of suspicion must be that we shall have collected in our central representative chamber all the most suspicious characters of the states. The proposed house will be formed in a sort of dumb-bell shape, the ladies sitting on one side, the gentlemen on the other, the object of the dumb-bell shape being to concentrate discussion in the centre, and to give the new principle of union a chance of arising.
There will certainly be no lack of that opposition, the absence of which from the Queensland Parliament so deeply distressed Sir Horace Tozer that he took his departure for another planet, casting from him as he rose above the earth his customary mantle of mendacity to be donned by his successor, and hurling from the blue, upon those adoring citizens who watched his apotheosis with wondering admiration, this last testament:—“One of the greatest curses that afflicted this country was the publication of Hansard.”

In our new house there is certain to be a deadlock everyday. All things in heaven and earth and purgatory will be discussed till a tired feeling creeps over the assembly and members of opposite sexes pair to the refreshment room, only the two national representatives—the male and female premiers—being left. And this will happen again and again until the refreshment room becomes far more popular than the assembly. But, thanks to the dumb-bell shape of the house, there will always be a tendency to concentration of discussion, and as the two national representatives—the male and female premiers—will, like the captain of a vessel, feel bound to remain at their post till everyone else is safely landed in the refreshment room, the real power in the assembly must be concentrated in their hands; and as they thus will have heard the whole of the debate, while other members only hear a part, they will be in a position to sum up the two sides of the argument. They thus stand forth as the two champions between whom the great battle of Armageddon has finally to be fought.

Now, here again let me point out the advantage of my scheme as compared with the Convention's. Dr. Quick says that “if all legislative powers are vested in one man, or in one assembly, there is despotism.” But in modern times, as parliaments are practically absolute, and not only propose but actually make the laws, parliamentary government is, by the Doctor's own showing, despotism; and so it will be in the federal scheme of the Convention, as the Doctor says the House of Representatives will be supreme. But in my scheme there cannot be despotism, since there is a woman to be considered as well as a man, and my chamber, being dumb-bell shaped, is as little like “one assembly” as possible. Some sort of connection is evidently necessary between houses of parliament, or government would be impossible; and I claim for my dumb-bell plan that it gives the necessary connection in the simplest and most direct manner.

The Doctor also says that “the Commonwealth created by the Bill is a double kind of union.” If the House is to represent the double oneness of the Commonwealth, the dumb-bell seems to me the only suitable form: the division is, as it were, skinned over.

Another advantage is that in the middle of the join, where the opposing
currents of discussion meet, I should have a sensitive plate which would record the net resultant of the debate, after the manner of a composite photograph. Since Tozer with his dying breath cursed **Hansard**, it is absolutely necessary to supersede it and the reporter by a more up-to-date method. A “composite photograph” of the debate would give the general public all necessary information, and the general impression it gave would be absolutely truthful, which the reporter's summary never by any chance is. The new machine, which I intend to patent, will be called “The Tozer Cosmotype.” Tozer's name attached to a machine so absolutely truthful will serve as an undying rebuke to that envious journalist who slandered poor Tozer so disgracefully simply because he proclaimed a higher truth—viz., the passing away of the old parliamentary system; a truth fatal, as all higher truths are, to those bred under the old régime, who are out of office, and who, seeing no chance of getting into the parliamentary heaven, seek to raise a parliamentary despotism of their own in that fair Eden, where the new Adam and Eve do not intend to be again seduced either by the emissary of the New South Wales Satanic League, or the serpentine guile of a “fossilized” paper “worm.”
The only despotism that can possibly arise under my federal scheme is one hinted at by the word itself,—for despot meant, originally, house- husband. The male and female premiers, left to themselves in the house by the continual pairing of the opposites to the refreshment room, are bound likewise to begin a flirtation, to propose union to one another; for if they remain in irreconcilable opposition or deadlock the whole business of the state must suffer; the only alternative to wedlock is dissolution of the house and appeal to the country. But this would merely be a waste of time and energy, since the same old deadlock is certain to reoccur. A dissolution, too, would mean the end of the pleasant pairing season for all the couples, and the possible anger of the goose that lays the golden eggs. So there is every reason for supposing that the deadlock of the premiers must end in wedlock, and the birth of a new principle of government from their union, as the “solution of the antinomy.”

Thus under my federal scheme the only despotism that can arise is the despotism of Love, which is no despotism at all. As Helena sings in Goethe's “Faust”:—

“Love, terrestrial bliss to capture,
   Two in noble union mates;
But to wake celestial rapture,
   He a precious three creates.”

Surely such a result as this is better than that which, according to the Sydney Bulletin, must attend the adoption of the Convention scheme. Said the Bulletin:—“It is impossible to make things balance quite mathematically; some day it may be found that there is either too much power with the federal authority or too much power with the provincial ones, and this paper believes in letting the federal authority have the benefit of the doubt. One tyrant is better than six.” The Bulletin ought to know, since it returned five out of the ten New South Wales Convention delegates.

Observe, too, that the Bulletin speaks of “federal authority” and “provincial ones,” not state ones. But if the other ones are provincial—i.e., not sovereign—then the federal authority virtually ceases to be federal, and becomes national; and observe also that the Bulletin agrees with Dr. Quick that parliamentary government is a despotism, since it speaks of six tyrants.
And any fool can guess who the “one tyrant” is to be.

The impossibility of maintaining the true federal position—*i.e.*, the equal sovereignty of the states—was admitted by Dr. Quick when he wrote:—

“The Constitution will come into operation under the fair and well distributed influence of *two forces*. One of those forces will be the centralizing attraction of the Commonwealth, and its tendency to detract from the power and dignity of the states. The other will be the centrifugal disposition of the states. They desire to retain their constitutional status unimpaired—to assert state rights and state interests in the Senate—to subordinate Commonwealth policy to state policy. In this struggle and competition for supremacy it would, without the aid and enlightenment of experience in other countries, be difficult to conjecture whether in the end the states or the Commonwealth would conquer. Securely entrenched in the Senate, behind the ramparts of equal representation, it might be argued that the states would in the end boss the federal legislative machine, and either clog it altogether or mould its decrees to suit the views of a majority of states, regardless of the interests of the Commonwealth as a whole. That, however, has not been the experience of the federal republic of the United States, for American politics have never turned on an antagonism between two sets of Commonwealths”—you are getting rather mixed, Doctor, when you talk of “two sets,” since the opposition is between one Commonwealth and various states—“but rather on the conflicts of parties.” And Bryce tells us that the Americans reproduced party government in spite of themselves. The Doctor continues:—“The national spirit which was growing as a silent force, after a long battle with the doctrine of state sovereignty, eventually emerged safely and soared victoriously over all opposition.” If reason and experience thus contribute to tell us that the doctrine of state right, state sovereignty, is certain to be conquered by the national force, why in the name of fortune can't we Australians learn from past history, instead of going through the dismal teaching by civil war which America suffered? For in America the would-be secessionists were made to give up their claim to absolute sovereignty by force of arms, *forced* back into the union. The Doctor goes on:—“The latent ambiguity in that constitution, as to whether the states formed a compact dissoluble at will, or whether it was an indestructible union of indestructible states, was for ever swept away by the civil war. It was that ambiguity alone which gave rise to the doctrine of secession and nullification which caused the war.”

No, Doctor! States don't fight about quibbles, about ambiguities, but about practical matters. The abolition of slavery touched the pockets of the Southern states; that is why they wished to secede. If your proposed
Federal Bill comes into force, and New South Wales, as the “one tyrant,” establishes a “crowned socialism” by means of old age pensions, and wants North Australia to do the same, *that* will touch the pockets of the North, and bring upon Australia another war of secession. And by your clause “indissoluble union” you do all you can to make such a war inevitable. Again I say: Australians, have nothing whatever to do with an “indissoluble union.” If you insist on federation, let it be clearly understood from the first that no state which wishes to secede is to be brought back by physical force. Make this an article of the constitution. And take good care that the Federal Government has no military force at its command, or the “article” will not restrain it, especially if New South Wales gets the upper hand, for she is the most domineering of the states to-day—*e.g.*, her recent action in respect to a shipment of bananas peremptorily excluded by a New South Wales official, and received by a Victorian one as free from the fly. As Milton wrote:—

“Who overcomes
By force, hath overcome but half his foe.”

Thus, as a matter of fact, America has not become a nation yet. She overcame the political polytheism of state sovereignties, but she has not yet overcome the old world dualism of party, the dualism of heaven and hell—altruism and egoism. Europe to-day is really a pandemonium, America a purgatory, Asia a sleeping beauty; and Australia, if she likes, can wake the beauty and become an earthly paradise, by uniting hell, heaven, and purgatory, and transforming them into a human kingdom of art, in which the poet shall reign, leading the world captive not by force of arms but by music.

Tennyson was not a federalist at heart, though he dreamt of a federation, since he sang:—

“As Ring out a slowly dying cause,
And ancient forms of party strife;
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.

Ring out the want, the care, the sin,
The faithless coldness of the times;
Ring out, ring out my mournful rhymes,
But ring the fuller minstrel in.
Ring out false pride in place and blood,
The civic slander and the spite;
Ring in the love of truth and right,
Ring in the common love of good.

Ring out old shapes of foul disease;
Ring out the narrowing lust of gold;
Ring out the thousand wars of old,
Ring in the thousand years of peace.

Ring in the valiant man and free,
The larger heart, the kindlier hand;
Ring out the darkness of the land,
Ring in the Christ that is to be.”

But we cannot bring in peace at the point of the bayonet, nor can we have sweeter manners, purer laws, until woman exerts her due influence on cynical and corrupt governments. Before we can bring Parliamentary misgovernment to an end we must have not merely one man one vote but one woman one vote also. A woman's parliament may or may not be necessary, but at any rate we want a woman's council, to deal in a practical way with sexual matters, particularly if we are to “ring out old shapes of foul disease.” And how is the connection to be established between our two councils? Women, the best women, do not care to discuss sexual matters with men. Well, if we can only change deadlock into wedlock and marry our male and female premiers, the necessary bond of communion is at once established, for there are, or need be, no secrets between husband and wife where the union is one of perfect trust and love. Those politicians of ours who leave women out of count altogether in their schemes are sham democrats and tyrants, who seek to perpetuate the despotism of man.

Before we can get rid of the federal incubus of distrust, with its Danish Board of Guardians, we have to put the lawyers into their proper place. And the best way is to let the widows at them. The “Widow of Windsor” should make one Chief Dane, who appropriated the Dane-geld for himself, when his country was in financial straits, disgorge; and we might make it a law of the constitution that every odd unmarried lawyer marry a widow, so that the law again becomes equitable, up to date, and procreative or progressive. The lawyers can never enter Paradise while their idea of Heaven is an infinity of endless litigation, for ever bringing in fat fees.

A few extracts from Adam Smith's “Wealth of Nations” on the “Expenses of the Sovereign,” may not be out of place here. “In the pastoral stage of society,” writes Adam Smith, “all the inferior shepherds and herdsmen feel, that the security of their own herds and flocks depends upon
the security of those of the great shepherd or herdsman; that the maintenance of their lesser authority depends upon that of his greater authority; and that upon their subordination to him depends his power of keeping their inferiors in subordination to them. They constitute a sort of little nobility, who feel themselves interested to defend the property and to support the authority of their own little sovereign, in order that he may be able to defend their property and to support their authority. Civil government, so far as it is instituted for the security of property, is in reality instituted for the defence of the rich against the poor, or of those who have some property against those who have none at all.”

This is federation to a T, and perfectly tallies with Sir John Forrest's idea of federal government. There is a Danish proverb, no doubt springing from the heart of a law-ridden people—"God help the sheep when the wolf is judge." But in the pastoral state Adam Smith was describing, there really was an efficient sovereign, quite unlike the American sovereign, whom, as Dicey says, it takes a civil war to wake. "The judicial authority of such a sovereign," Smith says, "however, far from being a cause of expense, was, for a long time, a source of revenue to him. The persons who applied to him for justice were always willing to pay for it, and a present never failed to accompany a petition. After the authority of the sovereign, too, was thoroughly established, the person found guilty, over and above the satisfaction which he was obliged to make to the party, was likewise forced to pay an amercement to the sovereign. He had given trouble, he had disturbed, he had broke the peace of his lord the king, and for those offences an amercement was thought due. In the Tartar governments of Asia, in the governments of Europe, which were founded by the German and Scythian nations who overturned the Roman empire, the administration of justice was a considerable source of revenue, both to the sovereign and to all the lesser chiefs or lords who exercised under him any particular jurisdiction, either over some particular tribe or clan, or over some particular territory or district. Originally, both the sovereign and the inferior chiefs used to exercise this jurisdiction in their own persons. Afterwards, they universally found it convenient to delegate it to some substitute, bailiff or judge. This substitute, however, was still obliged to account to his principal or constituent for the profits of the jurisdiction. Whoever reads the instructions which were given to the judges of the circuit in the time of Henry II. will see clearly that those judges were a sort of itinerant factors, sent round the country for the purpose of levying certain branches of the king's revenue. In those days the administration of justice not only afforded a certain revenue to the sovereign, but to procure
this revenue seems to have been one of the principal advantages which he proposed to obtain by the administration of justice. This scheme of making the administration of justice subservient to the purposes of revenue, could scarce fail to be productive of several very gross abuses. As long as such presents, as long as the emoluments of justice, or what may be called the fees of court, constituted in this manner the whole ordinary revenue which the sovereign derived from his sovereignty, it could not well be expected that he should give them up altogether. It might, and it frequently was proposed, that he should regulate and ascertain them. But after they had been so regulated and ascertained, how to hinder a person who was all-powerful from extending them beyond those regulations was still very difficult, not to say impossible. During the continuance of this state of things, therefore, the corruption of justice, naturally resulting from the arbitrary and uncertain nature of those presents, scarce admitted of any effectual remedy.”

At the present time, instead of a single personal sovereign we have an absolute parliament largely composed of lawyers. It is only natural, then, to find the politicians raising to supreme power lawyers, increasing their salaries, and a clamour arising to make the office of judge elective, and to make the term less than life. And, as in the case of the Transvaal, inferior judges themselves take up the cry, naturally, as they want a chance of getting the fattest billet. Thus they conspire with parliament to extend the elective principle beyond its due sphere, and poison the very fountain of justice itself.

“But when,” continues Adam Smith, “from different causes, chiefly from the continually increasing expense of defending the nation against invasion, the private estate of the sovereign had become altogether insufficient for defraying the expenses of the sovereignty, and when it had become necessary that the people should, for their own security, contribute towards this expense by taxes of different kinds, it seems to have been very commonly stipulated that no present for the administration of justice should, under any pretence, be accepted either by the sovereign or by his bailiffs and substitutes, the judges. Those presents could more easily be abolished altogether than effectually regulated and ascertained. Fixed salaries were appointed to the judges. Justice was then said to be administered gratis. Justice, however, never was in reality administered gratis in any country. Lawyers and attorneys at least, must always be paid by the parties; and if they were not, they would perform their duty still worse than they actually do. The fees annually paid to lawyers and attorneys amount, in every court, to a much greater sum than the salaries of
the judges. The circumstance of those salaries being paid by the Crown can nowhere much diminish the necessary expense of a lawsuit. But it was not so much to diminish the expense as to prevent the corruption of justice, that the judges were prohibited from receiving any present or fee from the parties. The whole expense of justice might easily be defrayed by the fees of court, and without exposing the administration of justice to any real hazard of corruption, the public revenue might thus be entirely discharged from a certain, though perhaps but a small, encumbrance. It is difficult to regulate the fees of court effectually, where a person so powerful as the sovereign is to share in them and to derive any considerable part of his revenue from them.” Yes, Adam, and it is especially difficult when that sovereign is a many-headed parliamentary giant. This is how the lawyers work the Treasury:—“Brisbane, Dec. 14, 1897.—A return was tabled in the Legislative Assembly to-day showing the amounts paid to barristers and solicitors for work on behalf of the Crown during the past seven years. The total thus disbursed was £36,469, of which the Hon. T. J. Byrnes received £6,491; Mr. J. G. Drake, £1,981; Sir S. Griffith, the present Chief Justice, for three years’ work, £2,912, of which £2,778 was for services in connection with the Robb arbitration case; Mr. Mansfield, £3,819, of which £1,139 is salary while acting as judge; His Honour Mr. Justice Virgil Power, £1,091; the Hon. H. Rutledge, £1,198; Mr. W. A. Shand, £2,485; Mr. W. F. Wilson, £2,926; and Mr. J. L. Woolcock, £996.”

Thus nine lawyers received £23,899, while the other members of the profession in Queensland—whose numbers I don’t know, as Government statisticians like Coghlan don’t give this information, for reasons best known to themselves—only received £12,570 of the total £36,469. Brisbane government again! The chief lawyers evidently want to be controlled by their profession as a whole. By the way, the feather-headed political parrots of New South Wales are now calling in question the statisticians' results, and will soon think it necessary to abolish this highly useful office altogether, much to the detriment of the public. “The result of the Hon. E. Pulsford's criticism was,” says B. R. Wise, “that Mr. Coghlan's figures were never again taken seriously by the Convention.” Mr. Coghlan naturally “has never replied,” since to do so would endanger his billet.

But, to return to Adam Smith:—“It is very easy to regulate the fees of court, especially where the judge is the principal person who can reap any benefit from them. The law can very easily oblige the judge to respect the regulation, though it might not always be able to make the sovereign respect it.” But, Adam, “the law” is an ineffectual abstraction. The Chief Justice must be made responsible to all the lawyers, and the Chief Justice
should be nominated by the sovereign and approved by the profession. “Where the fees of court are precisely regulated and ascertained, where they are paid all at once at a certain period of every process into the hands of a cashier or receiver, to be by him distributed in certain known proportions among the different judges after the process is decided, and not till it is decided, there seems to be no more danger of corruption than where such fees are prohibited altogether. Those fees, without occasioning any considerable increase in the expense of a lawsuit, might be rendered fully sufficient for defraying the whole expense of justice; but not being paid to the judges till the process was determined, they might be some incitement to the diligence of the court in examining and deciding it. Public services are never better performed than when their reward comes only in consequence of their being performed, and is proportioned to the diligence employed in performing them.”

Yes, Australians, and not only the legal profession ought to be thus paid according to its deserts: the whole civil service ought to cease to have the protection of the state, and be submitted to the natural and healthy law of competition; then railway redtapeism, &c., would be put an end to, and the political tendency to magnify the civil service at the expense of the public would find a natural automatic check. And this is really to the interest of civil servants as a whole, since it is the “mandarins of the civil service,” and not the mass of those beneath them, who benefit by the present system. And unless all classes are prepared for state socialism on German lines this reform must be brought about. For, as Pearson pointed out in his “National Life and Character”—“Planted in Australia, the Englishman, to whom St. Simon and Fourier are names of derision, if they are even names, is rapidly creating a State Socialism, which succeeds because it is all-embracing, and able to compel obedience, and which surpasses its continental State models because it has been developed by the community for their own needs, and not by State departments for administrative purposes.” But Pearson is quite in the wrong. “It” has been developed by State departments in their own interests, and this development is certain to continue unless the “mandarins of the civil service” are made responsible to the general public, by placing over them a national sovereign, single and personal, instead of a board of party politicians, whose interest is by no means identical with that of the general public. And just as in the case of the lawyers this reform would not only be advantageous to the public, but also to the civil servants themselves, for federation will simply centralize officialdom and create a few big offices at the expense of the majority of the civil service. Thus it is natural to expect that that which the Sydney Bulletin said in 1895, re civil
servants, is a fact:—“One of the strongest currents of opinion set against federation is noiselessly directed by prominent officials in the public service of the various provinces. The conviction of these is that, under a federation, the salaries of officials in the individual states will be reduced, the signs of the times all pointing to the unlikelihood of the federation paying its officers at increased figures. Just as the bulk of the members of the various parliaments know that the Federal Parliament will depress them to an almost aldermanic insignificance, so the bulk of civil servants read in federation their depression to the rank of borough officials. A few civil servants will, of course, expand into the higher sphere, but those who are left behind will suffer manifest disadvantages.” But, as a matter of fact, federation is pretty certain to increase the salaries of the few officials at the top. With a national council such as I have proposed a maximum salary might be fixed for the state representatives, say £1,000 per annum, one representative only for each state. This sum is amply sufficient for a complete and cultured human existence. If a minimum wage sufficient to maintain an individual in healthy existence were established it should not be sufficient for a family, for that would be to encourage over-population.

As Huxley says:—“The population question is the real riddle of the Sphinx to which no political OEdipus has as yet found the answer. In view of the ravages of this terrible monster, over-multiplication, all the other riddles sink into insignificance.” But unless a minimum wage is established, the labourer, as the base of the social fabric, is an outcast left in competition with lower inhuman nature.

Every Christian state should protect its lowest classes—that is simply to incorporate all persons in the state. As it is, this “submerged tenth” is a tax on individuals and a danger to society. Our present system in Australia has created a large loafer class, which is increasing. This class wanders about the country, setting fire to grass, spreading ticks and rabbits, &c. Its aimless wandering is a sort of work, but worse than unproductive. Once a minimum subsistence wage was introduced, this class would not have its present grievance against society, and public opinion would soon banish every loafer, or compel him to do useful work. To grant a minimum wage is to grant the bare right to live, and not the right to reproduce. No man should have the right to marry unless he can support a wife by his own exertions.

But the means of life, the minimum wage or reward, need not be paid in money. A grant of land might be made to each person who required it instead—a sufficient acreage for subsistence, say 50 acres for a single person, man or woman, so that they would have to exert themselves even
to subsist. The minimum money wage would then only be payable to the sick, aged, and infirm, who could not exert themselves. Of course private beneficence to any extent would have no hindrance put in its way. And this minimum land area would have to be inalienable, so that no one would give credit to a greater sum than was necessary to provide tools to work. A maximum area of land for a single individual would have to be established too—say 20,000 acres—for those who had or could raise the necessary capital to work such a large estate. The two limits being established, land might be transferred to any extent, and properties could be worked together if desirable.

If those engaged in similar industries desired to co-operate they likewise could fix for themselves a minimum and maximum wage, all profit above this being divided into, say, four portions, and redistributed in proportion to wages—one portion to go to labour, one to capital, one to the manager (as the fittest person to expend profit for the general good of the industry), and the fourth portion to go to the higher authority, local or national, for the general expenditure of the district. If all similar industries in a state combined a fourth portion of the profits of each would form the general state revenue, which might similarly be divided into four equal portions—one to be returned to all the wage-earners of the state in proportion to wages; one to all the managers of industries for purposes of general social amelioration, amusement, &c.; one to the foreign capitalist; and the fourth to the national government for the good of the commonwealth, for removing, say, the burden of debt, or for public works, &c.

Thus, if co-operation was established everywhere, all taxation would be of the nature of a dividend tax, or tax on profits, and the central government need not tax locally at all. A definite public revenue would be secured, and an equitable redistribution of profit automatically brought about, by which justice would be done to every individual member of the state, every corporate body or industry, every province of the nation, and the nation as a whole. And this plan would secure more than justice—it would secure progress in justice. Every individual, district, and state would share in the general social amelioration in proportion to social utility—i.e., according to perfection of character as determined by social wage.

Thus the adoption of the national principle of government would immensely simplify the financial problem, as even federalists admit.

If the principle of free trade with all the rest of the world was adopted, instead of protection against all the rest of the world, the objection to the revival, in a new and better form, of the old guild system of industry would be taken away. And in Australia we are so fortunately placed that we can
stand on our own feet, without protection of any sort, and conquer by sheer force of national merit. We have the chance of doing away with all interference with natural trade conditions; of doing away with a host of customs and excise officers and yet deriving a sufficient national revenue by means of a dividend tax on the state profits as proposed above. But by the adoption of the Convention's scheme we give federal sanction to protection, and tax the whole country simply to benefit a host of officials, who must constantly interfere with the states. And not only this, we set the world against us.

Even New Zealand fights shy of us on this account. The New Zealand Mail of 10th March, 1898, says:—“On the whole it appears that federation is still in the air. That is if anything a good thing for New Zealand, since the federated Australian colonies would almost certainly celebrate their partnership by imposing a heavier tariff than ever against the world, and therefore against our producers.” Judging by what has been said and written on this subject in Australia, it appears to be a safe conclusion that if border duties could be abolished to-morrow there would be no more talk about federation, except among those politicians who, from belief or from policy, as the case may be, are vigorously booming it. Thus the New Zealanders see that the whole federal movement is in the main political. As I pointed out, free trade between the colonies can be brought about by referring this simple issue to the people, and there is not the slightest occasion to create a cumbrous representative body to secure it. Then the removal of protection in the states can be secured by the influence of reason, and the powerful example of New South Wales. Mr. Reid is, however, prepared to abandon even free trade if he can only create another political machine, for he knows that in a federal government New South Wales will have power enough to force free trade on the unwilling states. Mr. Wise says:—“Free trade doctrines” (why doctrines, not doctrine?) “rest upon a fundamental truth of nature; federation gives us a wider sphere in which to try the influence of our reasoning.” But if removal of protection by reasoning is all that Mr. Wise desires, then there is nothing to prevent the use of reason as things are. The “sphere” is as wide as the world. Either Mr. Wise wants to use force in addition to reason, or he wishes to change his standpoint. Well, a national council gives every legitimate opportunity. Again, though he says federation does not imply protection, he is by no means sure of this, and is prepared to throw free trade over. He says:—“Whatever the future tariff may be, I urge free traders in New South Wales to remember that the permanent welfare of Australia, which only union can secure, is of more importance than the
temporary success in any separate colony of either free trade or protection.”

Mr. Wise desires union; so do I; but federation is not union. If federation means, as Garran says it does, “dual control,” how can it be described as union? The real issue is:—Are we to unite prematurely, too quickly, on imperfect federal principles which will make union on “a fundamental principle of nature” exceedingly difficult afterwards, if not impossible without civil war? Or are we to let reason, by its ethereal impact, which is continuous, slow, and sure, gradually build up a permanent union which is stable and indissoluble simply because it is a voluntary union? Federalists desire the former course. As we have seen, it is directly to their interest as politicians; but it is not to the interest of the Australian people, it is not conducive to the higher civilization of the world, and there is really no good reason for adopting it. A national council could soon influence the states to do their duty as regards provision against invasion. Queensland in this matter has already shown the way, and has legal power to mobilize her citizens for self-defence.

As to providing a revenue for national purposes, the growth of co-operation will gradually give a revenue in the manner above described; and for the present, I am sure, the people of the Australian states are sufficiently patriotic, whatever their degenerate parliaments may be, to voluntarily contribute the necessary funds, if directly appealed to, once they were assured that the national government was in good hands. They do not trust a Federal Council simply because it is a close body, elected by Parliament itself. Though a member of the state parliament might be elected to the national council, no one ought to have a seat in both.

As to the railways and rivers, the Convention practically left matters as they were. The Convention, as the Bulletin said, “solves nearly all the difficult questions by deciding to skip them over, like a gladsome child, and let them settle themselves in the dim future anyhow they can.” That practically means that they are left to be settled in the interest of the “dominant partner,” New South Wales. Mr. Reid introduced a clause to cut down the unrestricted power of the Federal Parliament, to regulate navigation on the rivers, and to control irrigation, “providing that the Commonwealth shall not abridge the right of a state to the reasonable use of the waters.” This Dr. Quick describes as a “masterly solution of the difficulty, as it endeavours to equalize as far as possible the conflicting claims of navigation and irrigation.” Now, who are navigation and irrigation? One would think they must be river gods or metaphysical entities who have to be propitiated. The conflicting claims must be those of
the respective states, unless the rival claims of farmers and navigators in individual states be meant. But in either case where does the “masterly solution” come in? It is the usual business of government to equalize claims, to be reasonable, and the “masterly solution” is simply a statement of this truism.

Mr. Wise in the debates “objected to the referendum in any shape or form. Mr. Reid argued that there was no use discussing the matter, as nearly everyone was opposed to it. The speakers were listened to impatiently, and before tea a vote was taken, when Mr. Isaac's proposal was defeated by 29 votes to 12.” The members were evidently getting thirsty, and disposed of this important matter very simply. This rejection of the referendum is only another evidence that federation is a conspiracy on the part of politicians, as we shall see. The referendum is supposed to be a liberal measure; as a matter of fact, in its actual working it has proved itself a highly conservative measure, even obstructive to progress—e.g., the authors of “Switzerland,” in the “Story of the Nations” series, after noting the conservative character of the referendum, write:—“At Zurich, in 1889, the Grand Council wished to bring in a new law for bettering the education of the masses by improving the supplementary schools. The country labourers had a majority, and rejected the measure, objecting, it is said, to the additional expenditure. It is to be hoped, however, that this measure will be carried eventually.” Professor Dicey, writing in the Contemporary, “Ought the Referendum to be Introduced into England?” says:—“The gravest charge against the referendum by its critics, and brought with much show of reason, is that it obstructs improvement. The referendum does not hurry on a single law which parliamentary wisdom or caution disapproves. It merely adds an additional safeguard against the hastiness or violence of party. It is not a spur to democratic innovation, it is a check placed on popular impatience.”

But if it is a check on popular impatience it is certainly put on the people by themselves, which is absurd. As a matter of fact the referendum is a method devised by the people of putting a check on the impatience and self-seeking of politicians. And this has become necessary, since, as Dicey himself says, “no phenomenon is more curious than the divergence which, in all countries enjoying representative institutions, is apt to exist between parliamentary opinion and popular convictions.” It is perfectly plain, then, why Mr. Worldly Wise and other politicians object to the referendum. Numa Droz, writing on “The Referendum in Switzerland,” says of the optional referendum:—“It has often hindered, but it has never destroyed; it is not within its power to do so. It acts as a restraint on the authorities, it
obliges them to govern with caution, but it does not make government impossible, for it is not in its power to disorganize the state. I doubt whether in federal affairs the compulsory referendum would give any better results. On the contrary, it is to be feared that under such a system more than one practical measure affecting some special locality or industry, such as those relating to watchmaking or the phylloxera, would have failed to find grace with the majority, who would simply have seen no reason for them.” Here is good evidence that as regards special legislation the referendum is likely to become obstructive.

Bryce writes of America:—“Reference to the people acts as a conservative force; it is a conservative measure as compared with action by the legislature. If we regard the referendum in its effect upon the state legislatures, we shall regard it as being rather a bit and bridle than a spur.” Lecky, too, in his “Democracy and Liberty,” says:—“On the whole the popular vote, when it extends over the entire confederation, more frequently negatives than ratifies the measures submitted to it. The tendencies which it most strongly shows are a dislike to centralization, a dislike to violent innovation. . . . On the whole it has been decidedly conservative.” This result as disclosed by experience, is only what anyone who knows human nature would expect, for the great mass of people, average human nature, is not original or inventive. “The initiation,” wrote J. S. Mill in his “Liberty,” “of all wise or noble things, comes, and must come, from individuals, generally at first from some one individual. The honour and glory of the average man is that he is capable of following that initiative; that he can respond internally to wise and noble things, and be led to them with his eyes open. People think genius a fine thing if it enables a man to write an exciting poem or paint a picture. But in its true (i.e., highest) sense, that of originality in thought and action, though no one says that it is not a thing to be admired, nearly all, at heart, think they can do very well without it. Originality is the one thing which unoriginal minds cannot feel the use of.”

Take the case of improvement in machinery. Arkwright, the inventor of the spinning frame, had to remove from Nottingham to escape the fury of the populace, which had before this driven Hargreaves, the inventor of the spinning jenny, out of Lancashire. A mob also destroyed a large factory of Arkwright's. Arkwright's sole crime was that he had “abridged human labour and increased its sphere.” Recently too, in connection with the engineers' strike, it has been shown that the unionists “deliberately limit the output of the machines entrusted to their care.” Of course the reason that the workers object to machinery, and refuse to make full use of it, is that
they do not share the increased profit it brings. The action of labour in England is destroying England's manufacturing supremacy. The moral, however, to be drawn from the strike is that social progress and national supremacy are impossible unless labour is better treated than it now anywhere is. And to ensure this, as also to prevent extravagant expenditure and undue centralization, it is evident that the national referendum is the very thing we want in Australia. But the politicians stand in the way, and the politicians who would have voted for it were excluded from the Convention.

A few extracts from Professor Dicey's article will make it clear that the politicians are worldly wise in objecting to the referendum. It strikes at the very base of the party system, and tends to supersede parliamentary or parrot rule altogether. “Two obvious objections lie against the introduction of the referendum into England. It diminishes the importance of parliamentary debate, and thereby detracts from the influence of Parliament. That this must be so admits of no denial; a veto, whether it be exercised by a king or by an electorate, lessens the power of the legislature. An appeal in matters of legislation from Parliament to the people is (it may be urged), on the face of it, an appeal from knowledge to ignorance. This line of attack on the principle of an appeal to the people is an assault upon the foundations of popular government.” As I pointed out in the beginning of this book, the opinion of the people on large and general questions is generally sound, while that of the upper classes is usually vicious. Dicey continues:—“The referendum is the only check on the predominance of party which is at the same time democratic and conservative. It is democratic, for it appeals to and protects the sovereignty of the people; it is conservative, for it balances the weight of the nation's common-sense or inertia against the violence of partisanship and the fanaticism of reformers. The referendum also tends to sever legislation from politics. That this separation is in itself desirable is a matter almost past dispute. Even as things now are, careful observers conjecture that measures, which it were hardly possible to propose in parliament, might not displease the electors, whilst proposals which command strong parliamentary support might not stand the ordeal of a popular vote. Small would be the support which parliament would give to one of the most salutary reforms conceivable—the reduction of the numbers of seats to be filled both in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords. Yet there is no reason for asserting that the people of the United Kingdom would object to a change which reduced the Houses of Parliament to something like the size of the Houses of Congress.” Thus a great political writer admits that “reduction by pairs,”
in accordance with the law of progress, is a necessary, salutary reform. Naturally politicians object to a referendum which might pare them away. “From whichever side the matter be looked at, the conclusion becomes more than probable that the results of a referendum would, occasionally at least, be utterly different from the results of a general election, and that the electors, when consulted on the advisability of passing a definite law, might break through the bonds of party allegiance to follow the dictates of their own prejudices or common-sense. The popular veto on constitutional changes which freed electors from bondage to the party system might also promote the straightforwardness of English statesmanship.” The referendum also tends to permanency of office, which is, of course only another aspect of its tendency to remove the party system. “Under the influence of the referendum,” writes Numa Droz, “a profound change has come over the spirit both of the parliaments and people. The idea of employer and employed, of the sender and sent, which lies at the root of the representative system (cf. the motto Ich dien), becomes an absolute reality. The people still choose their representatives to make the laws, but they reserve the right of sanction. When they reject a law, in virtue of this sovereign right, there is no entering on a state of conflict, for a conflict can only take place where the exercise of a right is met by a competing claim; and there is here no claim to compete. The craftsman carries out the work to his own satisfaction; the employer who gave the order is of a different opinion, and sends it back to be altered. It is perfectly simple; each has done his duty within the limits assigned him; there is no ground of quarrel. The legislator is not discredited, he is only in the position of a deputy whose bill is not passed. There is no question of resigning. If here and there a measure is rejected, other measures are passed; there is clearly no want of confidence. Moreover, after rejecting a law it is quite common to re-elect the same representatives. Thus the new régime leaves no room for either ministerial or parliamentary crises. The representatives of the people are elected for a short term, generally three years. During this time—thanks to the restraining referendum—they can do nothing really contrary to the public will, at least in any essential matter.”

Thus it is evident that the referendum is the very thing we want, and better even for the politicians themselves than the present irresponsible system. Mr. Wise's objection to it won't hold water. He said:—“The referendum meant government by newspapers, and he would sooner trust the destiny of the nation to the worst parliament ever elected than to the best newspapers the mind of man could possibly imagine.” The result of the referendum in Switzerland, however, Numa Droz tells us, is that “not
unfrequently the press, which loves to parade itself as the voice of public opinion, has been belied by the popular vote. Those who make the most noise cannot here impose on the people as they do in other countries; they are taken for what they are really worth.” And really the chief reason why the newspapers have exceeded their proper business—i.e., the collection and dissemination of news—is the absence of political wisdom from parliament.

As Goldwin Smith said, writing on the machinery of elective government:—“Parliaments are losing much of their importance, because the real deliberation is being transferred from them to the press and the general organs of discussion by which the great questions are virtually decided, parliamentary speeches being little more than reproductions of arguments already used outside the house, and parliamentary divisions little more than registrations of public opinion. It is not easy to say how far, with the spread of public education, this process may go, or what value the parliamentary debate and division list will in the end retain. . . . But this is a problem which belongs to the future.” Yes! it is a problem which it rests with Australia to solve, since the great Sir Horace has sung the dying swan song of parliamentary government. But it is not surprising to find that Worldly Wise has a down on the newspapers. And, indeed, as M. de Blowitz says, the predominance of irresponsible newspapers is a great social danger.

M. de Blowitz wrote, on “Journalism as a Profession”:—“I wish to draw attention to the danger for civilized society involved in the existence of so powerful an instrument for the dissemination of destruction, if it chance to be used by the first comer, and wielded by an untrained hand in a random direction. And I refer naturally to French journalism, as that which I see closest at hand, although I am obliged to keep a constant eye on the entire modern press. The lack of knowledge and authority in French journalism is most strikingly seen in its treatment of foreign affairs. And this lack has already had the most unfortunate consequences. Men of a scarcely conceivable lightness of character and irresponsibility, altogether lacking in knowledge, caring only for their own ephemeral and personal success, have succeeded, by the merest accident and with a stupefying self-assurance, in becoming the mentors of the French public on international questions; and they find no contradictors, simply because their own inadequacy, if not surpassed, is equalled by all who have adopted the same speciality as they. They propagate thus with impunity the most dangerous errors, establish doctrines which are a real danger from the point of view of the public interest, and, too ignorant to lead others, and too lacking in
authority to aid in bringing about international rapprochements, sow discord and hatred, and the seeds of inevitable future conflict. This is why France at the present moment suspects and hates all the Continental nations, Russia excepted, and even about the latter no one dares to tell the truth, because it would violate popular prejudice. But there is thus being prepared one of the most cruel and dangerous disillusionments ever yet experienced."

The press in Australia is not so bad as this, yet the press has almost universally advocated federation, which “is a real danger from the point of view of the public interest.” Australians imagine that they have a free press, but with a few possible exceptions this is a delusion. The press is largely in the hands either of the capitalist or the politician, and there is not a single newspaper in Australia that takes a sane and balanced view of great national questions. The *Review of Reviews*, *e.g.*, will not publish an article against federation, or if it does so tardily, cannot do it without stating at the head of the article that the writer is wrong in its opinion. Mr. Stead has written a book entitled “The Truth about Russia,” in which he recommends the Emperor to establish an imperial newspaper so that all his subjects can appeal directly to the imperial tribune. Of course, in Australia, without a head directly responsible to the nation, newspaper government would be a danger, but with a capable head a national newspaper would be a great public benefit and economy, since it would tend to render the present cumbrous system of parliamentary representation useless. It would simply be representation on a higher plane. Naturally politicians are set dead against such a higher development of the representative principle. And naturally also the press is certain to set its face against such a thing, as tending to supersede its authority, as it would be the business of a national press to disseminate sound opinion on all subjects. It could also introduce the best literature of the world into Australian homes cheaply. Once started it would pay its way, and might become a source of national revenue. Another advantage: it would not have to be always seeking for sensational matter. This suggestion falls completely in with my suggestion as to a national council entirely dissociated from political power, *i.e.*, from government by force. But even if a national government is not founded, a national newspaper, run not for profit but merely to pay its way, might be started. As things are the best thought of the nation cannot make itself heard at all without great expense, and as genius is frequently shy and lacking in self-assertive power, the best elements in the country are deprived of their due influence.

We certainly do not want to see the “Nonconformist conscience”
supreme in Australia, throwing the “shadow of the Cross” upon our sunny land. We are not as a nation religious, not ascetic; the monkish ideal is not ours. We believe in “a city which hath no temple,” a city of art. Religion itself, as Max Müller tells us, develops, and the only possible religion of the future is Christianity rightly understood and interpreted to meet modern needs. Christianity is really the religion of humanity, and those who prefer this religion can accept the creeds of all nations as partial and imperfect approximations to the truth.

Modern democracy finds its great original in Christ. As C. W. Stubbs wrote:—“I am prepared to maintain that in Jesus Christ we have not only the originator of the most far-reaching social revolution, but also the truest champion of free thought and liberator of the human spirit from the cramping shackles of spiritual despotism and arbitrary authority which the world has yet seen. . . . Christianity itself arose out of a revolt from the clerical and dogmatic spirit in religion. Certainly few things stand out more prominently in the life of Christ than this—that almost from the first He was at open feud with the religious authorities of his day. He, the mildest and gentlest of men, who had a good word even for the publican and prostitute, had nothing but denunciation and hostility for the scribes and Pharisees. In language which is certainly not wanting in energy He denounced this all-powerful order as traitors to the cause of human well-being and poisoners of the wells of the national life.” And in the same spirit I to-day denounce our modern scribes and Pharisees, the all-powerful political order of the present, as conspirators against the people and traitors to all that is highest in the spirit of humanity. But Christianity has done its work; to-day there are popular sympathies to appeal to, not only here in Australia but all the world over, and woe to those scribes and Pharisees of to-day if they presume to reject the corner-stone of the political temple which the builders of the Convention rejected. It is not necessary to-day to speak in parables. But it is well to call to mind the parable of the vineyard:—“A man planted a vineyard, and let it out to husbandmen and went into another country for a long time. And at the season he sent unto the husbandmen a servant, that they should give him of the fruit of the vineyard; but the husbandmen beat him and sent him away empty. And he sent yet another servant: and him also they beat, and handled him shamefully, and sent him away empty. And he sent yet a third: and him also they wounded, and cast him forth. And the lord of the vineyard said, What shall I do? I will send my beloved son: it may be they will reverence Him. But when the husbandmen saw him, they reasoned one with another, saying, This is the heir; let us kill him, that the inheritance may be ours.
And they cast him forth out of the vineyard, and killed him. What, therefore, will the lord of the vineyard do unto them? He will come and destroy these husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others. And when they heard it they said, God forbid. But he looked upon them, and said, What then is this that is written? The stone which the builders rejected the same was made the head of the corner.” So to-day I say, God forbid that these husbandmen be destroyed and the vineyard be given unto others, but they must recognize the head of the corner, they must submit themselves to the law of progress, they must recognize perfection of individual character as the method of progress, the way and the life, or the “rightful lord” will assuredly scatter them as dust. For, as Mill said—“The initiation of all wise and noble things comes, and must come, from individuals, generally at first from some one individual.” The importance of sufficient amending power in the state is generally admitted. “It is the almost insuperable difficulty,” writes a Queensland journal, “of amending the American constitution which has made it so cast-iron a law, and, on the other hand, it is the ease with which the British constitution can be amended so as to suit the needs of the nation in different circumstances and lines which has made it the freest in the world. If the Convention can only preserve for Australia the freedom of amending the constitution which is enjoyed by the people of the United Kingdom, the probabilities of acceptance will be vastly increased. If those who disapprove of the constitution see that to amend it will be a work of almost insuperable difficulty, they may be expected to work tooth and nail against its acceptance. But if amendment is a fairly easy task once the people have clearly pronounced in its favour, thousands who may be disappointed with the constitution will accept it in the hope that it will be amended later on in accordance with their views.”

And what has the Convention done in this matter? It has rejected the “corner stone” as far as it lay in its power to do so, and it has rejected that method, the national referendum, which the Christian spirit has added to the political fabric in order to ensure justice to the people.

“Opposition to our scheme must be founded on a want of confidence in representative and responsible government, and a desire to see it superseded or emasculated by the referendum,” says Dr. Quick. As we have seen, there is very good ground for this want of confidence, since representative government all over the world has ceased to be representative and become irresponsible, and instead of the referendum emasculating government it will strengthen it and reinvigorate it.

Numa Droz writes of its results in Switzerland:—“The system has borne
good fruit. The people have generally shown themselves wiser than the meddling politicians who have tried to draw them into systematic opposition. If now and then they have voted under the influence of obvious ill humour with their own representatives, they have, on the other hand, more than once given the agitator clearly to understand that he had no chance with them. The net result has been a great tranquilizing of public life. The debates which precede and accompany a referendary movement are a normal manifestation of popular life. And when the ballot has pronounced, everybody accepts the result. Adapted to a people fundamentally democratic like the Swiss, the referendum is unquestionably one of the best forms of government ever attempted. It may be thought good to modify it in accordance with the suggestions of experience, but there can never again be any question of doing away with it.” Australians! you can judge of what worth the dictum of an interested politician is compared with such testimony as this. The Convention showed a profound distrust of democracy, of the reasonable nature of the Australian people.

Dante's political creed is worth our consideration. It will be remembered how Dante, the kingliest soul of Italy, was treated by the ruling powers. In Carlyle's words—“His property was all confiscated. He tried what was in him to get reinstated; tried even by warlike surprisal, with arms in his hand; but it would not do; bad only had become worse. There is a record, I believe, still extant in the Florence archives, dooming this Dante, wheresoever caught, to be burnt alive. Burnt alive; so it stands, they say: a very curious civic document. Another curious document, some considerable number of years later, is a letter of Dante's to the Florentine magistrates, written in answer to a milder proposal of theirs, that he should return on condition of apologizing and paying a fine. He answers, with fixed, stern pride:—‘If I cannot return without calling myself guilty, I will never return—nunquam revertar.’” Thus Dante was banished, and banished himself, and still awaits the day when

“The poet shall return, and at the font
Baptismal shall he take the crown of laurel.”

But if the world has generally rejected those men of genius, who are in a special sense the sons of God, the fault has generally been their own as well as the world's: they have not understood that the kingdom cannot be won by violence. As Goethe sang of a great poet, who was greater than his poetry:—
“Earthly fortune was thy dower,
Lofty lineage, ample might;
Ah, too early lost, thy flower
Withered by untimely blight!
Glance was thine the world discerning
Sympathy with every wrong,
Woman's love for thee still yearning,
And thine own enchanting song.
Yet, the beaten path forsaking,
Thou didst run into the snare:
So with law and usage breaking,
On thy wilful course didst fare;
Yet at last high thought has given
To thy noble courage weight,
For the loftiest thou hast striven—
It to win was not thy fate.
Who does win it? Unreplying,
Destiny the question hears,
When the bleeding people, lying
Dumb with grief, no cry uprears!
Now new songs chant forth, in sorrow
Deeply bowed lament no more;
Them the earth brings forth to-morrow,
As she brought them forth of yore!

Dante's creed is summarized by a Quarterly Reviewer thus:—“Mankind is one, and if there exists a collective of men, it is because there is one aim for them all, one work to be accomplished by them all. Mankind, then, ought to work together, in order that all the intellectual powers that are bestowed amongst them may receive the highest possible development, whether in the sphere of thought or action. It is only by harmony, consequently by association, that this is possible. Mankind must be one, even as God is one—one in organization, as it is already one in its principle. Now unity seeks for something by which it may be represented, and this is found in a unity of government. There must then of necessity be some centre to which the general inspiration of mankind ascends, thence to flow down again in the form of law—a power strong in unity, and in the supporting advice of the higher intellects naturally destined to rule, providing with calm wisdom for all the different functions which are to be fulfilled—the distinct employments — itself performing the part of pilot, of supreme chief, in order to bring to the highest perfection what Dante calls ‘the universal religion of human nature;’ that is, empire—imperium. It will maintain concord amongst the rulers of states, and this peace will diffuse itself from thence into towns, from the towns among each cluster of
habitations, into every house, into the bosom of each man. But where is the seat of this empire to be? At this question Dante quits all analytic argumentation and takes up the language of synthetical and absolute affirmation, like a man in whom the least expression of doubt excites astonishment. He is no longer a philosopher, he is a believer. He shows Rome, the Holy City, as he calls her, the city whose very stones he declares to be worthy of reverence. “There is the seat of empire. There never was, and there never will be, a people endowed with more gentleness for the exercise of command, with more vigour to maintain it, and more capacity to acquire it, than the Italian nation, and, above all, the Holy Roman people.”

No, Dante! There is no city as yet whose stones are worthy of reverence. The day of empire in the old sense is over, and the coming commonwealth is not yet born, but never before has a people had such a splendid opportunity for bringing into existence a true commonwealth as the Australian people have to-day. And may I not say—“There never was, and there never will be, a people endowed with more gentleness for the exercise of command, with more vigour to maintain it, and more capacity to acquire it,” than the Australian nation.

But we must not establish our state on so narrow a principle as the national. Nor should our aim be cosmopolitan, but simply human in the highest and the broadest sense. Therefore, we should welcome the best, the select of all nations, those who wish to develop their highest powers, to our sunny land, which has been made by nature so fencible and strong, so rich and independent, that it could be held, if necessity arose, against the combined attack of the greatest hostile powers. For the race that is to lead must be able to hold its own against the whole world, must prove itself superior. “Australia,” said Wentworth, “is a country which nature seems to have designed as her masterpiece.” Dr. Magee wrote:—“The humanity that is to rule all things must first prove itself incapable of being ruled by any.” At present we are ruled by the monied power. This power we have to put in its subordinate place: not to destroy it, but control it, and unless we do so the sceptre of the higher civilization can never be ours. England is conquered by it to-day. As America saved England and the liberties of the world once in spite of England, so we have to save England and liberty again to-day, and let us hope that it will not be in spite of England this time.

But to do our work, to attain our end, we must be one and undivided: a house divided against itself cannot stand. No form of federation whatsoever will meet our case, and unity must grow by the mild suasion of
reason, the personal influence of character, recognized as supreme and given its rightful place in the state, as superior to law—as lawmakers, as empowered to alter and amend all law. For the initiating power does not reside in the people. It is the prerogative of wisdom, of representative personality. For what does amendment mean? What does progress mean? It does not mean simply increase in wealth, or increase in size, or increase in motion, or even, with Spencer, increase in structure. It means the collection of the greatest number of distinct individualities, and the establishment of concord between them, so that no individuality is lost, and yet no one transgresses or interferes with another, so that the result is harmonious cooperation—a living poem. Hence the poet has been called myriad-minded, and this is not a metaphor merely but a physical fact. Great men are not made in a lifetime; they are born with a material substance more varied, and therefore more capable of modification, of adaptation to circumstance, than the majority of men. They are physically capable of greater differentiation, greater complexity of structure, and a finer division of labour.

Dr. Wilson, writing on the researches of Ramon y Cajal, of Madrid, into the structure of the brain, says:—“When we get high intellectuality, associated with small or moderate size of brain (Gambetta's brain is instanced), we are to believe that while there are smaller brain-cells than exist in a bigger brain, their ramifications and connections are infinitely complex and numerous, admitting of free and uninterrupted service between them. ‘Big head, little wit,’ as the proverb runs, would be interpreted in the converse way—plenty of cells (or bigger cells, more probably), but the cells possessing fewer connections, and being therefore less available for active work. Probably the slow-going human with a big head, as opposed to the active small-brained man, derives his peculiarities from a like state of things. The metaphor used by the Spanish savant is so apt in this connection that it may well be quoted. He compares the brain-cells in this way to a garden full of innumerable trees ‘which, in response to intelligent cultivation, can increase the number of their branches, strike their roots over a wider area, and produce ever more varied and more exquisite flowers and fruits.’ Finally we are led, in looking at the anatomical conditions of thought, to see in the higher cells of the brain a different structure from that found in the cells of lower grades of nerve centres. It is suggested even that in intellects of high order we get a more elaborate structure of the cells than in minds of low degree.”

But we have to conceive of this difference in structure, variety, and complexity between men as not only a feature of the brain, but of the
whole organism. The human body is really a marvellous commonwealth in itself, of which the brain is simply the supreme centre of consciousness, to which, as in Dante's "imperium," the general inspiration of the body ascends, undergoing transformation as it does so, and thence flowing down in the form of nervous influence, animating the whole, directing the action of every part to attain its end, the purpose of its life. And the higher the organization is the less will the waste of effort be, the more easily and quickly will the end of action be attained.

Now, the analogy between the individual and the social organism has been noticed by a host of writers, among which Plato and Hobbes are conspicuous; and recently Spencer has worked it out minutely, but none of these writers have risen to the Christian point of view, the brotherhood of man, which, translated into modern language, means that there is a tendency towards the organization of all human beings on the earth into one co-operating whole—that is, humanity tends to become one organism, a system of interdependent parts, repeating, though on a far larger scale, and with a vast extension of power, the organization of the human individual. Now, if this be the case, each nation will resemble a particular organ of the whole, but somewhere or other there must be a supreme cerebral centre. At this centre, then, there must be brought about a different structure of society from that found in the cells of lower grades of nerve centres. As Ramon y Cajal finds it to be on the small scale, so it must be on the national. If Australia, then, is to become this higher centre, the whole constitution of her society must be different from that of other nations. The ramifications and connections of her individuals and industries must be "infinitely complex and numerous, admitting of free and uninterrupted service between them;" in other words, competition between the component individuals must be superseded by co-operation. Spencer points out that the function of houses of Parliament is exactly the same as that of the brain in the individual—viz., the averaging by means of representation of the interests of the various classes of the community. But under a co-operative system this averaging would be done locally, the interests of the members of each industry would be identical, instead of diverse as at present. Thus it would be only necessary for such state to have one representative in the national centre. And if Australia is to become a great international tribunal, then each nation would be represented as a whole in the supreme centre. It is obvious that the greater the area to be represented, the more intensive, and the less extensive, must such representation be. This is the law of all progress in organization, whether it be law in organic life, in knowledge or social progress. We can see then in the Federal
Council a sort of prophetic intuition of Australia’s destiny as an international centre. Now it is evident that the adoption of the federal scheme will tend to create one large centralized government as a national centre. This will utterly preclude the extension of the governing influence of this body beyond Australia; it will be much too cumbersome as a directing international organ. Unitary representation is an absolute necessity of an international centre. An international centre should obviously deal with nations as wholes; its business is to reconcile the interests of, not parts of nations, but whole nations. Federalists maintain that their states are sovereign wholes. This being the case, they are untrue to their own principles when they seek to bring about even a double representation in the national centre; this is practically to admit that their states are not sovereign wholes. Dualism, or party government, is, as I said before, totally inadmissible in a national government. Australia is right in not desiring unification—*i.e.*, a fusion in which the component states lose their individuality. The true form of government for her is a representative unity, which is quite different from unification. A representative unity is one in which whole states are singly represented. If Australia can adopt this method, she adopts a method, and the only method, suited for international control. And, of course, such an international council or assembly must be purely deliberative in nature and totally dissociated from executive power. The various Australian states become as it were the senses of the central soul, the seven quantities, like the elements of the orbit, necessary for averaging international movements and reducing them to harmony. Thus in the case of Australia a fusion of the states such as even federalists look forward to is inadmissible, and totally inconsistent with her future destiny. All that it is necessary to do is to add a central body to restrain by influence the aberrations of the states. This is not unification, nor is it federalism. I can only describe it as a representative unity. It resembles the system of the sun and planets, a stable yet progressive order. And it is only by establishing a highly complex system of this kind that continuous amendment is possible. As the universe is the scene of an infinite progression by infinitesimal increments and decrements, it is obvious that all methods by which social amendment has hitherto been brought about are inadequate, for they have only secured it by fits and starts; the governing organs have not kept pace with social amelioration generally, and thus there have always been social decay and popular suffering.

It is supposed by some that England has succeeded in amending her constitution according to social requirements, but this is so little the case that a competent judge like Huxley writes:—“Anyone who is acquainted
with the population of all great industrial centres, whether in this or other
countries, is aware that, amidst a large and increasing body of that
population, la misère reigns supreme. Throughout industrial Europe there
is not a single large manufacturing city which is free from a vast mass of
people whose condition is exactly that described; and from a still greater
mass who, living just on the edge of the social swamp, are liable to be
precipitated into it by any lack of demand for their produce. And, with
every addition to the population, the multitude already sunk in the pit and
the number of the host sliding towards it continually increase.” When a
journalist, then, writes of “the ease with which the British constitution can
be amended,” and professes himself satisfied “if the Convention can only
preserve for Australia a like freedom of amending the constitution,” he
either shows his ignorance of the state of affairs in England or thinks very
little of the political capacity of human nature. But he also makes it evident
that only the very highest political capacity can deal adequately with the
problem of amendment. And as continuous and constant amendment is an
absolute necessity if the people of the state are to escape the old world
evils, it is obvious that the only part that the people can take in bringing
about amendment is that of stating their desires and approving the result.
With a perfect governing organ the initiative and referendum would both
be superfluous, and would never be used. But as we have not perfection
they are both essential to free government; they should be part of the
constitution, capable of being used whenever occasion arose; and the
Australian people should certainly reject any constitution from which they
are absent, as without them it is impossible to properly control the political
class and make it responsible. For it is the very guardians of liberty
themselves against whom the people have to be on their guard to-day. Who
shall watch the guardians? There is only one answer! A permanent popular
head and council.

Those who are booming federation say it introduces “responsible
government on the British system.” Yes, on the degenerate British system
of to-day! And the cause of this degeneration is that the powers of the
House of Commons have become unlimited. Hume wrote in his essays:—
“The inconveniences attending such a situation of affairs present
themselves by thousands. If the House of Commons, in such a case, ever
dissolve itself, which is not to be expected, we may look for a civil war
every election. If it continue itself, we shall suffer all the tyranny of a
faction subdivided into new factions. And, as such a violent government
cannot long subsist, we shall at last, after many convulsions and civil wars,
find repose in absolute monarchy, which it would have been easier for us
to have established peaceably from the beginning. Absolute monarchy, therefore, is the easiest death, the true euthanasia, of the British constitution.”

The whole business of elections, &c., is after all only a higher kind of civil war, a protest against misgovernment, but it is a necessary step to the Parnassus of a higher and better state of things, towards the “civitas Dei.” Frederic Harrison, who, as a believer in the religion of humanity, is not blinded by political and metaphysical superstitions, wrote in 1881 of the House of Commons:—“Slowly the House of Commons has usurped step by step the whole machinery of government, which it now requires to be practically carried on within its walls and in open sittings. It is following the example of the Convention and the Jacobin Club during the Reign of Terror. It is gradually ceasing to be a deliberative chamber, and is fast drifting into the condition of an unorganized mob. I know it is idle to ask any professional politician, be he in the house or out of it, to consider the practice of Parliament as other than the perfection of wisdom. The House of Commons has a special belief about itself stronger than that of any club, or school, or regiment, insomuch that a professional politician, be he member or writer, or aspirant to either function, becomes incapable of seeing the system ab extra, independently, with an open mind. The mass of the public, and those who do not aspire to become professional politicians, do not at all share this artificial complacency. As I do not aspire myself, I am free to see and free to speak. For years I have been bold to say that there is much deeply wrong with the working of our parliamentary government. I make bold to say so again. Time has exhibited this wrong in even darker forms than ever. And I am not surprised that men whose lives are given to win prizes in the parliamentary arena are exceedingly slow to see it, and exceedingly sour when forced to look it in the face.” The only explanation I can think of for the blindness of the Australian public as to the great political conspiracy afoot is that everybody in the state aspires to “win a prize in the parliamentary arena,” or at least that everyone wants to become a state official—i.e., “socialism in our time.”

In Gronlund’s “Co-operative Commonwealth” there is a National Board at the head of affairs, “a strictly executive body, and therefore no government. But how shall we exact that responsibility on which we laid so much stress, which we considered the very keystone of democracy. Experience has shown that responsibility to many is in ordinary cases no responsibility at all. We therefore hold that, if these directing functionaries are to be made responsible for their work, they must be made responsible to some one person. But who is the proper one person? That important
question we have hitherto not touched upon at all, for the simple reason that there is absolutely nothing in the tendency of things that can guide us to any solution.” Evidently until nature is kind enough to evolve the “proper one person”—i.e., the perfect individual, whose self-interest absolutely coincides with the general interest; i.e., the perfectly representative individual—the co-operative commonwealth is likely to remain in the air, and the will of God likely to be done only in the heavens. But, writes Canon Stubbs (at least, I think he is a big gun):—“Suppose, for example, a new creed, or the old creed believed in a new way, to get hold of the masses of our people, or the new creed of science, say, hitherto for the most part the prerogative of the philosopher, to become the creed also of ‘the man in the street,’ how would our social arrangements stand the strain? No! however dry sometimes our souls may seem within us, we have not yet done with religion. The ‘God wills it! God wills it!’ may yet be the war-cry of a new crusade. Human nature, after all, is not so changed or sunk that spiritual forces may not once more outdo the miracles of chemistry and mechanics, or thought prove itself stronger even than electricity and gas, in moulding the doctrines of man. But for the realization of the new work new men are needed.” Thus this great writer is evidently referring to parliamentary “gas.”

The creed of Christianity is the essential, the infinite importance of the “perfect individual,” as the method, the life, and the way of social salvation, or universal progress. The legitimate development of the Christian idea, which must bring heaven down to earth, is that God is the human individual capable of infinite progression or amendment without dissolution; that is, the absolute realization or embodiment in a person, the incarnation of the universal law of progress.

How far the House of Commons has departed from the true Christian line of progress may be judged from these words of Augustine Birrell, M.P.:—“I know no place where the great truth that no man is necessary is brought home to the mind so remorselessly, and yet so refreshingly, as the House of Commons. Over the greatest reputations it closes with barely a bubble. And yet the vanity of politicians is enormous.” Here we see Cardinal Manning's “agnostic parliament” in full action.

Birrell's obiter dictum, or passing away remark, reminds one of Tozer's “dying swan song” of parliamentary government, the psalm of death:—

1. “All the glorious institutions of Parliament as conducted in the old country, and after which our own Parliament is supposed to be modelled, are being neglected and falling to decay.” 2. “It was commonly understood that a parliament should comprise a Government and an Opposition.”
3. “Instead of this desirable and legitimate system prevailing here, rival factions were bidding fair to make good government impossible.”

4. “There was no recognized or properly organized Opposition in the House; there was no person amongst the different factions opposing the Government who could take the Premier's place should a crisis arise.”

5. “At most, all these factions could do was to carry on a sort of guerilla warfare; none of them were prepared or able to take any responsibility for his action or vote.”

6. “The members of the Opposition, being utterly irresponsible, took every opportunity to talk upon every conceivable subject.”

7. “One of the greatest curses that afflicted this country was the publication of Hansard.”

Ernest Renan wrote:—“On the monuments of Persepolis you may see the various nations tributary to the King of Persia represented by an individual clothed in the fashion of his own country, and bearing in his hands specimens of its produce to offer in homage to his suzerain. Such is humanity; every nation, every intellectual, religious, or moral movement leaves behind it a brief formula which is, as the abridged type, surviving to represent those forgotten millions who once lived and died grouped around it.” Thus Tozer ought to be set up in a niche of the Imperial Institute as the abridged type, the brief formula, clothed in the fashion of his country, and bearing in his hands a scroll on which this psalm of his is written, to represent those millions who worshipped the “great political superstition,” and lost faith in human nature. Tozer repented at the last, and spoke the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth with his dying breath, and should therefore be forgiven for his sins. He left, however, a contribution to the “Slang Dictionary of Australia”—a “Tozer”—a formula which should be hurled at the president of the Queensland Council till he recants, for he, too, committed the unpardonable sin when he repeated the parrot formula not long ago that “no man is necessary.” Mr. Philp, too, not long ago declared that there was no political genius in his Government, so the only conclusion the “man in the bush” can come to is that his Government is quite unnecessary.

In London, the typical city of this progressive nineteenth century, where, as Mr. Charles Booth tells us, though it is the richest city in the world, the entire middle and upper classes number only 17.8 per cent. of the whole population, and the proportion in poverty in no case falls below 40 per cent., and in some cases reaches 60 per cent.; in London, where the great Jubilee was held, to which, I am told, Mr. Gladstone was not invited, though George Reid and Sir John Forrest were there quaffing champagne;
in London where, as before the fall of the Roman empire and the outbreak of the French Revolution, the beaux of Modern Babylon, the London Johnnies, take their baths in heated milk, so that their skins may be white and soft; where they visit their tailors every day, devoting themselves to the toilet like a fashionable beauty; where their noonday breakfast costs a couple of sovereigns; where, as a substitute for healthy exercise, they submit their delicate lily-white limbs to be kneaded, pummelled, and rubbed by skilled professors of the art of massage; where they banquet on choice viands collected from all parts of the world, to the sound of soft music, while a silly old man, a short distance off, sits on the stones throughout a bitterly cold night, and is found dead and shrunken in the morning, clutching a dry mutton bone, with a penny in his pocket—penny meant perhaps for Peter, the church, which the poor man still had faith in; in London, where misery and vice may now be counted, not here and there in spots, but in areas larger than the entire London of Elizabeth; in that London which Sir Daniel Cooper, Bart, G.C.M.G., would make the centre of an imperial organism “of irrefragable and resistless unity;” in that London where the kings of the earth, the prelates, the great merchants, meet and jubilate together, where the government of the greatest and freest nation of the earth sits, and with its marvellous elasticity and adaptability so successfully ameliorates the condition of the people; there the great Barney Barnato set to building for himself a palace, the drawingroom carpet to cost £1,500, the ceiling to represent a sky, in which, in one room the sun is full ablaze, and is made of pure gold; in the other the stars and moon are of silver and platinum, and cunningly contrived for electric lighting; the stables to cost £20,000; the exterior to be covered with exquisite carvings, much too fine for sooty, foggy London, and adorned with graceful statues—someone has named these “The Petrified Directors.” And though Barney, as he had a conscience, committed suicide, surely a niche can be found for a few more directors there, including some Queensland ones, as abridged types representing to future generations those forgotten millions who once lived and died worshipping the golden calf.

But there is plenty of good stuff in England yet—men like Lord Charles Beresford, who see that gold-worship is ruining England. One of the best women in England writes:—“It seems as if everything had gone wrong since the Jubilee. I fear England has been getting too proud, and requires humbling; and if the chastisement makes us think more seriously of our religious duties, and checks the terrible growing luxury of the upper classes, it will be a blessing in disguise; but the passing through it is sad
work."

"And a strong angel took up a stone as it were a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with a mighty fall shall Babylon, the great city, be cast down, and shall be found no more at all. And the voice of harpers and minstrels and flute-players and trumpeters shall be heard no more at all in thee; and no craftsman of whatsoever craft shall be found any more at all in thee; and the voice of a millstone shall be heard no more at all in thee; and the light of a lamp shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee: for thy merchants were the princes of the earth; for with thy sorcery were all the nations deceived. And in her was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that have been slain upon the earth. . . . And every shipmaster, and everyone that saileth anywhither, and mariners, and as many as gain their living by sea, stood afar off, and cried out as they looked upon the smoke of her burning, saying, What city is like the great city? And they cast dust on their heads, and cried, weeping and mourning, saying, Woe, woe, the great city, wherein were made rich all that had ships in the sea by reason of her costliness! for in one hour is she made desolate. Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye saints, and ye apostles, and ye prophets; for God hath judged your judgment on her."

"If a sober scientific thinker," wrote Huxley, "is inclined to put little faith in the wild vaticinations of universal ruin which, in a less saintly person than the seer of Patmos, might seem to be dictated by the fury of a revengeful fanatic, rather than by the spirit of the teacher who bid men love their enemies, it is not on the ground that they contradict scientific principles; it is conceivable that man and his works and all the higher forms of animal life should be utterly destroyed; that mountain regions should be converted into ocean depths, and the floor of oceans raised into mountains, and the earth become a scene of horror which even the lurid fancy of the writer of the Apocalypse would fail to portray. And yet, to the eye of science, there would be no more disorder there than in the sabbatical peace of a summer sea. If we confine our attention to that aspect which engages the attention of the intellect, nature appears a beautiful and harmonious whole, the incarnation of a faultless logical process, from certain premisses in the past to an inevitable conclusion in the future."

When science teaches such doctrine as this it is not likely to have much influence upon the people. And that Teacher who bid men love their enemies also said—"I come not to bring peace but a sword." And the sword has come! When this same Huxley threw aside his scientific superstitions and rose to the height of manhood he denounced modern
civilization in as severe a manner as the seer of Patmos. “Even the best,” he wrote, “of modern civilization appears to me to exhibit a condition of mankind which neither embodies any worthy ideal nor even possesses the merit of stability. I do not hesitate to express the opinion that, if there is no hope of a large improvement of the condition of the greater part of the human family; if it is true that the increase of knowledge, the winning of a greater dominion over nature which is its consequence, and the wealth which follows upon that dominion, are to make no difference in the extent and the intensity of want, with its concomitant physical and moral degradation, among the masses of the people I should hail the advent of some kindly comet, which would sweep the whole affair away, as a desirable consummation. What profits it to the human Prometheus that he has stolen the fire of heaven to be his servant, and that the spirits of the earth and of the air obey him, if the vulture of pauperism is eternally to tear his very vitals and keep him on the brink of destruction?” We have to recognize this as a fact, whether we can explain it or not, that evil, that error exists; that the universe is not the scene of a beautiful logical order; that Providence is an illusion similar to that of the order of the man of science; an ideal not realized, but to be realized, not by the working of any supernatural being but by our own efforts.

As Pope Leo XIII. wrote, in his “Encyclical on Labour:”—“It cannot be doubted that to attain the purpose of which we treat not only the Church but all human means must conspire. All who are concerned in the matter must be of one mind, and must act together. It is in this as in the Providence which governs the world: results do not happen save where all the causes co-operate.”

Now, the distribution of wealth and the excessive use of human reproductive powers, are matters which the human will can control, and society can be so organized as to secure a just distribution of wealth and put a due limit on the reproductive powers, and that not only without a decrease of individual and social happiness, but with a vast increase of happiness and freedom to one and all. But this is impossible unless men are willing to trust their fate to a human providence—to the best intellects—to the best characters throughout the world; unless they are willing to give up that anarchic competition for the means of subsistence which characterizes the brute creation, though even the brutes can teach us many a lesson in co-operation. Wisdom, in the highest sense, is not the possession of the people or of parliamentary bodies. It is the gift of nature to great men—men of genius. Other men have knowledge but they have not wisdom, for wisdom is the reconciliation, the unification of knowledge. But before the wisdom
which exists can be applied to human affairs, the people have to recognize wisdom, and look up to it for a solution of their difficulties. Until they are civilized enough to do this they must suffer the evils which society inflicts upon them to-day.

Plato was a philosopher, and though philosophers are not wholly human, as wanting in love and the power of action, Plato spoke the truth when he said in his “Republic”:—“We are now to endeavour to find out and show what is the evil which is now practised in cities through which they are not established in this manner we have described; and what is the smallest change, which, if made, would bring the city to this model of government; and let us chiefly see if this can be effected by the change of one thing.’ ‘By all means,’ said he. ‘Upon the change, then, of one thing,’ said I, ‘I am able, I think, to show that the state can fall into this model of government. But the change is not indeed small nor easy, yet it is possible.’ ‘What is it?’ said he. ‘I am now come,’ said I, ‘to what I compared to the greatest wave; and it shall now be mentioned, though, like a breaking wave, it shall overwhelm us with excessive laughter and unbelief. Consider what I am going to say.’ ‘Proceed,’ replied he. ‘Unless either philosophers,’ said I, ‘govern in cities, or those who are at present called kings and governors philosophize genuinely and sufficiently, and these two, the political power and philosophy, unite in one, and unless the bulk of those who at present pursue each of these separately are of necessity excluded from either, there shall be no end, Glauco, to the miseries of cities, nor yet, as I imagine, to those of the human race; nor till then shall ever this republic, which we have gone over in our reasonings, spring up to a possibility and behold the light of the sun.’” No doubt if Plato had read this passage before the late Convention he would have been overwhelmed with laughter, the huge guffaw of Western Australia’s Premier being heard above the rest; and, as we have seen, the belief of all Houses of Commons is diametrically opposed to this, and naturally, since parliamentary representation has its origin in distrust of the ruling powers. But yet the truth which Plato affirms is endorsed by every great thinker, whether religious, scientific, or philosophic. It remains to be seen whether the common-sense of the people rejects the keystone of the arch of the political fabric, as their politicians do—whether these modern sophists can delude a modern democracy. No one can deny that for efficient action unity is necessary.

Every man of common-sense knows that a business succeeds according as it is well managed. If, as Sir J. Forrest says, federation is purely an affair of £. s. d., then on business principles it is confessedly inadequate, since federation means dual control, party control of business matters.
I must here notice one dissentient from Plato's doctrine, Herbert Spencer, a man who has done a great deal for social science, but whose doctrines— they cannot be called a philosophy—are vitiated by a fundamental flaw. His primitive monads, or atoms, have no common original, and he gives no reason, makes no supposition to explain their after union or co-operation; thus it is only natural to find his sociology end with a republic of individual monads, without a sovereign, without a common bond of union, a centre of inspiration and expiration. As Huxley pointed out, Spencer is, in his sociology, untrue to his own principles. His system is mechanical, without soul or purpose. His fundamental idea is the persistence of force, and yet he admits that mental phenomena cannot be explained in terms of force. For the “God made” of Genesis he substitutes a cloudy phrase, the “instability of the homogeneous,” and thinks that by so doing he has made an addition to the world's wisdom. He, the great teacher of evolution, actually denies that there is any true progress at all, since without a creative power continually adding something absolutely new there can be no real advance; since he denies the possibility of perfect balance, without which any system would be unstable; and since he denies the possibility of a perfectly representative Power, the Power that knows, to which the infinitesimal creative increments return, in which they are summed up, and from which a new influence must proceed.

Thus he denies the three terms of the Absolute. Equilibrium to him means death, and though he admits the possibility of a universal resurrection, he gives no reason for supposing this to be a new beginning, and his force which vibrates through the universe merely arranges and disarranges, labouring for ever, like Sisyphus, without producing anything absolutely new; instead of being a power capable of absolute amendment, by infinitesimal steps, for ever and ever.

Thus his system, like a federal constitution, finds no place for the sovereign soul or absolute amending power, to which the inspiration of men can ascend, and from which it descends in the organized perfected form of law, with the result that the souls of men, their dynamic or progressive qualities, are certain to accumulate elsewhere than in the government, which can then only be modified by revolutionary methods. Spencer's philosophy, like existing governments, is not in correspondence with the universal law of amelioration, and both must be altered and perhaps destroyed till they conform themselves.

Spencer writes:—“The belief, not only of the socialists, but also of those so-called liberals who are diligently preparing the way for them, is that by due skill an ill-working humanity may be framed into well-working
institutions. It is a delusion. The defective natures of citizens will show themselves in the bad acting of whatever social structure they are arranged into. There is no political alchemy by which you can get golden conduct out of leaden instincts.” Now this is an apt illustration of the radical flaw of his system. If the defective natures of citizens are bound to show themselves, no matter how citizens are arranged, how on his system, which does not recognize any amending power, is social progress possible at all? Citizens must be either capable of amending themselves, or there must be a power somewhere capable of amending them. If Spencer says, “Oh! they dissipate their energy into space, and thus integrate—i.e., co-operate,” then I reply mere arrangement cannot turn lead into gold; power is lost by dissipation, and no good in the sense of producing a higher life done. Bricks remain bricks, however arranged. We know as a fact that association does give higher life, increased happiness. “Where two or three are gathered together in my name there I am.”

Organization, whether individual or social, gives an increased profit, whether material or psychical; and this is the raison d'être of all association, of all government; and government in its original and its final sense, when completely developed, is a pure progress association.

And how did governments arise? Evidently by the personal influence of higher individuals working for their own advantage or that of others. These educate men in higher and higher forms of co-operation. And as men have feeling and intelligence they can enjoy the benefits of association, and adapt themselves to a higher ideal when they see it in operation or sufficiently understand how it can be brought about. Thus society as a whole is influenced by individuals, and individuals are acted on by society. This is the simple “political alchemy” by which social amendment is brought about.

Thus Spencer's objection to Plato's doctrine that a single change can immensely alter society vanishes into smoke when analyzed. And if we turn to history we shall see Plato's truth exemplified.
Thus Prescott, in his “Ferdinand and Isabella,” wrote:—“The writers of that day are unbounded in their plaudits of Isabella, to whom they principally ascribe this auspicious revolution in the condition of the country and its inhabitants, which seems almost as magical as one of those transformations in romance wrought by the hands of some benevolent fairy. . . . If there be any being on earth that may be permitted to remind us of the Deity himself, it is the ruler of a mighty empire who employs the high powers entrusted to him exclusively for the benefit of his people; who, endowed with intellectual gifts corresponding with his station, in an age of comparative barbarism, endeavours to impart to his land the light of civilization which illumines his own bosom, and to create from the elements of discord the beautiful fabric of social order. Such was Isabella, and such the age in which she lived.”

Again, we have the case of Frederick the Great. Mr. L. E. Ruthning, of Brisbane, wrote:—“It is now a little over a century ago when, after a fearfully devastating war, which had laid waste a large part of her territory and carried ruin to the very gates of her capital, Prussia found herself with an empty exchequer, a bankrupt nobility, and a pauperized population. Yet within the course of a few years, and under the blessing of an administration which has yet to be surpassed, her agriculture was raised to a high position in Europe, her nobility became wealthy, her towns flourished, and her population increased and gained in all the attributes of a rising Commonwealth. A large share of this prosperity may be ascribed to the system of banking as applied to agricultural settlement by the transcendent genius of Frederick the Great, one of the best administrators even Prussia has had at her helm.”

Macaulay writes in his “Essay on Hallam's Constitutional History”:—“No men occupy so splendid a place in history as those who have founded monarchies on the ruins of republican institutions. Their glory, if not of the purest, is assuredly of the most seductive and dazzling kind. In nations broken to the curb, long accustomed to be transferred from one tyrant to another, a man without eminent qualities may easily gain supreme power. But a community which has heard the voice of truth and experienced the pleasures of liberty, in which the merits of statesmen and systems are freely canvassed; in which obedience is paid, not to persons, but to laws; in which magistrates are regarded, not as the lords, but as the servants of the public; in which the excitement of a party is a necessary of life; in which
political warfare is reduced to a system of tactics—such a community is not easily reduced to servitude. The mythological conqueror of the East, whose enchantments reduced wild beasts to the tameness of domestic cattle, and who harnessed lions and tigers to his chariot, is but an imperfect type of those extraordinary minds which have thrown a spell on the fierce spirits of nations unaccustomed to control, and have compelled raging factions to obey their reins and swell their triumph. The enterprise, be it good or bad, is one which requires a truly great man. It demands courage, activity, energy, wisdom, firmness, conspicuous virtues, or vices so splendid and alluring as to resemble virtues. Those who have succeeded in this arduous undertaking form a very small and a very remarkable class. Parents of tyranny, heirs of freedom, kings among citizens, citizens among kings, they unite in themselves the characteristics of the system which springs from them and those of the system from which they have sprung. Their reigns shine with a double light, the last and dearest rays of departing freedom mingled with the first and brightest glories of empire in its dawn. The high qualities of such a prince lend to despotism itself a charm drawn from the liberty under which they were formed, and which they have destroyed. He resembles a European who settles within the Tropics, and carries thither the strength and the energetic habits acquired in regions more propitious to the constitution. He differs as widely from princes nursed in the purple of imperial cradles as the companions of Gama from their dwarfish and imbecile progeny, which, born in a climate unfavourable to its growth and beauty, degenerates more and more at every descent from the qualities of the original conquerors. In this class three men stand pre-eminent—Caesar, Cromwell, and Bonaparte. The highest place in this remarkable triumvirate belongs, undoubtedly, to Caesar. He united the talents of Bonaparte to those of Cromwell; and he possessed also, what neither Cromwell nor Bonaparte possessed—learning, taste, wit, eloquence, the sentiments and the manners of an accomplished gentleman.”

Macaulay thus testifies to the doctrine of character as the rightful lord, and the natural results of the application to national life of this truth. Macaulay speaks of the death of liberty and the birth of tyranny, but could these men have imposed their will if men had not got tired of what is called liberty, and is really relative anarchy? The hour came, and the man appeared, and no one was sorry to exchange a disastrous liberty for firm rule. That this was so in Caesar’s case there is good testimony from the article before quoted on the fall of the Roman empire:—“The transformation of the republic into an empire used to be attributed to the ambition of one man, Caius Julius Caesar, and the historians even of the
last century used to bewail this event as the downfall of liberty and the
elevation of a tyrant. The more careful and philosophical investigations of
recent enquirers have entirely changed our point of view. It is now
admitted by nearly all historical students that the Roman republican forms
had proved utterly insufficient to secure decent government for the great
countries round the Mediterranean Sea, and that the only alternative lay
between a disruption of the empire into its original atoms—a process by
which the world would have sustained great loss—and its subjection to one
sovereign ruler. That the republic as it was administered in his day, and as
it had been administered for at least one generation before his birth, had
become impossible, admits of no question. As has been well said, it was
not liberty that fell on the plains of Pharsalia, but the right of three hundred
tyants to enthrall the world. Put at its very worst, the substitution of the
empire for the republic meant the substitution of one tyrant for those three
hundred. At its best it meant the rescue of the provinces from the grasp of
men whose avarice made them merciless, and the subjection of those
provinces to governors whom a wise and patriotic master called to severe
account for every act of oppression and injustice.” Thus the establishment
of the Roman empire may be fitly compared to the process by which some
of the mediaeval kingdoms, especially that of France, became established,
in spite of the revolts of the great barons, on the strong foundation of the
goodwill of the commonalty. That miserable deed, the assassination of
Julius Caesar—a yet bigger blunder than crime—arrested the progress of
the world. And the great patriot, Marcus Junius Brutus, turns out after all to
have been a usurer, who “pressed unhappy Cypriotes to despair for the
sake of his 48 per cent. interest, using the poor, pitiful rogue Scaptius as a
cloak to cover the avarice of a man who bore one of the noblest names in
Rome.”

Now, though we are more civilized to-day, can anyone doubt that the
provinces of the British empire are crushed down and hindered in their
progress by the avarice of the money-owner? The existing situation has to
be faced, and our Australian parliaments are afraid to do it. The
Convention, we have seen, shirked this question. It is plain that the monied
power really rules our parliaments, and that our free institutions are a more
or less useless sham. Many members of parliament are in debt to the banks,
and can be made bankrupt by them at any moment; thus their seats and
their whole means of livelihood are at the mercy of the monied power. If
Australia makes a stand, as she has a perfect right to do, she can save the
empire from disruption, and with it modern civilization. If the Australian
politicans are men enough to rise to the occasion, they can win the
confidence of the people; if they are not, if they prostitute their power to selfish ends, they are merely a hindrance and obstruction, and the sooner the people sweep them away the better. For in Australia the interests of almost all classes of the resident people are opposed to the continuance of financial rule. Thus, even in the English Parliament, Mr. Wyndham, member for Dover, said in 1897, in a debate on the monetary question:—

“When it was said we were a creditor nation, we forgot who were our debtors. Our own children. (Cheers.) For every bale of wool the colonies used to export they must now export two, if they were to pay the debt we had piled up. This financial policy, which said that a man who had contracted to pay interest in gold must continue to pay it in gold, although he had to shear twice as many sheep, and work twice as many hours as he did, was the financial policy of a Shylock.”

Mr. Balfour, in the same debate, said:—“The truth of the matter is that there is no subject in the world which is more proper for international agreement than currency. There was a time when commerce was, broadly speaking, confined within the limits of the country which issued the currency in which the debts contracted under that system had to be paid. That has been broken down by the advance of civilization, and at the present moment, in spite of your tariffs and the ridiculous system by which one nation tries to exclude the profits of another nation—in spite of all that, the civilized and commercial nations of the world form one community for the purposes of commerce, and therefore for the purpose of contracting debts and paying them. It is perfectly ludicrous that the standard of those debts should differ with longitude and latitude. The Chancellor of the Exchequer recalled to the memory of the House the ludicrous fact that at the present moment, within the limits of this one empire, men's debts are measured by three different standards. They suffer by alteration by three different sets of causes, and they are subject to variations from influences arising from three different quarters.” Now all this being the case, and as General Nettleton, of Washington, said:—“While actual property has thus collapsed in value to meet the new basis of value, the debt which that property must discharge has not shrunked by so much as the thickness of a hair. Result: one generation of struggling and once thrifty citizens have been forced to the wall, and are now passing through the process of financial extinguishment; their little properties transferred to their creditors, who, by the way, don't want those properties, and are themselves distressed over loss of income and lack of means to pay taxes on foreclosed realty.”

All this being the case, why does not England do something to right
matters? Well, Mulhall wrote, in 1894:—“The mortgages of the United Kingdom amount to about 2,800 millions sterling, and if they could be discharged to-morrow in silver the loss, at present price to the mortgagees would be 1,400 millions sterling, or more than double the national debt. It is certainly not our interest to depart from the gold standard, which has built up England.” Old-fashioned people believe that character — national character—built up England, and even English writers still believe it, as witness Hodgkin in the article quoted on the “Roman Empire”:—“National character: I end with that thought. After all, the most precious asset in our national balance-sheet is not this protectorate or that kingdom—not ‘ships, colonies, or commerce,’ but the character of the men of this nation, to which each of the three partners, England, Scotland, and Ireland, has contributed its own indispensable element.” But, of course, Mulhall, as a Government statistician, must be right.

Another high authority, Sir Robert Giffen, writes, in his “Essays in Finance”:—“Even in the fact that our capitalists are sending capital abroad, investing it in great undertakings in all parts of the world, supposed by some to indicate the slipping away of our trade, there is no real danger for our prosperity. It is merely evidence that, as the world gets more knit together, capital is becoming cosmopolitan. The effect of our capital going abroad is only to lay the whole world under contribution to the British Exchequer. There is not a country in the world which does not already yield its quota of profit assessable to the income tax of the United Kingdom. The interest on our foreign investments must also be many millions, no good authority that we know of making the annual sum less than £30,000,000, and the more correct sum being probably twice that figure, or even thrice that figure.” Thus a high statistical authority does not seem to know whether the interest on foreign investments is £30,000,000 or £90,000,000. It is evident why England sticks to monometallism.

And it is a significant fact that both these statisticians have been knighted, while this is the way England treats its greatest intellect, Herbert Spencer, who, whatever his failings, has devoted a lifetime of severe toil to that settlement of social questions on a scientific basis which must precede social regeneration. Spencer wrote in the Times of February, 1898:—“During the first 12 years of my literary life every one of my books failed to pay for its paper, print, and advertisements, and for many years after failed to pay for my small living expenses. Every one of them made me poorer. Nevertheless, the forty millions of people constituting the nation demanded of the impoverished brain-worker five gratis copies of each. There is only one simile occurring to me which at all represents the fact
and that in but a feeble way—Dives asking alms of Lazarus.” And Dives also thinks that the provinces of the empire, from which he draws his huge “unearned increment,” ought to contribute largely to his naval expenditure. It is about time that Dives should know what other people think of him. And who is responsible for this knighting of nonentities, and neglect of genius? Some people say the monarchy, which, of course, means the Queen. They would put the blame on an aged woman who has borne the heat and burden of the day, and done all that in her lay to save England from fatal mistakes, and who has held up before a corrupt society the example of a pure and noble life.

No, it is that beautiful Parliament again, that arrogant usurper, which—for I cannot call it human—believes neither in God, man, nor devil; which makes commercial interests its supreme concern—that is, mainly, London interests; that Parliament which prides itself upon being cosmopolitan instead of human. Mr. Gladstone would not degrade himself by receiving a title when anyone can get a title by making himself useful to party. A glimpse at Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons through Frederic Harrison's eyes may be interesting:—“Into this strange bear garden—i.e., House of Commons—Mr. Gladstone had to descend nightly and daily, and wrestle with man and beast. Nothing can be grander than the simple devotion with which he did the task; the endurance, fertility, and ingenuity of his effort; his patience, perseverance, command of temper, submission to impertinence, stupidity, and malice. There is something strangely touching in the way this undaunted old man has taken up the task as a matter of course, fondly believing that his adversaries must at last repent and listen to reason, and gently accepting this cup of torment and humiliation as part of the natural work of every English statesman.”

This is my lord of Salisbury’s “irresponsible statesman,” irresponsible because he was not afraid to denounce England's attitude with regard to Armenian massacres, or to champion the cause of Greece before a Europe which had forgotten that Greece once saved civilization and freedom: Gladstone, who wrote:—“The worst wealth of all, however, is probably that of the landowner who carries his income, or attempts to carry it, into the class of irresponsibles by systematic absenteeism. This case, apart from real necessity (which is for the most part temporary), is so bad as to be unpardonable and irredeemable.”

I am told that members of the English aristocracy own 20,000,000 acres in the United States. “Several attempts have been made to impose special taxation on alien landowners, but these have hitherto been defeated by clauses in the leases binding the tenants to pay all taxation which may be
imposed.” This in the land of “triumphant democracy,” which is run—mark it well, Australians!—by a Federal Government, the popular chamber of which is much more concerned in the game of territorial aggrandizement and foreign intervention than in righting the wrongs of its own citizens, which are nearly as great as those of the Cubans. Charity, it is said, should begin at home, but “triumphant democracy” has learnt the stale old dodge of diverting the attention of the people by getting up a foreign war.

Here is a telegram:—“London, 14th April. The United States House of Representatives, which consists of 357 delegates, last night discussed the position in Cuba. A resolution authorizing the President to use force to secure permanent peace and an independent government was passed. A minority proposal was then made affirming the necessity of recognition by the United States of the Cuban Republic. The motion was rejected by 191 to 150 votes. On the result of this division being made known, the minority were incensed, and a scene followed. Many of the members fought and rushed about the aisles like madmen, exchanging the epithets ‘Liars!’ and ‘Scoundrels!’ heavy books being thrown across the House. The Speaker vainly tried to restore order, and one member who appealed to the members not to disgrace Congress was hissed. The Times says the incident is unfortunate. Such scenes disgrace a representative assembly, especially while engaged in discussing a great national issue and claiming the right of the United States to act as the avenger of wrong.” “To act as the avenger of wrong;” and here is a little passage from Lloyd's “Wealth versus Commonwealth”:—“For thirty years the people of Pennsylvania have been trying to break a free way to the ocean through the Alleghanies and the oil combination, and in vain. For ten years the hope of independent outlet to the sea from the oilfields of Pennsylvania lay prostrate under the blow of the surrender of the tidewater. Twice the people have tried again, only each time to be headed off. The first of these two rallies collapsed in the shut down of 1887; the second was stopped at the cannon's mouth by an armed force at Hancock, New York, in the year of peace 1892.”

This is what Wendell Phillips said:—“There is no power in one state to resist such a giant as the Pennsylvania road. We have thirty-eight one-horse legislatures in this country, and we have a man like Tom Scott with three hundred and fifty millions in his hands, and if he walks through the states they have no power. Why, he need not move at all; if he smokes, a puff of the waste smoke out of his mouth upsets the legislatures.” So the politicians are set to play the rôle of liberators of oppressed nationalities. It must be plain as a pike-staff to any honest man that American representative institutions are a sham, a snare and delusion.
Lloyd writes:—“Two classes study and practise politics and government in America—place-hunters and privilege-hunters. America has grown so big, and the tickets to be voted, and the powers of government, and the duties of citizens, and the profits of personal use of public functions have all grown so big, that the average citizen has broken down. No man can half understand or half operate the fulness of this big citizenship except by giving his whole time to it. This the place-hunter can do. Government is passing into the hands of those who have a livelihood to make by it.” And this is the sort of thing federation will bring on Australia if the Convention Bill is accepted, with its Blunderbore at the head of affairs and no referendum.

To take the foul parliamentary taste out of one's mouth, Poultney Bigelow shall give us a glimpse of President Kruger in the Transvaal (Harper's Magazine, December, 1896):—“Kruger is the incarnation of local self-government in its purest form. He is president amongst hisburghers by the same title that he is elder in his church. He makes no pretension to rule than by invoking the law, but he does rule them by reasoning with them until they yield to his superiority in argument. He rules amongst free burghers because he knows them well, and they know him well. He knows no red tape nor pigeon-holes. His door is open to every comer; his memory recalls every face; he listens to every complaint, and sits in patriarchal court from six o'clock in the morning until bed-time. He is a magnificent anachronism. He alone is equal to the task of holding his singular country together in its present state. Already we hear the rumblings that indicate for the Transvaal an earthquake of some sort. We pray they may not disturb the declining years of that country's hero—the patient, courageous, forgiving, loyal, and sagacious Paul Kruger.”

So, Mr. Bigelow! Patience, courage, loyalty, forgiveness, and sagacity are “magnificent anachronisms,” are they? So much the worse for the modern world. The earthquake rumbles for its agnostic parliaments, not for Kruger, who sits more firmly on his chair than ever, because his rule is founded upon character, upon the confidence of his people, not upon a parliamentary caucus. Oom Paul is no doubt unprogressive in the eyes of the cultured, but he does not intend to have his country overrun and exploited by a rabble of adventurers.

He likened his state to a dam, inside which was clean water “surrounded by rushing streams of questionable cleanliness.” Oom Paul has simply been fighting the battle we Australians have to fight; he does not intend to have a kind of progress, of development, which involves the dominance of an alien monied power. Kruger had to meet intrigue with intrigue. “He used
the High Commissioner and the British resident in order to secure the disarmament of the insurgents, and then, the moment they were powerless, he seized their leaders and flung them into gaol. He jockeyed everybody, from the Kaiser to Mr. Chamberlain, and emerged from the crisis with a great reputation for magnanimity, gained chiefly by the adroitness with which he succeeded in getting all his difficult work done for him by Mr. Chamberlain. His magnanimity consisted chiefly in making Mr. Chamberlain believe that Jameson's life was in his hands. Mr. Chamberlain fell with eyes wide open into the trap, and in return for the fulfilment of the conditions on which Jameson surrendered, exacted terms which left the Uitlanders helpless in his hands. He is indeed a ‘dreffel smart man,’ Oom Paul. For by this smart trick he made a catspaw of Mr. Chamberlain. It was Mr. Chamberlain who paralyzed insurrection, Mr. Chamberlain who disarmed Johannesburg, and it is Mr. Chamberlain who has to punish Dr. Jameson.” So wrote the Review of Reviews. Kruger was too much for Chamberlain. But look to your rifles, Paul; they are getting rusty! Mr. Chamberlain is the incarnation of a commercial era, an intriguer who thinks to make a brummagem republic of the British empire. He does but follow the bent of his nature, but he cannot put screw enough upon the imperial ball to take the colonial wickets.

I referred before to Mr. Gladstone's glorification of the Cabinet system, and as this is the last great stronghold of the political superstition it is necessary to inquire into the claims of this body to act as the supreme governing power. Gladstone calls the Cabinet “the fourth power, entering into and sharing the vitality of the other three, and charged with the business of holding them in harmony as they march. It is the threefold hinge that connects together for action King or Queen, Lords, and Commons. Upon it is concentrated the whole strain of the government, and it constitutes from day to day the true centre of gravity for the working of the state, although the ultimate superiority of force resides in the representative chamber. It forms the inner council of the Crown. In the face of the country, the sovereign and the ministers are an absolute unity.” As Mr. Gladstone says:—“In every free state, for every public act some one must be responsible; and the question is, Who shall it be? The British constitution answers, The minister, and the minister exclusively. Sole action, for the sovereign, would mean undefended, unprotected action; the armour of irresponsibility would not cover the whole body against sword or spear; a head would project beyond the awning and would invite a sunstroke. There is no distinction more vital to the practice of the British Constitution than the distinction between the sovereign and the Crown. The
Crown has large prerogatives, endless functions essential to the daily action, and even the life, of the state. To place them in the hands of persons who should be mere tools in a Royal will would expose those powers to constant unsupported collision with the living forces of the nation, and to a certain and irremediable crash. They are therefore entrusted to men who must be prepared to answer for the use they make of them. This ring of responsible ministerial agency forms a fence around the person of the sovereign, which has thus far proved impregnable to all assaults.”

Thus, according to Mr. Gladstone, the sovereign is irresponsible, and a poor creature who cannot protrude his head beyond the ministerial awning without a danger of getting sunstroke. And from whom is it that this emasculated sovereign is to be protected by the ministerial fence? Why, the people, of course! The English sovereign, then, is not responsible to the people at all. “In the person of the mediaeval king,” Gladstone says, “was normally embodied the force paramount over all others in the country, and on him was laid a weight of responsibility and toil so tremendous that his function seems always to border on the superhuman; that his life commonly wore out before its natural term; and that an indescribable majesty, dignity, and interest surround him in his misfortunes—nay, almost in his degradation; as, for instance, amidst

‘The shrieks of death through Berkeley's roof that ring,
Shrieks of an agonizing king.'

For this concentration of power, toil, and liability, milder realities have now been substituted, and ministerial responsibility comes between the monarch and every public trial and necessity, like armour between the flesh and the spear that would seek to pierce it, only this is an armour itself also fleshy, at once living and impregnable.”

But who is trying to pierce the flesh of the sovereign? It can only be the people. “There can be in England no disloyalty more gross,” says the politician, “as to its effects than the superstition which affects to assign to the sovereign a separate, and, so far as separate, transcendental sphere of political action.”

Thus the ingenious politician refines the sovereign away to a metaphysical phantom, living in a protected heaven, where he “sees the world go round.” It is the protestant idea of God—a being to be worshipped on Sundays and feast days, but not suited to practical life; indeed, a positive nuisance on week-days, as he would be always calling upon ministerial rings to act in the interest of the people.
“We, the ministry,” let us suppose Sir W. V. Harcourt, as Premier, to say, “are responsible to the people. What, then, is the use of the Crown? But the English people have a stupid veneration for the sovereign; we must allow for superstitious human nature; but as the sovereign is a concrete fact, the only way to get supreme power into our hands is to make a nice distinction between the person of the sovereign and the idea of sovereignty. Then we can worship the idea as much as we please; this will satisfy the people, and at the same time put us to no inconvenience, for as we ourselves make the idea it cannot harm us or detract from our dignity. But, to make things absolutely safe, we will surround the Crown with an ornamental ring fence, and cover the whole in with an awning of the gayest colours, so that, though the people can still worship our Mikado-like sovereign, they cannot get at him. And, gentlemen, this is particularly easy to-day, because the sovereign is a woman, so we are not likely to be disturbed while we play the game of party; for of course, gentlemen, there need be no concealment here, in the Cabinet, away from the reporters; we need not here keep up the fiction that we represent the nation as a whole. Of course, as you know, we never represent more than half the nation, and sometimes even a very small minority of the nation, but as long as the people think we do, and imagine that we are a united ‘happy family,’ it is all right. But, gentlemen, we have met here to-day to consider what is to be done. Someone has blabbed. Here is the Contemporary Review (December, 1896), with an article entitled ‘The Happy Family.’ The writer is afraid to sign his name. But the intimate knowledge he displays proves him to be a member of some former cabinet, no doubt disappointed at losing office. But the article is most dangerous and revolutionary. It exposes to the public gaze the very ark of the covenant of parliamentary government, and though, gentlemen, as you know, the shechinah has departed, and there is only a fetish stone within, it would never do to let the people suspect this. Can there be in England a disloyalty more gross than this? I submit, gentlemen, that the writer be attainted for high treason.” It will be interesting to look at the article which created such dismay in the Cabinet. I can, however, only give a few extracts here:—

SIR W. H-RC-T: What are we waiting for?
MR. A-Q-H: Did you say “what” or “whom,” H-rc-t? Because I presume you have noticed that the Prime Minister has not made his appearance.
SIR W. H.: I said “what,” and I did notice the fact you remark upon.
MR. A.: Then you don't consider the absence of the Prime Minister is in itself a reason for waiting until—
MR. C-PB-LL-B-RM-N: My dear A-q-h, are you not aware that the
office of Prime Minister is unknown to the constitution, and that H-rc-t is such a stickler for constitutional etiquette that he thinks it his duty to ignore the holder of it?

(Ministers laugh, H-RC-T frowns.)

MR. J-N M-RL-Y: Something musty that theory of our absolute ministerial equality, isn't it? Besides, it was only invented originally as a handle of attack against Walpole.

LORD K-MB-LEY: Still, Walpole did “boss the show,” as the Americans say, in a way no minister has ever done since.

LORD SP-NC-R: Yes, he wouldn't have stood mutiny, you may be sure.

MR. S-W L-F-RE: Oh, nonsense! Mutiny was the regular thing then. In those dear old days a minister could get up on his legs and soundly rate a colleague sitting beside him on the Treasury Bench.

MR. C. B.: Yes, a good thing too. It cleared the ministerial air. It was, at any rate, better than having two of our number refusing to speak to each other out of doors, and losing no opportunity of talking at each other out of Parliament.

[Enter L-D R-S-B-Y.]

LORD R. (taking his seat): What, all here? Dear me, I beg your pardon. Am I late?

LORD SP-NC-R: Oh, no! only a quarter of an hour—a mere trifle. Besides, it's convenient; it gives us time to discuss things.

LORD R.: And persons too, no doubt. Well, now that we are all assembled, gentlemen, the first thing to be considered is, what are we to do about last night's vote in the House of Commons?

SIR W. H.: The question is whether we should go to the country on the Local Veto Bill, or whether—

LORD R. (timidly): But isn't it a preliminary question whether we should have to go to the country at all?

SIR W. H. (with deep contempt): It's preliminary in the sense that it might be answered by a child who has not yet crossed the threshold of the alphabet; but it's hardly worth an adult's while to ask it. And I certainly can't conceive any politician, however unformed (with meaning), and however inexperienced, who could hesitate for a single moment to answer it in the affirmative.

LORD R.: It appears to me, gentlemen, that the question whether we should go to the country or stay where we are is a question to be answered not without mature deliberation, and I should say that any politician, however advanced in years (with meaning), who would undertake to answer it off hand, can have profited little by his experience. (Awkward
MR. C. B.: Perhaps I can shorten the Prime Minister's deliberations. If he is considering any alternative which depends upon my withdrawing my resignation, he may dismiss it at once from his mind. I have not the slightest intention of withdrawing it.

LORD R.: Why? If it's a matter of wounded official dignity, I think we might manage to apply a salve. I am informed by those who are better acquainted with the technicalities of procedure in supply than I am, or (carelessly) perhaps than any of us are, that there are ways of getting round that hostile vote of yesterday.

MR. C. B.: Oh! For aught I know we could get over the “cordite” business, as you can over most things. But suppose I don't want to do that?

LORD R.: Well, if you don't do it, you force a ministerial crisis!

MR. C. B.: But suppose I don't object to that?

LORD R.: But don't you?

MR. C. B.: Why should I?

[Confused murmurs. Cries of “For the sake of the party,” “To dish the Tories,” “To get time for a new programme.” After a pause a voice is heard indistinctly muttering, “For the sake of the country.”] (No doubt this was the voice of the fetish stone.—ED.)

ALL (struck with the idea): Of course! Of course! For the sake of the country.

MR. C. B.: Rubbish! Excuse my frankness. The country—and, for all I know, the party—is not in the slightest degree interested in the question whether we go now or struggle on for another six months. The people who are interested are ourselves, the eighteen gentlemen sitting round this table; and as I, one of those eighteen, personally wish to get out of this boat at once, the only possible reason for my remaining would be to oblige the rest of you. In other words, it is for your beaux yeux that I am expected to go on occupying that distasteful position on the Treasury Bench, which you, my esteemed colleagues, forbade me, in spite of my known wishes on the subject, to exchange for the Speaker's chair.

LORD R.: What immediate action do you think should be taken, Mr.-ly?

MR. J. M.: Well, I should say certainly resign. But really it is not of much importance what we do. Dissolution is inevitable. The Tories would only take office for the purpose of advising the Queen to dissolve Parliament as soon as they have wound up the business of the session, so that perhaps we might as well devote our time to the question of the electoral programme.

SIR W. H.: I am not wedded to any particular plan of campaign. K-
ley, have you any better to suggest? Or you, Sp-nc-r? Or anybody? No! Then it is understood, is it, that we give Local Veto the foremost place in our programme?

LORD R.: We have now, then, to consider, gentlemen, what general scheme or policy and what specific measures of legislation we shall submit to the constituencies. For myself I say with perfect sincerity that I approach the matter with an almost open mind. In fact, I think I may describe it as open on all questions except the one on which your own minds are already made up. Whatever other issues we may select to fight the election we are all, or virtually all, resolved, I presume, that it shall not be that of Local Veto. (Emphatic signs of assent.)

MR. J. M.: Surely it is scarcely necessary for me to answer the Prime Minister's question. Personally, I am pledged to only one article in the Liberal programme, but to that I am pledged irrevocably. You may thrust anything else you please into the background, but Home Rule for Ireland must have a foremost place. (Murmurs.) My whole political credit is staked on that.

LORD R.: I am sorry you have plunged so heavily, M-rl-y. It seems a hard thing to tell a man with so big a stake on that we can't give him a run for his money. But I really don't see my way to it.

SEVERAL VOICES: No! No! No Home Rule at this election. Anything but that.

MR. A-Q-H: For myself, I am quite indifferent on that subject. My interest in the question some years ago was founded on a purely intellectual curiosity, which has long since been gratified. But how about Disestablishment?

THE L-D CH-LL-R: Well, my interest in that is also purely intellectual, and it doesn't amount to curiosity.

LORD R-P-N: Do you think anybody cares about it out of Wales?
LORD R.: It is the deadest of horses in Scotland.
MR. A-Q-H: Well, I'm running for it. It doesn't interest me much, but I see nothing else to go for, and in default of anything else I plump for Welsh Disestablishment. (Murmurs.)

LORD K-MB-LEY: Well, really, I was going to say that almost anything but Disestablishment—

SEVERAL VOICES: Yes, yes! Anything but Disestablishment!

LORD SP-NC-R: Or the absurd agitation against the House of Lords, which was of all the fiascos of the last six months the most—

SEVERAL VOICES: Absurd? Fiasco? Why it is the only good card that—
OTHER VOICES: No, no! A damp squib! Anything but the agitation against the House of Lords! LORD R.: With all deference to the unanimous expressions of opinion I hear around me, I must say that though no one more strongly disapproves of the existing constitution of that body, and though the Home Secretary and I are perfectly in accord with each other in desiring to deal with the evil in two totally different ways, I cannot think we should act wisely in going to the country with reform of the House of Lords in the foreground of our programme. Indeed, I must frankly own that it seems to me to be, with the single exception of Local Veto, the most unpopular question we have taken up.

SIR W. H.: As you seem to be looking to me for an opinion, K-mb-ley, I may say briefly that next to the policy of placing the control of the liquor traffic in the hands of the people, I incline to think that we could offer no more stimulating programme to the constituencies than that of the reform of the House of Lords.

MR. C. B.: Let's see, then, how we stand. The resultant of assents and dissents seems to be this—that we may safely fight the election on almost any issue we please, with the exception of the Reform of the House of Lords, Local Veto, Disestablishment, and Home Rule. Well, there is one thing to be said in favour of that: it should vastly simplify the drafting of our election addresses.

LORD R.: No doubt. But I shall, of course, summon another Cabinet Council immediately before the dissolution, and invite a discussion of the whole question of the electoral tactics of the party.

MR. C. B.: Oh, shall you? Then may I give notice that, with reference to the question who is to conduct the campaign, and to the uncertainty and confusion prevailing on that question in the party, I shall call the attention of the Cabinet to 1 Kings xxii. 47?

SEVERAL VOICES: Eh? What is that? This is too Scotch.

MR. C. B.: I have, for greater certainty, procured a copy of the text, and will read it to the Cabinet: “There was no king in Edom: a deputy was king.”

SIR W. H.: Very good; and I shall call attention to Standing Order No. 10.

SEVERAL VOICES: Which is—

SIR W. H.: “That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the commons of the United Kingdom for any lord of parliament or other peer or prelate. . . . to concern himself in the election of members to serve for the commons in parliament.”

LORD R. (rising): I take note of both subjects for discussion. It will
probably be convenient to consider them together.

“There was no king in Edom: a deputy was king.” A deputy, a party man; there you have the whole secret of the irresponsibility of cabinets and of parliaments. This sketch of a cabinet reminds one of the late Convention, which in like manner shelved all the really vital questions. This account is, no doubt, exaggerated for the sake of bringing out the truth clearly, and never having been a member of a cabinet, or even a member of parliament, for I have an unfortunate habit of seeing facts and speaking the truth, I cannot vouch for its accuracy. But I have “high a priori” reasons, derived from the fundamental law of progress—viz., “that the initiation of all wise and noble things proceeds generally from some one individual,” for thinking that cabinets living a “parasitical life” in the House of Commons must be, as a rule, deficient in amending power. As to the sovereign and the ministers presenting “an absolute unity in the face of the country,” as Gladstone says they do, it is simply because the people do not see behind the scenes. If they visited the “green room” they would soon be disillusioned, and they would find the sovereign “conspicuous by absence.” A “Tozer cosmotype” would not be a bad idea for the use of the sovereign, but then the sovereign must be responsible and get-at-able; the ring fence and the awning must go. Gladstone may be quite right as to the fact that the Prime Minister is supreme, but as Mr. C-pb-Il-B-rm-n is made to say—

“The Prime Minister is unknown to the constitution.”

But the English constitution is such a thing of shreds and patches that even constitutional experts get mixed. Thus Bagehot:—“The popular theory of the English Constitution involves two errors as to the sovereign. First, in its oldest form at least, it considers him as an ‘estate of the realm,’ a separate co-ordinate authority with the House of Lords and House of Commons. This and much else the sovereign once was, but this he is no longer. That authority could only be exercised by a monarch with a legislative veto. But the Queen has no such veto. She must sign her own death-warrant if the two Houses unanimously send it up to her. It is a fiction of the past to ascribe to her legislative power. She has long ceased to have any.” This is how Parliament “protects” the sovereign in England. As I said before, the Queen is at the mercy of Parliament, and is not responsible for the disgraceful state of things in London, or for the growth of grievances which threaten the existence of the empire.

Those who are booming federation in Australia say the bill provides “responsible government on the British system.” As a matter of fact the British system does not provide responsibility, and if the Queen “must sign her own death-warrant” to please Parliament, the nominated Governor-
General must do so too. True progress is often only possible by returning to forgotten truths, and I should advise Australians, if they want to have responsible government, to return to the good old English plan, and give the sovereign a separate and independent existence, and make him responsible, not to the states, but to the nation.

The bill, however, carefully omits a national referendum. But the politicians say the “people is sovereign.” The people should take them at their word in Australia and England, and prove that they are really sovereigns. And there is only one way to prove it.

That same Bagehot, who says that the Queen's legislative and executive power is a fiction of the past, wrote in the same book:—“It would very much surprise people if they were only told how many things the Queen could do without consulting Parliament, and it certainly has so proved, for when the Queen abolished Purchase in the Army by an act of prerogative (after the Lords had rejected the bill for doing so), there was a great and general astonishment. But this is nothing to what the Queen can by law do without consulting Parliament. Not to mention other things, she could disband the army (by law she cannot engage more than a certain number of men, but she is not obliged to engage any men); she could dismiss all officers, from the General Commanding-in-Chief downwards; she could dismiss all the sailors too; she could sell off all our ships of war, and all our naval stores; she could make a peace by the sacrifice of Cornwall, and begin a war for the conquest of Brittany. She could make every citizen in the United Kingdom, male or female, a peer; she could make every parish a ‘university’; she could dismiss most of the civil servants; she could pardon all offenders. In a word, the Queen could by prerogative upset all the action of civil government within the government, could disgrace the nation by a bad war or peace, and could by disbanding our forces, whether land or sea, leave us defenceless against foreign nations.”

It must be evident to every man of common-sense that some such power as this sovereign is necessary in every constitution, totally distinct from the politicians, or the civil service, or the legal profession, to restrain the tendency of military, legal, and political orders to self-aggrandizement and tyranny, and by putting such a power in direct contact with the people the dangers attending its use are removed.

For if I was to suggest that “long-considering Nature” could make a human being who would not abuse absolute power, I should be overwhelmed by that great wave of laughter and unbelief of which Plato wrote. But at any rate Nature can make a better man than the politicians of the Convention,
“Who hoped to find a spell
In some fine flourish of a pen
To make a better man
Than long-considering Nature will or can,
Secure against his own mistakes,
Content with what life gives or takes,
And acting on some fore-ordained plan,
A cog of iron in an iron wheel,
Too nicely poised to think or feel,
Dumb motor in a clock-like commonweal”—

a better man than those who did not “steer by stars the elder shipmen knew,” and did not “lay their courses where the currents draw of ancient wisdom channelled deep in law.”

The Hon. J. Cockburn wrote, in 1895, on the Cabinet system:—“This autocrat of yesterday, the Cabinet, carved its position out of the wreck of royalty, and drew to itself many of the functions of the legislature; and, while professing allegiance to both king and commons, took upon itself the exercise of supreme powers. From the earliest times the king had been surrounded by a council of ministers, but this council was presided over by him in person, and was dominated by his presence. Each minister tendered his advice separately to the monarch, and was personally answerable for it, but the ministers themselves had no corporate existence or responsibility. A radical change, however, took place at the time of the Hanoverian accession. George I. could speak no English, his prime minister knew no German, and such correspondence as took place between them was conducted in Latin. Under these circumstances the king could have little personal intercourse with his ministers. Ministers took advantage of the shortcomings of the monarch; freed from his personal influence, they established the practice of holding their meetings and arriving at their decisions by themselves. Like ambitious journeymen, they set up in business under the name and seal of their former master, and with consolidated power and corporate responsibility exercised a degree of control over the Legislature to which their royal predecessors in authority had been strangers.”

This is the true history of that marvellous organ which some politicians worship: it is merely the Privy Council, degenerate and irresponsible, and under the control of the House of Commons, of which it should be independent.

Cockburn says:—“The conditions necessary for the successful control of Parliament by ministers have passed away for ever. Indeed, when it is
remembered that the Cabinet is created by Parliament, and that the same power which created it can at any moment destroy it, any such control would involve the preposterous idea that the creature should be able to control the creator.”

Well, the idea may be preposterous, but it is a fact nevertheless: the people create the parliament and parliament controls the people, and the ministry while it lasts controls both; and “preposterous” means, literally, having that first which should be last. And that is just the state of things we have in Australia. But there is a saying, “The first shall be last and the last first.” Things in Australia, as the antipodes, are generally upside down when observed from Europe, but we think Europe is upside down. The people in Europe are under, and that perhaps is right in Europe, but in Australia they ought to be on top—i.e., a national representative is wanted to make ministers responsible.

Gladstone in his treatment of the sovereign is a good illustration of the political bias, while Bagehot, a banker, is an instance of the plutocratic bias. Bagehot wrote, in 1872:—“The spirit of our present House of Commons is plutocratic, not aristocratic; its most prominent statesmen are not men of ancient descent or of great hereditary estate; they are men mostly of substantial means, but they are mostly, too, connected more or less closely with the new trading wealth.” And as the spirit of the house has grown since then, it is small wonder that nothing is done to settle the monetary problem. The hereditary principle of rule has been departed from in England, as also the religious, not altogether to the advantage of England or her people. “An English monarch is now as much the creature of an Act of Parliament as the pettiest taxgatherer in his realm.” But neither is the English sovereign representative of the people. Two writers in the Nineteenth Century of September, 1897, say:—“By the law of primogeniture, the sovereign of these realms should be Mary IV. and III., née Maria Theresa Henrietta Dorothea, Archduchess of Austria-este-Modena, and wife of H.R.H. Prince Louis of Bavaria. Of her genealogical right to the throne, as representative of the senior female line of the royal house of Stuart, the male line having become extinct on the death of Cardinal King Henry IX., there is no dispute. The facts are stated every year in Whitaker's Almanac for all who run to read. The Hanoverian dynasty, being derived from a daughter of James I., has no right to the throne until the whole issue of Charles I. is exhausted, which is not yet the case. The title, therefore, of the present dynasty is a parliamentary title only. The parliamentary vote, by which alone the title of the Hanoverian dynasty was obtained, was in no sense a vote representative of the will of
the people. It was a time of unrest, confusion, and distrust. King James was
gone, and William was present with Dutch guards at Westminster to
overawe and with power to imperil the lives and fortunes of those who
stood in the way of his advancement. Each man doubted his neighbour, and
William employed actual intimidation. He had nothing to lose and
everything to gain. And the intimidation resulted in a majority of one, in
two of the most important divisions in the history of Parliament. On all
hands it is admitted that the Hanoverian dynasty has no claim on the
ground of heredity. They are not few who are of opinion that the death of
the present sovereign possibly, and the death of the next sovereign
probably, will be the signal for a popular movement, culminating in the
abolition of the monarchy in England, and with it the extinction of the
Hanoverian dynasty."

As the abolition of monarchy in England is certain to mean the disruption
of the British empire, and the complete supremacy of the politicians, and as
the greatest thinkers maintain that constitutional monarchy, rightly
understood, is the best form of government possible, and the form therefore
that must be assumed by the leading nation, Australians ought seriously to
consider the matter before they accept the Commonwealth Bill, which will
make irresponsible politicians supreme.

If Australia misses this great opportunity—good-bye to freedom,
political or religious.

The writers quoted above continue:—“The significance of Mr.
Gladstone's action in 1891, when he brought in a bill to remove religious
disabilities with the exception of those attaching to the Royal Family, lies
in the fact that from removing the religious disability from the Lord
Chancellor it is but one step to removing it from the sovereign, and so
troverting the abstract proposition of the Commons ‘that it hath been
proved by experience inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this
protestant kingdom to be governed by a popish prince.’ The removal of the
religious disabilities is a long stride towards repealing the Act of
Settlement, which it is equally within the power of Parliament to do.”

Now, let me ask, who controls the English Parliament? Who is the power
behind the throne? There is little doubt that it is the Jew. Here is testimony
to the fact. Arnold White writes in the Contemporary of February, 1898,
and quotes a private letter to him from Lord Salisbury written on 25th
March, 1896:—“I am very anxious,” says Lord Salisbury, “to pass an
Alien Immigration Bill, and I believe that it would be valuable and much
demanded by the working classes in many districts. But I am assured that
the position of business is so unpromising in the House of Commons that it
is of very little use to bring it forward at present. I think we shall have to wait till more pressing matter is cleared away.” The destitute alien, it must be remembered, is largely a low-class Jew.

In the diseased carcass of London the “destitute alien” breeds and multiplies like a germ in a fever-stricken body sick unto death. White continues:—“From that day to this practical politicians regard the restrictive legislation proposed by Lord Salisbury when in opposition as dead as Julius Caesar. With a cabinet divided on the subject, and the irresistible weight of Jewish influence inflexibly set against any measure of the kind, the ‘more pressing matter’ to which Lord Salisbury refers is not likely to be ‘cleared away’ in the lifetime of this Government, and I for one do not expect to see the subject seriously revived until public opinion brings it to the front in a new and ominous form.” Again:—“Lord Salisbury is probably aware that he would destroy his Government if he quarreled with the Jews. They will yet enjoy free entry here. I have worked for many years to promote the passage of a Destitute Aliens Prevention Bill. For the present the prospects of such a measure are not only hopeless, but even if it were passed it would be inadequate, in view of the magnitude of the Jewish question. No mere national or particularist remedy will suffice to cure the evil—i.e., the immigration of destitute aliens. Europe must deal with her Jews as a whole.”

But Europe is a federation, and all federations are weak, while the Jew believes in unity. The Jew is a “mighty power on the Continent,” and can do just as he likes as long as men reverence gold above character. While the English labourer lost his “Plevna,” the engineers' strike, although the Government had the opportunity at the critical moment of compelling the employers to do justice, the Government thus allows the destitute alien to crowd to England.

Sidney Whitman wrote, in May, 1893 (Contemporary Review):—“Today money is no longer earned, as of yore, but largely won. Application and industry have become of secondary importance as means to success compared with the instinct which enables men to ‘corner’ an article or ‘rig’ a market, and win or lose a fortune in a week. We note the evolution of a new type of fighting man: the manipulator, the exploiter, the floater, the inflater, the expander, the puffer, the wire-puller, the rigger—a kingly type of our time. And what is more, he is met with successfully at work in nearly every walk in life—in politics, literature, learning, science, art, and, above all, in journalism and commerce. Of this type the Jews furnish, in proportion to their number, by far the highest percentage among
Continental nations. They are not only the most eager combatants, but they are the most sea-worthy in the storms of our latter-day life. The Jew is possessed of an instinct of solidarity which can dispense even with the cement of Freemasonry. The Jew is the successful commercial man par excellence on the Continent.”

This exceptional fitness, in the face of tremendous odds, in the battle of life—as it is waged today—is the secret of the wealth and power of the Jews on the Continent. As the Jew grows more powerful, his innate instinct for dominion grows stronger. The noisy manifestations of anti-Semitism are but the coarse outer shell of a deeper inner revolt of many against the materialistic tendencies of our age, and their results: the gospel of “getting on” at any price and its accompaniments—arrogance, ostentation, vulgarity, heartlessness, and neglect of every moral principle. The haughtiness of the victorious soldatesca of old is reproduced by the victors of to-day, Christian or Hebrew, in the ostentation of the parvenu—the dragging through the mud of every ideal and of every hallowed name, the lowering of every art down to the standard of grocery, that must yield its commission. Fifty years ago, Karl Marx, with the discernment of genius, exclaimed:—“When society succeeds in eliminating manipulation and all that is connected therewith—then the Jew will become impossible. . . . The social emancipation of the Jew is the emancipation of society from Judaism.” Sidney Whitman, however, says:—“The English, Americans, and also the French, produce types perfectly well able to take care of themselves in the struggle for existence with the Semite. For it is not liberal conditions of toleration that set a limit to the competition of the Jew, but hardness of grit—where this fails Jews soon appear in victorious numbers, if there is anything to conquer.” Has England lost this “hardness of grit” that she allows the destitute alien to feed upon her vitals? “Where the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together.” “The Jew,” Sidney Whitman says, “dominates the press on the Seine, the Spree, and the Danube. For he possesses the self-assurance, the suppleness and alertness of mind needful for success in journalism in an extraordinary degree. The great international telegraphic news companies, Reuter and Wolff, &c., are the property of the Jew. He rules the money and the produce markets. It is only as a landowner and a manufacturer that he is still comparatively in the background; for, with all his natural gifts, he seems deficient in the qualities necessary to success in these fields, notably in the bent and capacity to control labour. On the other hand, the purveying of popular amusement, notably of the drama, is almost entirely in his hands. The consulship of the great and lesser powers is almost entirely in
the hands of the Jews. A large percentage of the lawyers and judges of the
different courts are Jews throughout North Germany. At a recent
examination in one of the Prussian classical schools, the item of religion
fell into abeyance because all those who came up for examination were
Jews. What the Jewish element in Germany means may be judged from a
few facts. In Berlin their number has increased from 45,464 to close upon
100,000 in 18 years. Most of the palatial private houses in the Thiergarten
are the property of Jews. In the Bellevuestrasse, one of the finest streets in
Berlin, there are said to be only three houses left which do not belong to
Jews. In short, it would only need the press to possess the power it has in
England, the entry to society and to Parliament to be easily open to the
blandishments of wealth, and the army to be as freely open to Jewish
energy as other professions already are, for imperial Germany to be
completely under Jewish dominion. We hold it on the authority of H. von
Treitschke that the press in Germany does not possess the power it wielded
a generation ago, and that its want of influence is directly owing to the
general knowledge that it is so largely in the hands of the Jew. The
majority of the members of the Reichstag are essentially poor men—not
Jews. “The extent to which the Jews assist one another financially is
unique.”

The Jew, you see, does not bother about either parliament, or press, or
army, because he knows that with his invisible monometallic sword he can
control parliament, press, and army at his pleasure. “The first Napoleon,”
says Whitman, “prophesied that in fifty years Europe would be either
Republican or Cossack. He reckoned without the Jew.”

In the “typical city” of the land of “triumphant democracy”—New
York—“the Jews own forty-nine synagogues and several hundred millions
of dollars in landed property.” The Jew laughs at democracy all the world
over. Thus Jehovah, the God of Nations, proves himself the fittest to
survive of all the national gods. “At the ethnic judgment - seat, at the
judgment - seat of the God of Nations, it is not asked,” wrote Goethe,
“whether this is the best, the most excellent nation, but whether it lasts,
whether it has continued. The Israelitish people never was good for much,
as its own leaders, judges, rulers, prophets have a thousand times
reproachfully declared; it possesses few virtues, and most of the faults of
other nations; but in cohesion, steadfastness, valour, and, when all this
would not serve, in obstinate toughness, it has no match. It is the most
perseverent nation in the world; it is, it was, and will be; to glorify the
name of Jehovah, through all ages. We have set it up, therefore, as the
pattern figure; as the main figure, to which the others only serve as a
frame. One chief advantage of this people is its excellent collection of sacred books; another I must here mention: it has not embodied its god in any form; and so has left us at liberty to represent him in a worthy human shape, and likewise, by way of contrast, to designate idolatry by forms of beasts and monsters.”

Jehovah, the “heathen ethnic god,” to-day appears to have reduced the lion and the unicorn, the eagle and the bear to subjection. John Bull is under his thumb. But Jehovah is, after all, only a national, not a Christian, universal, or wholly human god, and Mr. Punch, the god of humour, is not going to be enslaved by the jealous god, who had not a trace of humour in his composition. Jehovah, however, has developed. Semitic persecutions are in modern scientific language simply the restriction of the Jew to his proper function of universal financier, the “differentiation” of the Jew as the nervous system of the organism Humanity. H. Spencer, in his “Sociology,” likens the banking system to the vaso-motor nervous system in the human organism:—“There has arisen, in addition to the political regulating system, an industrial regulating system, which carries on its co-ordinating function independently. The Jew simply follows the line of progress. What we want is a further development of the ‘sympathetic system’ to break down the exclusiveness of the Jew and melt his hardness.”

Now, great rulers—e.g., William the Conqueror, Peter the Great, Cromwell, Napoleon, Frederick the Great—have never feared the Jew; have, on the contrary, used him for national purposes. And Australia, if she is to take the leading place, must control and use the Jew for universal and human purposes. But with a Federal Government this will be impossible. Unity must be met with and controlled by a higher unity. Only a solid point or personal unit can break through the “Lombard-street ring.”

And great rulers, too, have generally maintained religious freedom. Queen Victoria, too, carries on this regal tradition. Her father, the Duke of Kent, Holyoake tells us, understood Mr. Owen, the champion of cooperation, best in England, and “did not desert him on account of his irreligious views.” Lecky recently told the world that “after the suppression of the great Sepoy mutiny of 1857, which was mainly due to religious fanaticism, there was a moment of great peril. A powerful party, supported by the high authority of Colonel Herbert Edwardes, one of the most distinguished of Indian soldiers, attributed the mutiny to the British Government having neglected their duty of bringing home Christian truths to the native population, and Colonel Edwardes issued a memorandum urging that the true policy to be pursued was the elimination of all unchristian principles from the government of India. To carry out this
policy he desired that the Bible should be compulsorily taught in all Government schools; that all endowments of native religions from public money, and all legal recognition of caste, should cease; that the English should cease to administer Hindu and Mohammedan possessions.” This memorandum received a good deal of partial or unqualified support, but wiser counsels ultimately prevailed. In the Queen's proclamation of October, 1858, there is a remarkable paragraph, which is said to have been due to the direct action of the Queen herself, and which did very much to establish permanent quiet in India:—“We do strictly charge and enjoin,” it said, “on all those who may be in authority under us that they abstain from all interference with the religious beliefs and worship of any of our subjects, on pain of our highest displeasure.” As Mr. Stead has shown in his articles in the *Review of Reviews*, the Queen's influence has on various occasions saved the empire when the politicians had well nigh brought on it disaster. She upheld Sir George Grey when the Colonial Office frowned upon him, as it generally does upon anyone who dares to act on his own responsibility without direction from the usual Blunderbores there. Sir George Grey, it is well known, did much to save the Indian empire by diverting the China fleet on his own responsibility. “Sir George reported his act to the Home Government and to Lord Elgin. The latter never replied, and has been credited, oddly enough, by Lord Roberts with the merit of this opportune reinforcement. But the Queen commanded the Colonial Secretary “to express her high personal appreciation.” “Had the Queen,” wrote Mr. Stead, “not been at her post in 1861 it is probable that we should have been involved in a fratricidal strife with the great American republic; and had she been missing in 1864 we should in all probability have been embroiled in a suicidal and disastrous struggle with our German kinsfolk on the continent of Europe. The two greatest political crimes and blunders which it was possible for the empire to commit in these latter days were on the verge of being committed by the action of the chosen representatives of the people. That they were not committed was due to the Queen and Prince Consort in the case of the United States, to the Queen alone in the case of the Dano-German war.”

But the people know nothing or little of all this, and think they are safe with irresponsible and uncontrolled representatives. And, while Cabinets mismanage in England, the Privy Council has nothing to do.

E. A. Freeman, writing on “Reform of the House of Lords,” says:—“Lastly, all this discussion cannot but bring before our minds that we have among us what surely is the most illustrious assembly in the world, and yet we find for it as an assembly nothing whatever to do. The British Privy
Council is surely more like the Roman senate than any body of men that has been since the Roman senate. Like the senate, it is not hereditary, it is not elective, it is not filled by mere arbitrary nomination. The first men of all sides in politics, and in all branches of public life, find their way into it by natural selection.” In other words, it is composed of men of approved fitness of character, and just what is requisite to manage national affairs. Mr. Cockburn says of Australia:—“There is on the part of the public a growing discontent with the proceedings in Parliament. The adverse criticism is chiefly directed against party government, against the existence of organized bands of members engaged in a ceaseless struggle for possession of the Treasury benches. At present ministers are appointed in reality neither by the Crown nor by Parliament, but are nominated by the individual who, for the time being, secures the votes of the predominant party in the House of Representatives; and it is natural that they should owe their allegiance to that party from which they derive their existence, and which sustains them in office.”

Mr. Cockburn proposed to reform the Cabinet system by providing that the ministers be elected by the House at the commencement of each session. But this still leaves the supreme power in the hands of politicians. For a national council, which, I maintain, is the only addition we want in Australia, it should be as it is in England, where the ministers need not hold seats in Parliament, need not be drawn from Parliament.

We have seen how badly the Government of England secures the welfare of the nation; how the Jew virtually rules England and the continent of Europe; how America is dominated by capital; how the monied power has Australia in its grasp; how unstable Europe is. And to-day Europe, instead of reforming her own society, seeks to conquer and exploit the East, to establish a financial control over China. Thus there is a danger of the whole world being reduced to financial servitude.

A few passages from Mr. Kidd's “Social Evolution” will make clear the intention of the European nations, and disclose a still greater danger to liberty and religious freedom. “No one can doubt,” he says, “that it is within the power of the leading European peoples of to-day—should they so desire—to parcel out the entire equatorial regions of the earth into a series of satrapies, and to administer their resources, not, as in the past, by a permanently resident population, but from the temperate regions, and under the direction of a relatively small European official population. And this without any fear of effective resistance from the inhabitants. Always, however, assuming that there existed a clear call of duty or necessity to provide the moral force necessary for such action. It is this last stipulation
which it is all-important to remember in any attempt which is made to
estimate the probable course of events in the future. For it removes at once
the centre of interest and observation to the lands occupied by the
European peoples. It is, in short, in the development in progress amongst
these peoples, and not in the events taking place to-day in lands occupied
by the black and coloured races, that we must seek for the controlling
factor in the immediate future of the tropical regions of the world. . . . It
will probably be made clear, and that at no distant date, that the last thing
our civilization is likely to permanently tolerate is the wasting of the
resources of the richest regions of the earth, through the lack of the
elementary qualities of social efficiency in the races possessing them. The
right of those races to remain in possession will be recognized, but it will
be no part of the future conditions of such recognition that they shall be
allowed to prevent the utilization of the immense natural resources which
they have in charge.” But, Mr. Kidd, have those western nations of yours
properly utilized the resources of their own lands? Go and look at the
condition of any of your great cities! You have yourself testified to the
enormous accumulation of wealth at the positive pole of society, and the
revolting accumulation of poverty at the negative pole. “It is hard,” wrote
Huxley, in 1894, “to say whether the increase of the unemployed poor, or
that of the unemployed rich, is the greater social evil.” Are there not vast
areas of fertile land unutilized, undeveloped, in Europe itself? What brings
the armies of the West into the East? Is it not to find those unemployed
soldiers, which are such a curse to Europe, and which the jealousy of
nations makes it impossible to disarm, something to do? In plain English,
you want to exploit the East in order to feed your corrupt cities, swell the
number of your unemployed rich, and raise a whole race of beings like the
“beaux of modern Babylon.” Commerce, as you carry it on in the East, is
but a veiled form of robbery. You know how savage races value showy
shoddy products above gold and precious stones and really valuable goods,
and your western traders take advantage of their ignorance. You carry your
diseases with you, and poison with bad liquor. There is no moral force
behind your commercial movement, no desire to civilize, to humanize the
people of the East.

I read of a conspiracy against the Chinese throne. But it is not a Pekin
Palace conspiracy, but a conspiracy of the Western governments against
the Chinese people. You will have an awakening of the East directly that
you will not like, an awakening that will send your Western officials back
howling with fear and dismay, unless you can develop the East in a
humane manner, without robbery and violence. Perhaps you have heard of
“the coming of the Slav,” and perhaps you know that it has happened again and again in the history of the world that a new race has been called to take the lead in regenerating it. And there is a new race springing up in Australia, Mr. Kidd, which means to have some influence in the East, and is not in love with your Western methods, or your super-rational religion.

Mr. Kidd says:—“A rational religion is a scientific impossibility, representing from the nature of the case an inherent contradiction of terms.” Of course this is a begging of the question, but logic is not Mr. Kidd's strong point. “No form of belief,” he says, “is capable of functioning as a religion in the evolution of society which does not provide an ultra-rational sanction for social conduct in the individual.” Thus Mr. Kidd finds the moral force necessary to justify the proposed exploitation of the East in an ultra-rational belief—in Anglo-Australian, an irrational belief. “The movement,” he says, “of a certain class of minds towards the Church of Rome, the most conservative and uncompromising of all the Churches, which began in England in the middle of the century, and which has continued in some degree down to the present time, is not to be considered merely as a religious incident; it is of deep sociological import.

. . . The condition which the social mind has reached may be tentatively described as one of realization, more or less unconscious, that religion has a definite function to perform in society, and that it is a factor of some kind in the social evolution which is in progress.” To translate this misty language into clear Australian, Mr. Kidd means that the Church of Rome is to supply the moral force and ultra-rational sanction necessary for the successful exploitation of the East, the parcelling out of the “entire equatorial regions of the earth” into provinces, administered by managers in the interests of European absentee. It is plain that this kind of thing cannot justify its existence on rational grounds or reasons, so it is necessary to find an irrational ground. And the Papacy is the very thing, for it zealously maintains its claim to temporal power, and is notoriously unsatisfied with the spiritual arm. As the Church of Rome professes to be Christian, this claim is certainly irrational, for Jesus said—“Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword,” when one of his followers struck off the ear of a servant of the high priest. It may be said that it is one thing to claim the temporal power, another thing to use it. But now suppose that the power of the Papacy was to unite with that of the Jew, who controls Europe. The temporal weapon, the armies of Europe, would then be under the direction of the Papacy, and the Pope could realize his idea of a world-wide empire—if a “Mohammedan revival,” in favour of the sexual idea as opposed to the
ascetic, did not put bounds to his ambition. The idea of this Papal
domination is absurd, it will be said. But the editor of the Review of
Reviews, Mr. Stead, does not think so. He, like Zola's priest, has visions of
a new Rome and a new Holy Roman Empire.

Mr. Stead in 1889 contributed an article to the Contemporary Review,
ettitled “The Papacy—A Revelation and a Prophecy,” in which he says:—
“If the Pope is to fulfil his greater idea he will have to shake himself free
from the influence of the Vatican. . . . We stand at the dawn of a new epoch
which, from the point of view of universal history, is quite as momentous
as that in which the northern tribes broke in upon and destroyed the fabric
of the moribund empire of Rome. . . . The world is passing into the hands
of the English-speaking races; the fact is unmistakable—the future of the
world is English. What, then, is to be the attitude of the Holy See in face of
this strange remaking of the world? Upon the answer to that question
depends the future of the Church. If she still aspires to exercise her
beneficent dominion over the new and the coming world, she will no more
seek to restore Papal sovereignty in the capital of Italy than a thousand
years ago she sought to revive the proconsuls of the empire, or to restore
the Caesars. Let the dead past bury its dead. Rome, once the world's centre,
is now a mere provincial town in an out-of-the-way corner of a small
inland sea. If she is still to be a living reality, presiding over the
development of our civilization and mothering the children of men, then
she will be true to the law of her being, and establish the seat of her
Sovereign Pontiff in the centre where sovereignty resides. Rome is of the
old world, archaic, moribund, and passing away. The centre, the capital,
and the mother city of the new world, which Catholicism must conquer or
perish, is not to be found on the banks of the Tiber, but on the Thames. . . .
And in that hour when those who hate the church fill the air with insult and
exultation, and when those who love her more in her accidents than in her
essence are abased to the dust with humiliation and shame, then to the eye
of faith the enforced hegira of the Pope from the Latin to the English world
will be regarded as the supreme affirmation of the providential mission of
the Church—a new Divine commission for her to undertake, on a wider
basis, the great task of rebuilding the City of God.” Which, translated into
Australian, means that St. Stead aspires to the Papal throne when it is
established in London. He is certainly no ascetic, since his reproductions
fly monthly over the civilized globe, but at the rate he is spending himself
he cannot last, and the Papal chair will suit his declining years.

The Pope is not likely to follow Mr. Stead's advice and migrate to
modern Babylon after reading about Huxley's “kindly comet” and the
“birth of a new world,” and if the Pope left for London the Papacy would certainly decline to follow him. But Australians should beware of Stead and his emissaries. His sub-editor in Australia is an ardent federationist. And federation means dual control, and “when Pope Alexander VI. divided the newly discovered lands betwixt the Portuguese and the Spaniards, early in the sixteenth century, the line he drew almost exactly bisected Australia. This would have given Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria to the Portuguese, and the rest of Australia to the Spaniards.”

Perhaps now, Australians, you begin to see the gigantic conspiracy against our liberties that is afoot. Let me recall the chief factors. The Jew enthroned in London; Australia head and heels in debt to him; Pritchard Morgan and Chamberlain and a syndicate ready to annex the Northern Territory (which, mind you, does not belong to Australia but to the English Parliament), including somehow the Charters Towers, Croydon, Hodgkinson, and Palmer goldfields; the syndicate established in China, preparatory to landing a few million Chinkies on our shores; Sir Daniel Cooper waiting in the Imperial Institute to realize his “conception of a British empire, homologous, homogeneous, welded into an organism of irrefragable and resistless unity;” St. Stead enthroned in St. Paul's, of London, with an army of journalistic eunuchs (his own phrase) ready to do his bidding; a Parliament ready with a death-warrant for the Queen, which of course she will sign, as Bagehot, that great authority on constitutional matters, said she is bound by the law to do.

Now, Stead says that Leo XIII. is the greatest man in the world. How he arrived at certainty on this rather difficult question it is hard to say. Probably some “spook” inspired him, whispering, possibly, something about a cardinal's hat.

When Zola's Pierre went to Rome he found to his astonishment that the Pope “had been very fond of ‘sport’ before age had weakened him. He was indeed passionately addicted to bird snaring. Broad-meshed nets were hung on either side of a path on the fringe of a plantation, and in the middle of the path were placed cages containing the decoys, whose songs soon attracted all the birds of the neighbourhood—red-breasts, white-throats, black-caps, nightingales, fig-peckers of all sorts. And when a numerous company of them was gathered together, Leo XIII., seated out of sight and watching, would suddenly clap his hands and startle the birds, which flew up and were caught by the wings in the meshes of the nets. All that then remained to be done was to take them out of the nets and stifle them by a touch of the thumb. Roast fig-peckers are delicious.” “Perhaps so,” adds Zola's translator, “but what a delightful pastime for the Vicar of the
Divinity!” But this is the way the earthly Providence looks after the sparrows. Mr. Stead was immensely struck with this sport of the Pope's, and unlike Newton, who saw the law of gravitation in the fall of an apple, intends to apply his discovery, not to explain, but to control empirical phenomena. Therefore has he spread his nets through all the plantations or colonies, and even in America. And not satisfied with monthly reproductions, he aspires to establish a penny newspaper, which shall dictate to thrones and principalities and powers throughout the world.

Australians may imagine that I am exaggerating. Here, however, are Stead's own words in his “Satan's Invisible World Displayed,” in which there is a chapter on government by newspaper:—“The very conception of journalism as an instrument of government is foreign to the mind of most journalists, yet, if they could but think of it, the editorial pen is a sceptre of power compared with which the sceptre of many a monarch is but a gilded lath. In a democratic age, in the midst of a population which is able to read, no position is comparable for permanent influence and far-reaching power to that of an editor who understands his vocation. In him are vested all the attributes of real sovereignty. He has almost exclusive rights of initiative; he retains a permanent right of direction; and, above all, he, better than any man, is able to generate that steam known as public opinion, which is the greatest force of politics.” Now, perhaps, Australians, you see who it is that is booming federation, and who is generating the gas which is to work the federal machine. Stead continues:—“To rule—the very idea begets derision from those whose one idea of their high office is to grind out so much copy, to be only paid for according to quantity, like sausages or rope yarn—that in their eyes is journalism; but to rule! Yet an editor is the uncrowned king of an educated democracy. An extraordinary idea seems to prevail with the eunuchs of the craft that leadership, guidance, governance, are alien to the calling of a journalist. Their conception of what is a journalist's duty, if, indeed, they recognize that imperious word as having any bearing upon their profession, is hid in mystery. If it may be inferred from their practice, their ideal is to grind out a column of more or less well-balanced sentences, capable of grammatical construction, conflicting with no social conventionality or party prejudice, which fills so much space in the paper, and then utterly, swiftly, and for ever vanishes from mortal mind. How can they help to make up other people's minds when they have never made up their own? Even as it now is, with all its disabilities and all its limitations, the press is almost the most effective instrument for discharging many of the functions of government now left us. It has been, as Mr. Gladstone remarked, and still is, the most potent
engine for the reform of abuses that we possess, and it has succeeded to many of the functions formerly monopolized by the House of Commons. But all that it has been is but a shadow going before of the substance which it may yet possess, when all our people have learnt to read and the press is directed by men with the instinct and capacity of government.”

Thus Stead, instead of “seeing all things in God,” sees himself in all things. Just as the dog's idea of God is, says a modern doctor, a big, big supra-rational dog, so Stead's idea of the Divinity is a big, big editor in chief. The Queen, e.g., he turns into the chief editor of the realm. The press, he says, is almost the most effective governing instrument. It only wants the addition of the keystone Himself to make it quite so. And journalism, Stead says, has already learnt to act. “Methinks,” wrote Lowell, “the editor who should understand his calling and be equal thereto would truly deserve that title of ‘shepherd of the people,’ , which Homer bestows upon princes. He would be the Moses of our nineteenth century . . . . the captain of our exodus into the Canaan of a truer social order.” Yes, but, Lowell, we approach the twentieth century, and kings are somewhat differently built to shepherds or priests, not of the same genus at all, and emphatically sexual or virile.

Mr. Hearst, the son of Senator Hearst, and a millionaire, rescued Evangelina Cisneros from her Cuban gaol. “He would publish a newspaper which would beat the world, and began operations by annexing the pick of the staff of the world.” But Mr. Stead would not only beat the world but “lick creation.” The creative power of the universe he would trample under foot. There was a hidden meaning in that phrase of his “the eunuchs of the craft.” Mr. Stead, with his Romish, monkish proclivities, would emasculate the press, and leave the world-reviewer sole entire. And as the population question is, as Huxley says, the real riddle of the Sphinx, to which no political OEdipus has as yet found the answer, the journalist, as God Almighty, is not likely to confine his operations to journalists, is certain to descend from His throne “into private families, and in the end reach even the brutes.” It is hardly possible to revive the jus primoe noctis, but the “Argus eyes” of the world-editor will no doubt be present on first occasions, in order to collect material for a sensational pamphlet entitled “Love's Invisible World Displayed,” certain to have an enormous circulation. I prefer the poet Shelley's delicate handling of this subject:—

**A BRIDAL SONG.**
The golden gates of sleep unbar
Where strength and beauty met together,
Kindle their image like a star
In a sea of glassy weather.
Night, with all thy stars look down,—
Darkness, weep thy holiest dew,—
Never smiled the inconstant moon
On a pair so true.
Let eyes not see their own delight;
Haste, swift Hour, and thy flight
Oft renew.
Fairies, sprites, and angels keep her!
Holy stars, permit no wrong!
And return to wake the sleeper,
Dawn,—ere it be long.
Oh joy! oh fear! what will be done
In the absence of the sun!
Come along!

But Stead will not call “Come along” when the sun sets—not, indeed, till the sun rises, will his reporters hear the call—“Come along! quick! with copy.” Stead will, no doubt, permit select beings to perpetuate their species, the dominant journalistic race, of course, being favoured; and as he will provide by other means against the increase of population of the masses, C.D. Acts, &c., will be quite unnecessary.

Well, I think even the Australian blackfellows could give Mr. Stead a wrinkle. But, Australians! beware of the nonconformist conscience, and of those who would throw the shadow of the Cross, the shadow which is but the Brocken-spectre of their own darkness and intolerance, over sunny Australia! We have no call to take our pleasures sadly and surreptitiously, like the Puritans, but, like the Puritan soldiers, we should respect the daughters of the people and the homes of the poor.

In that book of Stead's there is a chapter entitled “Why not try the Inquisition?” which, when his leaning towards Rome is considered, has significance. Now, if Australia cannot put Stead, his sub-editors, and federation down, this is what will happen: Stead, as Pope, in London, for he is only making a footstool of the real Pope; Sir Daniel Cooper, the Jew; Pritchard Morgan, the Prime Minister; let us say Lord Rosebery, and M. de Blowitz—who also has a scheme for the organization of journalism, his journalists, however, being armed with revolvers, and no doubt also letters of introduction, as the French are more polite than the English—will put their heads together, and at the “psychological moment” Her Majesty will commit suicide, in accordance with the law of the constitution. The Crown
will descend on Stead's head from above, he will then immediately clap his hands; the word “clap” will flash over the wires to all sub-editors throughout the empire, who will also have gilded crowns ready made for the occasion. They will also clap their hands together, and at the sound the startled colonial birds—red-breasts, white-throats, black-caps, nightingales, fig-peckers of all sorts—will fly up and be caught in the meshes of the nets so carefully set through all the plantations. “Roast fig-peckers” especially “are delicious.” And those that escape the journalistic net will be snared by Chamberlain's bird-lime.

After this exposure may I not say again, “Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of the colonial birds.” Toby Barton was not far wrong when he denounced government by newspaper; but, Toby! we don't want government by Parliament either, nor do we want any crowns or sceptres, or God or “Belial on the judgment seat,” but simply the best man and woman we can get, to knit the world together by the touch of human sympathy.

Pandora let loose all the ills upon mankind, hope only remaining in the casket. Without the help of woman social reformation is impossible. You have quite forgotten the ladies, Toby! — whether ladies fortunate, indifferent, or unfortunate—and you had better think over my scheme for a woman's parliament if you will insist on federation.

But in any case there is work for you and yours; your training in distrust need not be thrown away. Go forth, armed after the Blowitzean manner, and rouse the oppressed women of the East, and if you meet Stead's myrmidons in the harems collecting information for a future pamphlet, exterminate them to a man, as enemies of the human race. Drawing, landscape and other, is one of the accomplishments that Blowitz requires of his ideal journalist; you will find this handy for preserving plans of the fortresses you storm for future use. But Blowitz is less dangerous than Stead, for he only proposes a federation of the press, while Stead goes in for unity, the English idea of government—an idea not realized, for, as has been pointed out recently, England is only a federation under the guise of unity, in which, as is usual in federations, the interests of the parts—i.e., Scotland, Ireland, Wales—are sacrificed for the good of the predominant partner, England. But Stead means to realize the idea.

“How important,” says the great constitutional authority before quoted, Bagehot, “singleness and unity are in political action no one, I imagine, can doubt. We may distinguish and define its parts, but policy is a unit and a whole. It acts by laws, by administrators; it requires now one, now the other; unless it can easily move both, it will be impeded soon; unless it has
an absolute command of both its work will be imperfect. The interlaced character of human affairs requires a single determining energy; a distinct force for each artificial compartment will make but a motley patchwork, if it live long enough to make anything. The excellence of the British constitution is that it has achieved this unity; that in it the sovereign power is single, possible, and good.”

But it has achieved it only in idea, and the Prince Consort, alas! is not alive. A woman alone cannot successfully rule, neither can a man, but man and woman united by the bonds of love can—can frame a policy which is a unit and a whole, applicable to all sorts of human beings and all conditions of social life, and thus regenerate the world.

Women of Australia! yours is an opportunity the like of which has never before occurred. You can check drunkenness, you can purify morals, you can cure the social evil, you can remove the distrust of lawyer-politicians, you can disarm soldiers. Assert your rights, and become a power in the state, or the business of Homo and Co. will never be properly performed, and hunger and love will continue their destructive work with all the enormous weapons in their hands to-day, of which dynamite is not the least potent.

Ladies, do not trust to a federal constitution, for it involves the supremacy of lawyers. As Stuart Mill wrote:—“Under the more perfect mode of federation, where every citizen of each particular state owes obedience to two governments—that of his own state and that of the federation—it is evidently necessary not only that the constitutional limits of the authority of each should be precisely and clearly defined, but that the power to decide between them in any case of dispute should not reside in either of the governments, or in any functionary subject to it, but in an umpire independent of both. There must be a supreme court of justice, and a system of subordinate courts in every state of the union, before whom such questions shall be carried, and whose judgment on them in the last stage of appeal shall be final. Every state of the union and the federal government itself, as well as every functionary of each, must be liable to be sued in those courts for exceeding their powers, or for non-performance of their federal duties, and must in general be obliged to employ those courts as the instruments for enforcing their federal rights. This involves the remarkable consequence, actually realized in the United States, that a court of justice, the highest federal tribunal, is supreme over the various governments, both state and federal, having the right to declare that any laws made or act done by them exceeds the powers assigned to them by the federal constitution, and, in consequence, has no legal validity. And this,”
says Mill, “is the only principle which has been found or which is ever likely to produce an effective federal government.”

But is not Australia already law-ridden enough? Are we so utterly uncivilized as to require further cumbrous legal machinery? But it is plain why lawyers love federal schemes; it gives their legal ingenuity scope, it extends their power, and creates numberless new billets. And says Mill:—

“The Supreme Court of the federation (American) dispenses international law, and is the first great example of what is now one of the most prominent wants of civilized society, a real international tribunal.”

Australia can become, if she wills, a great international centre, but under a Federal Government if she became supreme she would extend the tyranny of law over the whole world, and woman remain for ever in her present degraded position of dependence. And besides, it is only a question of the relative degree of civilization whether lawyers, like politicians, are necessary at all. If people trusted one another they need not employ lawyers. But if lawyers are made supreme they cannot be removed, except by dynamite.

Ladies, if you trust the lawyers, they will simply get you in Chancery. As a Frenchman said—“Nothing ever comes to an end in Chancery, and the unhappy being who has a process there can be sure of but one thing, namely, that whether it is gained or lost ruin is certain.” But the Frenchman was wrong. Nothing is certain in chancery, for the court has abandoned the popular sense of equity in England, and a technical sense unknown to the jurisprudence of other nations has been given to it. The proceedings of the court, “on its equity side,” are now as closely hedged in by rules and precedents as those of any court of common law. The etiquette of the court is such that amendment or procreation is impossible. Ladies, the lawyers will simply make April fools of you, and you won't even be able to give notice to leave and seek your rights elsewhere, for the lawyers, once supreme, can make such conduct illegal, null and void. The supremacy of the Chief Dane will be worse even than that of the journalist Stead. There is but one hope for you: put a woman in power, and keep her there, and make the law of Love supreme.

One of the 'cutest lawyers in Australia told me the other day that a law of “Free Bench” is part of the law of England, and applies to Berkshire and part of Devon. A widow is entitled to a portion of her husband's land held from the lord of the manor, but if she be proved incontinent she loses her right unless she is prepared to ride into court on a black ram, with the ram's tail in her mouth, and use a certain formula of words, then she is excused from her offence.
This is a specimen of Rabelaisian legal humour; but it is hardly fair for widows to be thus made the butt of legal rams. I don't know the correct formula of words to be used. Spencer's formula of evolution might upset a hidebound court, but I don't think even a widow could get through it correctly. However, here it is, in case any widow wishes to try its effect:—

“Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation.” Or Hegel's definition of matter, in his “Logic,” might be still better:—“Matter is the mere abstract or indeterminate reflection-into-something-else, or reflection-into-self at the same time as determinate; it is consequently Thinghood which then and there is—the subsistence or substratum of the thing. By this means the thing finds in the matters its reflection-into-self; it subsists not in its own self, but in the matters, and is only a superficial association between them, or an external bond over them.” Any widow who repeats either of these formulas, the highest products of modern German and English philosophy, correctly from memory ought to be forgiven “though her sins be as scarlet.”

But as only widows of the “highest culture” could manage this feat, it is necessary to find a formula that low-class widows can mouth. I will suggest one from the “Slang Dictionary” which is likely to move the court to mercy—“Skowbanker.” This is certain to bring about a dissipation of legal motion, and loosen the superficial association and external bond of judge-made law, which loosening is necessary to social evolution. Lawyers and widows would then undergo a parallel transformation from “thinghood” into humanhood. Cap and wig might both be dispensed with, and hunger and love have their due. The middle-class widows don't want a formula, as the lawyers are always kind to them.
Ch. Letourneau, in his “Evolution of Marriage,” concludes his chapter on widowhood thus:—“From a consideration of all these facts we find that the fate of the widow has varied according to the matrimonial form in use, and according to the degree of civilization, but that it has not always been ameliorated in proportion to the general progress. Laws and customs have ever been kind to the widower. It has been very different for the woman, and her position has perhaps been better, from one point of view, in certain primitive societies than it became later. Under a monogamic régime societies are generally more civilized, and the dominating ideas are then the care of property, and sometimes the perpetuation of the name. The widow cannot inherit, for the property must not be divided. She is then a most embarrassing encumbrance. Sometimes she is persuaded to follow into the next world the husband who has preceded her thither; this is the most radical solution. Sometimes her relations marry her again, and obtain a second price for her; sometimes she is provided for by the levirate. Traces of these ancestral iniquities are still preserved in our moral codes, which, though nearly emancipating the widow, push the fanaticism of consanguinity so far as not to consider her as the relative of her husband as concerns property. From a social point of view the whole of this survey of the treatment of widows is not flattering for humanity. In short, from a moral point of view, the easy resignation with which man and woman bear widowhood places mankind, as regards nobility of sentiment, far below certain species of animals; as, for example, the Illinois paraquet (*Psittacus Illinois*), for whom widowhood and death are synonymous, as well for the male as female. Doubtless it might be alleged that even in so-called highly civilized societies people do not marry as a rule from any lofty sentiment, but that is surely a poor excuse.”

In short, in marriage as in everything else we are in the federal semi-human stage. The welfare of widows and of all human beings is sacrificed to the care of property, and marriage is consummated with mighty oaths, although the pair care little for one another, and human beings do not mate according to their elective affinities. At the present time most men are polygamists. We want freedom in marriage as well as in trade.

Here is a legal curiosity from the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary:—“All restaurant knives are blunted according to law to prevent the convivial revellers who use the house from murdering one another when quarreling in their cups. The law, though old, is still considered necessary by the
authorities, and is enforced in practice.”

N. E. Porok, writing in the Contemporary of February, 1898, on the breaking up of the Austrian empire, says:—“The one centripetal force in the empire is the Emperor Franz Joseph, who enjoys the affection of all parties in the State. The magic of his words, the chivalry of his character, the strength underlying his human weakness, and the poignancy of his suffering, irresistibly draw his subjects to him, and in the wildest political storm an utterance of his suffices to produce a profound calm, during which the voice of reason has a chance of being heard.” This is a witness to the efficacy of the personal bond of character. “It is highly probable that as long as Franz Joseph lives the dual empire may contrive to subsist on its present basis, but only on condition that no wild experiments are attempted. A return to absolutism is not a whit more dangerous than a plunge into federalism. Both would prove suicidal. . . . There is yet another possibility far more efficacious, with results infinitely more durable than the foregoing, and its realization depends upon the Austrian Government itself. It is certainly a very radical suggestion, but it would have been accepted by Count Taaffe were he now living and in office. Briefly it is this: Let the present old-fashioned system of parliamentary representation be swept away, and let the Austrian peoples, instead of a few privileged classes, make their voices heard in parliament. This done, the future of the empire is assured for as long a time and on as firm a basis as mortals can assure it. The measure is undoubtedly difficult of realization and drastic in its effects; but the disease is desperate and the opportunity transient. Every party in the State will cry out against it, and leave nothing undone to hinder it from becoming law; but the interests of the state are above those of the political parties which compose it.”

Thus our friends the politicians and lawyers seem to rule the roost in the dual monarchy as well as in democratic Australia. They evidently want the referendum there to bring the monarch in touch with the people. “What is absolutely certain,” says Porok, “is this: from the day on which Austrian members of parliament ceased to represent the few, and came as spokesmen of the masses, the conflict of rival nationalities and the struggle between centralists and federalists would vanish as by the waving of a magician's wand. If democratic Switzerland can exist and prosper despite its heterogeneous elements, a democratic Austria would have equal chances of success.”

And Austria appears to have in Franz Joseph that centre of resistance—or, as I should prefer to call it, centre of response—which Switzerland lacks, and which Stuart Mill said was essential to government. “That there
should be, in every polity,” wrote Mill, “a centre of resistance to the predominant power in the constitution, and in a democratic constitution, therefore, a nucleus of resistance to the democracy, I have already maintained; and I regard it as a fundamental maxim of government.” Numa Droz writes of Switzerland:—“It cannot be denied that the Swiss people have shown a want of wisdom in adopting a system of initiative which places all our institutions at the mercy of any daring attempt instigated by the demagogue, and favoured by precisely such circumstances as should rather incline us to take time for reflection. . . . There is, unfortunately, no authority to reverse a mistaken decision of the whole Swiss people.” That is, the Swiss constitution is in danger because it has no single head to its state, no centre of unity, no concrete representative of the nation. Numa Droz hopes by experiment to arrive at a successful use of the initiative, but common-sense is better than experiment, as it is the “long result of time.” Why does not he try to find another William Tell?—for, as Byron wrote—

“If the free Switzer yet bestrides alone
His chainless mountains, 'tis but for a time,
For tyranny of late is cunning grown,
And in its own good season tramples down
The sparkles of our ashes.”

Demagogues could not endanger the institutions of Switzerland if the people trusted their rulers; the interests of the people and the government are not identical, and that is a dangerous state of affairs when you live in an armed camp, such as Europe is to-day.

I alluded just now to the use of dynamite. The dynamiter is generally supposed to be a madman, an outcast, an enemy of the human race. But this is in many cases utterly untrue. Dynamiters are often men driven to extremes by the tyranny of unjust governments. They simply meet government by force with its own weapon, and protest against the tyranny of the stronger in the only way left to them. The Hon. Auberon Herbert, writing on the “Ethics of Dynamite,” says he detests dynamite, yet he declares that it is the perfection, the ne plus ultra of government. Indeed, he says, “if we poor liberty folk, who detest the root-idea at the bottom of all governing—the compelling of people to do what they don't want to do, the compelling of them to accept the views and become the tools of other persons—wished to find an object lesson to set before those governments of to-day which have not yet learnt to doubt about their property in human material, where could we find anything more impressive than the
dynamiter, with his tin canister and his supply of horseshoe nails? Here is your own child. This is what your doctrine of deified force, this is what your contempt of human rights, this is what your property in men and women lead to.” He says:—“I myself have seen in England a clever, industrious workman driven to the edge of revolt by the persecuting character of our education laws, and changed from a man ready to fight within the law to one who was almost ready to fight outside it. There are men, not bad parents, who have passed from town to town to avoid this persecution; there are families who have broken up their homes and lived as they could, in their detestation of it. It is time we laid aside this odious weapon of compulsion. More and more bitter will be the fruit of it as the years go on. Compulsion everywhere is a brutalizing weapon. If we cannot by reason, by influence, by example, by strenuous effort and personal sacrifice, mend the bad places of civilization, we certainly cannot do it by force. Force is the weakest and most treacherous of human implements. The history of force is the history of the continuous crumbling away of every institution that has rested upon it. Whatever on the one day looked to the eyes of men as if it could defy all attack, towering above subject things in its magnificence, and resting on what seemed its immovable and almost eternal foundations of force, on the morrow has gone to pieces as if it had been built wholly of rubble and clay. It would seem as if every institution possessed of overweening material power has been pitilessly selected for destruction. The jealous gods have hated it, and have aimed their lightnings at its head. The only thing that lasts is moral force—the word, the conviction which attempts to bind no hands but only acts on the soul.”

Let no one say that this truth needs no reassertion in Australia to-day, when the people are asked to accept an “indissoluble” federation scheme. Auberon Herbert quotes a letter from a correspondent which shows how a dynamiter is made:—“Ravachol was at one time an ardent Christian, seeing in that doctrine social hope and a message to the poor. He kept his principles but changed their form. One day, walking through the slums of Lyons, he saw a little neglected baby barefoot in the gutter. Ravachol stooped, lifted it up, pressed it to his breast like any mother, and the tears came. ‘Can any revolt,’ he said, ‘be unjustifiable against a society that treats its little children in this way?’ He then became taciturn and absent-minded through the rest of the walk.”

Let any young Australian go and walk through the slums of a great English city. If he has human sympathy he will feel a silent rage and hate rising within him against a civilization which produces such things as he sees there; he will feel a maddening sense of his own impotence, and cease
to wonder that ill-balanced natures seek to forestall Huxley's comet. He will understand Ravachol, and will ask himself: "Must these things be in my own land, too? Welcome socialism, communism, chaos, anything, rather than a civilization such as this, which dares to call itself Christian!"

And yet these things are here already, and daily growing worse, while our politicians talk and let things drift and abuse one another. Ravachol, while he pressed that child to his breast, was meditating those words: "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these least, ye did it not unto me. Blessed are the children, for they shall behold the face of the Father.” Victor Hugo said:—“The child's murmuring is more and is less than words; there are no notes, and yet it is a song; there are no syllables, and yet it is a language. This poor stammering is a compound of what the child said when it was an angel and of what it will say when it becomes a man.” And Ravachol heard the song of the child. It was the “Song of the Shirt,” the Nessus' shirt of a civilization about to pass away—the song of the spirit that makes all things new, the spirit which, divorced though it be from drawingrooms and Downing-streets, still lives in the hearts of the poor, and shall again renovate the world.

And is the dynamiter right? Must the new birth be attended by the roar of cannon and the clash of arms, and the slaughter of innocent beings by the infernal agency of dynamite? Well, it rests with the sovereigns and the people to shake those proud spoilers, those useless parliaments and tyrannous officials, to shake those proud spoilers down, and they should call Mr. Punch, and Figaro, and Simplicissimus to their aid, and kill them by ridicule, shatter them with the shafts of irony, and smother them in laughter. If the sovereigns much longer neglect their duty to the people, the dogs of war will be heard barking, not for but against the thrones of kings.

As things are to-day, every poet, every thinker who is not a mere Babbage machine, and every true Christian, is constantly tempted to say—"Here stand I, Chaos' well-beloved son,” and to call aloud to the disinherited of the earth—“Come to me, ye sons of Chaos! troop to my standard, ye larrikins and anarchists! ye prostitutes and thieves, give me your aid! and let us together sweep into nothingness a civilization full of hypocrisy and cant, and rotten to the core, and let us build afresh according to the law of God.”

For the power that creates can also destroy, and every state built upon an unjust basis becomes more unstable the bigger it grows—as an iceberg that at one moment proudly floats upon the ocean, glorious with colour, beautiful with natural pinnacles and arches and terraces and caves, yet at the next moment overturns and crashes down into the sea, since the warm
waters of the Gulf Stream have been perpetually, slowly and surely, melting away its base. So more than one modern state trembles in the balance, its foundations having been destroyed by the warm influence of the Christian spirit, till the touch of the finger of a little child suffices to send it reeling into the abyss. Those words of Shakespeare's sage in "The Tempest," which the modern literateur glibly repeats without understanding and with an untroubled mind, still have their meaning when applied to states—

"The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,  
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,  
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,  
And like this insubstantial pageant faded,  
Leave not a rack behind."

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away," As Renan said:—"Such is humanity; every nation, every intellectual, religious, or moral movement leaves behind it a brief formula which is as the abridged type, surviving to represent those forgotten millions who once lived and died grouped around it."

"It may be," said Huxley, "as Kant suggests, that every cosmic magma predestined to evolve into a new world has been the no less predestined end of a vanished predecessor. And it was a sense of this eternal law of representation that moved the poet Coleridge to exclaim, 'O man, surplus of Nature's dread activity.'"

"Between the early cell and the infant's formed body," says Professor Drummond in his "Ascent of Man," "the ordinary observer sees the uneventful passage of a few brief months. But the evolutionist sees concentrated into these few months the labour and progress of incalculable ages. Here before him is the whole stretch of time since life first dawned upon the earth; and as he watches the nascent organism climbing to its maturity he witnesses a spectacle which for strangeness and majesty stands alone in the field of biological research. The human form does not begin as a human form. It begins as an animal, and at first, and for a long time to come, there is nothing wearing the remotest semblance of humanity. What meets the eye is a vast procession of lower forms of life, a succession of strange inhuman creatures emerging from a crowd of still stranger and still more inhuman creatures; and it is only after a prolonged and unrecognizable series of metamorphoses that they culminate in some faint likeness to the image of him who is one of the newest yet the oldest of
created things. Embryology has startled the world by declaring that the ancient life of the earth is not dead. It exists to-day in the embryos of still-living things, and some of the most archaic types find again a resurrection and a life in the frame of man himself. It is an amazing and almost incredible story. The proposition is not only that Man begins his earthly existence in the guise of a lower animal-embryo, but in the successive transformations of the human embryo there is reproduced before our eyes a visible, actual, physical representation of part of the life-history of the world. The human embryo is a subtle phantasmagoria, a living theatre in which a weird transformation scene is being enacted, and in which countless strange and uncouth characters take part. Some of these characters are well known to science, some are strangers. As the embryo unfolds, one by one these animal actors come upon the stage, file past in phantom-like procession, throw off their drapery, and dissolve away into something else. Yet, as they vanish each leaves behind a vital portion of itself, some original and characteristic memorial, something itself has made or won, that perhaps it alone could make or win—a bone, a muscle, a ganglion, or a tooth—to be the inheritance of the race. And it is only after nearly all have played their part and dedicated their gift, that a human form, mysteriously compounded of all that has gone before, begins to be discerned in their midst.”

And the transformation we see going on around us to-day in society is in a similar way the attempt to produce an ideal social form, the attempt to humanize society, to evolve a governing or amending organ which shall make equable social progress possible. But it must not be supposed that there is no such thing as catastrophic change either in nature or society. As Huxley said:—“Mr. Darwin has unnecessarily hampered himself by adhering to his favourite ‘Natura non facit saltum.’ We greatly suspect that she does make considerable jumps in the way of variation now and then, and that these saltations give rise to some of the gaps which appear to exist in the series of known forms.”

Sometimes structures become useless and dangerous. These, then, disappear totally from the most progressive organisms, social or individual, as being disadvantageous. “There are undoubtedly cases,” writes Drummond, “where we know that certain vestigial structures are not only useless to Man, but worse than useless. Coming under this category is perhaps the most striking of all the vestigial organs, that of the Vermiform Appendix of the Caecum. Here is a structure which is not only of no use to man now, but is a veritable death trap. In herbivorous animals this ‘blind tube’ is very large, and of great use in digestion, but in Man it is shrunken
into the merest rudiment, while in the Ourang-outang it is only a little larger. In the human subject, owing to its diminutive size, it can be of no use whatever, while it forms an easy receptacle for the lodgment of foreign bodies, such as fruit-stones, which set up inflammation, and in various ways cause death. In the early embryo it is equal in calibre to the rest of the bowel, but at a certain date it ceases to grow pari passu with it, and at the time of birth appears as a thin tubular appendix to the caecum. In the newly born child it is often absolutely as long as in the full-grown man. This precocity is always an indication that the part was of great importance to the ancestors of the human species.”

And just such a useless and dangerous organ as the vermiform appendix in the human subject is the parliamentary organ in the social. Parliament forms an easy receptacle for the lodgment of foreign bodies, like the demagogues and the agitators. In our early embryonic Australian stage it is largely developed, but its precocity is merely an indication that the organ was useful to our ancestors, and it already ceases to grow “pari passu” with the rest of society, and we shall soon be able to jump this stage of social evolution altogether, and we shall suffer till we do so.

Drummond writes:—“As the modern stem-winding watch contains the old clepsydra and all the most useful features in the old timekeepers; as the Walter printing-press contains the rude hand-machine of Gutenberg, and all the best in all the machines that followed it; as the modern locomotive contains the engine of Watt, the locomotive of Hedley, and most of the improvements of succeeding years, so man contains the embryonic bodies of earlier and humbler and clumsier forms of life. Yet, in making the Walter press in a modern workshop, the artificer does not begin by building again the press of Gutenberg, nor in constructing the locomotive does the engineer first make a Watt's machine, and then incorporate the Hedley, and then the Stephenson, and so on through all the improving types of engines that have led up to this.”

But this is just what the politicians of the Convention have been trying to do: to reproduce all the antiquated, obsolete political forms of the old world, which have already become useless there, while rejecting the last legacy of England to her children—constitutional monarchy as the ultimate outcome of the representative process.

Gladstone wrote, in “Kin Beyond Sea”:—“The original authorship of the representative system is commonly accorded to the English race. More clear and indisputable is its title to the great political discovery of constitutional kingship. And a very great discovery it is. Whether it is destined, in any future day, to minister in its integrity to the needs of the
new world, it may be hard to say. In that important branch of its utility which is negative, it completely serves the purposes of the many strong and rising colonies of Great Britain, and saves them from all the perplexities and perils attendant upon successions to the headship of the executive. It presents to them, as it does to us, the symbol of unity, and the object of all our political veneration, which we love to find rather in a person than in an abstract entity like the state. But the old world, at any rate, still is, and may long continue to constitute the living centre of civilization, and to hold the primacy of the race; and of this great society the several members approximate, in a rapidly extending series, to the practice and idea of constitutional kingship. The chief states of Christendom, with only two exceptions, have, with more or less distinctness, adopted it. Many of them, both great and small, have thoroughly assimilated it to their system. The autocracy of Russia and the republic of France, each of them congenial to the present wants of the respective countries, may yet, hereafter, gravitate towards this principle, which elsewhere has developed so large an attractive power. Should the current that has prevailed through the last half-century maintain its direction and its strength, another fifty years may see all Europe adhering to the theory and practice of this beneficent institution, and peaceably sailing in the wake of England.”

This is merely an instance of political law, political rhythm. The political power resides now in the people, now in the aristocracy, now in the monarch. It is merely because politicians are ignorant of history, and have not generalizing power enough, that they fail to recognize the law. Hume saw long before Gladstone the tendency to monarchy. In his essays he wrote:—“Durst I venture to deliver my own sentiments amidst opposite arguments, I would assert that, unless there happen some extraordinary convulsion, the power of the Crown, by means of its large revenue, is rather upon the increase, though at the same time I own that its progress seems very slow, and almost insensible. The tide which has run long, and with some rapidity, to the side of popular government, is just beginning to turn towards monarchy.” And this is simply because social necessities require the reassertion of the rights of the Crown as superior to the rights of the monied aristocracy, which rights, just like the feudal rights at the close of the fifteenth century, have become detrimental to the well-being of the people.

The following passage from Prescott's “Ferdinand and Isabella” exactly illustrates the political rhythm; the feudal institutions then corresponded to the representative institutions of to-day:—“The close of the fifteenth century presents, on the whole, the most striking point of view in modern
history, one from which we may contemplate the consummation of an important revolution in the structure of political society, and the first application of several inventions destined to exercise their widest influence on human civilization. The feudal institutions, or rather the feudal principle (i.e., the spirit of the age.—ED.), which operated even where the institutions, strictly speaking, did not exist, after having wrought its appointed uses, had gradually fallen into decay; for it had not the power of accommodating itself to the increased demands and improved condition of society. However well suited to a barbarous age, it was found that the distribution of power among the members of an independent aristocracy was unfavourable to that degree of personal security and tranquillity which is indispensable to great proficiency in the higher arts of civilization. The conviction of this reconciled the nation to the transfer of authority into other hands (cf., the transformation of the Roman republic into the empire.—ED.); not those of the people indeed, who were too ignorant and too long accustomed to a subordinate dependent situation to admit of it, but into the hands of the sovereign. In whatever degree public opinion and the progress of events might favour the transition of power from the aristocracy to the monarch, it is obvious that much would depend on his personal character; since the advantages of his station alone made him by no means a match for the combined forces of his great nobility. The remarkable adaptation of the characters of the principal sovereigns of Europe to this exigency, in the latter half of the fifteenth century, would seem to have something providential in it (i.e., the monarchs were not isolated or accidental phenomena, but true centres of the social organisms.—ED.) Henry VII. of England, Louis XI. of France, Ferdinand of Naples, John II. of Aragon and his son Ferdinand, and John II. of Portugal, however different in other respects, were all distinguished by a sagacity which enabled them to devise the most subtile and comprehensive schemes of policy, and which was prolific in expedients for the circumvention of enemies too potent to be encountered by open force. Their operations, all directed towards the same point, were attended with similar success, resulting in the exaltation of the royal prerogative at the expense of the aristocracy, with more or less deference to the rights of the people, as the case might be; in France, for example, with almost total indifference to them; while in Spain they were regarded, under the parental administration of Isabella, which tempered the less scrupulous policy of her husband, with tenderness and respect. In every country, however, the nation at large gained greatly by the revolution, which came on insensibly, at least without any violent shock to the fabric of society, and which, by
securing internal tranquillity and the ascendency of law over brute force, gave ample scope for those intellectual pursuits that withdraw mankind from sensual indulgence and too exclusive devotion to the animal wants of our nature. No sooner was the internal organization of the different nations of Europe placed on a secure basis than they found leisure to direct their views, hitherto confined within their own limits, to a bolder and a more distant sphere of action. Their international communication was greatly facilitated by several useful inventions coincident with this period, or then first extensively applied. Such was the art of printing; the establishment of posts, which, adopted by Louis XI. in the fifteenth century, came into frequent use in the beginning of the sixteenth; and lastly the compass, which, guiding the mariner unerringly through the trackless wastes of the ocean, brought the remotest regions into contact. With these increased facilities for inter-communication, the different European states might be said to be brought into as intimate relation with one another as the different provinces of the same kingdom were before. They now, for the first time, regarded each other as members of one great community in whose action they were all mutually concerned.”

But the sovereign power has passed from the monarchs to the modern aristocracy of wealth, and the diffusion of thought, and increase of the means of communication, are making the retention of their power impossible. To-day, then, unless there is to be a vast social revolution, in which all will go down in a common ruin, there must be an alliance of the people and monarchs of Europe against the monopolists of wealth. Then the new scientific inventions can be applied to social amelioration, and a new era commence for the human race. But is this possible in Europe without a convulsion? And a convulsion means the death of liberty in Europe, and the restoration of absolute instead of constitutional monarchy. It seems impossible for Europe to remove her vermiform appendices without disaster, or to reduce her armaments. But Australia has an unrivalled opportunity of making a fresh start, of avoiding the errors of Europe; of basing her government, not like Europe upon force mitigated by religion, but directly upon religion—not upon any federal or religious compromise, but upon the law of progress as embodied, as realized in her best human personalities. If she can succeed in thus freeing herself from the past, and in adopting only its most perfect results, she can take the lead, inaugurate a new era of art, and call to her shores all those who in the old world love liberty and light rather than darkness and bondage, and thus at once relieve Europe from progressive elements for which she has no place, concentrate those elements here, and provide for the gradual amelioration
of the human race by peaceful means.

But instead of rising to this opportunity and sweeping away the system of government by force, and establishing on a secure basis government by character, which is what representative government really means, we find our politicians preaching the stale old doctrine of government by the mere majority of votes—government, that is, by mere unintelligent will power, human though it be. Thus Mr. Hughes, M.L.A., New South Wales, objects to the Federal Bill as “a subversion of the principle of democracy, and an abandonment of the rule by majority,” apparently quite ignorant of the fact that every political writer who knows anything of science regards the American doctrine of the political equality of men as an absurd delusion. It is just as absurd as to suppose that all men have equal capacity for ordinary business, and much more absurd, since the art of politics requires an infinitely greater capacity for its successful practice. Those who prophesied the world-wide ascendency of democracy, as has been remarked, counted without the Jew—the monied power. And it is only great sovereigns, backed up by their people, who can control the Jew, and as to-day the monied power has acquired a world-wide ascendancy, only a combination of the sovereigns can assure progress. But at the present day this can be done by influence, as the people are more intelligent, so that the danger to liberty which a standing military force always is, is removed. With increased self-government and a universal press, despotism is impossible. The people can safely entrust the sovereign power to an individual, do away with the clumsy parliamentary method, take direct control of their own affairs, leaving only the national business to their best men.

America has proved that government of the people, by the people, for the people is a failure, and only results in creating a useless political class, under the control of the money-owner. Lloyd wrote:—“It will be an awful price to pay, if this attempt at government of the people by the people must perish off the face of the earth, to prove to mankind that political brotherhood cannot survive where industrial brotherhood is denied.” The demonstration has been given by America, but there is nothing awful about the failure of democracy, if the interest of the employer is made identical with that of labour, and this can easily be done by an equitable arrangement of profit-sharing, alterable by the national government, with a view to complete industrial enfranchisement.

H. Spencer calls in question the right of a mere numerical majority to rule. “The fundamental assumption made by legislators and people alike is that a majority has powers which have no bounds. Instances may readily be selected which prove, by reductio ad absurdum, that the right of a majority
is a purely conditional right, valid only within specific limits, *e.g.*: Suppose that under the excitement of news from Australia the majority of a freehold land society should determine, not simply to start in a body for the gold diggings, but to use their accumulated capital to provide outfits, would this appropriation of property be just to the minority? and must these join the expedition? The members of an incorporated body are bound severally to submit to the will of the majority in all matters concerning the fulfilment of the objects for which they are incorporated; but in no others. And I contend that this holds of an incorporated nation as much as of an incorporated company.” “Yes, but,” comes the obvious rejoinder, “as there is no deed by which the members of a nation are incorporated, as there neither is nor never was a specification of purposes for which the union was formed, there exist no limits, and consequently the power of the majority is unlimited.”

But the essence of federal government is that it is government by an express contract. Federation is, as Sir John Forrest said, simply a business matter. The absurdity, then, of adding the term indissoluble to a federal contract is patent. What business man would form a partnership that bound him, and not only him but his children, for ever? As it is, many men would retire from business corporations, *e.g.*, banks, if they could do so without loss, and they would certainly never enter them if they had no power of retiring. The Convention, then, is proved utterly unbusiness-like, and it becomes evident that the term indissoluble was added for political purposes, to fasten upon Australia for ever the dominance of those who worship the great political superstition, which, as it ensures them bread and butter, they naturally revere, and do all they can to uphold.

Belfort Bax aptly describes modern governments thus:—“What is constitutionalism but a compact between land and capital, whereby the one agrees to subserve the interests of the other? The Conservative landowner pledges himself to support the Liberal capitalist in his self-interested reforms, and the Liberal capitalist promises to preserve intact for the Conservative landowner the fundamental bases of hereditary privilege. And so the game has gone merrily on, barring little quarrels now and then, for a century past.” This is exactly the federal position. And when we consider the immense indebtedness of Australia, which practically means that the residents of the country have no land or property of their own whatsoever, that, in other words, foreign capital and resident labour are diametrically opposed in interest to one another, we see that the modern system of competition has here reduced itself to an absurdity. This indebtedness means that, as far as commercial matters go, the interests of
all persons and classes are allied, and that the socialization of our industries will be advantageous to all. This means again that the political class, whose sole reason of existence is that they mediate between employer and employed, are totally unnecessary. Their political incompetence has landed us in debt, and now, again, they have proved, as I have shown above, their utter incompetence to manage business matters, by insisting that a business corporation shall be indissoluble. Thus the only excuse the politicians can give for their existence is that they have to live somehow; but since, as politicians, they are worse than useless—indeed, a positive danger and nuisance—and since no one can deny them the right to live, the only thing to do is to transform them into a defence force—to turn the parrots into eagles. And this is only just; they have got us into debt; they must free us from the enemy of all, *i.e.*, the foreign capitalist. And as this is a tremendous task, its performance is likely to completely use them up; so that the political class is completely provided for. It is fortunate that the Convention was summoned, because we now know who the politicians pure and simple are—we have them in a nutshell. Of course, there are other politicians, but they have other business to attend to, and can thus make a living without public assistance.

But as there is some doubt whether any federal politician, *qua* federal, *i.e.*, imperfectly united, can break through the Lombard-street ring, and as my own belief is that only a solid point can do it, the politicians might be provided with niches or cells in the Imperial Institute. A writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* recently suggested that the Imperial Institute be converted into an ethnological and anthropological bureau, such as the British Association at Toronto last year decided ought to be founded. If this were done it would be just the place for belated politicians. The writer says:—

"Under its present management, and on its present lines, the Institute is admittedly a grievous failure, and no one really would be sorry to see the institute go, except possibly the present administrative staff, and such remnants of the old South Kensington gang as still infest it. It would be infinitely better to replace it by something of truly imperial scope, and of genuine imperial utility, than by the concert hall, dancing saloon, or circus into which it would probably degenerate by itself."

Now, the man in the street, or in the bush, is hardly likely to agree with this writer when he calls provision for the amusement of the people degeneration; the man in the street is more likely to approve of the Prince of Wales' efforts for the encouragement of music in connection with the institute. But this writer's remarks illustrate in a very effective, because quite unintended, way how little imperial interests coincide with human
interests. To collect dead relics is a business of “truly imperial scope” and “genuine imperial utility.” The feeding of the starving poor of London is quite unworthy of the attention of truly imperial persons.

And science generally does not bother its head about the poor. Like Lombroso, it prefers collecting skulls. Lombroso, the great criminologist, by the way, has started a new religion, the worship of disease. Heraclitus said religion was a disease, but a sacred one. So Lombroso, in his book on genius, defines it as “a degenerative psychosis of the epileptoid group,” and yet in the same book confesses it is the highest manifestation of the human spirit, and “the one human power before which we may bow the knee without shame.” So it is plain that he worships disease. Of course Lombroso, after the manner of scientists, neglects the most important facts—viz., that genius is more than its aberrations; that sane genius, such as Homer, Shakespeare, Goethe, is possible; and that absolutely sane genius means perfect humanity, character, as the ultimate outcome of evolutionary processes of the universe, as Emerson and other writers have declared.

But to return to Spencer and his doctrine of political right. Spencer has quite exploded the idea of divine right of numerical majorities, for all sane minds, except politicians, who get their bread and butter by keeping up the popular worship of their idol, just as priests of old used to live by the offerings, food, &c., placed in the temple for their hypothetical god to enjoy and devour. But Spencer's doctrine of right is not quite up to date, as it neglects the important fact of social growth or progress. And this omission is the more extraordinary since he admits that “though mere love of companionship prompts primitive men to live in groups, yet the chief prompter is experience of the advantage to be derived from co-operation. On what condition only can co-operation arise? Evidently on condition that those who join their efforts severally gain by doing so. This which we see must hold of the very first step towards that industrial organization by which the life of a society is maintained, must hold more or less fully throughout its development.” Thus profit, the more complete satisfaction of some want—physical, intellectual, or emotional—is the motive which leads men to form societies, from the very beginning and all through the course of social development. But this profit! is it a fixed, constant quantity or quality? Certainly not! What men desire is not to maintain things as they are, to equally distribute the existing profit or surplus, but to advance to a higher life, to realize a higher ideal, and to make this ideal when realized common property, to share it. Thus not justice merely, but progressive justice, is the great social end.
Simple societies of men have satisfied and still satisfy the claims or rights of all their members far better than complex modern societies do, but their level of life is far lower than ours; they are not troubled with ideas of a higher perfection, while we are. And this is where Spencer fails; he does not recognize that the idea of justice, of liberty itself, changes and ascends. His principle is:—“Every man has freedom to do all that he will, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man.” But what is freedom to one man is tyranny to another—e.g., not to be allowed to fight freely is tyranny to the average Irishman, not to be allowed to drink unlimited whisky is tyranny to the average Scotchman; but to the more civilized Irishman or Scotchman it is tyranny to be compelled by social usage to fight or to drink more than he wants. Has this more civilized man no right to use his influence, or his physical power, to restrain the pugnacious nature of his countrymen, or to resist being compelled to drink when he does not want to? Certainly he has. He has a right to use his superior physical power, if, as is often the case, he possesses it, to disarm his countrymen and make fighting impossible or excessive drinking impossible. And he derives this right from the fact that he is more civilized, and therefore capable of a higher degree of happiness, and because he knows what his less civilized countrymen do not know, that the cessation of fighting or drinking will make them happier. Thus the more civilized a man is, the higher his character, the more fitted he is to rule and make laws for men. And as all men really desire to improve their condition, they willingly submit to rule and guidance by character the moment they feel, or believe, or know that it is higher than their own. And it is by means of higher personal character, by great men, that nations are built up and governments formed.

Whether governments ought to use force or to confine themselves to influence is merely a question of the relative degree of civilization of the people governed. And the more highly civilized a nation is the less will it submit to government by force; men, if they rise at all, must rise by superior intelligence; guidance takes the place of rule, and leaders and people by mutual action and reaction civilize one another.

If great men do not appear in politics to-day, if they are specially absent from democratic politics, it is not because they are absent from society altogether, but because the combination of qualities necessary to a really great statesman in modern times is exceedingly rare and difficult. Intelligence, courage, firmness, moderation, sterling honesty, wide sympathy, universal knowledge, rapid energy, alertness of mind, physical endurance, patience, perfect good temper—all these qualities may exist in
separate persons, but to produce a perfect statesman they have to be combined in one personality. And the more civilized a nation, the higher and more complex are the requirements. But as government has to be carried on somehow, with or without statesmen, in democracies government usually becomes degraded, the political ideal falls lower and lower, and politicians instead of controlling fall under the control of the monied power. And this is the state of things to-day in America, in Australia, and even in England. And the explanation is simple. Man has lost faith in himself as “the masterpiece and darling of nature,” as the heir of all the ages, and this faith, though science is establishing it on durable foundations, is as yet possessed only by the select few. When the higher part of human nature falls asleep, the lower organs still carry on the work, and the protests of Spencer against meddling governments are really directed against government in its degraded form as carried on by persons relatively low in the scale of civilization, who, because they are low, prefer the use of force to influence, and think the acquirement of wealth is man's chief end. The higher a man's individual character the greater is his respect for other individuals and their rights; the more does he dislike the use of material force, and the less does he care about material wealth. No man who makes office-seeking a trade is fit to manage the affairs of a nation.

To what a low ebb political life has fallen in Queensland, if this from the Rockhampton Record is true:—“In Parliament everybody who is anybody is an office-seeker, avowed or furtive. In Queensland there is already a fairly long roll of men so distinguished, including Sir Robert Herbert, Sir R. R. M’Kenzie, Mr. Arthur M’Alister, Sir Charles Lilley, Sir Samuel Griffith, Sir Arthur Palmer, Sir Thomas M’Ilwraith, Sir Hugh Nelson (despite affected indifference), and Mr. T. J. Byrnes, in the very front rank. . . . The Treasury Bench is the logical haven (?heaven) of the successful politician—of the people's representative who wishes to translate convictions into statutes.” The editor of that paper, being himself a politician, knows what he is talking about.

The appointment of a certain Mr. Murray to the Queensland Ministry called forth this candid political confession, but if this Mr. Murray does “translate his convictions into statutes” there is likely to be wholesale reform of the civil service in Queensland. Studying the Queensland Hansard, that Hansard which Tozer cursed, I find the following (August, 1895) speech of this Mr. Murray:—“There are, no doubt, some directions in which electoral reform could be carried out with advantage to the country. I believe that it would be greatly to the advantage of the country if the civil servants were deprived of their vote. That is the most necessary
electoral reform that I am aware of at the present time. The civil servants have got a preponderating power in the elections, and it is impossible to have good and effective government while it is guided and directed by civil servants. It is a common thing for members of this House to appeal to the sympathies of civil servants, and it must be recognized by everyone that when a general election is going forward that party, be it Conservative or Liberal, which offers the most liberal programme, the largest pay and the shortest hours of work for the civil servants, is bound to secure the whole of that vote. I am satisfied that a great deal of the trouble that has overtaken this colony, and the other colonies, in the management of their affairs is attributable to that vote. How is it possible to economize where that vote has such a preponderating influence? It is the industrial classes who keep the business of the country moving, and I hold that the civil servants are enjoying greater privileges, greater ease, and greater comfort than those who are engaged in carrying on the industries of the country. I am not one of those who think they are underpaid. Some member opposite interjects that if I was on the railway I would not say that, and that interjection is exactly an example of the evil I am trying to illustrate. Scarcely a member rises on the other side of the House but he asks, ‘Are the wages of the railway employés to be restored to the original rates?’ And they do that knowing perfectly well that such talk secures the whole of the votes of these men. I hold that anyone who is in receipt of pay from the state should not have a voice in the government of the state. At any rate, it is not expedient, and it is not consistent with good government, whether it is right or not, that the servants of the state should have the appointment of their masters.”

This new Minister for Railways is evidently a federalist, since he makes a distinction between good government and political right and wrong. And as he holds that no one in receipt of state pay should have a voice in the government, he apparently intends to give his services as a minister gratis, for a silent minister is a physical impossibility. But his remarks make it evident that it is the civil service which runs the government in Queensland. Mr. Murray must have had few civil servants in his electorate or surely he would have been assassinated long ago, or indicted for high treason against the power behind the throne.

In the same year, 1895, the Sydney Bulletin had some remarks on “Federation and the Civil Service.” “One of the strongest currents of opinion set against federation is noiselessly directed by prominent officials in the public service of the various provinces.” As I quoted these remarks before I will not give them in full. But it is worth while noticing that in the
Commonwealth Bill the Governor-General has power to appoint and remove civil servants. But as things are the Governor-General is almost certain to be either a figure-head or a politician, so that the evils arising from the undue influence of the civil service have little chance of being removed. This is the way the politicians intend to turn “the strong current of opinion set against federation” into a current in its favour. As it is the industrial class which keeps the country going, it is evidently to the interest of the industrial classes to have an independent Governor-General approved by them.

There is another little matter, too, which I should like to direct public attention to. By the Commonwealth Bill persons are disqualified for membership in the federal houses who hold any office of profit under the Crown or any pension out of the revenues of the Commonwealth, but this disqualification does not apply to officers or members of the Queen's navy or army, or the members of the Commonwealth's navy or army whose services are not wholly employed by the Commonwealth. But naval and military men are civil servants. What right have they to be exempt from a disqualification which applies to other civil servants? It is just this admission of naval and military officers to the Parliament which makes Jingoism inevitable. And if they ought to be excluded from government anywhere it is in Australia. Again, insolvents or bankrupts, or those who “take the benefit, whether by assignment, or composition, or otherwise, of any law relating to bankrupt or insolvent debtors,” are disqualified from membership. And yet protected civil servants are admitted. Insolvents are often so by no fault of their own, through the stress of competition. The politicians are evidently determined to keep the industrial classes under, as at present. Now, what is the right remedy for the dangers arising from the undue power of the civil service? Evidently to subject them also to the law of competition. Not, as Mr. Murray proposed, to take away their votes. And what does Mr. Murray know about railways? He does know something about land matters. Evidently the railway employés ought to have the power of appointing, or at any rate approving, their own chief, who would then be removable, not by them, but by a higher authority, who would submit the question of removal to the railway employés by the method of referendum.

The Commonwealth Bill, be it observed, leaves the railways to the control of the states, except for military purposes. Thus the Queensland Government, e.g., is at liberty to disfranchise the railway employés if it pleases, thus depriving them of any voice in the determination of their wages, share of railway profits, appointment of an efficient head, &c., &c.,
while at the same time other civil servants, the military, have the power of controlling railways. I think it ought to be evident to railway employés and other civil servants that federation is not to their interest. It will simply give fat prizes to the few at the head of the service. And the public ought to be able to see that it is desirable to let the healthy law of competition operate in the railway service as a whole.

The system of free passes for politicians and military men is largely abused. Before long the whole civil service and their hangers-on will have free passes. Commercial men ought to see to this. If we are going to have socialism let us all be in it. That is only fair. We must either have free railways, free justice, &c., or we must remove privilege altogether. The railways ought to be nationalized—that is, the whole body of employés in Australia ought to be organized, and the management of railways removed from the meddling interference of politicians altogether. But centralization of the railways on the present system would lead to this sort of thing. The defence force of Central Queensland was drawn up outside North Rockhampton railway station ready to go to Emu Park for Easter manoeuvres; a special train was ready, steam up, but the Brisbane official had forgotten to give the station-master authority to start it; he refused to do so without special authority from Brisbane; so the train remained where it was, and the force was disbanded. They evidently want home rule badly in Central Queensland. Mr. Reid was going to do a lot for Central Queensland and separation, but has, like the Imperial Government, left Central Queenslanders out in the cold. If anyone wants to realize the inefficiency of the Imperial Government as the amending power for Australia, the case of separation in Central Queensland affords a demonstration. The Separation League is rather thick-headed, but probably it realizes by this time that nothing is to be hoped from a Federal Parliament. And perhaps it sees now, especially since Brisbane has begun the same game with the Centre as it has long played with the North—viz., buying over politicians—that absolute separation is an impossibility. Central Queenslanders should, then, abandon the federal principle altogether and oppose federation, and use their influence to bring about a true national union instead, which would quickly ensure them that local self-government which is their due.

The leader of the Separation League, though a politician, evidently shares the opinion of most sane men with regard to the political class. “Bear in mind,” he said in the Queensland House, “the obstacles to federation are not natural, but manmade, artificial obstacles which could be got rid of. Without wishing to say anything disrespectful of politicians, I am disposed,
after hearing the debates upon this question, to think that so long as politicians have anything to do with it we shall never get federation. The question must be taken out of the hands of politicians before anything satisfactory can be done.” But Mr. Curtis himself did what he could to oppose federation, when he found practically, and it was a theoretical certainty, that the Convention could never provide for separation without the consent of Brisbane. If, in the passage above quoted, the word “union” be substituted for federation, his remarks are strictly true. The politicians will do all they can to prevent union, national union, because it is against their personal interest as a class. And Mr. Curtis is really a unionist, since he said:—“Notwithstanding our progress, we lack the essential element of national success, and that is unity.”

And there were some other instructive remarks made in this debate on Federation (29th July). Mr. Storey said:—“It is a spectacle beyond comprehension that a lot of men should discuss this question all night and then go away without coming to a decision. It is a question upon which a decision is looked for by the general public, and this is to be the result of the discussion. Let us divide, &c.”

Mr. Groom, the “father of the House,” also said: —“Practically, owing to the policy which has been pursued in the past, there is federation now as far as the central district is concerned. If you take the exports and the imports you cannot but come to the conclusion that someone is draining the central district of a very large proportion of its material wealth, and giving very little in return. And one has only to look over the Government Gazette to find the list of those who are nominally the owners of the various pastoral properties in that district to get a clear insight as to where the profits are going. I am not going to be led astray by what the hon. member said about certain persons having introduced capital into the colony, and that we have had the benefit of the expenditure, because the early pioneers, who might have deserved consideration, have in a great many instances disappeared from the scene altogether, and now huge areas as big as German principalities are in the hands of absentee proprietors. . . . And I tell the hon. member that anyone who reads the proceedings of the Canadian Parliament, more particularly during the régime of Sir John Macdonald (another empire builder), will find that a great many of the provinces which had to join the confederation are by no means satisfied with the results.” Surely Central Queenslanders have had enough of the kind of federation that Mr. Groom describes. The real enemy is not Brisbane, but the foreign capitalist, who controls the Brisbane and all other parliaments, and must control them as long as federation of any sort lasts.
The churches ought to oppose federation on £ s. d. principles, since they seem to have forgotten the Christian political doctrine. Here is an extract from a Rockhampton paper of 28th September, 1897:—“The British Australian says the Anglican bishop of Brisbane has written to the vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington, a letter, from which the following is an extract:—‘There may be a lurking thought in some men's minds that Queensland should do its own mission work in its back blocks, and should not appeal for aid to their partners in the other ship here at home. That might be a valid objection to take if the money made in Queensland were spent there. But what are the facts? Your great English financial institutions (notably in Lombard-street and Bishopsgate-street Within) own immense tracts of our western and southwestern country. Our sheep by the hundreds of thousands part with their fleeces in the interests of the possessors of splendid equipages which roll along in Hyde Park or in Edinboro’. The old squatter who did contribute to local work for the spiritual and social elevation of the people has gone down before the financial institutions, whose directors courteous assure you that their articles of association do not admit of the recognition on their part of moral obligation. Thus the money, instead of being spent where it is made, comes home and circulates here. Hence the justice of asking that the people of the country which benefits by its circulation should help in furthering moral and spiritual work in the country from which the money is derived.' There is, of course, force in the Bishop's argument,” commented the editor, “but we fancy that for the last season or two the great English financial institutions have not done so well that they will care to take up new responsibilities.” But, pray, who is responsible for the low profit of financial institutions? It is largely due to the system of absentee management, which discourages individual initiative, and prevents the proper development of properties. And it is worth nothing that the editor above quoted speaks of “new responsibilities.” It will be indeed something new for syndicates to consider the “spiritual and social elevation of the people.” And a federal government once instituted in Australia is likely to reply courteously, like the Lombard-street syndicates, when asked to provide for the social elevation and amusement of the people that “the articles of association do not admit of the recognition of moral obligation,” as anyone can see who is bold enough to tackle that cumbersome and elaborate instrument, the Commonwealth Bill of the Convention of '98, which is the instrument of an indissoluble union on pure principles of £ s. d.

The Roman Catholics, too, of Central Queensland appear to suffer from
the existing state of things. Their fine cathedral remains unfinished and useless. Are there no Catholic absentee s? They cannot even, I am told by a lawyer, bury their late bishop in the cathedral without special parliamentary legislation.

Then, again, the syndicates neglect to support agricultural societies. The Rockhampton Agricultural Society is in debt, and the cattle-yards, &c., in their show-ground are in a bad state. In order to get funds some of the members think it necessary to introduce games of chance on show days, so as to increase the gate-money. It takes an hour or more of eloquent pleading to get a couple of guineas out of big firms with a capital of millions, such as, let us say, the Van Zoëlen Bone and Deathgage Co. or Messrs. Salbetty and Co. I heard of one absentee who owns fine cattle properties, and many thousand acres of freehold land in the central district, who is a Babylonian director of Salbetty and Co., and of the Separation Bank of Australia, and largely interested in the Federal Sugar-squeezing Co. This absentee used to contribute to the agricultural society, but this year declined, the excuse being that his partner, a certain Mr. Yacht, a “white man,” and only an absentee because unable to travel through paralysis, had died.

Unfortunately under the monied rule “white men” are becoming scarcer every day, and it will become harder and harder to screw money out of absentees. Here is evidence that in the above case failure to subscribe was due to said death, from a newspaper:—“Mr. Foxtail Ragg, manager of Denfairy, advised that, owing to the death of the late Mr. Yacht, that station would not be a subscriber this year.” This absentee bears a significant name which it won't do to mention. I am inclined to think he is the Wandering Jew himself. I am told he was a plunger in his youth, and runs a yacht in the Mediterranean, and was formerly known in New South Wales. Somehow Marcus Junius Brutus came to my mind when thinking of him—Brutus, who “slew his best lover for the good of Rome,” and who, though he bore one of the noblest names in Rome, was a usurer, who pressed unhappy Cypriotes to despair for the sake of his 48 per cent. interest, using the poor, pitiful rogue Scaptius as the cloak for his avarice. I should not be at all surprised to learn that this gentleman owned Australia.

While in Central Queensland, I, seeing the bad state of things there, wrote to him very strongly in hopes of converting him to the true Christian faith, but I got no reply from him, though I heard that my remonstrance caused him a slight indisposition which compelled him to put off his customary cruise in the Mediterranean. I enjoyed some good sport on one of his places decapitating squatter pigeons with a rook rifle, and, like roast
fig-peckers, they were delicious eating. Squatter pigeons are the only squatters left now in Central Queensland, and I thought I might as well put them out of their misery. But there are still men left there, and squatters' sons, who, though fast becoming emasculated under the absentee system, have still some memories of their childhood, and sing—

“O joy! that in our embers
Is something that doth live;
That nature yet remembers
What was so fugitive!”

viz., the simple creed of childhood. Heaven save us from “the philosophic mind,” which produces such monstrosities as Hegel's and Spencer's formulas. The squatter tribe have no wish to eat the Jew; he is too bitter a morsel to swallow, as he has no humour in his composition; but unless he manages his capital better he will certainly be decapitated; and as he is progressive up to a certain ring, and is the heaven-born financier, pastoralists cannot very well dispense with his services. They usually make a horrible mess of finance when they attempt to master it, and their bimetallism is quite absurd and out of the question. Bimetallism and federalism are logical counterparts, neither of them suited to Australia, which is a large gold-producer. But of this more anon.

Meanwhile, Central Queensland is a most interesting place for the sociologist; that is why I went there, for there, if anywhere in Australia—except perhaps Tasmania, and I have not studied Tasmania yet—the interest of all classes is really opposed to that of absentee capital; only the funny thing is that they don't know it, and go on cutting their own throats by competition, much to their own loss, and, as it now appears, to the loss of the absentee in so far as he is a landowner. It is not likely that the absentee is going to allow a new government to be formed there, for that government might tax absentee's land, which already becomes a burden. This would be simply taking money out of one pocket to put it in another, with the additional expense of gloves to keep the coins from sticking to the palm during transit. So, why should not my scheme of government without politicians be tried there? It would be much simpler, quicker, more efficient, and less expensive; besides, it is the only place in Australia the politicians have not collared, except the north of Queensland. The Northern Territory Pritchard Morgan has arranged about.

The Danes are already in Central Queensland, but I found the Chief Dane a good sort, a man who does not mind being dictated to by a progressive
editor when off the bench. And one of the other Chief Danes quite believes in a dictatorship of the right sort, and believes in socialism as a heavenly ideal. And the Danes generally there I found have quite thrown off the shadow of the Cross. One of them is a keen student of the “Slang Dictionary,” full of curious legal information, chiefly archaeological, and can tell sooty yarns by the hour. He knows all about the New South Welshers in the early days too, but it is hard work pumping him on this subject. Some of the younger Danes, too, have taken to photography, and have learnt from the camera the trick of seeing things as they are. Another young Dane actually confessed to having blushed when he received his first fee. And some of them are unmarried, too. And one day I observed a widow driving up and down the town in a bran-new suit of widow's garments, a bran-new yellow dog-cart, drawn by a bran-new pony, and driven by a bran-new tiger. Everything seems propitious for the practical application of my scheme. I saw there, too, the dead image of Socrates, and, curiously enough, I was told that Socrates was nearly poisoned by the doctors, who, by the way, have all been reduced to subjection by a progressive doctor who sells his own soap and tooth-picks. But as since the Grecian era the stomach-pump has been invented, Socrates was turned upside down and inside out, and saved by the combined efforts of the medical profession, which feared indictment for manslaughter. Socrates is now well, and thinks of taking to poultry-rearing, a business which the capitalist has not collared yet. Everything I found there was in a depressed state, owing to imperial federation and the incubus of tick inspectors.

They have a fine river there, bridged over with a new kind of iron bridge, which in high flood tilts its floor to an angle of 45 deg. to let the water run off. It was built by politicians, who sent two of their pets up to erect it, but these had to be superseded, as they could not make up their minds which end of the cylinders to put in the water. The chief engineer was then sent up, who, however, was unable to rectify all his predecessors' mistakes, so that now in flood time they have to tie the bridge, perhaps half a mile long, to a tree with a hawser, so as not to lose it altogether. On both sides of this river ticks abound, so they keep a man at one end of the bridge to take the ticks off horses, &c., as they pass to and fro, hoping by this means to exterminate the pest. Down this river, too, at the mouth, the politicians built a splendid wharf in the middle of the water, where no dry land is, intending to build a railway to it, but as it would have to cross a mangrove flat, in which one day the engineer got bogged, it was declared impossible to carry rails over it. So the politicians determined to try again on the other side of the river, higher up, though all the townsmen of the chief city
protested. The politicians began by building a wharf on a sandbank with about 6 inches of water at low tide, to save pile timber. Then they started to dredge the sand away to make deep water, but, finding that the wharf was likely to collapse, they gave the contractor, nothing loth, another contract to build the wharf further into deep water. Then they made a railway up to a certain meat works, owned by a Melbourne absentee, and managed by a champion humourist. The railway runs through the company's land. It was meant to cross the river and join the central railway, but this was apparently only a blind, as the work is not being continued, though it went far enough to spoil one of the municipal parks, in which the city's nightsoil is deposited. Some of the townsmen told me that the railway was made for the meat works, but I can hardly believe this, as there is a sandbar between the new wharf and the deep water, and the meat works are alongside the water. So I came to the conclusion that it was merely a case of political absence of mind. This meat company, too, makes splendid profits—some years as high as £75,000, I was told—but the funny thing is that it never pays any dividend to local shareholders, numbering about three, I think. All appears to be swallowed by the erection of new machinery, just as the national profit is certain to be when federation is accomplished in Australia.

A specimen of this meat manager's wit will not be out of place here, as it deals with politics. The manager nightly addresses his mill hands, inculcating respect for the governing powers of the land. The following extracts are from an address on “The Sorrows of a Member of Parliament,” delivered at the Baptist Church. The title is evidently borrowed from Marie Corelli, and is most appropriate. “The address,” says a local paper run by a politician, “being delivered in Mr. Paterson's inimitable style, was punctuated by frequent bursts of laughter, and at its conclusion there was a long-continued round of applause”:—“‘The Sins and Sorrows of Parliament’ is altogether a subject too vast, too comprehensive, to be treated by a merely human understanding; it covers too much ground (what will it be when federation comes?—ED.) It would require the intellect of a pure and spotless spirit to undertake the task, and, indeed, I question whether any bright angel could be found equal to the contract. To adequately portray the combined sins and transgressions of a Queensland Parliament for only one short, fleeting session would task the powers of the blackest of black angels. Hence, I feel obliged to climb down somewhat, and rechristen my poor little bantling by the more modest title—‘The Sorrows of a Member of Parliament.’ I have been in the habit of making an annual journey south (with the dividends?—ED.), and I am much
impressed with the steadily increasing passenger traffic on all the main lines of railway, especially that section of traffic which travels on free passes. I think it no exaggeration to say that the Australian members of Parliament constitute the most-travelled class of gentry on earth. They simply swarm the carriages; they collar the softest lower berths on the sleeping cars, and they monopolize the services of the conductors, who are reluctantly compelled to leave the unfortunate paying passengers to themselves. Some four years ago I had the honour of a conversation with a southern member on this very subject. He complained of the meanness of the Government in not allowing the members' wives to accompany them free of expense. We agreed that it was exceedingly mean, and suggested that the Governments of this rich continent could very easily afford to issue free family passes to every individual member of parliament, so that when the tired legislator, worn out with the fatigues of debate, felt ready to sink, he could flee for rest and refreshment and change of scene to the seaside or to the mountains, accompanied by his faithful wife, seven children, and a nurse, the family ticket being strictly limited to ten souls, irrespective of age, sex, and colour. . . . We fear that the average member of parliament entertains little hope of reward in the world to come—let us make him as happy as we can in this present planet. Let us not meanly seek to curtail his privileges; let us rather endeavour to extend them. . . . We would venture to suggest that three-fourths of the first-class accommodation in every express train be specially reserved for the exclusive use of members of parliament, government officials, distinguished strangers, and other illustrious deadheads, and we feel reasonably sure that the remaining fourth will amply suffice for the requirements of those passengers who actually pay their fares. Besides, plain business men do not desire the companionship of these shining masses of intellect.

Now it is curious to remember that this proportion of three-fourths is just that which the Commonwealth Bill provides shall be returned to the states. Evidently this proportion is a fixed principle of politics. £1,550,000 per annum will be required to run the federal machine, so Mr. Reid says. This is to be collected by customs authorities; then I suppose one-fourth is for the Commonwealth politicians and three-fourths for the state politicians. Surely Mr. Paterson ought to be gratified. But it seems a little unnecessary to collect three-fourths and then hand it back again. The man in the bush would have collected only one-fourth for the Federal Government and left the three-fourths where they were. However, of course, it means an increase of political patronage a vaster army of state officials to obey the bidding of their masters and keep the official class in undiminished force. I
confess to getting rather muddled over the Commonwealth Bill. The American Constitution is nothing to it, and Spencer and Hegel are far, far easier; but as far as I can make out this federal expenditure is a clear increase of government expenditure. Now, according to the Australian Field's statistics for 1897, the only ones I have handy, the annual expenditure for administrative government only amounts in the three colonies—

New South Wales, South Australia, and Victoria to ... ... £12,847,386

Suppose we add another million for Western Australia and Tasmania ...

1,000,000

And Commonwealth expenditure ... 1,550,000

Total ... £15,397,386

This total is not bad for a population of 3,200,000 persons. Evidently Australia, not America, is to be the politicians' paradise, for the United States, with its 63 millions, only spends 42 millions for government administration. However, there is this advantage, that Australians will never be able to afford the expensive pleasure of war which the Americans are beginning to hanker after. It might be supposed that the three-fourths returned to the states, after travelling the vicious political circle, would get back to the pockets of the people. But, as Mr. Reid said in his recent soul-stirring speech:—“Look at the tremendous temptation put upon the Commonwealth Treasurer to impose direct taxation, because he can keep all the 20s, and if in the vicissitudes of the Commonwealth business £200,000 more were wanted for Commonwealth purposes, the Treasurer, if he resorted to the customs at all, would have to raise £800,000 to get the £200,000 he needed. Of course, the other £600,000 would come back to the states; but would it ever get back to you?” (Laughter.) Yes, indeed, the Commonwealth finance is about the biggest joke of the century.

But to return to our sociological study of Central Queensland. They had a paper called the Laughing Jackass in their chief city once, but there was so much to laugh at that the poor Jackass died of laughter, and is now heard only in the bush, the inhabitants of the towns having atrophied the laughing muscles through over use. I really could not make the people there see the funny aspect of things, and the editors of their newspapers are totally deficient in humour. I sent one of them a satire on the press, proposing to turn the journalists into “Knights of the Holy Ghost,” taking the hint from a poem of Heine's, asking the editor to return the satire when he had done; but he has not done so. I suppose he is trying to find out whether it is joke or earnest. I sent him also a bush dialogue on politics, but he considered this unfit for publication.
I tried another editor, with like result. He rejected my article because it was ethical rather than political, and therefore unfit for publication in a political journal. And later on he called me a “fossilized bookworm”—glow-worm I suppose he meant, as he accused me of trying to enlighten the universe; meaning, I suppose, the hub of it, Rockhampton.

I visited now and then another editor's sanctum, where I met German philosophers, who discoursed on the absolute; poets, who taught swimming, and practised palmistry, and discoursed on love to married ladies in the streets; labour members, a bit suspicious of me; unwashed democrats, and lightning debaters, who keep the ball of discussion rolling when politicians are at rest on Sundays.

Then I visited Mount Morgan, about the richest gold mine in the world, concerning which the “Encyclopaedia Brittanica” betrays such profound ignorance. The shares, of course, in this mine are principally held by absentees. The mine has turned out over seven millions of gold, of which I was told five millions had gone into the pockets of the shareholders. The mine is under excellent management, employs a number of experts. Two principles I saw illustrated in the arrangements and machinery of the mine that might well be applied to politics: the principle of coalescence of function, and direct action—e.g., the lighting and pumping machinery has all been collected in one fine room, thus dispensing with a double staff required before, and a number of driving wheels requiring expensive belting have been replaced by a single shaft. How is it that no one seeks to simplify the political machinery in like manner, for it could be done to the infinite advantage of the people? Well, of course no one derives any profit from such a simplification. Responsible ministers do not get any increase of screw from it, and the people who are directly interested have no direct say in the matter, and no one to represent them and act for them. And, of course, as things are, reduction of political expenses would only mean that more profit went out of the country than at present, for the politicians do, at least generally, spend their incomes in the country.

Two half-yearly meetings of the Mount Morgan Company afford an example of quick dispatch of business, from which also the politicians who think government merely a matter of £s. d. might well take note. One meeting was terminated in two and a half minutes, the other in two minutes fifty seconds. Of course some people said the meetings were a farce, as only officials of the company were present, but the fact of the matter was, I believe, that the company is so well managed that there was no occasion for criticism.

But Parliament is a farce, and a rather expensive one, and if politicians
understood their business there is no reason why business should not be disposed of almost as quickly. But then some people think politics and discussion are ends in themselves, and necessary to keep the world from falling to pieces.

But though the mine is excellently managed there remains the question: By what right do absentees draw so large a revenue from the mine? Does the country get its proper share of profit? Is the welfare and social elevation of the miners properly provided for? The town itself is a disgrace to the richest gold mine in the world. The streets are disgraceful; the sanitation nil; typhoid fever abounds; the school-house is not sufficient for the number of children. Evidently the place is run almost entirely for the sake of profit, and the welfare of the residents sacrificed to the greed for gold. The owners find a more profitable use for their money than that of wasting it on the toilers who help to make it for them—e.g., in the development of Pacific islands and so forth. By the way, one of my suggestions, in my satire on the press above mentioned, was the starting of a humanistic newspaper at Mount Morgan, the chief seat of gold worship, in order to rouse the miners to a sense of their rights, and assert the claims of humanity in the very stronghold of capital. Perhaps the editor thought I expected to see him shifting his plant there. But he may rest assured that I never expected to see him become a knight of the spirit; and then he is not the boss.

Now the question arises what are the rights of labour—by which I mean the wage-earner pure and simple—with regard to the profits or surplus wealth of industry? Here is an American view of the subject which is worth considering:—“The harmony of things insists that that which is the source of power, wealth, and delight shall also be the ruler of it. It is the people from which come the forces with which kings and millionaires rule the world.” As a matter of fact it is money that rules the world to-day—money, which is the source of power and delight, which gives command of all good things, whether material, intellectual, emotional. Money is to-day the measure of all things. The wage, or salary a man receives is a rough test of his social usefulness—it is, at any rate, the only efficient test we have. If this be so, how is it that it is possible to-day for a man to sit in his easy chair, have all luxuries at his command, and yet do nothing for society? This man may have become utterly useless to society; his life even may be a burden to himself, and yet the wealth of the world is poured into his lap. Is it that he has money in his house which he gives in exchange for goods? Not at all! If he had to give away a coin, or the right to wealth, every time he receives any satisfaction he would be constantly becoming poorer,
instead of which he is constantly becoming richer without any exertion of his own.

There is clearly something wrong here. The wrong is made possible, not by the existence of money, but by the existence of credit and interest. Money is by a social convention accepted as real value; a gold coin is real value in its highest, most concentrated, most convertible form. But money is quite useless unless it can be exchanged for something. But this exchange need not be an exchange of money: a claim to money lying in a bank may be given instead of goods, because the owner of the goods believes that the note or cheque represents real value. This is credit. And what is interest? How does it arise? Evidently from the desire of producers to develop their businesses or properties, which they cannot do without money or credit. A. says to a money-owner:—“Lend me £100. I will give you 3 per cent., so as to make good to you what you might have realized by employing your money yourself.” The money-lender says:—“I want 4 per cent.; B. will give me that for the use of my money.” Thus the competition of producers for money determines the rate of interest. But now the effect of competition among producers, among those engaged in the same industry, is to reduce the money value or price of goods, while at the same time it makes the organization of industry more perfect, for superior organization means a higher surplus or profit, made in a shorter time and with less labour. The most intelligent man, or the man most favourably situated for his special business, can sell cheaper, and other producers are beaten out of the field. This is, of course, good for the public in every way; a better and cheaper article is produced, and intelligence is rewarded. But competition tends to monopoly. The monopolist, when he has beaten all competitors, can raise his price on the public, as the rings and trusts do in America. It is therefore generally admitted that the government has a right to take over or control monopolies. But just as there is competition among producers so there is competition among money-owners. This competition leads to the perfect organization of the business of keeping and lending money and receiving interest; the organization of banking, likewise an immense boon to the public, for when banking is developed the usurer can't take advantage of people and change his 60 per cent. or so. The market rate of interest is thus a perfectly legitimate charge for the use of the convenience of the banking system.

I will suppose that the competition of money-owners is carried out to its natural conclusion, monopoly; that one great bank has practically reduced all the rest to subjection. Stuart Mill, in his “Political Economy,” makes such a supposition: —“Suppose that all persons dealt with the same bank,
payments being universally made by cheques. In this ideal case there would be no money anywhere except in the hands of the banker, who might then safely part with all of it, by selling it as bullion or lending it to be sent out of the country in exchange for goods or foreign securities. But though there would then be no money in possession, or ultimately even perhaps in existence, money would be offered, and commodities bought with it, just as at present. People would continue to reckon their incomes and their capitals in money, and to make their usual purchases with orders for the receipt of a thing which would have literally ceased to exist. There would be in all this nothing to complain of, so long as the money, in disappearing, left an equivalent value in other things, applicable when required to the reimbursement of those to whom the money originally belonged.”

Now, competition thus carried out to its ideal limit would produce just such a state of things as Mill supposes. But as the banking business is the highest and last form of business to be perfected; as it deals with the highest form of value; as all different businesses compete with one another for money—money being universal material value—and by this competition determine the value of money, i.e., interest, it is evident that money cannot have a stable or fixed value until the competition of all producers, of all industries, ceases. But this competition is not likely to cease while different industries can make a profit. As long, then, as men trade for profit the unstable value of money, which the bimetallists complain of, is certain to last.

This matter of the currency is undoubtedly one which society is at liberty to alter and amend, since money is a social invention. The only question is—What ought to be done to remedy the evils arising from the unstable value of money? The bimetallists propose to remedy the evils by making silver equal to gold, according to a fixed ratio, and, of course, if they have their way, we shall have trimetallists seeking to fix the value of copper, and this will go on till we come down to corn. If governments once begin tampering with the natural value of goods, as determined by the cost of production, money being simply the highest form of goods, the price of everything will have to be regulated by government. This means a vast host of government officials, inspectors, &c., to keep things at an artificial value as established by an omnipotent parliament. As I said, federation and bimetallism go together. Bimetallism is directly to the interest of the political class. The return to bimetallism is retrogression, is to undo the whole result of commercial development as established by competition.

The commercial supremacy of gold is simply an instance of the
Darwinian struggle for profit. In the struggle gold has triumphed as the fittest to survive. As in Mill's ideal case, if we let the natural tendency of things work out we shall have a monopoly of money in the hands of one trustworthy bank, and shall be able to do without money altogether. What we want is not more money, but a firmer credit. If an international banking system, an international clearing-house, was established, all money might be kept in a central bank for the settlement of international balances, and all business within a country transacted, as it largely is in Australia, by cheques on a banker, and all payments might be made by a banker.

Atkinson, in his “Distribution of Products,” says:—“The bank is the agent for assigning and transferring titles to property; that is the exact function of the bank or banker, nothing more and nothing less. The property assigned may either be its own capital in coin or a title to some property of its depositors. A part of its capital is kept in reserve, in the form of coin, in order that if anyone wants actual money it may always have enough to meet that demand. It lends the rest of its own capital.” Any banker will admit the less coin that has to be kept the better, for it is a dead loss. The sole reason why coin has to be kept is that credit is not good enough to do without it. The firmer credit is, the less coin is necessary. Credit means that the representations of value held by banks correspond to real value. If credit becomes bad, bankers have to increase their coin reserve, but to hold all circulating value or capital in money is of course impossible. Banking is a method of transferring value where it is wanted, and the more representative or ideal value becomes the better for everyone. The bimetallists are thus simply trying to get the thin end of the wedge in which must revolutionize all our commercial arrangements in a direction the reverse to the direction of progress. But while their method of remedying things is utterly unscientific, the evil that they complain of is real. But it is to be cured by going forward, not by going backward. The evil that they complain of, and they are merely voicing the grievance of all producers, is this, that owing to monometallism the price or exchange value of all commodities has been reduced. It is not that there has been any real decrease in the value of commodities, but that simply they exchange for less money. Thus a gold sovereign commands twice as much as it did; it exchanges for double the quantity of goods. But, as we have seen, this is simply the ultimate result of the competition of producers themselves. The necessities of commerce have brought into existence the banking system, and those who elaborate and perfect this system naturally get their reward as the result of satisfying this high social need. But as banking is non-productive it is evident that society must find the necessary nutriment for
the banking system, and as it is necessary to the whole of society, the whole of society contributes to maintain it. But the banking system does not come into existence all at once; like everything else, it grows, it evolves. And, as Spencer says—"That there may be growth, the commodities obtained in return must be more than sufficient" for the needs of maintenance; growth means gratis nourishment, reward in excess of desert, just as a child is maintained by its parents, or as Australia has been fostered by English capital. Wherever there is growth there social profit, the unearned increment—uneearned because in ultimate analysis it is derived from nature—flows. And that is the sole justification for the immense reward which the money-owner reaps to-day. But it is obvious that to the growth of material value there must be a limit; as soon as this limit is reached growth ceases. Commercial competition tends to the determination of this limit, to the elimination of profit altogether, what economists call the "tendency of profits to a minimum." Economists, however, maintain that this is a tendency that can never be absolutely realized. But in this they are wrong. Every ideal is, and must be, realized sometime and somewhere. Though the chances against it are a million to one, that one chance must occur sometime or other—e.g., the chances of holding all the trumps in the game of whist. Professor Schiller writes:—"All who are even slightly familiar with the calculus of probabilities know that even the most improbable result may be expected to occur if a sufficiency of cases is given. It is highly improbable that anyone should by fair dealing acquire a hand containing thirteen trumps at whist. But if he had played about 640,000,000,000 hands he might fairly expect to hold all the trumps on one occasion. Everything that happens may be due to chance, and no matter how improbabilities are multiplied we never altogether eliminate the infinitesimal probability that everything is due to chance."

If every chance occurs sometime, in any limited number of chances—and no one can maintain that there is no limit, for if so there would be no order at all—it must happen sometime and somewhere that commercial profit is reduced to an absolute minimum. Wherever this occurs the whole world of commerce, all producers, must be in debt to the money-owner, and thus they are virtually no more than wage-earners, getting just sufficient reward for the purposes of maintenance and no more. When this state of things occurs, the money-owner gets as his reward the whole unearned social increment, while at the same time the sole justification for his receiving this unearned increment is taken away. The banking system has grown to its perfection, thanks to the competition of producers for money. It has
grown out of, as it were, their aberrations, has reaped all the benefit of these personal equations, and the result is that all surplus value is held by the bank as money-owner. Thus in the ideal case the interest of the bank and that of all producers are diametrically opposed. We have then an absolute deadlock, capital and labour utterly opposed to one another. The one chance in a million has occurred.

Now, Darwin maintained that man himself was the result of natural competition, of the struggle for existence in which the fittest survives. But, as I have pointed out, this struggle is not a mere struggle for existence, but a struggle for supremacy—for rule, control. Now, Professor Drummond tells us that “it was one chance in a million that the multitude of cooperating conditions which pushed man onward were fulfilled, and though it may never be known what these conditions were, it was doubtless from the failure on the one hand to meet one or more of them, and on the other from the success with which openings in other directions were pursued by competing species, that man was left alone during the latter aeons of his ascent.” Thus it becomes conceivable how by the competition and strife of the lower creation, the “groaning and travailing” of the whole universe—for the earth is by no means out of relation with the rest of the universe—man arose as the realization of the universal ideal; that is, infinite progress without dissolution or death, the progressive being par excellence. And such a being manifestly is the ruler or measure of the universe—the test of truth as embodying the absolute law. He thus realizes the idea of immortal life, eternal ascension of being. He is not, indeed, the creator of things, but the tiny impulse that must be supposed as existing before any created thing may be supposed as having returned to its original source, its centre of origin.

Spencer, to explain progress, is compelled to posit a force which he calls “the instability of the homogeneous,” and this force it is which he supposes must bring about progress or a universal resurrection, when absolute equilibrium or deadlock is arrived at. Huxley wrote:—“If there is proof that the cosmic process was set going by any agent, then that agent will be the creator of it and of all its products, although super-natural intervention may remain strictly excluded from its further course.”

Now, creation means, in the strict sense of the word, the production of something absolutely new, that never before existed. Science declares that creation is impossible in this sense; but not only is it not impossible, but we are compelled to assume it to explain facts. Spencer does practically assume it; so does the book of Genesis. We have to suppose that the Creator, in the act of creation, as it were dissolves the creative power,
leaving the created beings with a surplus motion or “energy of position.” This surplus energy or surplus matter, or both, when the centrifugal influence of creation comes to an end, cannot be lost; there is a reversal of the cosmic movement towards the original centre, the surplus of creation is delivered up, as by competition, equation after equation is established, until finally there remains only the infinitesimal force, the tiny point or fount of energy and will, which must be supposed to have preceded all creation. Thus the amending power capable of making an absolutely new start in progress is finally concentrated in a single point, a single personality, and the Creator regains control of the universe. Huxley recognized this law to a certain extent when he wrote:—“The faith which is born of knowledge finds its object in an eternal order, bringing forth ceaseless change, through endless time, in endless space; the manifestations of the cosmic energy alternating between phases of potentiality and phases of explication.” But mere centripetal and centrifugal motion do not allow for progress in the true sense of the word. We have to suppose, then, that these phases of explication and implication are always accompanied by an absolutely creative movement, an absolutely new power spreading forth over the universe, undergoing variations as it spreads, and returning to itself as a representative unity. To put this in a familiar way: No matter how wide the universe, no matter how great the number of chances, it must come about sometime and somewhere that someone holds all the trumps in his hand. He has simply then to show his hand to win the game. The game is not worth playing; everyone can see that it is useless going any further. But suppose the players are playing for their lives. In that case the holder of the trumps has the lives of the players at his mercy. But it is not to his interest to take their lives. He likes society, and though it is useless playing the game of whist any longer, the former players may help to play a new game really just as interesting.
Now, whist is a highly aristocratic game, but the game of politics is a kingly game, and he who can play it takes precedence of club whist-players. Modern politics is more like the game of euchre, a popular game, in which the Joker always scores. So perhaps it would put the matter better to say that the sovereign always holds the Joker at the critical moment when there is a danger of the “equilibrium” which the usurer has established stopping progress, for progress after a certain point has to undergo reversal. Commercial development has resulted in the concentration of money in the hands of the “Lombard-street ring;” the banking system has grown, so far good; but the usurer, having done his task, having reduced Australia, as I maintain, to a state of complete financial servitude, has brought about a deadlock. “The rule of the antinomy,” Naquet says, “is, that every time a given order of phenomena develops its consequences in two opposed and contradictory series, there is reason to anticipate a higher principle, a synthesis, which will cause the contradiction to disappear, and will solve the antinomy. This higher principle, in the examples quoted by us, is the action of the State exercising itself, either by laws and regulations imposed upon all similar industries, or even by the substitution of the public service for the free competition of individuals.” Again: “Private industry does not manifest its useful effects except in cases wherein the immediate profit is the motive which determines the industry and serves as its propelling force. Absolute freedom of commerce and of industry is therefore incapable of giving rise to the social reforms which the worker has a right to exact,” because it leads to monopoly.

Whenever, then, freedom of commerce leads to a monopoly of money as universal value, it is the duty of the state to take over the banking service, to socialize it. This means no radical change, and banker and bank employé may remain as they are, but the profits of banking, after wages and salaries are paid to bank servants, must become the property of the Government for redistribution throughout the country by means of the banking system. Thus the completion of the growth of the banking system means a reversal of the current of profit; it must flow, not as before to the head—the capital—and remain there, or suffer large deduction before it returns to the body of the nation. When growth is completed it must suffer no deduction at all, except for purposes of banking maintenance, the whole of the profit beyond maintenance being returned.
Now this ideal case must sometime occur on this earth, if man is the infinitely progressive being which the Bible asserts him to be, but it can only occur on a world-wide scale. We have seen that all the world is in debt to the Lombard-street ring, while at the antipodes of Australia there is, ex hypothesi, complete indebtedness. Thus the government of Australia, when it becomes a nation, must find the nation bankrupt. But it has to raise funds. If it taxes the people, who are all on the supposition made wage-earners, it is virtually only taxing the Lombard-street ring; and not only this, it must waste money by collecting taxes which likewise must come out of the money-lender's pocket. Taxation thus, in Australia, is of no use to the money-lender, and an unnecessary irritation to the people of Australia, and to all the nations who trade with Australia; and as, ex hypothesi, all these nations are in debt to the money-owner, it becomes advisable to abolish all taxation whatsoever all over the world. Thus the government of the world can enter upon a new stage of development, for it, by turning bankers into civil servants, and depriving them of the profits they have hitherto enjoyed largely for themselves, has brought to its hand by natural channels the entire social unearned increment or profit. Parliamentary representation was instituted to grant supplies; that is the true and proper function of all Houses of Commons. When society, then, has evolved a natural means of granting supplies, automatically, it is evident that Houses of Commons become totally useless and unnecessary. It is the interest of all classes in Australia to insist on the Government taking for its own use the whole of the banking profit. And, except by the use of physical force, it is impossible for the money-lender to prevent this if the people of Australia are unanimous. For, if unanimous, and if they can trust their government, they can dispense with the use of coined money altogether within this country, and all the gold that is raised within the country can be used for paying off the national debt to the gold-owner. If we want coin for ordinary purposes we can use a common metal like aluminium, which, once a cheap process is discovered of producing it, would have little or no intrinsic value. All the gold raised, instead of being sent away by various channels, would be collected in a central bank. The money-lender claims gold in return for gold. We can give him gold—and much good may it do him, for he cannot live on gold. And if other nations can trust us we can free them from debt too. An accurate record of the capital or circulating wealth of other nations could be kept in the books of the National Bank of Australia, and international balances could thus be adjusted, while notes could be issued by the Bank of Australia which would be as good as coin all the world over. Thus gold could be absolutely
dispensed with, except for the purpose of returning to the Jew what he has lent, and which he so much prizes that he is ready to sell his soul for it. Unless, then, the Jew takes to production himself he must starve. His only alternative is to give his services to the Government for the benefit of humanity, and thus become a civil servant of the representative of God, or rather God as representing in personal unity the multiplicity of the universe. I claim for my financial scheme that it, unlike the Commonwealth Bill's scheme, is natural, scientific, simple, and the only scheme which is worth consideration. Its practicability depends upon the trust people can put in a government. The government, of course, would not do the banking; it would simply retain a portion for national purposes, say 5s. in the £, as in Sir Edward Braddon's scheme.

Of course I am aware that economists like Thorold Rogers assume that profit and interest are identical:—“The rate of profit is to be identified with the rate of interest. Whatever else is secured to the capitalist beyond the average rate of interest is wages of the labour of superintendence, superior intelligence, &c.,” but then he makes the initial mistake of supposing that “one man's gain in all acts of free exchange is another man's gain,” thus he does not recognize that men are born into positions of advantage. Superior intelligence is a natural advantage, so with superior station. The capitalist has a right to receive enough to maintain his station—i.e., to those conditions necessary for the exercise of his faculties. But the owner of money or its equivalents, credit notes, &c., by the decline in general prices commands an ever-increasing quantity and quality of goods, and if competition reduces all goods to their natural value or cost of production, the owner of money, as universal value, reaps the sum total of the natural advantages which all others have lost by competition. The “tendency of profits to a minimum” does not apply to the money-owner; all interest whatsoever may disappear, but profit still remains in the hands of the money-owner. When we say everyone is in debt to the money-owner, we mean that he has claims upon all wealth whatsoever. If these claims were absolutely valid the money-owner would have a right to turn, e.g., Australia into a kangaroo park, and evict all except keepers, as some lords have turned Scotch counties into deer forests. If it is untrue that labour produces all wealth, it is equally untrue that the money-owner or the manager produces all wealth. Who then does wealth belong to? The words, “The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof,” express the truth. But as the Lord has become the creation, and as the creation seeks to recreate God as the representative person—i.e., perfect character—the highest personality is the rightful lord of, not wealth, but profit. But the
representative person, because representative, does not desire profit for himself but for redistribution. As the American writer before quoted says:—“The harmony of things insists that that which is the source of power, wealth, and delight shall also be the ruler of it.”

Personality is the outcome of evolution, or, better, involution; but involution is only one phase of cosmic activity—a phase which is realized when a reversal of motion comes about, and this reversal is not simply reaction but ascension also. As Spencer says:—“All terrestrial changes are incidents in the course of cosmical equilibration, and movement must continue till equilibration takes place, and we are warranted in finally concluding that evolution can end only in the establishment of the greatest perfection and the most complete happiness.” This is Spencer's way of stating that the highest and most complete individuality is the outcome of involution. But as he does not recognize an absolute creative power at all, he fails to recognize the law of progress, that the highest individuality is the source of a new quality and substance. There is in his philosophy no absolute amending power, just as there is none in a federation. The scientific method of the distribution of wealth is thus stated by Bishop Butler in his “Analogy of Religion,” which, when translated into modern language, and brought from the ideal cloud-land of religion down to solid earth, expresses the truth I am contending for—namely, that character in its highest expression ought to have the disposal of profit—in other words, the government—when Isaiah's political ideal is realized. And the Jew, as Jew, ought to recognize this. Butler wrote:—“And thus, when we go out of this world, we may pass into new scenes, and a new state of life and action, just as naturally as we came into the present. And this new state may naturally be a social one. And the advantages of it, advantages of every kind, may naturally be bestowed, according to some fixed general laws of wisdom, upon everyone in proportion to the degrees of his virtue. And though the advantages of that future natural state should not be bestowed, as those of the present in some measure are, by the will of the society, but entirely by His more immediate action, upon whom the whole frame of nature depends, yet this distribution may be just as natural as their being distributed here by the instrumentality of men.” When we get rid of our metaphysical illusions, and recognize that God simply means the human ideal of character, this passage becomes intelligible.

John Morley recognized the imperfection of the method of distributing wealth when he wrote:—“Pre-Newtonians knew not the wonders of which Newton was to find the key; and so we, grown weary of waiting for the master-intelligence who may effect the final combination of moral and
scientific ideas needed for a (new) social era, may be inclined to lend a half-complacent ear to the arid sophisters who assume that the last word of civilization has been heard in existing arrangements. But we may take courage from history to hope that generations will come to whom our system of distributing among a few the privileges and delights that are procured by the toil of many, will seem just as wasteful, just as morally hideous, and just as scientifically indefensible as that older system which impoverished and depopulated empires in order that a despot or a caste might have no least wish ungratified, for which the lives or the hard-won treasure of others could suffice.”

In its monometallism and its banking, as in its constitutional kingship, England has given us the hint, the idea, which we ought to realize here.

Bagehot, that great constitutional authority, who thought the Queen was bound to cut off her head if courteously requested by the Imperial Parliament to do so, wrote, in his “Lombard-street”:—“I shall have failed in my purpose if I have not proved that the system of entrusting all our reserve to a single board, like that of the Bank directors, is very anomalous, is very dangerous. The natural system is that of many banks of equal or not altogether unequal size.” That is, he wanted a federation of the banks; to remedy the evil he wanted a deputy-governor who should be a trained banker. But no banker's interests are identical with those of the Commonwealth, therefore the sovereign should have the right to control the banker. Bagehot, as a banker, of course could not see this. “A monarchy in trade,” he says, “is a sign of some anomalous advantage, and of some intervention from without.” Certainly bankers can only form a ring, like the ring fence of Gladstone's cabinet, and as man is not merely a trading animal but also has a soul, the ring has to be controlled in the interests of the whole. Bimetallists merely seek to increase the size of this ring; they see that the supremacy of the gold standard takes away their supremacy, and naturally object, but they forget that their supremacy would be disastrous to the rest of the people, and more disastrous, since the less number of persons in the ring the easier it is for government to control it. To use another metaphor, money is a reservoir at which only those who own money are allowed to drink, and they drink it almost dry. By demonetizing silver the reservoir becomes the property of a fewer number of persons, who cannot drink as much, but who drink more than is good for them or for the toilers who pump the water up from subterranean sources. And the smaller the number of those who own the pool the more there are against them, and the easier it is to keep them to their proper ration, and to spread the precious waters over the plain amongst the gardens of the
people.
Morley spoke of being “weary of waiting for the master-intelligence;” but intelligence appeals in vain to the unintelligent, and it is not so much want of intelligence but want of goodwill—of sympathy—that makes social reform impossible. Till a people is found so favourably circumstanced and so civilized as to adopt an intelligent method, the “master-intelligence” must speak in vain.
The Sibyl offers her books, in which the future is forecast, to nation after nation, and all those who refuse to pay the price lose the supremacy and leadership, and sink quickly or slowly into senile decay. The golden moment flies, which, seized, might have brought eternal youth. The spirit of progress moves onward and upward, and the dwellers on the plain, as they watch the shining figure rising, beautiful with sunlight, towards the mountain tops, are stricken with remorse, deep sadness, and longing. But the dark shadow of night steals over them, and they cry in vain, “Come back! come back! and we will give you all we have.” From afar the voice replies, “Too late, too late, ye cannot enter now.” So the divine spirit passes from world to world, from nation to nation, and so it is that

“Deep slumbers fill
The stars overhead
And the foot-trodden grave.”

Australians! yours is the choice, the chance to-day.

“Heard are the Voices,
Heard are the sages,
The Worlds and the Ages:
Choose well, your choice is
Brief but yet endless.”

Federal Republic or divine Commonwealth! Which is it to be? No compromise is possible, and to this earth the Sibyl offers not her books again. Must the chorus of invisible spirits sing once more—

“Woe! Woe!
Thou hast destroy'd
The beautiful world
With violent blow:
'Tis shiver'd! 'tis shatter'd!
The fragments abroad by a demigod scatter'd!
Now we sweep the wrecks into nothingness!
Fondly we weep
The beauty that's gone!"

For ours is the first and last of worlds, and the universe demands nothing less than absolute perfection, ruthlessly destroying that which falls short of this, since our earth is the scene of the development of God. Much is expected of those to whom much is given. And to us much *has* been given.

As an Australian poet sings:—

“This be thy destiny, fair southern land!
Before the nations of the earth to stand—
‘First to discern and first to dare’ the truth,
And in the ardour of thy glowing youth—
Beneath the splendour of thine own clear skies
O'erthrow the wrong, and make the Right to rise.
There vice, oppression, poverty, and crime,
Swept down the backward abysses of time,
Shall vanish from men's souls, and be forgot,
Phantoms of midnight, that at morn are not.
There envious hate and selfish greed shall cease,
And dawn the reign of universal peace;
When each man's highest gain is all men's good,
And hand clasps hand in joyous brotherhood;
And love and labour, joined in happy toil,
Shall win new treasures from thy fruitful soil;
Shall to thy sons the Golden Age restore,
And joy and plenty rule from shore to shore.”

“Our analysis,” wrote Karl Pearson in his “Grammar of Science,” has led us from the simple law of the survival of the fittest to three great factors—individualism, socialism, and humanism—tending to modify human life. Our strong inherited instincts to individualism, to socialism, and to a less extent to humanism, guide us to those principles of conduct, duty to self, duty to society, and duty to humanity, which our forefathers were taught to think of as the outcome of supersensuous decrees or of divine dispensations, and which some even of their children still regard as due to mysterious tendencies to righteousness, or to some moral purpose in the universe at large.”

But there is a fourth duty, which science has forgotten, because it recognizes no moral law or purpose in the universe; because it does not know that law and personality are one; that the universe is the scene of an
infinite ascension of being without beginning and without end. Time, space, and matter are not infinite or unlimited, but life is, and the law of life is infinite amelioration of being. The will of the universe is progressive. “Everyone that falleth on that will shall be broken to pieces; and on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust.”

Wilhelm, in “Meister's Travels,” asks of Goethe's sages:

“To which of these religions, the ethnic or pagan, the philosophic, and the Christian, do you specially adhere?”

“To all the three,” replied they, “for in their union they produce what may properly be called the true religion. Out of those three reverences springs the highest reverence, reverence for oneself, and these again unfold themselves from this; so that man attains the highest elevation of which he is capable, that of being justified in reckoning himself the best that God and Nature have produced; nay, of being able to continue on this lofty eminence without being again, by self-conceit and presumption, drawn down from it into the vulgar level.”

“Such a confession of faith, developed in this manner, does not repulse me,” answered Wilhelm; “it agrees with much that one hears now and then in the course of life; only you unite what others separate.”

To this they replied: “Our confession has already been adopted, though unconsciously, by a great part of the world.”

“How then, and where?” said Wilhelm.

“In the Creed!” exclaimed they. “For the first article is ethnic, and belongs to all nations; the second, Christian, for those struggling with affliction and glorified in affliction; the third, in fine, teaches an inspired communion of saints, that is, of men in the highest degree good and wise. And should not therefore the Three Divine Persons, under the similitudes and names of which these threefold doctrines and commands are promulgated, justly be considered as in the highest sense One?”

Thus Goethe's Third Person is not a unity, but a “committee of the whole,” and we have still a “federation of the churches.”

All thought brings us down to three terms—object, subject, and relation—and these though separate are united. Thus if the doctrine of the Trinity is a mystery, it is at the same time a common-sense truth which every man with the least capacity for thought can verify in his own person. We recognize subject and object (spirit and matter) as realities eternal though ever changing. And relation too (mind or purpose) is just as much an eternal reality. And if the union of these three in organic life has hitherto been an imperfect federal one, subject to the law of death and dissolution, it does not follow that this must always be so. Death, whether social or
individual, is simply the result of non-adaptation, want of correspondence. If the universe at large is the scene of an infinite progression, then it must inevitably produce sometime and somewhere an organic being, a microcosm, a representative person, in correspondence with it; otherwise the spirit which creates, and separates as it creates, could never know the universe as one, nor could the universe know itself as one. Otherwise both the one and the many must fall short of their highest happiness and perfection. And this which is absolutely true of the whole is relatively true of every part. Humanity can never know itself as a whole, never become an organism with a living soul, till it produces a living sovereign in response to its needs.

Just as modern science, as it acknowledges no creative power, fails to explain progress, so it fails to explain death. “Sure as death” is a common phrase, but science is not sure about it. “Crayfishes,” wrote Huxley, “may attain a considerable age; and there is no means of knowing how long they might live if protected from the innumerable destructive influences to which they are at all ages liable. It is a widely received notion that the energies of living matter have a natural tendency to decline, and finally disappear, and that the death of the body, as a whole, is the necessary correlate of its life. That all living things sooner or later perish needs no demonstration, but it would be difficult to find satisfactory grounds for the belief that they must needs do so. The analogy of a machine that sooner or later must be brought to a standstill by the wear and tear of its parts does not hold, inasmuch as the animal mechanism is continually renewed and repaired; and though it is true that individual components of the body are constantly dying, yet their places are taken by vigorous successors. A city remains, notwithstanding the constant death-rate of its inhabitants; and such an organism as a crayfish is only a corporate unity, made up of innumerable partially independent individualities.” Thus science approaches the Christian standpoint.

Nothing really dies. “Matter,” says Cooke, in his “New Chemistry,” “is indestructible, and is measured by weight. Energy is indestructible, and is measured by work. Intelligence is indestructible, and is measured by adaptation. These great truths explain and supplement each other.” But as a fact we know that intelligence is destructible, and why? Because it has not yet become perfectly adapted to the universe of which it is the complement and crown. Federation is not merely a political but a universal fact. The universe is not one, though it must become so. And to this “divine event the whole creation moves.”

The ideal which the creation strives to realize is that of an infinitely
progressive being who shall make immortality possible for all. “We must bear in mind,” wrote E. M. Caillard, “that what death ministers to is not death, but life. These hecatombs of victims are sacrificed in order that throughout the organic world the most perfect attainable life of which each surviving species is capable may be reached and maintained, and, according to one of our greatest living biologists, it was on this account, because in no other way could this end be attained, that the ‘adaptation’ of death arose.”

And why in no other way? Because the spirit which knows is the same spirit which creates. The same writer says:—“Does it ever cross our minds as we contemplate and share in the pain which encounters us on every side, that the supreme sufferer in all this accumulation of suffering is God?” The martyrdom of Man is the martyrdom of God; but martyrdom is but the prelude to victory. It is because Humanity now contains within itself the progressive elements, because it endeavours to free itself from and realize the ideal, that it labours and suffers, and till it has freed itself must suffer and fall short of victory. As the poet sings of the body—

“Form’d for a dignity prophets but darkly name,
Lest shameless men cry ‘Shame,’
So rich with wealth concealed
That heaven and hell fight chiefly for this field.”

Weismann, the biologist referred to, wrote:—“The necessity of death has been hitherto explained as due to causes which are inherent in organic nature, and not to the fact that it may be advantageous. I do not, however, believe in the validity of this explanation. I consider that death is not a primary necessity, but that it has been secondarily acquired as an adaptation. I believe that life is endowed with a fixed duration, not because it is contrary to its nature to be unlimited, but because the unlimited existence of individuals would be a luxury without any corresponding advantage. There cannot be the least doubt that the higher organisms, as they are now constructed, contain within themselves the germs of death. The question, however, arises as to how this has come to pass; and I reply that death is to be looked upon as an occurrence which is advantageous to the species as a concession to the outer conditions of life, and not as an absolute necessity inherent in life itself. Death—that is, the end of life—is by no means, as is usually assumed, an attribute of all organisms. An immense number of low organisms do not die, although they are easily destroyed, being killed by heat, poison, &c. As long, however, as those
conditions which are necessary to their life are fulfilled they continue to live, and they thus carry the potentiality of unending life in themselves. The process of fission in the amoeba cannot be truly called death. Where is the dead body? What is it that dies? Nothing dies. The body of the animal only divides into two similar parts possessing the same constitution. In the lower organisms, then, there is nothing comparable to that deterioration of the body which takes place in the higher. Unicellular animals are too simply constructed for this to be possible. If an infusorian is injured by the loss of some part of its body, it may often recover its former integrity, but if the injury is too great it dies. The alternative is always perfect—integrity or complete destruction."

The higher organisms die and deteriorate because so infinitely complex and unstable; but such instability and complexity is a condition of correspondence, and until such correspondence or representation becomes perfect, death and destruction must continue. And this is true of social organisms also. And immortality, if true of the lowest organisms, is true also of the highest. “Perfect integrity or complete destruction” is the alternative of states as well as individuals. But if one state can realize perfection, continued life becomes possible for all. And this is the justification of that struggle for supremacy which modern science so well understands but fails to justify.

Kidd wrote:—“Regard it how we may, the conclusion appears inevitable that, to the great masses of the people, in the advanced civilizations of today, the conditions under which they live and work are still without any rational sanction.” Perfectly true; but it does not follow that no rational sanction for progress is possible. Progress is growth, but growth is not all progress. Growth must end in recompense, in compensation; and any civilization that fails to secure this must die the death or be amended by a higher power.

The immense accumulation of wealth in London has no rational sanction for its existence, and the agents of destruction are already there eating away its vitals. The soul of progress has passed away, leaving a dead carcass, and where the carcass is there the vultures and the eagles gather together.

Mr. Kidd looks to religion to reanimate the dying body. Let us look at the state of religion in London through Mr. Hall Caine's eyes. “The Christian” is a fiction, but the novel often gives a more truthful picture than piles of blue-books. The artist has an eye, and is disinterested; the official has only an eye-glass, and sees only what he wishes to see. Caine's Father Superior thus speaks of the clergy:—“And our clergy, sir—our fashionable clergy!
Surely some tremendous upheaval will shake to its foundations the church wherein such things are possible—a church more worldly than the world.”

“As for the church,” said his Prime Minister, “it was founded on Acts of Parliament; it was endowed and established by the state; its head was the sovereign, its clergy were civil servants, who went to levies and hung on the edge of drawingrooms, and troubled the knocker of No. 10, Downing-street. As for Christ's laws, in this country they were interpreted by the Privy Council, and were under the direct control of a state department. Still, it was a harmless superstition that we were a Christian nation. It helped to curb the masses of the people. If you want to see what times the church has fallen on look at the advertisements in your religious newspapers—your **Benefice and Church Patronage Gazettes** and so forth. A traffic, John, a slave traffic, worse than anything in Africa, where they sell bodies, not souls. It is a crime which cries to the avenging anger of heaven.” Said John Storm—“It is the Establishment that is to blame, not the church, uncle.” The Prime Minister replies—“We are a nation of money-lenders, my boy, and the church is the worst usurer of them all, with its learned divines in scarlet hoods who hold shares in music-halls, and its Fathers in God living at ease and leasing out public-houses.”

And when we turn from the novelist to those who merely profess to describe facts, the same tale of degeneration is told. Richard Heath, writing in the **Contemporary Review** (February,'95), on the elections to the parish councils, says:—“The most striking fact, because it has been so universal, is the reprobation of the clerical power which the rural people of England have deliberately, and with most surprising unanimity, pronounced. ‘Mene, mene, tekel upharsin’ is the message that has gone forth through England to the rural clergy. Who can say that it is not a just judgment when one reflects in what a curiously unChristian manner Christianity has been presented in most rural parishes? The care of souls is undertaken, not because a man feels that he has a special call to be the pastor of a particular parish, but either because he has interest with the patron, or because he is considered deserving of reward for work done elsewhere. Then, again, the ghastly contrast between the dwellingplace of the shepherd and those of most of his flock. While the shepherd has often room enough and to spare, his poor sheep have been driven to herd together in their old age as so many criminals, separated from their wives and children, doomed to a pauper's death and a pauper's grave. How can the people forget these things? They may grumble about the charities, but the way in which they have been administered is only part of the scandal of the whole position, the impossibility of simple men believing in Christian ministers who live in
palaces and closes, rectories and vicarages, while so many thousands of
their brothers and sisters live out their lives in such terrible discomfort. Are
we to suppose that the Medes and Persians, among whom the old clerical
kingdom is to be divided, are the various dissenting ministers, to whom the
rural people will now turn? The universal answer is distinctly negative.
Nothing is more striking. The clergy are not rejected that the ministers may
be welcomed. Both alike have received their congé. If we ask what the
dissenting ministers have done to deserve this censure the answer will be
that they have done nothing but follow in the wake of the clergy: as the
clergy have lived as part of the gentry, so they have lived as part of the
middle class, neither of them being, in consequence, truly in sympathy
with the common man.”

It is not this or that church which has failed in England to amend the
social life. It is the spirit of religion itself which has passed away, having
proved itself inadequate to deal with modern social problems. Science has
conquered religion, while it has proved unable to put anything in its place,
and the monied power rules supreme. Though there are still good men in
the church, they can do little; they are often left in obscurity all their lives,
while the highest benefices are open to those who have either money or
influence, or who can titillate the vanity of fashionable audiences and keep
unpleasant truth well hid.

The Church of England is founded, not upon a clear principle, but upon a
protest. As Macaulay wrote:—“The protestant doctrine touching the right
of public judgment, that doctrine which is the common foundation of the
Anglican, the Lutheran, and the Calvinistic churches, that doctrine by
which every sect of dissenters vindicates its separation, we conceive not to
be this, that opposite opinions may both be true; nor this, that truth and
falsehood are both equally good; nor yet this, that all speculative error is
necessarily innocent; but this, that there is on the face of the earth no
visible body to whose decrees men are bound to submit their private
judgment on points of faith.” England is the transition from the standpoint
of faith to that of reason, and all its institutions exhibit the spirit of
compromise, and so blinded are men by the influence of England that they
have come to believe that there is no such thing as a fundamental principle
at all, especially in politics.

Parliamentary government and Protestantism are logical counterparts. “In
the history of our own country,” wrote Stubbs, “the political principle of
representation is directly to be traced to the action of the Christian Church;
and remember that the union of the democratic principle with
representative government is an entirely modern fact, which throws out of
court all interested appeals to the failure of the democratic principle in ancient history.” Well, the church seems to have done its work in England; has it enfranchised labour? The engineers' strike ended in a deadlock. And I read (London, 21st April):—“The miners' strike is costing South Wales £300,000 weekly. Including the ironworkers and employés in other industries there are now 200,000 persons out of employment. The local authorities are asking the Board of Trade to interfere.” Here is a good illustration of the way in which labour politicians arise. An onlooker, writing on the engineers' strike (“Plevna of Labour,” Contemporary Review, January, 1898):—“The union had become the more obnoxious to the employers since it had appointed paid officials, by whom any complaints that might arise in a workshop were carried to the master, so that his own employés did not appear in the matter at all. Even the most just and honourable of employers dislike this change, and even the most submissive of unions finds it expedient some time or other to make it. In the earlier stage, when any man or group of men in a workshop feel aggrieved, they have to go or to send a deputation to the management. The masters therefore know the ringleaders of the shop, and, to put it brutally, they can either get rid of them or can at least check any inconvenient zeal by the constant fear of the result. But, once a paid delegate exists, there is no one for the master to dismiss. The result is that there are more complaints, reasonable or otherwise, as the case may be, and no doubt the result is also that this independent ‘ambassador of labour’ often gives himself airs and plays the fool, as ‘his betters’ do in similar circumstances of sudden elevation.”

Of course we find that in England both masters and employés are organized on the federal principle, and of course, too, the result is deadlock, nothing done, and the trade of England going to the dogs. Neither party will trust an independent arbiter.

Washington Gladden writes, in his “Tools and the Man”:—“This great truth of the absolute unity of human interests, which involves the impossibility that any social class should rise by depressing another social class, which implies that if one member of the social organism suffers all the other members must suffer with it, is the corner-stone of Christian ethics, of Christian social science. Very slowly does the world move towards the realization of this truth; it is but a small section of the Christian Church, even, that comprehends it. The sects proceed upon the theory that rivalry, and not co-operation, is the basis on which neighbouring churches coexist; if they should make their creeds correspond with their deeds, they would profess their faith, not in the communion of saints, but in the
competition of saints. When the churches themselves thus flatly repudiate the Christian law, it is scarcely to be wondered at that the factories spurn it.”

The Church of Rome claims to be the true church and the organ of social regeneration. How utterly God is an unknown power to the highest Catholic minds of England, here is good evidence from Cardinal Newman's “Grammar of Assent”:—“What strikes the mind so forcibly and so painfully is, His absence (if I may so speak) from His own world. It is a silence that speaks. It is as if others had got possession of His work. Why does not He, our Maker and Ruler, give us some immediate knowledge of Himself? Why does He not write His Moral Nature in large letters upon the face of history, and bring the blind, tumultuous rush of its events into a celestial, hierarchical order? . . . I see only a choice of alternatives in explanation of so critical a fact: either there is no Creator, or He has disowned His creatures. My true informant, my burdened conscience, gives me at once the true answer to each of these antagonist questions:—it pronounces without any misgiving that God exists; and it pronounces quite as surely that I am alienated from Him.”

Then there is Spencer's unknown Power, and Max Müller's perception of the Infinite, and Comte's “generic concept of Humanity.” Turn to one of the most powerful writers of England, Carlyle, who denounced the greed and injustice of England's rulers in language that might have proceeded from the mouth of a Hebrew prophet, and we find this—“But whence? O, Heaven, whither? Sense knows not; Faith knows not; only that it is through Mystery to Mystery.”

Those who hope much from the Papacy ought to read Zola's study on Rome—how an enthusiastic French priest cherished visions of a new Rome, and his gradual disillusionment when he came in contact with the actual Rome. Here is a sketch of the Pope's cupbearer:—“Monsignor Gamba, whose cowardice and nullity were legendary, seemed to have no other rôle than that of enlivening Leo XIII., whose favour he had won by his incessant flattery and the anecdotes which he was ever relating about both the black and the white worlds. Indeed, this fat, amiable man, who could even be obliging when his interests were not in question, was a perfect newspaper, brimful of tittle tattle, disdaining no item of gossip whatever, even if it came from the kitchens. And thus he was quietly marching towards the cardinalate, certain of obtaining a hat without other exertion than that of bringing a budget of gossip to beguile the pleasant hours of the promenade. And, heaven knows, he was always able to garner an abundant harvest of news in that colossal Vatican, swarming with
prelates of every kind, in that womanless pontifical family of old begowned bachelors, all secretly exercised by vast ambitions, covert and revolting rivalries, and ferocious hatreds, which, it is said, are still sometimes carried as far as the good old poison of ancient days.”

And this is what prelates appear to think of government by reason or purely personal influence:—“At thought of that papal court, congealed in ritual, pride, and authority, Pierre suddenly understood what horror and repugnance such a pastor would inspire. How great must be the astonishment and contempt of the papal prelates for that singular notion of the northern mind, a pope without dominions or subjects, military household or royal honours, a pope who would be, as it were, a spirit, exercising purely moral authority, dwelling in the depths of God's temple, and governing the world solely with gestures of benediction and deeds of kindness and love!”

The papacy still claims the temporal power, and Cardinal Moran in Australia apparently believes in the policy of the Pope. The church, too, in Australia appears to be unaware that constitutional sovereignty is the political creed of Christianity. Indeed, in some parts of Australia religion seems to be dying of a natural decline. Thus I read in a Queensland journal the other day:—“Complete trust in spontaneous giving is sometimes justified, but often it ends in disappointment and debt. Variety would be beneficial to both preachers and congregation. Monotony is one of the most depressing facts of life, and nothing gives greater relief to the public teacher than a change of audience. The Church of England is behind the age in many respects.” The writer was pleading for the union of two Presbyterian churches. “The difference in the gospel teaching of the two Scottish ministers in Queensland is,” he says, “no greater than between tweedledum and tweedledee.” And this remark might be extended to all the Christian churches, whose differences from a rational standpoint are much the same. But the fact is that the life of religion, like that of parliamentary or party government, depends upon the existence of an opposition—the dualism of God and Satan. But as no one to-day among the cultured classes in Australia really believes in either the one or the other as supernatural beings, religion ceases to be procreative. And really the monotony of church services is most forbidding. Dualism of all sorts is getting quite out of date as a final explanation of things, as the basis of a creed of any sort, except of course among federal politicians and parsons, both of which classes have naturally a professional bias in favour of it, for union, coalescence, might mean a reduction in the staff.

Of course, it is just as inconceivable to the clergy that the church and
religious stimulation can be dispensed with without endangering society as it is to the politicians that men can live without being governed and hunted to the polling-boothes. But both religion and politics, as commonly understood, are abnormal features of society. The seer of Patmos saw no temple in his holy city.

And as to a “continued revelation,” these sentences of Matthew Arnold's are worth remembrance:—“Now poetry is nothing less than the most perfect speech of man, that in which he comes nearest to being able to utter the truth.” “The noble and profound application of ideas to life is the most essential part of poetic greatness.” “Wordsworth's poetry is the reality, his philosophy the illusion. Perhaps we shall one day learn to make this proposition general, and to say—Poetry is the reality, philosophy the illusion.” The Book of Genesis, as Canon Cheyne tells us, or at least the first chapter of it, “is not only Babylonian, nor wholly Canaanitish, nor wholly Israelitish, but has developed out of elements supplied by each nationality.” In other words, it is the result of selection.

And what we want to-day is a new Bible, containing selections from the literature of all nations. English literature is full of inspiration, and the best writers in their best moments were just as genuinely inspired as the Hebrew prophets. The new Bible is sadly wanted, to purify political life especially. Here is a contribution to it from Wordsworth on the “Character of the Happy Warrior”—

“'Tis he whose law is reason, who depends
Upon that law as on the best of friends;
—Who, if he rise to station of command,
Rises by open means, and there will stand
On honourable terms, or else retire,
And in himself possess his own desire;
Who comprehends his trust, and to the same
Keeps faithful with a singleness of aim;
And therefore does not stoop, nor lie in wait
For wealth, or honours, or for worldly state;
Whom they must follow; on whose head must fall,
Like showers of manna, if they come at all:
Whose powers shed round him in the common strife,
Or mild concerns of ordinary life,
A constant influence, a peculiar grace;
But who, if he be called upon to face
Some awful moment to which Heaven has joined
Great issues, good or bad for human-kind,
Is happy as a Lover; and attired
As the great aim of the true politician is the formation of character, I feel sure that had these lines of Wordsworth's been read to the late Convention occasionally we should have had a better Commonwealth Bill. Except for the title, which is a little naïve, I know no finer delineation of the character of a true politician. I prefer it to Isaiah's, and it is certainly more “up to date.” And this from “Faust” is significant:

“Hark! those notes so swiftly sounding!
Cast aside your fabled lore:
Gods in olden time abounding—
Let them go! their day is o'er.
None will comprehend your singing
Nobler theme the age requires,
From the heart must flow upspringing
What to touch the heart aspires;
Vanish may the sun's clear shining,
In our soul if day arise;
In our heart we, unrepining,
Find what the whole world denies.”

Here is a motto for a progress association, also from Faust—

“Who the impossible desires I love.”

“Man hath all which nature hath, but more,” wrote Arnold, and Goethe wrote too—

“Man and man only
Achieves the impossible;
He can distinguish,
Elect, and direct.”

Australians! those poor Europeans can't find anything to believe in. Suppose we believe in ourselves, then they might come to believe in us. But “the Humanity that is to rule all things must first prove itself incapable of being ruled by any.” Men cannot be ruled by politicians or priests—the thing is absurd.

Here is as grand a psalm as any in the Bible, at once poetic and scientific, religious in the truest sense (but whoever heard it in the churches?), from Patmore's ode “To the Body”:—

“Creation's and Creator's crowning good;
Wall of infinitude;
Foundation of the sky,
In heaven forecast
And long'd for from eternity,
Though laid the last;
Reverberating dome
Of music cunningly built home
Against the void and indolent disgrace
Of unresponsive space;
Little sequester'd pleasure-house
For God and for His spouse;
Elaborately, yea, past conceiving, fair,
Since, from the graced decorum of the hair,
Ev'n to the tingling, sweet
Soles of the simple, earth-confiding feet,
And from the inmost heart
Outwards unto the thin
Silk curtains of the skin,
Every least part
Astonish'd hears,
And sweet replies to some like region of the spheres.”

The creed of poetry is the religion of the future. Each being and each man has his own ideal, and so with each nation. And the national gods are simply magnified images of this. But it must not be forgotten that there is a universal ideal god as poet. The myriad-minded poet stands for the whole, while other men stand merely for a part. The poet alone can truly stand for humanity, and as the world becomes civilized the ascendancy of the poet must become more and more pronounced.

The Greek ideal ought to be the Australian. The historian Smith wrote:—“The ‘Iliad’ and the ‘Odyssey’ were the Greek Bible. They were the ultimate standard of appeal on all matters of religious doctrine and early history. They were learnt by boys at school, they were the study of men in their riper years, and even in the time of Socrates there were Athenian gentlemen who could repeat both poems by heart. In whatever part of the ancient world a Greek settled, he carried with him a love for the great poet; and long after the Greek people had lost their independence the ‘Iliad’ and the ‘Odyssey’ continued to maintain an undiminished hold upon their affections.” The “Iliad” and the “Odyssey” were of course the result of the selective action, not merely of the national memory, but also of individual genius acting on this selected material and combining it into a whole. As Smith wrote:—“Short epical poems appear to have existed before the time of Homer, but the construction of the epic poem in the nobler sense is probably to be attributed to the genius of Homer.”

Of course, little men, who can see no higher than their own noses, critics who presume to judge what is immeasurably higher than themselves, look upon Homer and Shakespeare as mythological personages. They are quite sure that they could not produce an epic poem or a drama like the “Tempest;” therefore it is impossible for any individual to do so. It is precisely the creed that suits a democratic age. The people is sovereign, therefore everything great must be the result of the collective action of a people. I think it was Whately who proved the non-existence of Napoleon by the use of the arguments adduced to prove the non-existence of Christ. But, of course, in a commercial, money-grubbing age the poet is at a discount, like everything else that is great and noble. But still men, as Homer sang, “long for the gods.”

“What is it that keeps men in continual discontent and agitation?” wrote Germany’s greatest man. “It is that they cannot make realities correspond with their conceptions, that enjoyment steals away from among their hands, that the wished-for comes too late, and nothing reached and
acquired produces on the heart the effect which their longing for it at a
distance led them to anticipate. Now, fate has exalted the poet above all
this, as if he were a god. He views the conflicting tumult of the passions,
sees families and kingdoms raging in aimless commotion, sees those
inexplicable enigmas of misunderstanding, which frequently a single
monosyllable would suffice to explain, occasioning convulsions
unutterably baleful. He has a fellow-feeling of the mournful and the joyful
in the fate of all human beings. When the man of the world is devoting his
days to wasting melancholy, for some deep disappointment, or, in the
ebullience of joy, is going out to meet his happy destiny, the lightly-moved
and all-conceiving spirit of the poet steps forth, like the sun from night to
day, and with soft transitions tunes his heart to joy or woe. From his heart,
his native soil, springs up the lovely flower of wisdom, and if others, while
waking, dream, and are pained with fantastic delusions from every sense,
his passes the dream of life like one awake, and the strangest of incidents is
to him but a part both of the past and of the future. And thus the poet is at
once a teacher, a prophet, a friend of gods and men. Sufficiently provided
for within, he needs little from without. The gift of communicating lofty
emotions and glorious images to men, in melodies and words that charmed
the ear, and fixed themselves inseparably on whatever objects they referred
to, of old enraptured the world, and served the gifted as a rich inheritance.
At the courts of kings, at the tables of the great, beneath the windows of the
fair, the poet's voice was heard, while the ear and soul were shut to all
beside; and men felt as we do when delight comes over us and we stop
with rapture if among the dingles the voice of the nightingale starts out,
touching and strong. The poet found a home in every habitation of the
world, and the lowness of his condition but exalted him the more. The
hero listened to his songs, and the conqueror of the earth did reverence to
the poet, for he felt that without him his own wild and vast existence would
pass away like a whirlwind, and be forgotten forever. The lover wished
that he could feel his longings and his joys so variedly and so
harmoniously as the poet's inspired lips had skill to show them forth; and
even the rich man could not of himself discern such costliness in his idol
grandeurs as when they were presented to him shining in the splendour of
the poet's spirit, sensible to all worth, and exalting all. Nay, if thou wilt
have it, who but the poet was it that first formed gods for us; that exalted us
to them, and brought them down to us.”

Matthew Arnold wrote:—“It is the mark of the greatest poets that they
deal with what is really life, and to say that the English poets are
remarkable for dealing with it is only another way of saying, what is true,
that in poetry the English genius has especially shown its power.”

The literature of England is the highest and purest of her gifts to the world. To what a depth has literature sunk there when the laurel crown is in the gift of Parliament. I can see the “lonely widow of Windsor” looking forth from her tower, “set like a little nest among wide waves” of rude, imperious war, and crooning to herself—“Is there, then, no one of all my children who can carry on the higher life of England, can welcome the spirit of the poet, and cultivate the arts of peace?” And I can hear the voice of the great King Alfred, the father of England and England's literature, saying—“Noble lady, thou hast ruled wisely and well; but how can there be peace, how can literature flourish, whilst the Danes are rulers of the earth, and rob my people of their due? The peace thou wouldst establish is but a balance of iniquity, which can only be upheld by force of arms. And these Parliaments of thine know this right well. Rather than do justice to thy people, rather than restore ill-gotten gains, they would set the whole world in wild uproar and confusion, till the earth runs red with the blood of men, and the sun glares lurid through the smoke of war. Exert thy power, call thy brother sovereigns into council. Do justice! or this little nest of thine will sink beneath the waves of world-wide war. This London of thine, my Wessex, this grimy capital of yours, has it not slain the soul of England? Thy statesmen have lost vision, and even thy poets have turned traitor to the law of wisdom. He who bore my name, who had so many great and noble gifts, yet despised my people, and was an aristocrat at heart; he who vainly imagined that a ‘parliament of man,’ a ‘federation of the world,’ could still the throbbing of the war drum, was no true son of mine; neither shall he be welcomed to the Eternal City, which shall arise to the sound of music when the din of battle ceases, until he confess his sin against the Highest. Great qualities were his, and the people of thy wide dominions looked to him for light and guidance; yet did he with his false words lead many astray. The poison of distrust threatens thy realm with death, and dims the lustre of the ‘brightest jewel of thy crown’ to-day. Do justice and fear not! The spirit that is above all law, and dwells in perfect freedom, shall uphold thee.” And as the voice of the king who loved his people died away, I heard another saying:

“It is not to be thought of that the Flood
Of British freedom, which, to the open sea
Of the world's praise, from dark antiquity
Hath flowed ‘with pomp of waters, unwithstood,’
Roused though it be full often to a mood
Which spurns the check of salutary bands,
That this most famous Stream in bogs and sands
Should perish; and to evil and to good
Be lost for ever. In our halls is hung
Armoury of the invincible Knights of old;
We must be free or die, who speak the tongue
That Shakespeare spake: the faith and morals hold
Which Milton held. In everything we are sprung
Of earth's first blood, have titles manifold.”
“Milton! thou should'st be living at this hour:
England hath need of thee; she is a fen
Of stagnant waters; altar, sword, and pen,
Fireside, the heroic wealth of hall and bower,
Have forfeited their ancient English dower
Of inward happiness. We are selfish men;
Oh! raise us up, return to us again;
And give us manners, virtue, freedom, power.
Thy soul was like a Star, and dwelt apart;
Thou hadst a voice whose sound was like the sea;
Pure as the naked heavens, majestic, free,
So didst thou travel on life's common way,
In cheerful godliness; and yet thy heart
The lowliest duties on herself did lay.”

And I heard the organ voice of Milton:—“Methinks I see in my mind a
noble and puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and
shaking her invincible locks; methinks I see her as an eagle mewing her
mighty youth and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full midday beam;
purging and unscaling her long-abused sight at the fountain itself of
heavenly radiance, while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds,
with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she
means.”

And then a harsher voice began to sound:—“With nations it is as with
individuals. Can they rede the riddle of destiny? This English nation, will it
get to know the meaning of its strange new to-day? Is there sense enough
extant, discoverable anywhere or anyhow, in our united 27 million heads,
to dare to do the bidding thereof? It will be seen! The secret of gold Midas,
which he, with his long ears, could never discover, was that he had
offended the supreme powers; that he had parted company with the eternal
inner facts of this universe, and followed the transient outer appearances
thereof; and so was arrived here. Properly, it is the secret of all unhappy
men and unhappy nations. Had they known Nature's right truth, Nature's
right truth would have made them free. They have become enchanted,
stagger spellbound, reeling on the brink of huge peril, because they were
not wise enough. They answer the Sphinx-like riddle wrong, and go astray
more and more. Foolish men imagine that, because judgment for an evil
thing is delayed, there is no justice but an accidental one here below.
Judgment for an evil thing is many times delayed, but it is sure as life, it is
sure as death! In the centre of the world-whirlwind, verily now as in the
oldest days dwells and speaks a god. The great soul of the world is just.”

And from the under-world the faint voice of Euripides rose—

“Thinkest thou
To overcome the wisdom of the gods?
That justice has her dwelling far from men?
Nay, she is near, she sees, herself unseen,
And knows whom she must punish. Thou knowest not
When she will bring swift ruin on the base.”

“Slow come, but come at length,
In their majestic strength,
Faithful and true, the avenging deities.”

And then Arnold spoke, addressing the spirit of Heine—

“So thou arraign'st her; her foe;
So we arraign her, her sons.
Yes, we arraign her! but she,
The weary Titan, with deaf
Ears, and labour-dimm'd eyes,
Regarding neither to right
Nor left, goes passively by,
Staggering on to her goal,
Bearing on shoulders immense,
Atlantean, the load,
Well-nigh not to be borne,
Of the too vast orb of her fate.”

And Heine's sole answer was—

“The sea hath its pearls,
The heaven hath its stars;
But my heart, my heart,
My heart hath its love.
“Great are the sea, and the heaven;
Yet greater is my heart,
And fairer than pearls or stars
Flashes and beams my love.
"Thou little, youthful maiden,
Come unto my great heart;
My heart and the sea and the heaven
Are melting away with love!"

And then I heard the unmelodious voice of the World-Reviewer, preaching the gospel of force as the “new policy for the new time”:—“We are going to keep what we have got. We are not going to give up anything because some people choose to say that the weary Titan is overburdened, or because of theories as to the rightness or wrongness of the methods in which they came into our possession. John Bull has dined.” And then I heard a tumult of sounds—ancestral voices prophesying war! followed by a death-like silence.”

“For all the charm
Is broken—all the phantom world so fair
Vanishes, and a thousand circlets spread
And each mis-shape the other.”

When the central sun of reason dies away at the seat of empire, and men base their claims to rule upon force, naked and unashamed, that seat ceases to be the centre of attraction; the sun can no longer restrain the aberrations of the planetary bodies, and if the fragments of empire are ever to come trembling back into unity, they must do so around a new centre of affluence and effluence.

And, significant fact, a statue has, I am told, recently been erected in London to—Force. Lord Salisbury delivered a speech in 1895 in which he said the recent general elections would prove the turning point in the political history of the country. The extreme depression existing in the farming industry, he stated, demanded the first attention of the Government, and it was proposed to increase the means of transit for agricultural produce, and to relieve the land from the burdens from which the owners now suffered most.

In other words, Lord Salisbury proposed to remove the burden of debt from the landowners. Huxley said:—“At one time the great body of the nation did own the land; it must be admitted that now they do not; that the land is in the hands of a relatively small number of actually or comparatively rich proprietors, who constitute perhaps not 1 per cent. of the population. What is this but the result of robbery and cheating? The descendants of the robbers and cutthroat soldiers who came over with
William of Normandy have been true to their military instincts, and have ‘conveyed’ the property of the primitive corporations into their own possession.”

William the Conqueror held the land of England by a double right, the right of election to the crown and the right of conquest. He received the crown at Westminster from the hands of Archbishop Ealdred. After buying off the Danes, and after the struggle in the fens of Ely, he confiscated the lands of England and granted them to his followers. But, as Green wrote:—

“He found himself fronted in his new realm by the feudal baronage whom he had so hardly subdued to his will in Normandy, nobles impatient of law, and aiming at an hereditary military and judicial power within their own manors, independent of the king.” How did he meet this danger? “He availed himself of the old legal constitution of the country to hold justice firmly in his hands. He retained the local courts of the hundred and the shire, where every freeman had a place, while he subjected all to the jurisdiction of the king’s court. The authority of the Crown was maintained by the abolition of the great earldoms which had overshadowed it, those of Wessex, Mercia, and Northumberland, and by the royal nomination of sheriffs for the government of the shires. The estates of the great nobles were scattered over the country in a way which made union between the landowners, or the hereditary attachment of great numbers of vassals to a separate lord, equally impossible. By a usage peculiar to England, each sub-tenant, in addition to his oath of fealty to his lord, swore fealty directly to the Crown. The feudal obligations, too, the rights and dues owing from each estate to the king, were enforced with remarkable strictness. Each tenant was bound to appear if needful thrice a year at the royal court, to pay a heavy fine or rent on succession to his estate, to contribute an “aid” in money in case of the king's capture in war, or the knighthood of the king's eldest son, or the marriage of his eldest daughter. An heir who was still a minor passed into the king's wardship, and all profit from his estate went for the time to the king. If the estate devolved upon an heiress, her hand was at the king's disposal, and was generally sold to the highest bidder. Most manors, too, were burdened with their own 'customs,' or special dues to the Crown, and it was for the purpose of ascertaining and recording these that William sent into each county the commissioners whose enquiries are preserved in ‘Domesday Book.’”

My lord of Salisbury, has not the Crown to-day by the law of England rights to the land superior to every private landholder? Have the dues and customs been paid to the Crown? Are not the landowners of England in considerable arrears? What right have you then to confiscate national
revenues to compensate landowners? The sole right you have is the right of the stronger, the natural right of force. William the Conqueror introduced the Jews into England. As the Jew was the only capitalist in Europe, William found him very useful; his loans gave an impulse to industry, and castles and cathedrals rose all over the land. But the Jew had no right or citizenship in the land; his life and goods were absolutely at the king's mercy. "It was in the Hebrew coffers that the Norman kings found strength to hold their baronage at bay."

Two things are worth noting in connection with William the Conqueror's government: he formally abolished the punishment of death, and put an end to the slave trade, which had till then been carried on at the port of Bristol. Here is additional evidence that great men are far in advance of their age and the true amending force of society. In respect to capital punishment we have not got to William's standpoint yet, though he lived over eight hundred years ago. A single execution only stains the annals of his reign. And he saved England from the Danes. Cromwell reintroduced the Jews, which appear to-day to have England under their thumb.

Now, how is Lord Salisbury or any other statesman going to relieve the land from its burdens? How big a question it is may be seen from Mulhall's statistics in his "Industries and Wealth of Nations" (1896):—"Landowners and farmers have lost 450 millions of capital since 1880—that is, an average of 30 millions yearly." And he says that two-thirds of England, nine-tenths of Ireland, and nineteen-twentieths of Scotland are held in ownership by a small group of persons. Excluding estates of less than 10 acres the land is held as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>19,275</td>
<td>57,890,000</td>
<td>3,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>157,640</td>
<td>13,600,000</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>176,915</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,490,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>—</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the population of the United Kingdom he gives as 39,400,000 in 1896. How agriculture has been sacrificed may be seen from this:—"Ireland produces enough to feed 7,000,000 persons all the year, or 50 per cent. over her actual population. England raises food enough to support her population only 51/2 months, Scotland 10 months; yet Ireland has to pay a tribute of at least £2,000,000 a year to absentee landlords, and her share of taxation is £1,800,000 over what it ought to be." And in the United Kingdom "nearly 80 per cent. of the total wealth is held by 11/2 per cent.
of the adult population. Fortunes of £5,000 are multiplying much faster than those under £5,000, which is the reverse of what is desirable, and this congestion seems to increase in intensity the higher we go. The improved condition of the working classes is evident from the increased number of depositors in savings banks. It was less than 4 per cent. of the population in 1850, and has now risen to 19 per cent. Nevertheless, the sufferings of the indigent class in our large towns are greater than ever before. The condition of this class has been aptly described as far worse than that of the Hottentots. The evil arises partly from habits of intemperance, but much more from want of suitable dwellings at a moderate rent.”

To the callous man of the world the state of society in England here disclosed seems right and natural, yet any fresh intelligence sees in a moment that it represents an accumulation of injustices certain to bring about a terrible retribution. And retribution means destruction or alteration by force. If we consider the question for a moment we shall see how impossible it is for an English government to remedy social evils by pacific means. How is any statesman to find the means for relieving the land and the farmer?

There are said to be three great factors of wealth—land, labour, and capital. But to call capital a source of wealth is absurd: it is wealth itself. Land, of course, is the material; labour, *i.e.*, all human exertion, is the energy; capital is the product. To tax the landowner or the farmer is, as we have seen, out of the question. Some other class, then, must be taxed in favour of the primary producer. But to do this without breaking up the land monopoly means simply doling out charity to paupers. The monopoly of land is unjust, but can it be broken up without compensation to the landlord? Is it likely that other classes are going to submit to heavy taxation when compensation at all is unjust? And suppose the land bought back, then money has to be obtained to develop it. The resistance to land reform in England is too great to be brought about by any method except the use of physical force. To tax the commercial class is to abandon free-trade and complete England's ruin as a commercial state.

The author of “Made in Germany” says:—“The industrial supremacy of Great Britain has been long an axiomatic commonplace, and it is fast turning into a myth, as inappropriate to fact as the Chinese Emperor's computation of his own status. This is a strong statement. But it is neither wide nor short of the truth. The industrial glory of England is departing, and England does not know it.” And the writer supports this statement by a vast mass of statistical detail relating to many branches of industry. Iron and steel, ship-building, textiles, cotton, linen, jute, silk, wool and worsted,
chemicals, toys, glass, cement, leather, paper and pasteboard, musical instruments, printing. After reviewing the trades, he writes:—“Here ends the tale of England's industrial shame.” Of this industrial decline he gives as causes: English insularity and arrogance; manufacturers do not study the tastes and wishes of their customers; commercial travellers are ignorant of the language of the country which they are sent to canvass. Small orders are scorned. Manufacturers refuse to quote in terms of currency and weights and measures other than those of England. There is a want of adaptability; conservative methods of conducting business prevail; there is a want of push, of alert progressiveness. Machinery is often obsolete. Artistic finish is not studied. The workers lack scientific knowledge, while professors disdain to practically apply their science. Scientific independent research is not provided for. England has the superiority as far as capital goes, but capital is cosmopolitan, not patriotic. It will be unpleasant news to Englishmen that German factories are largely run with English money, but we have it on the authority of a trade journal that English capitalists are not backward in making such investments whenever required for the establishment of new firms and factories.

The final conclusion of the book is:—“England's unique position as unchallenged mistress of the industrial world is gone, and is not likely to be regained. But some of the departed glory may yet be restored to her.” How is this to be done? Of course, the old thing—imperial federation! “We must federate the empire,” the writer says. “At present we are losing our grip of our own colonies and dependencies, which are steadily falling into the hands of the German. We protect the colonies with our flag; our gigantic navy is largely for the purpose of safeguarding them. But we pay all the cost; they, in return, think they have done their duty to the mother country when they have sung the National Anthem at their banquets. They must discriminate in their tariffs, and admit English products on more favourable terms than those of other nations.”

That is, in plain language, the most energetic, pushing, and progressive sons of England have left her to develop the colonies; the English stay-at-homes have lost character and energy; capital has become cosmopolitan, and is uniting the world by the bond of debt. But in order to revive little England, and principally London, free-trade must be abandoned, the jealousies between nations must be revived, the narrow insular standpoint returned to; and all this to foster and pamper the decadent residue of a race that has spread over the earth. And it is not England that really pays for the navy. The profits of the world are drained to London, and these profits
maintain the fleet. As Giffen wrote in his “Essays on Finance”:—“The effect of our capital going abroad is only to lay the whole world under contribution to the British Exchequer. There is not a country in the world which does not already yield its quota of profit assessable to the income tax of the United Kingdom.” To relieve the primary producers of England, then, means to tax the empire in order to dole out pensions to the primary producers of the United Kingdom. Once this is understood the impossibility of relieving their burdens without the use of force is palpable. Public opinion all over the empire would be against the imposition of an income tax heavier than at present exists. When a nation ceases to progress, to grow, its right and title to receive the profits of the world lapses, and the attempt to maintain this unnatural state of things simply sets the whole world against such a nation, as we see it arrayed against England to-day.

It is not the English race that is decadent, or whose supremacy is passing away. It is simply that the world centre of civilization is shifting, that a reversal of the currents of circulation is about to take place. England has her own problem to settle; she has sinned for centuries against human law, and must pay the penalty; but the world is not going to be sacrificed to save England, to maintain the equilibrium of injustice which exists there.

If England is prepared to do justice to her own people, then her sons can help her; but they are not going to help her to continue in wrong-doing. And if the English Government cannot alter things without the use of military force, then force must be used, and used if necessary against an obstructive Parliament.

It is worth observing that the growth of injustice in England is an accompaniment of parliamentary absolutism. Capitalism and militarism are also its concomitants. The more governing incapacity increases, the more does injustice increase, and the more necessary is it to create a military power to maintain an unjust state of things.

Here is additional evidence, from the article before referred to on the engineers' strike, that the only remedy in England is force. The writer points out that when the employers were about to make a concession “a group of firms who live by Government contracts determined that they could not stand it. They were, in fact, hard pressed by provincial competitors.” Having deteriorated, as all bodies artificially protected by government do, they feared extermination, and stepped in at the critical moment and determined the action of the other employers, who, knowing that these Government-protected firms would be backed up, determined to continue their policy of “smashing the unions.” “The Admiralty,” the
writer says, “had in fact been very sympathetic; they had acquiesced quite patiently in the paralysis of their great shipbuilding programme. It is supposed by the innocent outsider that this was because the Admiralty was bound by the strike clauses in the contracts to wait until the combatants had settled their dispute. It is now known, however, that this is not true. Detailed statements have been made in the London press, and have been left conspicuously unanswered, in which it is alleged that there are large quantities of Admiralty contracts in which there is no strike clause at all of any kind, and in which the Admiralty nevertheless has put on no pressure to demand delivery of goods which ought to have been delivered months ago. The fact is that these Government orders have been quietly put aside, while the limited resources which the contractors now possess are employed in turning out the work of such private customers as refuse to wait.”

Here is good evidence that even as a naval centre England has become obsolete. The Government has become so weak that it allows, perhaps, enemies of the empire to get their work completed, while the great arm of imperial defence is neglected. Such a magnificent harbour as that of Sydney would be a much better base for naval defence, since the thoughts of men are turning to the East and the development of the countries around the Pacific.

To return to the strike, the writer says:—“We have drifted into a state in which both the masters and men have organized themselves upon a great scale, and are able, therefore, to wage battles of the first magnitude. Once this state of things has come about, it is absolutely senseless to be contented with arrangements which settle nothing, and with definitions which can only mean a prolonged period of guerilla warfare. If the fighting masters had half as much statesmanship as cunning, they would have long since recognized that the only safety, as well as the only justice, is to be found in frankly dealing with the collective power of the men, and in making it to the interest of the union as a whole to stop the vagaries either of branches or of individuals”—that is, on both sides the federal principle of union must be abandoned. “Meanwhile, the moral is plain. There is an interest which is greater than either that of the master or that of the men, the interest of the community. *This dispute has made it plain that arbitration must presently become compulsory.* It is said that the employers of the north are furious with the Tories because of the operation of the Conciliation Act, lame as it is. If it be true, it only shows that men who are enraged and despotic have little sense of their own interest. But the Conciliation Act is itself a stronger machinery than Mr. Ritchie has
himself yet dared to make it. It is high time it was made stronger still. The fighting section” of the employers, the writer says, “declared roundly that they would not tolerate any sort of conciliator or independent chairman. They were perfectly frank about it. ‘Any independent chairman,’ they said, ‘would give the men something. We are quite satisfied that we have beaten them already, and we propose that they shall come back absolutely on our own terms.’ ”

It is evident that the English Government was either on the side of the employers, or indifferent to the result of the struggle, or impotent. In any case the pretensions of such a Government to control the affairs of the empire are worse than ridiculous. And it is evident, too, that in England industrial settlement can only be brought about by the use of military force, since both the labourer and employer are not intelligent enough to see their own true interest, and the public opinion of the community is not strong enough to restrain both parties to the struggle by the suasion of reason. But the use of military force means the death of liberty, since, as Huxley said:—“Wherever and whenever the individual is forced to submit to any rules, except those which he himself spontaneously recognizes to be worthy of observance, there liberty is absent.” And without liberty there can be no progress. As Hume wrote:—“Absolute monarchy, therefore, is the easiest death, the true euthanasia, of the British constitution.” A Parliament has proved itself useless, and is not likely to abolish itself, and as it has a thousand sins of omission and commission lying at its door, no sensible person can regret its removal. “Stern,” writes the historian, “as was the rule of William the Conqueror, it gave peace to the land. Even amidst the sufferings which necessarily sprang from the circumstances of the conquest itself, Englishmen were unable to forget ‘the good peace he made in the land, so that a man might fare over his realm with a bosom full of gold.’ ” William the Conqueror is no more, but William the Witless lives—called “witless” by the overcultured, who are so wise that they have forgotten how to act. And if England cannot right things by her own military power, without upsetting Europe, the only resource is for the Queen to form a foreign alliance; otherwise England goes down sooner or later in ruin.

And this beautiful system of absolute parliamentary government which has well-nigh ruined England, it is that politicians recommend to Australians. And these politicians are prepared to abandon the idea of free-trade if they can only bring it about, ignorant of the fact that free-trade is always to the advantage of the leading, the most progressive nation.

As the editor of the Saturday Review remarked, in a series of articles on
politics (9th January, 1897):— “In fact, the love of England for free-trade is only a sign of her power to win in an open commercial struggle for existence. And if England were to lose her present industrial supremacy among nations we should hear no more from Englishmen of the supposed blessings of free-trade.”

Why was it, Mr. Harris, that you left off writing those political articles of yours? Was it that a prick of the Damocles sword of the Jew taught you caution? Or did you chance to read an article of S. Low's in the Nineteenth Century of August, 1896, on “The Decline of Cobdenism,” in which this appeared:—“In England the protectionists are no longer a party obscure, discredited, half-disgraced. It has ceased to be a mark of mere intellectual obtuseness—as if one should express doubts on the law of gravitation or the accuracy of the multiplication table—for a man to express a liking for import duties on other articles besides wine, spirits, tobacco, dried fruits, cocoa, and tea, which things may lawfully be taxed according to the true Cobdenite faith. On the contrary, protection raises its head again, open and unabashed; it is vocal on the platform, it is felt at the elections, and in Lancashire itself—nay, even in Manchester, which was the Mecca of free-trade, and in Birmingham, which may be called its Medina, since it received the prophet, John Bright, when the Holy City had cast him out—it is probable that if a popular vote could be taken the free-traders would be left in a minority.”

If Australia cannot maintain the grand tradition of free-trade, the faith is likely to be lost altogether. And were free-trade with all the world to be put to the popular vote in Australia, I have little doubt that, as things are, the vote would be against it. And yet protection is not to the true interest of any class. The question of free-trade has been argued again and again from the standpoint of experience. Germany, we are told, abandoned free-trade to protect her commerce, but “agriculture failed to benefit by the increased duties,” so the corn duties had to be raised. But, as a matter of fact, there never has been free-trade, so experience goes for nothing. Before there can be free-trade, or rather before its good results can be felt, land must be everywhere accessible, labour must be free to move where it can work most efficiently, and capital must be free to flow where it is wanted most. But if there was universal free-trade the result of competition and free means of communication would simply mean that the money-owner reaped all the benefit of the lowering of prices.

Now, what is the true function of money in relation to commerce? It is simply that of transferring, of distributing wealth. And the proper distribution of wealth is emphatically the business of government. The real
object of protection on the part of governments is to prevent the accumulation of wealth in hostile hands. Money is not capital, fixed or circulating; it is, or it represents, surplus wealth, wealth available for purposes of social amelioration, and as general amendment is the proper purpose of government, old governments very properly tried to keep it. But money, like everything else, evolves; thus credit takes its place more and more, and must eventually make money useless.

And just as it was once the right thing for a government to control the flow of money, so it is its duty now to control credit in the general interest. The nation that abandoned the obsolete system of retaining money had the advantage over the other nations. Its superior intelligence enabled it to rise above the barriers of protection of any sort—i.e., artificial hindrance to the flow of surplus wealth. And that nation, being a cosmopolitan nation, i.e., the Jewish, has naturally drawn all surplus wealth to itself, and thus does not possess but controls the world's commerce. And the instrument of control is, of course, the banking system. But the banking system tends to supersede money altogether. The Jew has taught the world how to bank. The secret once learnt the Jew becomes useless, except in so far as he is actually a working banker. Jews who are not bankers are simply left with gold, the value of which in this case is simply its value as a commercial product. Its present value is largely mental, the result of a social convention. Once it became useless for the control, the command of wealth, its value would be simply that placed upon it for ornamental purposes. Men can do very well without it, and I doubt whether they would even trouble to raise it from the ground.

Mulhall says of gold-mining in Australia:—“However attractive gold-mining must always prove to a large number of the human race, it has been, on the whole, a business that hardly pays working expenses.” Here are Mulhall's statistics for 1892:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miners.</th>
<th>Product.</th>
<th>£ per Man.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria .. .. ..</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>2,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland .. ..</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>2,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales, &amp;c. ..</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>1,110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total .. .. ..</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>£6,830,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above gives an average product of £114 per man, or less than two-
thirds of the average product per hand on farms. It is clear, then, that the high value of gold does not depend upon labour or cost of production. Its high value must be artificial, the result of protection on the part of human beings. Its unnatural value must depend upon the fact that it is the measure of value.

With the invention of machinery, &c., the value of goods declines, as they are more easily produced, but the cost of producing gold is fairly stationary, so that whoever produces gold and exchanges it directly for goods gets a greater quantity or better quality than he would formerly have done. But the miner, though he shares the advantage with the money-owner if he retains the gold and bases a credit system on it, loses the advantage when he exchanges the gold for goods. The value of gold depends upon the social desire for it as money; if it was wanted merely for ornamental purposes its value would be very small. The bank by its system of credit based upon gold, to which society gives a more or less stable value, reaps an immense profit, since gold has a protected value while other commodities have not, and are subject to natural competition. The rational course for government, then, is not to protect industries directly by a tariff, but to itself take possession of the instrument of credit; not to manage the banks, but to socialize them, and take the profit for national purposes. The National Bank should receive the gold and use it solely for international payments, and all borrowing whatsoever should be through the International or National Bank. The buying and selling of money, like the buying and selling of land or of labour, should be a national matter, determined by the government, and not left to private individuals at all. Within each country a metallic coin, of some cheap substance could be used for the sake of convenience.

By the socialization of the banking system the state of the national finances would be easily ascertainable, and the financial function of representative bodies almost entirely superseded, much to the advantage of all. For the reckless borrowing of parliaments it is which has landed us in debt. It is perfectly clear why the political class declines to face the financial question. It might find its services unnecessary. But it is to the interest of every resident to cease outside borrowing. Credit ought to be obtainable cheaper through a National Bank and its local branches. If credit was socialized in Australia, and no gold coin used here, gold would still retain its abnormal protected value elsewhere, and if deposited with the National Bank could be used to pay off external obligations. Resident individuals would, as at present, reap the full value of gold, subject to a dividend tax or royalty. As a nation has an undisputed right to its own land,
and therefore to its mines, the government has a perfect right to put an end to absentee ownership and absentee interference—either to limit it by taxation or abolish it altogether, as seems desirable, all just claims to capital invested and interest being respected, and satisfied by national bonds bearing interest or terminable annuities.

Of course, if the mining industry as a whole was organized the settlement of matters would be much simplified. If other industries were similarly organized, only the mining fraternity would have the right to develop mineral resources. And the interests which persons not engaged in mining now have in mines might be satisfied in a similar manner to that by which the claims of absentees can be met.

By the organization of industries, the consolidation of debts, and the cessation of borrowing from foreign sources, the stream of profit which now flows to London would be put an end to or limited, and the necessity of protection by governments in the interest of their people removed.

But it is hardly necessary to say that monetary reform is impossible in England by peaceable means. But if anywhere the dissociation between resident labour in all its forms and capital has been brought about by the absentee nature of the monied power, then such a reform becomes desirable for all persons concerned.

It may be said it is absurd to suppose that Australia, or any part of it, is so deeply in debt that it merely pays its way, for are not individuals in many cases making a profit. But gold-mining is supposed to be one of the most profitable of industries; individuals make large fortunes; yet Mulhall says that the business on the whole hardly pays working expenses. And yet Coghlan says:—"The colony yielding the best return to investors is Queensland, with 6.8 per cent., a very high rate, which is made possible by the rich development of the gold mines, which are largely owned outside the colony. New South Wales shows a return of 5.9 per cent. As in the case of Queensland, the returns from mining investments are answerable for the large excess of this return over the present market rate of money."

Now, can there be a better proof than this of the absurdity of statistics in finance? All financial statistics are based upon the assumption that the measure of value remains constant, which, as we have seen, is not the fact. The measure itself changes, and those who possess the measure derive the benefit. To compare the measure to a foot-rule, we have to suppose that the measure itself increases in length by imperceptible steps, so that say in 50 years the foot-rule has grown to 2 feet. As there is no absolute standard to measure the rule by, this increase cannot be proved. The individual owners of rules say to the practical man, who complains of this increase in
length—“My good sir, you can compare my rule with C., D., and E.'s rules; you will find them all the same.” As the practical man knows this to be the case, he goes away suspicious, but puzzled. He bought, say 50 years ago, 100 yards of cloth, but he finds to-day that, owing to the growth of the measure, 100 yards then only measure 50 yards now, and of course, if he agreed 50 years ago to give 1 inch of cloth for the temporary loan of the rule, and if he, instead of returning the rule, keeps it, still paying 1 inch on every 100 yards, it does not make the least difference: the rule in his possession has changed like the others, and he has to pay 2 inches instead of 1 for the use of it.

It is customary for political economists to say that there can be no universal rise or fall in values, though there may be in prices. But the distinction between price and value is a relative, not an absolute distinction. Thorold Rogers wrote:—“Price is the measure of an article by one standard, value is the measure of an article by all other objects.” But, as to get the value of an article by comparing it “with all other objects” would take more than the lifetime of Methusaleh, no individual can arrive at a result by this method. Accordingly, society takes the matter in hand; the value of articles is arrived at by the “higgling of the market,” i.e., each individual makes an estimate of the goods he wishes to exchange. But for convenient exchange a common meeting place—a market—is necessary. Goods are stored; towns spring up. Men settle there who devote themselves purely to the business of transferring, exchanging goods. A “mechanism of exchange” is perfected—money, which flows backwards and forwards in defined channels and becomes more and more ideal, i.e., disconnected with material value. But from beginning to end value is determined by the “higgling of the market,” and price simply records the result. The commercial man simply lives upon the differences, errors, or aberrations of the higglers. He knows that one man in one place will take a certain price for his goods, and that another man in another place will give more; he exchanges, and reaps the profit himself. But there is no reason, except lack of intelligence and of means of communication, why producers should not exchange directly. Accordingly we see that, with the growth of intelligence, middlemen tend not to be superseded, but to be neutralized. Thus governments turn individual railway, telegraph, and post-office services into social services. In other words, the government fixes the value of these services, puts an end to the higgling of individuals. The distinction between value and price thus vanishes, and if these services are just made to pay expenses, value and price, i.e., their value to the public and the price the public has to pay for them, become identical. Of course, the practice of
free passes quite upsets this balance, or introduces endless complications in book-keeping. But it is plain that with social progress, if this balance of income and expenditure cannot be maintained, surplus revenue then must either be taken by the government, given to the railway employees themselves, or used to reduce the cost of the service to the public; or, fourthly, used to make new railways. At present this is done in a haphazard, unscientific sort of way. But if there is one service more than another which ought to be thus neutralized or socialized, it is the banking service, as it is the mechanism of exchange of all goods whatsoever. Other monopolies of public functions are particular monopolies, but this one is a universal monopoly. If the monopoly of the railway service allows the owners of railways to appropriate to themselves an excess of profit, much more so does the monopoly of the banking service allow it. If this one service were socialized, protection to other services might be removed with advantage; individualism might be allowed free play, unlimited competition established amongst them; for the result of competition is simply to reduce prices, not values; competition simply tends to make value and price identical, to reduce profit. But profit is not lost, yet as long as the banking system is not socialized it is lost to the community, and totally lost where bankers are absentees. By socializing the banking service we socialize profit, while at the same time allowing individuality free play. What we should do in Australia, then, is to totally abolish all privilege, all protection, so that character, social fitness may have absolutely free play within defined limits. It should be impossible to make a profit out of land or money. If in any definite area it has come about that land has completely passed into the hands of absentees, so that those working upon it are mere wage-earners, then it is evident that all profit flows out of the country, and that amelioration of the people which is the proper function of government is impossible. Government, then, has the right to appropriate the profit and secure a just apportionment of it, and this it must do by demanding of banks full and correct statistics, since the banks record the full commercial transactions of a country. And the government has this right at all times. Unless this right is exercised it is impossible to say whether the banks have drawn all profit to themselves or not. Coghlan, however, writes:—“The returns furnished by the banks, though in compliance with the laws of the colonies, are by no means satisfactory, being quite unsuited to the modern methods of transacting banking business, and they cannot be accepted without question as indicating the stability or instability of the institutions by which they are issued. As a rule nothing can be elicited beyond what is shown in yearly or half-yearly balance-sheets. No uniformity is observed
as regards the dates of closing the accounts, and the modes of presentation are equally diverse. Important items, which should be specifically stated, are lumped with others of minor import, and, as a rule, current accounts are blended with other accounts, instead of being separately shown. The value of the information vouchsafed to the public is illustrated by the fact that it was impossible to obtain from the publications of several institutions suspending payment in 1893 the amount of their liabilities either to the public or the state, and these particulars were never disclosed.”
Now, surely any business man can see that before any constitution can be framed for Australia full financial information should be available. Sir J. Forrest admitted that federation was essentially financial, and, as we have seen, the constitution suitable to Australia depends essentially on the financial position of the country as a whole. To adopt an indissoluble form of government without this full information must be, then, the height of folly. Politicians do not seem even to be aware that the constitution of a government is not an isolated fact, but, on the contrary, bears, or should bear, as close a relation to the structure of society as that of the brain does in the human constitution of the body. Government is simply the complement of the whole social constitution. This want of full financial knowledge alone should damn the Commonwealth Bill in the eyes of all sensible business men. Instead of getting the experts full information, politicians seek to discredit their figures. How impossible it is to get full information as things are may be seen from these remarks of Coghlan's:—

“For the colonies to pay their way there ought to be an excess of exports over imports equal to the interest on loans outstanding and the earnings of investments—that is to say, if no capital were introduced and none withdrawn. But equilibrium in this respect is not to be looked for. Even in these times there is a stream of capital coming to the colonies in excess of what is withdrawn; and even in the worst years several thousand persons arrive in Australia with the intention of settling there, and a large proportion of these bring with them some capital. Under the condition of equilibrium between the introduction and withdrawal of capital, Australasia would show an excess of exports representing the interest on public loans and private tributes. This export for 1895 was £15,411,000, and it is therefore plain that Australasia might increase its indebtedness to the extent of over £15,000,000 in any one year, and at the same time show an equality between its imports and exports. With this explanation in mind it will not be difficult to understand how, in spite of the fact that during the last twenty-five years the indebtedness of Australasia was increased by £276,730,000, the money or money's worth actually received was only £22,235,000. Such is the operation of interest as affecting a debtor country. . . . It will be seen that out of loans aggregating £182,774,000, a sum of only £51,916,000 reached Australasia, the balance of £130,858,000 being retained in London to meet interest charges, as a set-off against a similar sum which otherwise it would have been necessary to remit from
Australia.” The loans referred to refer to the borrowings of the governments and local bodies during the twenty-five years, 1871-'95.

Thus the interest on loans is paid out of loans themselves, not by the excess of exports over imports. How is this excess to be accounted for? Can it be accounted for by the interest on private borrowings? Coghlan makes the excess of outflow over inflow, allowing for persons introducing capital who come here to live, and allowing for their incomes derived from abroad, £6,145,000. Now, it has been noticed as a curious fact by Sir S. Griffith and Mr. Garran, that the Customs and excise revenues almost exactly equal the aggregate interest bills of the six Australian colonies. Garran put this amount at about £7,000,000. It would appear, then, that it takes nearly the whole of the Customs and excise revenues to pay interest on private borrowings. Coghlan puts the interest on private investments paid abroad at £6,317,000. This being the case, what is the sense of taxing imports at all? The Customs Department is not a producer of wealth, it is simply an expense and irritation. The seven millions raised, being only about equivalent to the interest on the private debt, might be paid directly by the trade balance, the excess of exports over imports, and the necessary revenue for public expenditure be raised directly by loan. If the Customs revenue and the private interest on debt balance, the Customs tax is virtually a tax upon the importer—we tax the importer to pay him interest.

I do not profess to be a financier, but it seems to me that the interest on private borrowings might be paid in a much simpler manner, while if protective duties were abolished altogether both parties would be better off, as the expense of the Customs Department would be saved.

There is another curious coincidence in connection with Australian finance noticed by Mulhall in 1895:—“The coincidence is worthy of remark that the sum of £108,000,000 sterling expended in Australia since 1873 in the construction of railways is precisely the amount of the value of the gold produced in that interval.” He does not give any explanation of this coincidence. But this and that coincidence in connection with the Customs duties and the interest on debt can hardly be accidental.

Here is another rough coincidence. Mulhall says:—“The experience of Europe shows railways to effect a saving in freight equal to 12 per cent. of the value of merchandise, and if we suppose a saving only of 6 per cent. on the imports and exports of Australia (£120,000,000), this would be a benefit of £7,200,000 per annum.” Here we have a saving approximating to the amount of the interest on the public debt, and approximating to the amount raised by Customs. Now gold is, perhaps, our one product which has not shared the fall in prices. We get full value for gold when we
exchange it for goods, but these goods, these imports, we tax to the extent of £7,000,000, so that the good done by railway saving is about balanced by the harm done by Customs revenue, this “balance of trade” being successfully established—that is, the revenue from Customs and the saving on railways, which together amount to about the sum of the private and public interest on debt, £14,601,000. This being successfully achieved, we have the amount of the gold raised to spend for national purposes—i.e., opening up the land by railways. Of course the politicians go on borrowing all the time, but the land is the security for that, and no doubt they will go on borrowing till it is all mortgaged.

After this lucid explanation, I think no one can doubt that I am a “heaven-born financier.” It is at any rate just as lucid as Mr. Reid’s exposition of the Commonwealth Bill’s finance. I may as well state, however, the conclusion I draw from these numerous coincidences, which is this:—Pure English banking, I may premise, is commercial; banks don't understand land business. And as politicians are under the thumb of the banks, their finance also relates purely to trade matters. The great object of their finance is to establish a trade balance. As long as this is done nothing else matters. And these curious coincidences above referred to are simply the result of political book-keeping, and don't represent facts at all, since all financial statistics are founded upon the assumption of a stable measure of value which does not exist.

My conclusion from the whole exposition is that Australia is getting daily deeper and deeper into debt, and that no government statistician or politician knows anything worth knowing about the finances of Australia, and cannot possibly know till the facts are honestly returned and collated. Also, that until private borrowing is brought to an end it is hopeless to rescue Australia from the quagmire of debt. I will write no more on this hopeless subject, except to give an instance from Coghlan of the awkward kind of statistical information which the Convention politicians so much dislike:—“It will be seen that, leaving out of consideration the capital introduced by immigrants, the return to investors, together with absentee incomes, has exceeded by nearly 30 millions the amount invested in Australasia, although the principal sum (£93,956,000) still remains due. It may be difficult to conceive how such a result has been possible, but the difficulty will be lessened when it is remembered that at the beginning of the period embraced in the tables the Australasian colonies were already paying an annual tribute to private investors of £3,517,000, and, therefore, on account of debts incurred and investments made prior to 1871 something like 88 millions might have been paid away during the last 25
years without any reduction in the principal owing."

One thing seems to me clear, that interest is the only legitimate charge that can be made on borrowed money, and that there is a great deal more than interest at the bottom of Australian indebtedness.

Another thing is that the expenses of bank management and interest, which amount to 91.5 per cent. of the gross earnings, are vastly greater than they should be, and that the British investors had better send out an expert they can trust, certainly not a board, to help Australian financiers to unify the banks, and reduce the expenses of the banking machinery. For the banks are thinking of “federating in their own interests,” which interests do not quite coincide with either that of the Australian people or that of the absentee capitalist.

This matter of the variation of the measure of value may be illustrated by the scepticism scientists are beginning to feel as to the universality of Newton's law of gravitation, that “every particle of matter attracts every other particle,” &c. “The geologists and geodetic gentlemen,” said Dr. Emmens, “make common cause with the astronomers and physicists so far as the acceptance of the Newtonian system is concerned. And yet some of their most cherished theories are in glaring defiance of Newton's law of gravitation. Take, for example, their views as to the interior of the earth.” And the result of “pendulum and weight observations for ascertaining the varying force of terrestrial gravity in various localities has been to demonstrate that the figure of the earth as determined by gravity differs considerably from the figure as measured.” This suggests the idea that there is in our earth something that resists, opposes, the law or rule that operates elsewhere, and which may eventually completely reverse the gravitative action, which, as Mosetti tried to show, “may be only the residual part of other forces of nature,” or, as Spencer says, “a resultant of actions pervading the ethereal medium.” Our earth may respond to magnetic vibration of the ether of an amplitude such as no other bodies in the universe can answer. Magnetic vibrations are probably the vibrations of celestial bodies as wholes. These, then, have to be compounded to some centre, which thus becomes the source of an absolutely new effluence, which, when the compounding is complete, may absolutely change the character of the universe by its action. This change would, of course, completely alter the measure or test. So in society whoever can respond to the universal demand of men for something higher than the ideal of mere wealth, must become the true measure of value, and reverse the action of the monied power, which is merely the creation of the competition of social individuals. Personal magnetism always has been the true social
centre, and if it is not to-day, this is simply because the ideal of the age has not been evolved.

It is not bigness of any sort that gives supremacy. Man is physically one of the weakest of beings. He comes into the world more helpless than any other creature, and yet he makes the physical forces of nature do his bidding. And so it is in history. E. A. Freeman wrote:—“If we look to man's civil and political history we shall find that its most striking, its most instructive pages, those which we turn to and remember with the greatest delight, are those which record the endless cases in which the weak have been chosen to confound the strong,” and those in which a small people, fighting for right and freedom, has overcome the physical force of an invading despot. We may, for all practical purposes, say the physical force of the despot for an army does become so mere a tool, it so thoroughly does the will of its master and not its own, that we may truly speak of each soldier, his arms, his training, his corporate spirit, as practically going to make up the physical strength of his master. For a people in this sense physically weaker to withstand or overthrow such a power, the work of the old Greek against the Persian, of the Hebrew against the transplanted Macedonian, of the men of the Three Lands against the Austrian, of the men of the Seven Provinces against the Spaniard—all these are the noblest instances of the general law,” that mere bigness and physical force are as nothing when arrayed against spiritual power.

The most remarkable instance of this is the spread of Christianity. As Principal Fairbairn wrote of Christ:—“There is no romance so marvellous as the most prosaic version of His history. The son of a despised and hated people, meanly born, humbly bred, without letters, without opportunity, unfriended, never save for one brief and fatal moment the idol of the crowd, opposed by the rich, resisted by the religious and learned, persecuted unto death by the priests, destined to a life as short as it was obscure, issuing from his obscurity only to meet a death of unpitied infamy, He yet, by means of His very sufferings and His Cross, enters upon a throne such as no monarch ever filled and a dominion such as no Caesar exercised. He leads captive the civilized peoples; they accept His words as law, though they confess it a law higher than human nature likes to obey; they build Him churches, they worship Him, they praise Him in songs, interpret Him in philosophies and theologies; they deeply love, they madly hate for His sake. It was a new thing in the history of the world; for though this humble life was written, and stood vivid before the eye and imagination of men, nay, because it veritably did so stand, they honoured, loved, served Him as no ancient deity had been honoured, loved, or served.
We may, indeed, say He was the first being who had realized for man the idea of the Divine; He proved His Godhead by making God become a credible, conceived, believed, real being to man. And all this was due to no temporary passion, to no transient madness, such as now and then overtakes peoples as well as persons. It has been the most permanent thing in the history of mind; no other belief has had so continuous and invariable a history. The gods of Greece lived an even more changeful life than the Greek men; the Zeus of Homer and Plato, though one in name, is in character not only two, but two radical opposites. The history of religion in India is but a record of the variations and the multiplications of deities. The mythologies of Mesopotamia and Egypt were never fixed; they bewilder by the number and extent of the changes in the crowd of figures they present for analysis. But the belief in Christ has now for almost two thousand years lived under a criticism the most searching and scientific that ever assailed any idea of mind or fact of history, and yet this criticism has only made the belief more active, more vigorous, more sure of its intrinsic truth and reasonableness.

Christianity is an instance of the triumph of the principle of unity over that of federalism in the struggle of religions for supremacy. And the truth on which Christianity makes its stand is this: that man in his perfection is the universal ideal; that however small and insignificant he and his home may be when considered according to the measures of physical strength and material magnitude, yet that our earth is the seat and source of an influence and power higher than any that elsewhere exists, a spiritual power before which and against which all the physical forces and gigantic motions of the universe of worlds are impotent and powerless. Christianity is geocentric in this sense, and so is poetry, and all the criticism of science has gone rather to confirm than destroy this belief. “What if we were to say that the physical littleness of this earth,” wrote Freeman, “as compared with many other objects in this universe, is in no way inconsistent with the belief that the inhabitants of this small planet really are the most important beings in the universe? What if we were to say that such experience as we have of the working of things in our own world does actually suggest a certain presumption that it may really be so? There is a saying of St. Paul's which puts in a Christian shape a doctrine which no theist of any kind can well deny, and which those who do not admit even theism must allow to be in full agreement with the ordinary course of nature and history:—‘God chose the weak things of the world that He might put to shame the things that are strong; and the base things, and the things that are despised, did God choose, yea and the things that are not, that He may bring to nought
As science recognizes no creative power, no transforming and progressive life; as it does not know that “the things that are not” may yet be; as it neglects “the one chance in a million” which can alter the whole course of history, its whole fabric of thought is built upon unsound foundations, and becomes less and less representative of the universal movement of things.

Even the saying that “God made man in his own image” may yet be confirmed by modern science, thus: J. B. Stallo writes:—“The cumulation of difficulties presented by the nebular hypothesis has become so great, and is beginning to be so extensively recognized, as to develop a tendency to modify or supplant it by another hypothesis, that of meteoric agglomeration. Meteors, according to Mayer, are in a sense the fuel of the sun, and all bodies within the planetary system are subject to accretions, both of mass and temperature, in consequence of their collisions with them. Now, it is supposed that in astronomically primeval times the proportion of these meteoric masses to the masses of the large solar and planetary bodies may have been far greater than it is now—that, in fact, there may have been a time when the space now occupied by our planetary system presented the appearance of a swarm of such meteors of all sizes and of all degrees and forms of consistency and aggregation, moving about at all rates of velocity, in all directions, and in orbits of every degree of eccentricity. These masses would be consolidated, and movements, both of rotation and revolution, would be generated in the bodies so formed by their collisions. But how can a theory which seeks to derive the orderly, symmetrical, and harmonious world as we know it from the wildest congestion of aboriginal differences and anomalies—from a spring-head of utter incongruity and confusion—be made to account for the regularities and coincidences whose simple and natural explanation was the conspicuous merit of the hypothesis of Laplace? An answer to this question is sought, by the advocates of the new theory, in an appeal to a principle long since established by Laplace himself. This principle relates to the fact that, amid all the disturbances caused by the mutual attractions of the planetary bodies, there exists an invariable plane passing through the centre of gravity of the whole system, about which these bodies perpetually oscillate, with but slight deviations on either side. If on this invariable plane we project the areas described by the radii vectores of the several elements of mass in a given time, and multiply each mass into its respective area thus projected, the sum of the products is a maximum and the rate of its increase is constant. Such a plane exists not only for the solar
system, but for any system of bodies controlled solely by their mutual attractions. . . . From this follows the general principle that the movements of the bodies constituting any finite system, whatever be their original divergence of direction, tend (except in a very few special cases), by reason of any resistance to these movements, to become parallel to, or coincident with, an invariant plane. And this principle, which admits of a further generalization—that all movements of the elements of a finite material system depending upon the mutual action of such elements tend, in consequence of any permanent interference with or determination of these movements from without, from irregularity and disorder to regularity and order—is, in my judgment, one of the most important in the whole range of theoretical physics. For the condition here assigned—that the internal movements of the system be subject to constant interference from without—is in fact inseparable from every material system, there being no such system which is at any time under the exclusive control of its own internal forces. There is, consequently, in every finite part of the world an ingenerate bias from irregularity to regularity, a natural bent from disorder to order, an inherent tendency from chaos to cosmos.”

Now, in this theory there are several suppositions: the existence of meteorites differing in all ways from one another, the mutual attraction of these, and constant interference from without. Let us suppose a creative power that produces these differing monads, that they all originate from a common centre and parent, that the creation spreads like a water-wave through space, not simply moving particles like such a water-wave, but also creating them. Science ought to be able to demonstrate that the spread of such a wave, like an expanding sphere, would produce all kinds of differential motions. Now, to account for the existing facts of the universe we must suppose this wave of dispersion limited, and succeeded by a wave of concentration, a reversal of the cosmical movement from the centre. At the moment of this reversal there would be bodies left in a state of perfect balance—\textit{e.g.}, moons in which the centrifugal and centripetal tendencies were perfectly equilibrated. These become balancing agents, dividing the general movements of the system into two orders, till the whole system is perfectly balanced, but on the supposition of an indestructible, creative, or ameliorative power such balance is unstable, the tiniest force must upset it; thus a centripetal tendency will be set up and must continue until all the differential movements of development are integrated or concentrated at the original centre, where there must be produced a form representing in miniature and in combination all varieties of individual differences—\textit{i.e.}, a representative unity. This accomplished, an absolutely new order of
creative phenomena may commence.

Suppose our earth be such a representative centre, and that the new order of phenomena be that of humanity, which shall repeat and reproduce and represent on a higher plane celestial phenomena. Man himself may represent the invariable plane about which bodies perpetually oscillate, for the human organism is a marvellous community of balanced motions, co-operating organs about a central spine.

In society we can see the equatorial plane establishing itself, and society exhibits three great institutions—the Family, the Church, and the State—as the creative, the dividing, and regulating agents. And it is admitted that humanity originates from one centre. If scientists study the evolution of society they may arrive at the law of cosmical evolution. These brief hints are necessary to indicate that the last word of science has by no means been said, that it has by no means destroyed the cardinal truth of Christianity.

If the physical system of the universe is limited, as we must conceive it to be, the “interferences from without” must cease sometime and somewhere; then, if infinite progress be a fact, a new order of phenomena must arise. Matter, resistance, competition, heat, such as we experience on our earth, need not be eternal realities at all, merely temporary modes of being, resulting from the fact that at the last, supreme, and final centre of the old order of things the surplus elements of matter and force, not being able to escape elsewhere, have to transform themselves into something higher before they can escape from and alter the old-established order of the universe around them. And pain, evil, and death may be but methods of this transformation.

An illustration of this method of the formation of new and higher organs is the case of Australia, to which the surplus elements of the old world have flocked, and much of the surplus capital. But before Australia can react on and establish its supremacy over the whole world, it must constitute its society in a superior manner, organize its industries into co-operating wholes. Such coalescence of those engaged in similar industries, so that industries compete instead of individuals, and so that, finally, all industries co-operate, is the necessary condition of success.

As Karl Pearson says, in his “Grammar of Science”:—“In the face of the severe struggle, physical and commercial, the fight for land, for food, and for mineral wealth between existing nations, we have every need to strengthen by training the partially dormant socialistic spirit, if we as a nation are to be among the surviving fit. The importance of organizing society, of making the individual subservient to the whole, grows with the
intensity of the struggle. We shall need all our clearness of vision, all our reasoned insight into human growth and social efficiency, in order to discipline the powers of labour, to train and educate the powers of mind. This organization and this education must largely proceed from the state, for it is in the battle of society with society, rather than of individual with individual, that these weapons are of service. Here it is that science relentlessly proclaims: A nation needs not only a few prize individuals; it needs a finely regulated social system, of which the members as a whole respond to each external stress by organized reaction—if it is to survive in the struggle for existence.”

As the American writer, Lloyd, before quoted, says:—“The cardinal virtues cannot be established and kept at work in trade and in the highways with the old apparatus. We can get industrial and economic liberty only by a covenant never to let ourselves be millionaires.” As the conditions of commerce absolutely preclude our becoming millionaires while we retain the present individualistic system, the sooner we recognize this the better. If we give up individual competition, then the nation can become rich, and, as always happens when individual strife is voluntarily given up, a higher general happiness must follow. But we must allow no “state socialism” that is forced co-operation, it must be voluntary. Forced or state socialism is utterly unstable and disastrous. It means the death of freedom. And yet to this state of things the old world is approaching. To meet this and save our own freedom federation is utterly inadequate. We want unity, singleness of action, and unanimity of feeling, such as nowhere else exists. To win our industrial freedom we have to put down, to put below us, the greatest concentration of financial power that ever existed. Our numbers are small, yet should we take courage from history, which witnesses to the fact that “all great things have been done by little nations.” The French in the revolution hurled back all the armed forces of Europe. The Dutch withstood the imperial might of Spain. At Salamis the mighty host of Persia was scattered to the winds. If little Cuba to-day was really worthy of independence she could win it without the aid of the United States. The sympathy of some Australians appears to be with the United States. But before they give their aid to America they should free their own country. Has America the moral right to interfere in this matter at all? How do these Americans, who are supposed by the ignorant to be lovers of liberty, treat the poor foreigner in New York? Here is a little evidence from the report of the Lexow Committee on the police tyranny of New York:—“The poor ignorant foreigner residing on the great east side of the city has been especially subjected to a brutal and infamous rule by the police, in
conjunction with the administration of the local inferior criminal courts, so
that it is beyond a doubt that innocent people who have refused to yield to
criminal extortion, have been clubbed and harassed and confined in goal,
and the extremes of oppression have been applied to them in the separation
of parent and child, the blasting of reputation, and consignment of innocent
persons to a convict's cell. . . . Oppression of the lowly and unfortunate, the
coinage of money out of the miseries of life, is one of the noteworthy
abuses into which the department has fallen. The evidence of many
witnesses shows the existence of a wonderful conspiracy in the
neighbourhood of Essex Market Police Court, headed by politicians,
including criminals, professional bondsmen, professional thieves, police,
and those who lay plots against the unwary, and lead them into habits of
law-breaking, or surround them with a network of false evidence, and then
demand money as the price of salvation, and if they do not receive it drag
their victims into court and prison, and often to a convict's cell. . . . This
condition (of things) has grown to such an extent that even in the eyes of
our foreign-born residents our institutions have been degraded, and those
who have fled from oppression abroad have come here to be doubly
oppressed in a professedly free and liberal country. A police official had
his boots polished by an Italian shoeblack till he ran up a bill of 75 cents.
The boy wished to get paid. ‘Why don't you pay me what you owe me?’ he
said to the officer. The reply was: ‘The next time you stop me on my way
going across the street, I will smash you on the jaw, you dirty Italian son-
of-a-bitch.’ The boy's partner then got up and said: ‘Well, why don't you
pay us?’ The officer rushed up against the boy like a cyclone, struck him
right and left with his hand, and left him all bleeding. The result was the
boys were arrested and brought before the magistrate, who dismissed the
case. The boys raised £5 to pay a lawyer, and began an action for assault.
But the case was postponed again and again. The lawyer insisted on more
money; the boys lost their £5, had their beating, and did not even appear to
have recovered their 75 cents.” And this state of things is the direct
consequence of the federal principle of government—government by
lawyers, politicians, and police, without a responsible head.

Senator O'Connor asked witnesses before the commission:—“Is there
any recognition of merit at all in the department as now conducted, apart
from money considerations or political influence?”

The reply was:—“To a very small extent. It is either politics or money.”

Mr. Seth Low said:—“The aim of the Americans for many years
deliberately was to make a city government where no officer by himself
could have power enough to do much harm. The natural result was to
create a situation where no officer had power to do good.”

The Lexow report says:—“The conclusion which has impressed itself upon your committee is that the disorganizing elements at work in the Police Department are such that operate from the higher officials down.”

Thus the absence of a responsible head, which is the essence of federation, at the crown of the social structure produces irresponsibility throughout the state, and instead of peace and happiness descending into the bosoms of families, injustice falls into them. Is not the war of liberation pursued by a people which allows such a state of things in its premier city a sham and a delusion? Is there no Italian consul in New York for Italian subjects to appeal to? Millionaire Hearst's New York Journal announced that it had “always been an energetic ally of the Cuban patriots.” Of course, it is much better for a journalist to promote a sensational war of liberation against a European power than to champion the cause of the poor of its own city. It pays much better. And had this millionaire journalist anything to do with the financial crisis in Madrid? Is a journalist and the Jingo element of America to be allowed to precipitate world-wide war. If His Holiness Pope Leo XIII is really progressive he should use his influence over Spain and America to put an end to this miserable war, which, if it is allowed to continue, is likely to envelop the whole of Europe in flames. The Roman Catholic Church has here a great opportunity of exercising its power in the cause of civilization and progress. If it misses this chance it is demonstrated worthless.

The English world is supposed to sympathize with America, but this, of course, means simply the journalistic and political world, the true English world not being vocal. But, perhaps, it may be necessary to have a world-wide demonstration of the impotence of a Federal government when pitted against even a second-rate monarchy. As Hall Caine wrote of England:—“Oh, miserable delusion, to think that because a nation is rich it is therefore great!” Oh! miserably deluded American people! this war is simply got up by the monied class to divert your attention from your own industrial bondage. And when a great army has been created, the arms of the soldiers will be directed against you, kept to hold you down in financial servitude. The arms of your patriotic government have been used for this purpose before now. I think the great Cuban war of liberation is likely to end in smoke and bimetallism for America. If not, the Pope ought to resign in favour of Mr. Stead, who would soon make things hum throughout the Roman Catholic world. For Mr. Stead at least believes in himself, and as Ibsen wrote:—“The strongest man in the world is he who stands most alone.” “Who will govern the world?” asked the compounded king in
Goethe's tale. “He who stands upon his feet,” replied the old man. “I am he,” said the mixed king. “We shall see,” replied the man, “for the time is at hand.” And when the time did come in the poet's imagination, “The old man stept between the virgin and the youth, and cried with a loud voice: ‘There are three which have rule on Earth—Wisdom, Appearance, and Strength.’ At the first word the gold king rose, at the second the silver one, and at the third the brass king slowly rose, whiled the mixed king on a sudden very awkwardly plumped down. Whoever noticed him could scarcely keep from laughing, solemn as the moment was, for he was not sitting, he was not lying, he was not leaning, but shapelessly sunk together.”

It is hardly necessary to state that the mixed king is the federal one, who, having no soul at all, and being merely the clay idol which the politicians have set up so that they can delude the people, naturally plumped down in an awkward manner the moment that the sleeping conscience of the world awoke.

But let us hope that there are better times coming for the American people, since the Mayor of New York, where the federal principle has been abandoned and “one-man power” established, addresses his fellow-citizens as follows:—

(1) “Should the people repose confidence in me, I will endeavour to act with that largeness of view which considers the rights of every man, regardless of race, creed, or colour.”

(2) “The results here (New York) exhibited furnish one of the most costly object lessons ever taught a community as to the wasteful character of a government permitted to whirl incoherently with the whims of its several officials as contrasted with the economy enforced by the organized vigilance and definite policy of responsible government controlling all the expenditures of its subordinate departments.”

(3) “The flagrant violations of the principles of home rule by the republican majorities in recent legislatures have challenged the attention and excited the indignation of our citizens. The usurpation of the rights of our municipality and its people has become such an intolerable wrong that it cannot be too strongly rebuked.”

(4) “In the Raines Liquor Law we have an example of a class of legislation utterly without public sanction. It was imposed upon our citizens against their vigorous and united protest; it has failed to secure a single one of the advantages urged in justification of its enactment; it employs the spy (inspector?), and necessitates methods which can never be approved by men who believe in democratic government. I favour its prompt repeal.”

(5) “With you, I believe that one of the chief duties of the incoming administration will be to provide adequate school accommodation. It is not with the intention of reproaching anyone for the condition of affairs in this direction in the past, but
simply to emphasize a determination in the future that I express my full indorsement of your demand, that every child desirous of education in our schools shall be afforded full opportunity, whatever labour and expense may thereby be involved.”

(6) “Subject to the limitations of reasonable but not parsimonious expenditure, the municipality should provide all needed facilities for the open-air recreation of the people. Good roads, bicycle paths, improved pavements, open-air playgrounds, small parks, and pier gardens are improvements in this direction. I deem it proper to make a special mention in this relation of the pressing necessity for proper bicycle paths, and to add that, if elected, I shall make it my duty to have them constructed.”

(7) “All lawful combinations which deny to any or all of our citizens a free field of competition must be suppressed.”

(8) “The eight-hour law should be enforced, and, where practicable, resident labour should be directly employed.”

(9) “Let me add, in conclusion, that should the people entrust me with the great responsibility of the mayoralty, I shall make the promotion of their welfare, to the exclusion of all antagonistic ends, the object to be striven for with every power of my mind and body.”

“Yours respectfully,

ROBERT A. VAN WYCK.”

This is a better psalm of the dying party spirit than that uttered by the great Sir Horace, who has recently received the approbation of the imperial authorities. There is hope in it; it is the new Phoenix denouncing the foul nest of federal government—the expression of a strong man determined to do his duty—while Tozer's was that of a man retreating to a good fat sinecure, and expressing his spiteful contempt of the people whose interests he is still supposed to serve. If the imperial politicians are so fond of him, why, let them pay his screw, and seat him among the fossils of the Imperial Institute.

Now, in connection with this matter of war it is worth noting that, by the Commonwealth Bill, the states of Australia are prohibited from raising military or naval forces without the consent of the Commonwealth. This gives a beautiful opening to the politicians to create a standing army to enforce their will upon states desirous of leaving their indissoluble business corporation. Manifestly, in the case of Australia, the only military force required is for defence purposes. To guard our extensive coast line, a small military force would be quite useless, and merely for defence purposes very little training is necessary. The mounted rifle is said to be the arm of Australia. If our most valuable possessions, and the banking reserves, were in the centre of the continent, no enemy would find it worth while to land an infantry force which could be gradually decimated by mounted rifles. Surely the states are patriotic enough to defend their own territory. The Commonwealth Bill's provision ought to be reversed. The
National Government ought not to be allowed to create a military force without the consent of the states. The old world governments, of course, had to have this power, for conquest, not defence, has generally been their aim. In Australia it is not even desirable that the state military forces, if they have each a small nucleus of specially trained men, should be united under one head. They should simply look to their own head as supreme. The business of government, properly understood, is to restrain the naturally pugnacious tendency of uncivilized man, as much as is consistent with national safety. It is advisable, then, to keep the state forces independent of one another. If they unite the barbarous military spirit is more likely to grow.

Tyson thinks the dominant race is likely to be bred in Central Australia. Well, if the present federation scheme becomes a fact, we shall probably have there a rich and leisured aristocracy with a military force at its command, and along the coast line a people enfeebled by the moister climate, toiling and slaving for the dominant race of politicians, who, whenever their supremacy is questioned, will descend upon the rebels with an armed force, thoroughly trained in warfare, against which, as the states are forbidden to have a trained force, they will be powerless. Few Australians realize what war means, how utterly hostile the military spirit is to true civilization, and how dangerous it is to encourage it in the least; as a military machine, once started, grows of itself.

A glimpse at the armed camp of Europe through the eyes of Jules Simon will help us to realize the hatefulfulness of the military spirit, and its disastrous consequences. Jules Simon wrote on Disarmament in 1894, and things have got worse since then:—“We are safe in saying that there is no people in Europe which does not desire peace, yet we find there nothing but war. Let us look at France; but what I say of France is equally true of Russia, of the nations that constitute the Triple Alliance, and of the great powers like England, which are the arbitrators of the nations. It is even true of the smaller countries, neutralized by treaty. For if they keep their neutrality, it will be the neutrality of the bed of a torrent; and if they attempt to protect themselves they will be swept along, crushed, and broken in the orbit of some of the great powers. All these countries, which tremble at the very name of war, are preparing for war with feverish desperation. France sends all her children to serve three years with the colours. She makes a few partial exceptions in favour of the liberal professions; but the total of these is quite insignificant. Even those who are destined for the priesthood learn the soldier’s trade, which they are never to practise. This active army, composed of the whole youth of France, recalls,
and exceeds, in time of peace, the heaviest conscriptions of the empire. France gives the whole of her spring-time. For three years her youth is lost to marriage, to study, to agriculture, to industry. All apprenticeship has to be taken at twice. When they retire from active service the men still belong to the army. There is still the armée territoriale, still the reserve; they are soldiers up to the age of twenty-five. One would have thought it was a question of starting at sunrise to-morrow for the conquest of the world. This active service, from which no citizen is exempt, is no mere interruption. A man does not come out of it the same as he went in. The artist's hand is grown clumsy, the morals of the young priest are impaired. The unproductive professions, which men enter as children and remain in by habit, are abandoned by these old soldiers who have had the opportunity of comparing and judging. They refuse to go back to labour on the land. They enter the regiment as country folk, they leave it townspeople. The villages are depopulated. Hands are wanting for the plough. Agriculture is threatened by a rise of wages, which will have to be balanced by a rise in prices. And what does a rise of prices mean but a money warfare almost as disastrous to the country as a foreign war? This seizure of the entire manhood of the nation from twenty-one to twenty-three years of age, together with the annual muster, and that simulacrum of war, which manoeuvres masses of a hundred thousand men, are no less dangerous to public health than injurious to art, industry, and agriculture. The germs of all diseases may be found in the caserns, and the men disperse to convey them all over the country, into every village and every workshop. Many of these young soldiers have not stopped growing. They are at the very age for typhoid fever. But the point at which the evil shows itself in its full force is in the budget. Let us suppose that for the increase of the effective, for barracks, fortresses, maintenance in clothing and provisions, and for the accumulation of cannon, guns, arms of all sorts, powder and projectiles, the country pays half its revenue year by year. All this is absolutely unproductive expenditure since all these united and accumulated efforts culminate in the bullet which only serves to kill. It is as if the state divided its income year by year into two equal parts, and flung one of them into the gutter, while the requirements of trade, industry, and agriculture, of art and of the public health, must all be met out of the other, and the police expenditure must be increased to make head against the growing number of assassins. On the other hand, we see day by day how the government is forced to meet the most urgent claims, the plainest exigencies, with a non possumus:—‘I would, but I cannot. There is no wherewithal. Half my income goes in war expenditure. I cannot make the rest suffice for the
services of peace.’ We shall some day see the result of this admirable method in the conflict with America, who alone is exempt from this sort of suicide (alas, not now!) and spends all her forces in the service of her own interests. She alone goes on multiplying her productive industries, while the European nations are rushing headlong into bankruptcy. But France can hold out for a long time yet. As for Italy, it is all over with her. She is past praying for. The Triple Alliance, as a first instalment, has ruined her. What is she to do? What are the other countries going to do which are threatened with the same fate in the long run? (Easily answered, Simon! They are going to “exploit” the East.) It is worse than folly to go on with a system which imposes all the evils of war except war itself. It must come to an end. And it can only be put an end to by war or by peace—a real war or a real peace—a war of extermination or disarmament. Consider how you would like the experiment of a universal war. It is an experiment that has never been made since the world began. The battles of Alexander, of Caesar, of Napoleon, were but skirmishes. Twenty years after the wars of the Republic and the Empire it was a difficult matter to recruit the army. Twenty years after the general war it will be impossible. The war will have killed off all the armies in the field, and over the four millions of their carcases it will have flung the four millions of the reserves and the territorial armies. All the machinery everywhere will be destroyed, or what remains of it will have no hands to work it. There will be no more brawny arms tearing open the bosom of the earth. The arts and the sciences will be deserted no less than the industries. Humanity will be put back six centuries in a single day. Europe will be given over to the wolves and the Huns. The victors of that day will be as miserable in their triumph as the conquered in their defeat. They will be like two hostile fleets which have all day long been trying to destroy one another, and which at nightfall find themselves caught and enveloped in a common tempest. The sea opens to engulf them, and they go down together, ground and crushed and indistinguishable, into the abyss. But disarmament? It means the renunciation of twenty years toils and sacrifices. It is risking all our conquests. It is sinking to the level of those whom we have distanced by superhuman efforts. It is to invite the war which these gigantic armaments have been holding at arm’s length. It is equivocal, moreover—both the word and the thing. Who is to decide the details of the disarmament? Who is to superintend its carrying out? Who is to judge, who is to punish in case of infractions? It is but a dream of the philosopher, the theo-philanthropist. It is all very well for a homily; it is not practical politics. The wise declare that everything is for the worst. I hold, on the contrary, that all is for the
best; that some good may spring from the most apparently unworkable combinations; that the nations may be overwhelmed by a common lassitude, and may find themselves constrained by an invincible force to lighten themselves of their armour, little by little. I observe that the most eminent thinkers of the several nations are uniting their efforts to overcome prejudice and persuade to concord. One suggestion has lately been brought forward which would have the double advantage of cutting short the diplomatic difficulties and of leaving existing differences just where they are, while suppressing the extravagance of excessive armaments. The suggestion is that an international convention should decide on the reduction of the term of service from three years to one. It is here that one might introduce Fourier, or the Marquis de St. Simon, or Owen, to point out how much might be done with a sum of five or six hundred millions suddenly recovered. These millions, cast into the treasury of peace, would prolong and beautify human life. All the arts—which have made marvellous progress during these last years—are only awaiting the signal to scatter their benefits among the people. But the soldiers raise an objection. They say that a man's education cannot be got through in a single year. We are nearing the end of the century. I have proposed to all the nations to conclude a truce, which I would call the truce of God, to last till after the Exhibition, with which the twentieth century is to open. I cling to all the forms of peace, in the hope that, after she has once tasted of it, the earth may long to satiate herself with it to the end. Let the sovereigns, among whom I reckon our own deputies, since they have the making of peace or war—let the sovereigns look to it! Every day that passes increases the risk of war, and adds to their responsibility.” Yes! the sovereigns had better look to it, or they and their chairs are likely to ascend to heaven on the wings of dynamite. But what a pitiful state of enchanted obstruction is disclosed by Jules Simon and his remedy! Another convention of politicians. And suppose the war expenditure to cease. Would the people be much better off? There would be a few more millionaires, that is all, and a bigger host of social outcasts. Of course, the distribution of wealth is at the bottom of the whole matter. Things which ought not to be for sale and purchase, such as land and money, are bought and sold, and the profit accruing to them is appropriated by individuals, so armies have to be brought into existence to protect unjust privileges. As injustice increases, armies and police forces increase to maintain it, and government by force grows till bankruptcy and ruin stare nations in the face. And then, inconceivable as it may appear to us, many of these poor European barbarians actually delight in the pastime of potting each other at long
ranges in cold blood, and so vitiated is the morality of Europe that even sovereigns—yea, even queens—applaud and encourage when there has been a more than usually successful battue of human game.

“What,” wrote Carlyle, in his “Sartor Resartus,” “speaking in quite unofficial language, is the net purport and upshot of war? To my own knowledge, for example, there dwell and toil, in the village of Dumdrudge, usually some five hundred souls. From these, by certain ‘natural enemies’ of the French, there are successively selected, during the French war, say thirty able-bodied men. Dumdrudge, at her own expense, has suckled and nursed them; she has, not without difficulty and sorrow, fed them up to manhood, and even trained them to crafts. Nevertheless, amid much weeping and swearing, they are selected; all dressed in red, and shipped away at the public charges, say to the south of Spain, and fed there till wanted. And now to that same spot are thirty similar French artisans, from a French Dumdrudge, in like manner wending, till at length, after infinite effort, the two parties come into actual juxtaposition; and Thirty stands fronting Thirty, each with a gun in his hand. Straightway the word ‘Fire!’ is given, and they blow the souls out of one another; and in place of sixty brisk, useful craftsmen, the world has sixty dead carcasses, which it must bury, and anew shed tears for. Had these men any quarrel? Busy as the Devil is, not the smallest! They lived far enough apart; were the entirest strangers; nay, in so wide a universe, there was even, unconsciously, by commerce, some mutual helpfulness between them. How then? Simpleton! their governors had fallen out; and, instead of shooting one another, had the cunning to make these poor blockheads shoot. Alas, so is it in Deutschland, and hitherto in all other lands; still as of old, ‘what devilry soever kings do, the Greeks must pay the piper!’”

Of course the governors know very well what they are about; they either make a profit out of this shooting business, and call this the extension of commerce and civilization, or they save themselves from loss when the “poor blockheads” breed too fast, and demand food in an inconvenient way; then a war of extermination is set afoot and called a crusade, or a war for the liberation of oppressed nationalities.

And though we in Australia don't shoot one another, we are just as foolish; we cut our throats by commercial competition with one another, the result being that our masters, the monied kings, reap all the profit of our industry, while they sit and smile at our folly in the spiders' den of Lombard-street. The sole title of these monied kings to their enormous profit is their superior cunning—I cannot call it intelligence—which enables them to persuade the “blockheads,” with the help of government
statisticians, that their claim is a just one. But their very intelligence is a social gift; their wealth is the result of the intellectual labours of dead men of inventive genius. And their claim to receive the unearned social increment holds good only so long as no one can be found to receive wealth and distribute it better.

If the nations of Europe united—formed a common centre of intelligence, “a concrete representative of the sovereign power”—of course the financial problem could be dealt with, but this would not suit the monied kings at all, for such a sovereign power would be superior to and control them in the general interest of Europe, so they do what they can to prevent union, and strive to keep up that balance of power, that “equilibrium of the usurer,” which really means the sovereignty of money.

Federation is really an impossibility; some power is always supreme. Political federation is possible, but this only means that the high political human ideal is subordinated to the low ideal of the millionaire. The monied power, however, in becoming cosmopolitan, has made a cosmopolitan union against it possible, and this is at the bottom of the vast growth of political machinery. The duty of politicians all over the world is to put the monied power under foot and reassert the claims of humanity. Lecky talks of the parrots ruling the eagles as if it were an absurdity. But mental power always does in the long run rule physical force, and the rule of money is simply an intellectual psychological fact which the growth of intelligence, the advent of insight, can at any moment profoundly modify.

The monied power as it develops specializes itself, grows more and more unreal, and loses more and more the real control of industry. Thus, in Pearson's Magazine, March, 1898, J. H. Schooling, writing on the world's wealth, says:—“For convenience, and as a neat way of handling the wealth of the world, perhaps (illustration) No. 11 could not be easily beaten. It is a small cubical box, which measures inside only 211/4 inches each way, and yet this box is big enough to hold the world's wealth if it be turned into bank notes, each one worth a million sterling. This bundle of notes would weigh nearly 160 lbs. avoirdupois—i.e., about 111/2 st.; so that if the Bank of England were to convert the world's wealth into million-pound notes, and then pack them in this little box, you could drive up in a hansom and take away the wealth of the world in your cab.” The writer seems to imagine that he would really have the world's wealth in the hansom cab. If society liked to decide that those bank notes were mere paper—and as it gives them their value it has a perfect right to do so if the claims of humanity made it necessary—the man in the hansom, who we will suppose robbed the bank of them, would look rather foolish. And the claims of
Lombard-street to the wealth its titles represent are little more rational than that of this supposed robber, the difference being that the Lombard-street robbery is legal. But as man, and not nature, makes social law, the law can be altered at any moment.

And if Lombard-street demands gold in exchange for its titles, then Dr. Emmens, who I before referred to in connection with the law of gravitation, can make gold out of silver, which the United States Assay Office buys as gold. Here are Dr. Emmens's charges, as given in *Pearson's Magazine*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price of one ounce of silver ...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee to Dr. Emmens ...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of gold obtained ...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit to yourself ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would pay Australia to engage the services of Dr. Emmens to pay Lombard-street off, and give the ring the sack.

I think Dr. Emmens may claim to have settled the bimetallic problem in a practical way. We ought to hear no more of bimetallism after this. But, of course, the problem of credit and debt remains just as before; no mere man of science can solve this question.

The writer referred to, Schooling, talks of “our (England's) contribution to the wealth of the world.” He gives, taking Mulhall's statistics, the world's wealth as 70,385 millions, of which England owns 11,806 millions. Mulhall puts the population of the United Kingdom at 39,400,000 and the population of all countries at 453,700,000. Turkey, China, Persia, Japan, &c., &c., do not seem to be included in these statistics, or even the population of England's Asian possessions, which undoubtedly contribute to England's wealth. The population of the Asian Pacific is put by some at 520,000,000, and the total wealth of the world at £97,500,000,000. Of the nations of Christendom, Great Britain thus owns about one-sixth of the wealth, while her population is about one-eleventh. Her earnings per annum Mulhall put at 1,423 millions in 1895, and the average earnings have risen 50 per cent since 1836. But has labour benefited by those earnings? We have seen that 80 per cent. of the total wealth is held by 11/2 per cent. of the adult population, while Giffen says that during 1871–73 new foreign investments were made at the rate of about £60,000,000 annually, and the interest on foreign investments probably amounts to
£90,000,000. Giffen, writing in 1877, put England's annual savings at £200,000,000 for the previous ten years. It seems clear that the welfare of the English people as a whole has been sacrificed in order to give the colonies a good start in the race, and that without the concentration of the claims to wealth in a few hands the use of surplus income for the plantation and nourishment of colonies would have been impossible. The result is that the colonies are in debt. But the colonies having sufficient capital now, the justification which their necessities gave for the concentration of wealth in England has gone. It is plain that if England gave up commerce altogether the rich few could still live at ease without attempting any productive work upon their investments, and England become a series of private parks. If England's commerce is declining, and if the colonies decline to borrow further, and insist, as they have a perfect right to do, on paying off their debts and reclaiming their lands, &c., England, instead of being independent and superior, must become dependent and inferior, while if the stream of profit is still allowed to run to London the colonies are depleted to maintain an idle rich class.

But the people of England who have in times past by their toil made this class possible have a claim to the profit made by this class. And they know it, so that an idle rich class is not likely to be allowed to live in England, unless it finds the means to deport the farmers, &c., who cannot make a living in England, to the colonies where they can work successfully. But as there is no longer a necessity for planting and nourishing colonies, there is no justification for the concentration of wealth in a few hands, and a new start ought to be made in Australia on equitable principles, so that all classes of the population advance in civilization together. And this is possible only by the national adoption of the wages system, and the national control and distribution of profit. Under this system individual merit still reaps a pecuniary reward; social advance and reward are made identical, but a limit is put to the concentration of wealth and to the pecuniary reward, and when this limit is reached the reward must be social honour and esteem. Social position thus assured, there would be no temptation to miserly saving, and everyone would live up to his income. As the people grew more civilized they would value mere wealth less; thus they would raise no objection to using the national surplus for the purpose of raising the social condition of other nations. As to England, she evidently wants good old John Bull at the helm again, John Bull as he was before commerce corrupted him—a country gentleman, a lover of sport, the friend of the farmer, ill at ease in the town, bluff and honest, a good judge of cattle and sheep, and fond of a good run to hounds.
Lord Rosebery? No, he won't do. Norman Hapgood wrote of him in 1897:—“What is wanting is a lack of unity, of strong single feeling, of purpose. His perceptions, like his efforts, are unsustained and unrelated, lacking in concentration, and therefore in force. There is honesty, frankness, generosity; there are convictions, but there is no single unifying conviction or conception, no faith, or passion, or need of accomplishment.”

And, if the Saturday Review is right—and can anyone doubt its inspiration?—Lord Rosebery has lost faith in himself. He is, as Hapgood witnesses, a federation, and like all federations fails at the critical moment.

This is how the Saturday Review reveals the inmost thoughts of men:—

“Lord Rosebery's Soliloquy.”—“No, I had a worse foe than Harcourt; a thousand Harcourts would never have frightened me. Like Randolph Churchill, I went to the edge of the world and looked over, and was frozen with fear of what I saw. Oh, yes; I'll admit that I was frightened to death. The only hope was to forget and live again the life of ordinary men. Randolph went on working too long and staggered from horror to horror, till death itself was a deliverance. I pulled up in time—I hope, in time. At any rate I can sleep now. That ghastly evening at the club. How shall I forget it. All of a sudden in the middle of my speech memory left me, and I stood dumb and dumbfounded. I didn't know who I was, or where I was, or what I was doing. As I realized the weakness of man's intellect, the imperceptible line that divides sanity from madness, the cold perspiration of utter fear broke from me, and I shook with cold as in a palsy, and all the while I saw the looks of wonder and the foul whisperings of man to man, and the grins of vulgar comprehension! The horror of it: the martyrdom! At last the spell broke and divine memory came back, and all was right. But I shall never forget the horror and the shock! I had seen the Arch-Fear, and my heart will never again beat freely as it used to do—never. It was clear enough to me, then, that my work was done, and if the fools that judge me knew the courage it took to go on for months, without making a sign, they would admit that at all events I was not a coward. But after all what does it matter?”

Now, what was it that Lord Rosebery saw? Was it the sun of England's glory setting, and the shade of Cobden gesturing doom? Did the dream of Atheism, with which Jean Paul Richter used to frighten himself back into a belief in an inhuman supramundane God, appear to him as a horrible reality? “I went through the worlds, I mounted into the suns, and flew with the galaxies through the wastes of Heaven; but there is no God? I descended as far as Being casts its shadow, and looked down into the Abyss and cried, Father, where art thou? But I heard only the everlasting
storm which no one guides, and the gleaming Rainbow of Creation hung, without a Sun that made it, over the abyss, and trickled down. And when I looked up to the immeasurable world for the Divine Eye, it glared on me with an empty, black, bottomless Eye-socket, and Eternity lay upon Chaos, eating it and ruminating it. Cry on, ye Dissonances; cry away the Shadows, for He is not!” Or did he, like the hero in Calderon's drama, who, thwarted throughout life by a masked enemy, at last discovered this evil spirit to be but the Brocken-spectre of himself? Or was it that the veil which hides the image in the temple at Sais was drawn aside and he beheld the statue of the great Egyptian Queen, with this inscription written on the pedestal:—

“Woe, woe to him who treads through Wealth to Power?” Or was it that he saw a vision of the Nonconformist conscience ruling the destinies of nations with a rod of iron, denouncing “Sport” of any kind?

No, it was none of these things! What Lord Rosebery saw was this—the “masterpiece and darling” of his stable beaten by a clear length in the race for the Australian National Cup of the future, and the Australian Punch, the Laughing Jackass, with its fierce eye and sharp beak, twitting its English progenitor, who seemed a little out of humour. But Lord Rosebery did not die, like Calderon's hero, and, as Dr. Magee says in his “Gospel and the Age,” “the humanity that is to rule all things must first prove itself incapable of being ruled by any.” If Australia is to be the nation of the future, she must prove her superiority on the turf, and I feel confident that no federal horse will ever put Lord Rosebery's stable down. The Commonwealth Bill, too, takes no thought for the future in the matter of the amusement of the people, and the purification of sport, so that gentlemen can take their place upon the turf without being millionaires. Yet surely this is a matter which claims the attention of government when “specialized” as a Progress Association. To my mind this alone damns the bill.

Then there is the matter of education. As everyone admits, the higher education of character is fundamental for the welfare of society. Our central state ought to realize the beautiful ideal of an educational province in Goethe's “Wilhelm Meister's Wanderjahre.” A great educational centre is a world-wide want, especially a centre for the teaching of art. Since common-sense is likely to dispense with “the little systems which have had their day,” there should be time for the study and production of the beautiful. Education has manifestly failed in England since ultra-rational Kidd says, in his “Social Evolution,” that the educated classes have in almost all the great political changes “taken the side of the party afterwards admitted to have been in the wrong.” And Mr. Kidd's ideal of character is
not a low one, since he says:—“A preponderating element in the type of character which the evolutionary forces at work in human society are slowly developing would appear to be the sense of” (humour? No!) “reverence. The qualities with which it is tending to be closely allied are great mental energy, resolution, enterprise, powers of prolonged and concentrated application, and a sense of simple-minded and single-minded devotion to conceptions of duty.” Is Benjamin kidding the House of Commons, since reverence for character is there, as we have seen, reduced to zero? Where is this new kind of being illustrating Spencer's formula of evolution? Is it in the civil service, rife with socialism? Does Mr. Kidd agree with Goethe's Wagner—

“As nonsense we declare
The ancient procreative mode,
This from its dignity is now dethron'd!
The brute indeed may take delight therein.”

Has Mr. Kidd accomplished the passage “out through the doorway of matter” into fourth dimensional space. If so, he has beaten Mr. Stead, who is only “on the eve of the fourth dimension.” As Karl Pearson says:—“The necessary mathematical equipment for genuine research in the field of higher-dimensioned space will at any rate act as a safeguard against over light-hearted expeditions beyond the sensible.” I suppose this new kind of man must be a-making at the universities. Yet I doubt it! That great authority, the Saturday Review, had an article on “The Making of Men at Cambridge,” a criticism of Benson's “Babe, B.A.,” from which I glean the following:—“Education, using the word in its modern sense, is the first business of a civilized community; nothing else matters very much if the making of able, intelligent, and broad-minded men goes on. And Cambridge is one of the two great establishments where the wealthier classes of England are educated; upon its circle of ideas and suggestions depends very much of the direct legislation, and, what is far more important, the informal control of our land and industries in the times of trouble that lie before us. Nothing can alter that; however inefficient Cambridge and Oxford may be in their man-making, nothing can deprive them of their fundamental influence upon the mental development of the powerful classes for many years to come. The only possible countervailing force of any importance is literature. . . . The remarkable thing is the utter absence of any real grip by the authorities upon the undergraduates. Discipline, apart from the ‘Proggins’ and a shabby system of petty fines,
there is none. The Babe's attitude towards his teachers and governors—and he is by no means a very vicious youngster—is simply light-hearted contempt. The strongest influence is Stewart, an undignified person who talks like the 'Green Carnation' and makes a boon companion of these youngsters. He is an atrocious tuft-hunter, and talks fouly on Saturday nights. Besides him we are introduced to Mr. Langridge, 'in body insignificant and in mind incoherent;' to Mr. Jones, of mean appearance and uncertain temper, who is better at croquet, and mutters 'Impudent young ass' at the Babe; to Swotchem, the history coach, the 'dustiest, fustiest thing' in his 'dusty, fusty rooms,' with bleary eyes and 'a quick, nervous manner;' and that crammer, who circulated among his pupils a half-sheet of paper, not very clearly printed, containing all the procedure of the Athenian law, and which, if learnt by heart quite unintelligently, as he recommended, would ensure full marks on any question that might be set on the subject. When one of his pupils returned from the examination 'he literally danced for joy when he saw that three questions out of nine could be answered from his repulsive little half-sheet.' The modern don seems rarely cleanly, and always wanting in self-respect. Swotchem was a member of an occult club, called the Apostles, the members of which met in a shamefaced manner. 'They were radical Agnostics. They affected red ties, to show they disapproved of everything.' And, again, the dons 'are bounded by narrow horizons, and the only glimpse they catch of the great world (of sex?—ED.) is their bedmaker, as she carries out their slop-pail from their bedrooms.' They play 'whist at threepenny points, which they seem to find strangely exhilarating.' They talk seriously of Psychical Research, and read Max Nordau's 'Degeneration' with equal seriousness. It is a dismal picture. Are there no men at all, one wonders, but only coarse snobs and shy cramners, afraid of their pupils, physically and socially, for the nearest approach to energy? Such are the men-makers at Cambridge, as Mr. Benson saw them, and so they make men by an elaborate regimen of snobbery, idleness, and timidity; and these youngsters go on—the richer ones to administer great businesses, wide lands, and to influence, some of them, thousands of lives, while the poorer ones drift into the middle-class schools and the Church, and disseminate the tradition, the students' tradition, chiefly of manners, the point of honour, and slang, which seems the only really educational influence at work there."

Cambridge seems to be a good place for the making of prigs. If men emerge from such a school it must be in spite of Cambridge man-making.

A glimpse at Oxford will be enough, from the pen of one who has recently gone through the mill:—"I have been over three years in a cynical,
rather decadent, nil admirari, soft aesthetic atmosphere, where one reads and talks much in order to avoid thinking deeply.” This candid confession is certainly a sign of grace in the writer, but it hardly says much for Oxford as a “man-maker.”

Now, curiously enough, I find the old enemy, federalism, want of unity, in Oxford. Thus, A. M. Fairbairn writes on “Oxford and Jowett”:— “Oxford has, to the outside imagination, a remarkable unity of character” (cf. the Cabinet), “but to inside experience a remarkable variety of temper and tendencies. . . . The difference between a university and a learned society lies in this—that the one cultivates knowledge that it may discipline men, the other prosecutes discovery that it may enlarge science. The society seeks knowledge for its own sake, but the university seeks it for the purpose of evolving the humanity latent in man. Each may equally pursue learning and encourage research, but it must always be with this fundamental difference of end.” This reminds one of the twofold character of federation. There is really no rational ground for the distinction between “knowledge for its own sake” and knowledge as a means of evolving character. The final end of nature is the formation of character, as Emerson said. To make knowledge an end in itself is simply a metaphysical error. Oxford in this exhibits that compromise between religion and reason, the supernatural and natural, which England everywhere exhibits—i.e., the English character wants the Australian sun to fuse it into unity. And we find the worthy doctor preaching the same old European doctrine of balance, equilibrium, which is a religious, not a rational truth:—“The ideal academic state, then, would be one where the forces represented by the university and the college existed in a condition of equilibrium and constant interaction. And Oxford, in its twofold character of a university and a city of colleges, stood in an unrivalled position for realizing the ideal academic state. But in order to this it was necessary that neither character should devour or enervate the other. Of course, it might be possible, were the two functions separable, to argue that it is better to form character than to cultivate knowledge.”

I am afraid the doctor’s “ideal academic state” is, like Goethe’s, still in the clouds. The pursuit of “knowledge for its own sake” has evidently subordinated the true end of education, the “making of men,” at Oxford and Cambridge, as witness the Saturday Review, with mournful results.

And the same may be said of political federation. It subordinates the national life to state life, the whole to the parts, the humanization of the state to government as an end in itself. How little the university did for great men the doctor admits:—“Of the Oxford men of the eighteenth
Of course it is much easier to go on in the old groove, but, really, neither university life nor political life are ends themselves, they are simply a training men have to go through, and which it is to be hoped may be steps of evolution capable of great abridgment in the case of Australia.

“Jowett's residence began at a time when it was becoming obvious that reform must lay its compelling hand on Oxford. One of her own most eminent sons had subjected the studies of the English universities to a most merciless criticism. The colleges had practically eaten up the university, and it was no easy matter to find how they could be got to disgorge, or how the disjecta membra could be built into a homogeneous structure.”

This is exactly like the political problem in Australia, where the states have to disgorge before there can be a nation. But Jowett “had more faith in the college than belief in the university,” just as our politicians have more faith in the state than in the nation. And Jowett had reason. “What probably weighed with him still more was the practical difficulty of shaping the policy of a university whose ultimate authority was a convocation composed of members who could be summoned from the uttermost parts of the kingdom, and who in many cases were not qualified to discuss the question on which they were convened to vote.” Reason governs as little in academic as in parliamentary politics; and in a body which was not educated by experience, or even frequent discussion, but only came together on special occasions to do a special thing, great questions could never be seriously considered, and were more likely to be settled by gusts of passion than by deliberative reason, or by arguments.
more whimsically subtle than morally or intellectually cogent. In such a case unreason is surer to reign than reasonableness. And Jowett had known convocation summoned to do the most high-handed things, and had seen them do it. And so he came to doubt its competence, and to expect no reform in a body over which convocation remained in a sense legislatively supreme. In this he was by no means singular, for even in Stanley’s “Life” we find an ironical account of its proceedings, illustrated by a letter to the Times, with the characteristic signature—“An M.A. who abhors Convocation.”

This reminds one of the old phrase, “Nature abhors a vacuum,” which expresses a truth, for when the creative “plus” leaves the centre a “minus” must remain; hence concentration and the filling up of the vacuum with the old surplus, differentiated and integrated into representative personality as the sovereign.

We see in the university the operation of the poison of parliamentary absoluteness and disloyalty and unreason. Of course, what is wanted is an expert university council, independent of the colleges, though possibly abstracted from them, responsible to the Crown, nominated by the Crown, approved by the colleges. And, instead of convocation, a university newspaper to represent the educational grievances to be dealt with by experts. The university, like Australia, needs the application of the democratic and monarchic principles in conjunction. For the academic class, like the political, tends, when free from the independent control of reason and disconnected with popular opinion, to subordinate everything to its own ends, and to forget the prime object of its existence. “It is remarkable,” writes Dr. Fairbairn, “that the man who was the head of Balliol, a representative Oxford scholar, should yet have had so small intercourse with the scholars either of Great Britain or the Continent, and have been so little concerned in the discussions, the investigations, the discoveries, the controversies that during his long and active life agitated the world of letters.” But Jowett was a student of Plato, and he knew that these controversies were only the revival of errors discussed long ago, without much result, by the Grecian sage; that the personal aberrations must be allowed to equate themselves, that the hour had not yet arrived, or the man, for the “single change” of which Plato wrote.

His attitude was that of Goethe, who, according to his biographer, James Sime, “during his last years took little interest in the public affairs of Europe. Least of all did he interest himself in the proceedings of Liberal politicians. The essential aim of the Liberal party all over Europe in those days was to secure a political system in which the functions of Government
should be restricted within the narrowest possible limits. Every interest of life was to be submitted to the operation of the principle of free competition. Goethe could have no sympathy with a movement of which this was the ultimate object, for it was one of his deepest convictions that strong government is an enduring necessity of society, and that the path of free competition is a path that leads to ruin. And have events proved that his opinion was mistaken? So far as industry and trade are concerned the western world has had ample experience of free competition, and can we take much pride in such of its results as are seen in the foul and pestilent dens in which, in every great city, multitudes of men, women, and children are compelled to lead degraded and unhappy lives?” But it is not competition that is the evil, but competition applied to matters that ought to be either below or above its sphere—competition unlimited, unrestrained, and absolute.

“Goethe did not mean by strong government a system which should crush thought and true individuality. On the contrary, to him thought and true individuality seemed the vital conditions of human progress. But he wished, too, that the weak should be protected against the tyranny of the strong; that the State (i.e., the government—the confusion of the words state and government is the source of numberless errors) should be the supreme organ of practical reason for the establishment and maintenance of wholesome relations between man and man, and for the execution of measures designed to promote the free development, not of this class or of that only, but of the community as a whole.”

And Goethe proved to the world that a poet can be a business man and an able administrator as well as a poet. “He devoted special attention to questions connected with finance, and so wisely did he deal with them, seeking to secure at once economy and efficiency, that he excited the astonishment and admiration of those who had doubted the fitness of a poet for the practical work of life.” And Goethe, too, had his suspicions of science and Newton. The poet always stands for unity. His notion of unity comes from within and is real, not, like Newton's, from without and therefore an unreal abstraction.

He, like Dr. Emmens, was regarded “with fear, anger, and horror by the Gravity-cum-Ether-cum-Contraction worshippers.” The poet, as he stands for the whole, is necessarily dangerous to the partial idols of science. As G. H. Lewes, Goethe's biographer, wrote:— “The undulatory theory fails to account for important phenomena. If the atoms exist at all, it is unthinkable that they should not have certain geometric properties, and these geometric properties entail dynamic properties. They must have movement, size, and
form, and the motions deducible therefrom. But these facts have hitherto been disregarded. . . . let the movement of the atom, the movement of rotation, according to Poinsot's principles, be investigated. In the mechanics of translation the form of a body is indifferent, but in the mechanics of rotation the form is everything."

The "Canon of Restitution" wants applying to a good many things besides the phenomena of light and magnetism. Religion recognizes that men have souls, but it does not recognize that these souls have geometric dynamic properties, an inalienable sphere of movement. Such falsification of facts is likely to have disastrous consequences to both science and religion, which are logical counterparts, both only relatively true, unless they make haste to apply "the loftiest idea yet attained by the human mind," the "transcendental calculus," to terrestrial affairs.

Infinitesimally small quantities, when neglected for centuries, mount up into a giant error. I am afraid the auxiliaries—*i.e.*, soldiers—introduced for the compensation of social errors can never equate the fact of progress, and armies are composed of special human atoms, and he who holds the prime atom, the Joker, developed and integrated, can dissolve even armies, and make them dance to a more perfect rhythm. Here is a little formula better than Spencer's—"In the beginning God made man to love one another," which even men of science may hear, if at the forthcoming Paris Exhibition, they mount one by one to the aërial solitude of the modern Tower of Babel—the Eiffel Tower, I mean. And here is another utterance of the "still, small voice" which they will not hear, since it is the prerogative of one:—"Revolution is the sign of disease." Yet may it be transmitted. Mary Somerville wrote: —"If we raise our views to the whole extent of the universe, and consider the stars, together with the sun, to be wandering bodies revolving about the common centre of creation, we may then recognize in the equatorial plane, passing through the centre of gravity of the universe, the only instance of absolute and eternal repose." Mrs. Somerville wrote before science had become quite agnostic. Faith is an aid when reason is imperfect. "The state of the whole universe," wrote Stuart Mill, "at any instant, we believe to be the consequence of its state at the previous instant, insomuch that one who knew all the agents which exist at the present moment, their collocation in space, and all their properties, the laws of their agency, could predict the whole subsequent history of the universe," yet Mill had not entirely lost the light of the waning moon of Christianity, for he added—"At least, unless some new volition of a power capable of controlling the universe should supervene." And he added in a note:—"To the universality which mankind are agreed in ascribing to the
law of causation, there is one claim of exception, one disputed case, that of the human will.” The “man in the bush” knows what the man of science has forgotten. The scientific belief in “invariable sequence” is the counterpart of the religious idea of “providence,” and both are “pious aspirations” rather than realities, ideals not yet realized, but which have to be realized through the instrumentality of man. The universe itself is a federation, an imperfectly united whole, “which groaneth and travaileth within itself, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God.” If the “test of science is prevision” I think science will shortly be utterly found wanting. Scientists had better study Goethe's “Helena,” in which Lynceus, the scientific warder, found nodding, was saved from death by the immortal Grecian beauty.

“Watching o'er the course of morning
   Eastward, as I mark it run,
Rose there, all the sky adorning
   Strangely in the south, a sun.”

But Helena replies:—

“The ill myself occasioned dare I not chastise.”

And Faust breaks in:

“Filled with amaze, O Queen, I see at once
   The unerring smiter, here the smitten one;
The bow I see, wherefrom hath sped the shaft
   This man that wounded. Shaft doth follow shaft,
And me they smite. Them crosswise I perceive,
   Feathered, and whirring round through court and keep.
What am I now? Thou makest, all at once,
   My trustiest, rebellious; insecure
My very walls; henceforth my hosts, I fear,
   Will serve the conquering, unconquered queen.
What now remaineth, save myself to yield,
   And all I fancied mine, to thy sole sway?
Freely and truly, let me at thy feet,
   Acknowledge thee as Queen, who, coming here,
Hath won forthwith possession and a throne.”

Goethe's susceptibility to female beauty is well known. Heine's ideal is truer and more virile, though lacking in love, and still “jealous.”

“Our God has not died like a poor innocent lamb for mankind; he is no
gushing philanthropist, no declamer.

“Our God is not love, caressing is not his line, but he is a God of thunder, and he is a God of revenge.

“The lightnings of his wrath strike inexorably every sinner, and the sins of the fathers are often visited upon their remote posterity.

“Our God, he is alive, and in his hall of heaven he goes on existing away throughout all the eternities.

“Our God, too, is a God in robust health, no myth pale and thin as sacrificial wafers or as shadows by Cocytus. “Our God is strong. In his hand he upholds sun, moon, and stars; thrones break, nations reel to and fro, when he knits his forehead.

“Our God loves music, the voice of the harp and the song of feasting; but the sound of church bells he hates as he hates the grunting of pigs.”

But the modern “lord of hosts” may well learn from the German God of poetry:—

“Oh! Majesty, with reason never
Will thy omnipotence be crowned!”

And to descend to prose:—“There is nothing so terrible as energetic ignorance.”

The Germans are great on education. But Max Müller, who deserted the Fatherland, for reasons best known to himself, says:—“There is a lack of philosophical receptivity in Germany. Books which in England would sell by thousands, and be reviewed in all the leading journals, sell in Germany by hundreds hardly, and are generally discussed in the correspondence only that passes between the author and his friends.”

There are exceptions. Some philosophical books have made a stir in Germany, even in these days of blood and iron. But there is generally a reason for these exceptional successes. The following specimens of this kind of popular, or rather vulgar, philosophy are taken from Noire's books and elsewhere:—

“An external quality is seeing, an internal one is digestion.”

“Man is what he eats. Homo est quod est.”

“The moral rule for each man is given by his own nature only, and is different, therefore, for each individual.”

“Faithfulness is good so long as it pays; but treason is good also if it fetches a higher price.”

“Fraud is good, theft, robbery, and murder, if they lead to wealth and enjoyment. Life is good so long as it is a riddle; good is suicide also after
the riddle has been guessed. But as every enjoyment culminates in our being deceived and tired, and as the last pleasure vanishes with the last illusion, he only would seem to be truly wise who draws the last conclusion of all science—i.e., who takes prussic acid, and that without delay.”

Now, if this is the sort of thing that sells in Germany, it does not say much for German education; it must be quite unpractical and visionary, like Hegel, who, while the cannon of Jena were roaring under the walls, was so deeply immersed in his “Phänomenologie des Geistes” that he knew nothing until the spirit of the age, in the shape of “bearded and gesticulating French soldiers,” arrested him on his way to the publisher's, informing him that “the interests of men lay elsewhere than in manuscripts.” According to G. H. Lewes the rigour of Hegel's pitiless logic excluded God from the universe. The French god of war, however, taught him a little sense. If Germans believe that seeing is only an external quality and digestion only an internal one, it must be because the professors lack practical vision, and because the German statesmen insist on feeding Britshers at less than cost price. The German people are evidently trying to bring their rulers back to common-sense and free-trade by announcing the other side of the truth, which the wiseacres have forgotten. If the German authorities will insist on feeding Britshers gratis by bounties, &c., someone has got to pay for it, and there is little doubt that it is the German people that pay. No doubt the welfare of the people of the fatherland has been sacrificed to the necessities of military strength, and to a less extent to the German colonies. Individual freedom in Germany has been too much restricted, therefore such sentences as that quoted above, which are a denial of social law, and an extreme assertion of individuality, are popular. Tyranny ever begets anarchy. I am afraid German education and philosophy won't do. German philosophy is but a method, a path of transit to the positive or absolute common-sense. Hegel's principle of the “identity of contradictories,” the reconciliation of egoism and altruism, Satan and God, individual and social interest, is an ideal to be realized, but not in Germany.

I prefer Sentimental Tommy's method. Cathro, in Mr. Barrie's book, said:—“To be candid, I don't think Tommy could study in the big meaning of the word. I daresay I'm wrong, but I have a feeling that whatever knowledge that boy acquires he will dig out of himself. There is something inside him, or so I think at times, that is his master, and rebels against book learning. No, I cannot tell what it is. When we know that we shall know the real Tommy.” Tommy was, of course, digging for the “absolute” in the
only place where it can ever be found, in himself. Tommy knew that external knowledge is useless until the key is formed which unlocks for each person his own special chamber, where the treasures he desires are to be found. “In my Father's house are many mansions;” there is room for all.

Tommy had some difficulty about words; he could not divest himself of the thought that every word ought to have a special meaning. And I must confess to the same failing with regard to the words national and federal, which political theorists are so fond of confusing. The sooner Australians learn to distinguish between these two words, which have totally distinct meanings, the better, for definite action follows definite thought, and Australians will have to be very determined if they wish to win their freedom.

The words profit and interest especially want strict definition. The results of such a definition are likely to be most interesting and profitable to Australia, and, indeed, to the whole world, but it is Australia's first duty to make such a definition in the only way possible, by the action of a national government—a federal is much too impotent to do it.

I alluded above to philosophy. Now, philosophy is really a vastly important matter to society. Philosophy G. H. Lewes defines as an “explanation of the world and of human destiny.” If this be a correct definition, it includes religion and science. A change in men's beliefs is certain to bring about a change in their institutions and in their actions. At the present time men really do not know what to believe; every thoughtful person admits that something ought to be done in the way of social reform, yet no one has a definite policy, and nothing is done. Those whose aims are purely material do pretty well as they please, while those who have higher aims are comparatively powerless. But a definite policy implies a philosophy of life.

Here again England fails. England has no philosophy, no consistent scheme of thought, necessary to consistent action. Herbert Spencer has made an attempt at a positive, a scientific creed. As B. Kidd says:—“One of the monumental works of our time is the ‘Synthetic Philosophy’ of Herbert Spencer, begun early in the second half of the century and not yet completed. It is a stupendous attempt, not only at the unification of knowledge, but at the explanation in terms of evolutionary science of the development which human society is undergoing, and towards the elucidation of which development it is rightly recognized that all the work of science in lower fields should be preliminary. Yet so little practical light has the author apparently succeeded in throwing on the nature of the social problems of our time, that his investigations and conclusions are, according
as they are dealt with by one side or the other, held to lead up to the opinions of the two diametrically opposite camps of individualists and socialists into which society is slowly becoming organized.” Huxley, as Kidd says, “devoted himself to reducing the aims of the two conflicting parties of the day—the individualists and socialists—to absurdity and impossibility.”
Huxley invented the term “agnostic.” The principle of agnosticism he defines positively. “Follow your reason as far as it will take you, without regard to any other consideration. And negatively, in matters of the intellect, do not pretend that conclusions are certain which are not demonstrated or demonstrable.” This is the method of agnosticism. Unfortunately for the method, no one has defined reason, and, except in mathematics, it is hard to demonstrate anything. The method won't work in practical life. Huxley apparently thought that reason was something outside of self which had to be followed. And then, whose reason is it that has to be followed? Most men are irrational. Evidently we come back again to “character,” the most highly developed reason, as the test of truth.

Descartes said, “Cogito, ergo sum”—“I think, therefore I am. And this is generally the way with philosophy—it puts thought before being. Reason is only a special kind of consciousness, the function of a special organ, and dependent upon the whole bodily organization, itself the result of ages of development. Herbert Spencer, the high priest of agnosticism, goes a good deal further than Descartes. He says—“I think, therefore I am not,” as witness this passage from “First Principles”:—“The existence of each individual, as known to himself, has been always held by mankind at large the most incontrovertible of truths. To say, ‘I am sure of it as I am sure that I exist’ is in common speech the most emphatic expression of certainty. Belief in the reality of self is, indeed, a belief which no hypothesis enables us to escape. But now, unavoidable as is this belief, established though it is, not only by the assent of mankind at large, endorsed by divers philosophers, and by the suicide of the sceptical argument, it is yet a belief admitting of no justification by reason. Nay, indeed, it is a belief which reason, when pressed for a distinct answer, rejects.”

The common-sense man would say to this that the reality of self is not a belief at all, but direct and absolute knowledge, and that it requires no reasoning whatever to be sure of it. every act of reason, every sensation even, implies real, absolute knowledge of some kind. Of course, once the assumption is granted that the reality of self is merely a belief, no logical legerdemain can prove self real. Having made this vicious assumption Spencer arrives at the absurd conclusion “that the personality of which each is conscious, and of which the existence is to each a fact beyond all others the most certain, is yet a thing which cannot be truly known at all; knowledge of it is forbidden by the very nature of thought.”
Thus, according to “our great philosopher,” a man may be directly conscious and absolutely certain of a thing and yet not know it. “To speak more rigorously —this consciousness is not the abstract of any one group of thoughts, ideas, or conceptions. That which is common to them all, and cannot be got rid of, is what we predicate by the word existence. Such consciousness is not and cannot be constituted by any single mental act, but is the product of many mental acts.” The old Greek said, “Know thyself,” but the modern agnostic says this is impossible: you can only infer your own existence by abstracting yourself from yourself, and it takes many such difficult operations before you can even acquire a belief in your own existence.

If such are the foundations of the great agnostic philosophy, what must the superstructure be? Spencer is not even consistent in applying his own methods. His method is:—“To compare all opinions of the same genus; to set aside as more or less discrediting one another those various special and concrete elements in which such opinions disagree; to observe what remains after the discordant elements have been eliminated; and to find for this remaining constituent that abstract expression which holds true throughout its divergent modifications.” But when he treats of religion, and finds the idea of propitiation or sacrifice common to all religions, instead of retaining, he rejects it. So of the common religious assumption of self-existence, he says:—“It is vicious, unthinkable.” Of course the man of religion would reply:—“Your assumption that thought is the ultimate test, that nothing is real except that which thought can grasp, is equally vicious.”

Here is an instance of Spencer's scientific one-sidedness. He says:—“Religion and science are necessary correlatives, which cannot exist asunder; neither can become more distinct without giving greater distinctness to the other.” Yet while he says of science:—“We have a veritable revelation in science—a continuous disclosure, through the intelligence with which we are endowed, of the established order of the universe,” he says of religion:—“We shall always be under the necessity of contemplating the ultimate existence as some mode of being; that is, of representing it to ourselves in some form of thought, however vague. And we shall not err in doing this so long as we treat every notion we thus frame as merely a symbol, utterly without resemblance to that for which it stands.” Thus while the products of reason, as seen in science, are “veritable revelations,” the products of faith, as seen in the historic religions, are mere delusions, “utterly without resemblance to reality,” and this though science and religion are necessary correlatives, “neither of
which can become more distinct without giving greater distinctness to the other.”

In truth, science and religion both assume the ultimate reality, the cause of things, to be unknown and unknowable, and find their measure, their unifying principle, in an external something; a supernatural transcendental force in the case of science, and a supernatural, supra-mundane God in the case of religion. Philosophy, however, maintains that man himself, as the word indicates (Sanskrit Mâ, to measure), is the measure by reference to which things can be arranged in their true relations. As all knowledge whatsoever is built upon human experience, it is mere common-sense to say, with Comte, that the only possible synthesis of things for man is a human synthesis. Science, religion, and philosophy merely express different aspects of the one human experience, and are the work of the separate faculties—sense, faith, and reason. And when these faculties work harmoniously in the same being we have the poet. Poetry is the highest expression of the truth; truth being simply the harmony of the deliverances of all faculties. And to-day the deliverances of science, religion, and philosophy tend to one result—that is, to restore to man faith in himself as the highest outcome and result of the workings of the universe.

Spencer's unifying principle is the “persistence of force.” “This,” he says, “being the basis of experience, must be the basis of any scientific organization of experiences. To this an ultimate analysis brings us down, and on this a rational synthesis must build up.” But, of course, it is impossible to explain chemical, vital, or psychical phenomena in mere terms of force, and this Spencer himself admits in his “Psychology”:—“The development of mind itself cannot be explained by a series of deductions from the persistence of force.”

Philosophy, he says, is “completely unified knowledge.” But it is impossible to unify in terms of force. As a matter of fact, analysis brings us down to will, not force. Spencer writes:—“An entire history of anything must include its appearance out of the imperceptible and its disappearance into the imperceptible. Be it a single object or a whole universe, any account which begins with it in a concrete form, or leaves off with it in a concrete form, is incomplete, since there remains an era of its knowable existence undescribed and unexplained.” If this is correct, philosophy is impossible until the universe has ceased to be, and then the philosopher himself would have disappeared. And Spencer's philosophy begins, not with a single force, but with an innumerable number of separate atoms and forces, which, he admits, need accounting for: “Diffused matter as much needs accounting for as concrete matter.” Obviously the only way to
account for diffused matter is to suppose that it originated from one point, one parent atom. And this is an hypothesis mathematical science can test, prove, and disprove. If matter expanded from a single point after the manner of a water-wave, which created, instead of moved, the particles, there must result an immense number of atoms having different individual motions.

Spencer's law of evolution, as it deals simply with matter and force, is manifestly inadequate. It is purely mechanical, objective, and contains no recognition of a creative, progressive power or will, which is really the supreme fact of the universe, and without supposing which phenomena are totally inexplicable. I think it must be evident that Spencer's organization of facts has no claim to the name philosophy, and that much has to be added to it before it can become the basis of the reorganization of practical life. Spencer believes in a possible unification, but fails to conceive it or make it real. Nevertheless, he has undoubtedly done much to simplify knowledge, and make a final conception possible for those who come after him; and no competent person can doubt that his is one of the most powerful intellects the world has ever seen, or hesitate for a moment to pay a tribute of respect to a life consistently devoted to a great purpose. England in philosophy, as in other things, attempts to take the rational human standpoint, but fails to do it completely, arriving only at an imperfect temporary compromise.

The conditions of life too, in England, seem to be bringing about a physical deterioration. A recent writer in the *Idler* quotes Frederic Harrison, who, he says, “has described our industrial civilization as it really is, and I will give his terribly truthful words:—‘Our present type of society is, in many respects, one of the most horrible that ever existed in the world's history—boundless luxury and self-indulgence at one end of the scale, and at the other a condition of life as cruel as that of a Roman slave, and more degraded than that of a South Sea Islander.’” This writer says Englishmen are now mostly athletes by proxy. “In every crowd that watches an important game of cricket, of football, there are thousands of men who should not take their exercise at secondhand.” The way in which recently a picked English eleven was put down at cricket by Australians may be but an instance of national degeneration. The leading race must not sacrifice bodily to mental perfection, must cultivate an all-round human perfection. But the conditions of life in England seem to make this almost impossible. The modern instruments of war have by no means made physical endurance and strength superfluous. English soldiers are not likely to forget those “great bounding beggars” who broke through a British
square in the Soudan, achieving what Napoleon's veterans were unable to do.

And Lord Roberts recently said in the House of Lords:—“It must be remembered that India was only loyal while the natives believed the British to be invincible.” If Lord Roberts is right, India is still held mainly by force. There are many disaffected persons there. And the press is disloyal. G. M. Chesney, editor of the Pioneer, wrote in the Nineteenth Century (February, 1898):—“If it is possible to imagine the entire English press existing as a thing apart from the public, the organ of a single class, indifferent or opposed to the national interest and national successes, and animated by a standing spirit of hostility which would lead it to rejoice over a disaster to the country's arms, and would render even the evidences of material prosperity a subject of affliction—if such a press could have existed here, it is obvious that it would not have existed long unregulated. Such a press, unfortunately, has come to exist in India, but its regulation is impossible because regulations have not been wanted in England.”

English institutions are not suitable to India, and yet foolish philanthropists in London are always seeking to introduce them. And the same with South Africa.

Chesney writes of the Indian press:—“There is no place for sport, social amusements, music, the drama, literature, art, science, or foreign travel, for these things have no existence as matters of general and recognized interest in the narrow and monotonous life of the people of Hindustan. What is more strange is that there is no commercial intelligence, and in a land of agriculture no attention to agricultural topics. A belated reprint of some returns, or report from one of the Government Gazettes, inserted now and again when there is nothing better to fill a page, is all the acknowledgment that this vital interest receives from the newspapers of the country.”

Surely in India Mr. Stead might find legitimate scope for his journalistic energy. A wider knowledge of the sexual habits of the East would probably remove a good deal of his intolerant Puritanism. He says India is “fatal to the brain and conscience.” I suppose that is why he has not gone there. If he “dissipated” a little of his superfluous energy in India by Asiatic methods, it might be advantageous both to his brain and conscience.

If Stuart Mill is right, England has, in this matter of governing semi-barbarous countries, as in other matters, given a sort of prophetic hint of the right method and then abandoned it. Mill wrote, in his “Representative Government”:—“It has been the destiny of the government of the East India Company to suggest the true theory of the government of a semi-barbarous dependency by a civilized country, and after having done this to
perish. It would be a singular fortune if, at the end of two or three more generations, this speculative result should be the only remaining fruit of our ascendency in India; if posterity should say of us that, having stumbled accidentally upon better arrangements than our wisdom would ever have devised, the first use we made of our awakened reason was to destroy them, and allow the good which had been in course of being realized to fall through and be lost, from ignorance of the principles on which it depended. Di meliora; but if a fate so disgraceful to England and to civilization can be averted, it must be through far wider political conceptions than merely English or European practice can supply, and through a much more profound study of Indian experience, and of the conditions of Indian government, than either English politicians, or those who supply the English public with opinions, have hitherto shown any willingness to undertake.” And these words of Mill's are, I believe, truer to-day than when he wrote. An English Parliament never can understand India, and its dominance over India is full of danger to the empire. One institution India, at any rate, understands—monarchy.

I referred to South Africa. This is what F. Mackarness wrote in the *Contemporary Review*, August, 1889, in an article entitled “South Africa Under Irresponsible Government”:—“When a British administrator learns by experience what colonists are and what natives are, he learns also that justice between them is not justice as it is understood by the Aborigines Protection Society. He sees the evil of having his own advice, founded on that experience, overridden by the ignorance and prejudice of persons at home, however well meaning, and it is this evil which, if warning is not taken from Sir H. Robinson's emphatic words, will in no short time make British rule odious even to the most loyal of our colonists at the Cape.” The English Aborigines Protection Society has no right to meddle with other countries while it fails to protect and reclaim the London Hottentots.

It may be said that Australians are politically free from interference. That may or may not be true, but they are certainly not free from financial and industrial interference, and it is this kind of interference, absentee management, &c., which is making the connection with London odious in many Australian homes.

The trading interests of the northern part of Australia are not properly with London, but largely with the Asiatic world, and the financial connection with London is a great obstruction to development. Thus Mr. Craig, in his “Federal Defence,” writes:—“The population of the Asian-Pacific is set down at 520,000,000, most of which are likely consumers of Anglo-Australian products. Australians have been neglecting these
markets. Mr. Dyer concludes, after three years' travel, that 20,000,000 persons are ready to consume Australasian fruits, butter, meats, wines, wool, hides, &c., by the aid of well-directed thought and study of the markets. The greatness of the Asian-Pacific trade lies in the future, which only requires to be creative.” I should prefer to say it requires to be conducted on human principles.

The financial servitude of Australia to London, it must be evident, is hindering the progress in civilization of the whole world. There is not a shadow of reason for its continuance except the force of habit, for it is not even to the interest of British capitalists. Englishmen can't get rid of the absurd idea that London is the hub of the universe.

An American statesman pointed out, in 1852, that “henceforth European commerce, politics, thoughts, and activity, although actually gaining force, and European connections, although actually becoming more intimate, will, nevertheless, relatively sink in importance; while the Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands, and the vast region beyond, will become the chief theatre of events in the world's great hereafter.”

So a Hawaiian minister, writing in the North American Review in 1895, says:—“Prophesying is dangerous and uncertain business, but it seems altogether probable that within ten or fifteen years the railroad from St. Petersburg to Vladivostock will have been completed, and that steamship lines will radiate from the latter point to Vancouver, San Francisco, the Nicaragua Canal, and the southern colonies. The railroad system of North America will have extended to Alaska on the north, and to Chili on the south. The Nicaragua Canal will have been constructed, and a large proportion of the enormous commerce which now pours through the Suez canal will have been diverted to its American rival. Honolulu will be the centre of a cable system radiating to Tahiti, Australia, Japan, Vancouver, and San Francisco; while between all the main ports of the Pacific, steamers of the size and speed of those now plying between New York and Europe will be in use. The Pacific has already made giant strides in progress, but it is yet only on the threshold of the destiny which looms before it.” Opinions such as these make evident the pitiful narrowness of vision of such writers as Mr. Kidd, who imagine that in the future the world is to be controlled by the European nations.

The present Cuban war is, of course, financial in its origin, arising from Spanish maladministration, but the question for Cubans to consider is, will they be any better off under American rule? For, though Cuba may become politically independent, such independence is a sham while financial servitude remains. Cuba, freed from Spain, may find in America a master
almost as exacting.

While Englishmen, generally, are blind, there are writers who are aware that a change of the centre of civilization is likely. Thus Frederick Greenwood writes in the Contemporary; of June, 1895:—“Certainly it does appear that Englishmen, shut up within their island security, are losing vision. Coming events are scanned with the enfeebled vision which clouds plain things and throws near ones to an indefinite distance. . . . I say that, in my belief, the world is now at the beginning of tremendous changes, comparable with those which in other times have brought empires to the ground and transferred sovereign power from continent to continent. . . . In my firm belief the next great change in the government of the world is imminent; that it is already topping the brink of preparation, and before long will begin to descend at the usual surprising rate of speed. Usual, I say, because there is nothing more constant to such events than the rapidity of their accomplishment when they begin to move. It will be immediately understood, of course, that these anticipations of a no very distant future start from the fulfilment of the prophecy that one day the world would witness the portent of an ‘awakened East.’ . . . If the whole future of the world will probably be changed by this awakening, no nation is likely to feel the change sooner than our own.”

But the East is not awake yet. Australia still sleeps, and when she awakes, this awakening is certainly likely to affect England sooner than any other nation. But if Englishmen can only rub the cobwebs from their brains, and adapt themselves to the necessities of the future, there is no reason why the awakening should not do them good rather than harm. Mr. Greenwood admits that “England has fallen from her pride of place. . . . The British Government no longer gives but takes the word of command.” And he has little doubt that the party system is to blame. “Nothing is more clear,” he writes, “than that the party system in politics, which has been the substructure of government for many a generation, has become thoroughly degraded and demoralized; nothing more clear, except it be that at the same time, and as a consequence, the functions of parliament have fallen into such disorder that Liberalism itself is heard clamouring for gag and fetter to discipline what only yesterday was still the freest and most august assembly in the world. . . . The country is sound enough, but, like every great community, it has its corruptible elements, and these it has been the business of the politicians to pander to for years past. The people did not teach them to traffic with disorder, to compound with lawlessness, or to make what, no doubt, many of them are willing enough to profit by—a Dutch auction of principle. If parliamentary government is going to pieces,
it is the work of the politicians alone; and if the country is unprepared, and worse than unprepared, for a time of trial which no other nation in Europe hopes to escape, theirs is the blame. . . . No man of the world will be disposed to doubt that should the democratic spirit govern henceforth in the temper which it now displays, and should it continue to speak by the mouths that now answer for it in the House of Commons, ministerial government will become far more difficult when a king sits on the throne.” It becomes daily more evident that the unjust state of things which exists in England and on the Continent of Europe today cannot much longer continue, and that unless a radical change is made extremely bad times are in store for England.

In what I have written against England my object has been to make it plain that the spirit of liberty and progress is departing from her, and that London as the centre of the empire is impossible. I know England, have many friends there, and have many pleasant remembrances of years spent there, but these are personal matters, which, when weighed in the balance against the claims of world-wide humanity, are trifles.

Many Australians look upon England as a model to be imitated, and it was necessary to point out the essentially imperfect and temporary nature of English society. Australians have to do better, and if they cannot do better all the monstrous evils and injustices of the old world are sure to be reproduced here.

Particularly I have endeavoured to make it clear that what is known as parliamentary government has become obsolete and obstructive, and that Australia has reached a stage of civilization which makes it possible to reduce and simplify the organs of control by a great extension of local self-government, so that the central governing body can devote its energies to purely national and international affairs.

And modern inventions, the telegraph and telephone, and the development of journalism, make it easy to supersede to a great extent what I may call the corpuscular method of representation—representation by persons travelling backwards and forwards—by a quicker, easier, and less expensive method. This is undoubtedly the direction of progress.

A similar case in the world of thought is the displacement of the emission theory of the propagation of light by the undulatory theory.

Bryce writes, in his “American Commonwealth”:- “We have distinguished three stages in the evolution of opinion from its unconscious and passive into its conscious and active condition. In the first it acquiesces in the will of the ruler whom it has been accustomed to obey. In the second, conflicts arise between the ruling person or class, backed by those
who are still disposed to obedience on the one hand, and the more independent and progressive spirits on the other; and these conflicts are decided by arms. In the third stage the whilom ruler has submitted, and disputes are referred to the sovereign multitude, whose will is expressed at certain intervals upon slips of paper deposited in boxes, and is carried out by the Legislature, to whom the popular mandate is entrusted. A fourth stage would be reached if the will of the majority of the citizens were to become ascertainable at all times, and without the need of its passing through a body of representatives, possibly even without the need of voting machinery at all. In such a state of things the sway of public opinion would have become more complete, because more continuous, than it is in those European countries which, like France, Italy, and Britain, look chiefly to parliaments as exponents of national sentiment. . . . The mechanical difficulties, as one may call them, of working such a method of government are obvious. How is the will of the majority to be ascertained except by counting votes? How, without the greatest inconvenience, can votes be frequently taken on all the chief questions that arise? No country has yet surmounted these inconveniences, though little Switzerland with her referendum has partially dealt with some of them. But what I desire to point out is that, even where the machinery for weighing or measuring the popular will from week to week, or month to month, has not been, and is not likely to be, invented, there may nevertheless be a disposition on the part of the rulers, whether ministers or legislators, to act as if it existed; that is to say, to look incessantly for manifestations of current popular opinion, and to shape their course in accordance with their reading of those manifestations. Where that is the attitude of the people on the one hand and of the governors on the other, it may fairly be said that there exists a kind of government materially, if not formally, different from the representative system as it presented itself to European thinkers and statesmen of the last generation. And it is to this kind of government that democratic nations seem to be tending.”

Now in this passage the old political error that rulers are simply servants, agents, of course lurks. When once we realize that the true aim of government is the raising of human beings in the scale of perfection, and that the best method of accomplishing this is to give the rule to the most developed persons, we see that the rulers, and not the people, are the chief agents of progress, and that it is their business to guide the ship of state, to restrain the aberrant wills of the people, and to lead this surplus will and train it to the performance of higher work.

Hitherto this higher work has been largely performed by the few for the
few, and the people have been more or less unwilling workers, and have had to be restrained by force and stimulated by the fear of starvation. But a more intelligent race can surely be trusted to act efficiently from higher motives. And such a race is sure to produce statesmen whose natural disposition leads them to do all they can to promote the welfare of all classes, and to find their highest pleasure and delight in doing this. And such statesmen should be freed from the necessity of following other avocations to provide themselves with the necessary means of sustenance. While representatives are constantly being changed they cannot devote themselves to their proper functions, they cannot become so efficient as if they held permanent office. Were they permanent their numbers might be greatly reduced, superior quality making up for loss of quantity. And with modern facilities of communication permanent ministers, instead of becoming irresponsible, would feel a growing sense of responsibility.

All that I have written has been one long argument for freedom and progress. It has always been the case in history that the idea creates the institution, and the institution then smothers the idea. So it is to-day that the great danger to liberty comes from those very parliamentary institutions which had their origin in the desire for greater freedom. If I have argued against federation, and in favour of the monarchical principle, it is because federation inevitably gives the supreme power in the state to a class—the political—which has become unworthy of it. I have not pleaded for monarchy in the old sense of the word, but for a monarchy of character, the putting of the supreme power in the hands of the most completely human person to be found in the state. Such a monarchy requires no titles or ceremonies, or military force to maintain it. It is broad-based on an indestructible foundation which no political storms can disturb. There is no stronger bond of political union than the personal. And such a bond the monarchical principle allows, while the federal does not. No people can give their enthusiastic loyalty to a Senate, or a House of Parliament, or a figurehead Governor-General, and if freedom is to be saved to-day nothing less than the passionate enthusiasm of a whole people can accomplish it.

"The very first element of the social union," wrote J. S. Mill, "obedience to a government of some sort, has not been found so easy a thing to establish in the world. . . . Wherever habitual submission to law and government has been firmly and durably established, and yet vigour and manliness of character preserved, certain essential conditions have been fulfilled. First, there has existed for all citizens a system of education, beginning with infancy and continued through life, of which one main ingredient was restraining discipline. The entire civil and military policy of
the ancient commonwealths was such a system of training. In modern nations its place has been attempted to be supplied by religious teaching. And whenever and in proportion as the strictness of the restraining discipline was relaxed, the natural tendency of mankind to anarchy reasserted itself, the state became disorganized from within, mutual conflict for selfish ends neutralized the energies which were required to keep up the contest against natural causes of evil, and the nation, after a longer of briefer interval of progressive decline, became either the slave of a despotism or the prey of a foreign invader.”

And it is precisely such a relaxation of discipline which to-day threatens the British empire with destruction. Every thinking man can see that a firm stand must be made somewhere, and that immediately. I take the following from a daily newspaper:—“It is obvious that at this point an unrivalled opportunity presents itself for drawing close together the severed branches of the Anglo-Saxon race. If the statesmen who direct the affairs of the British empire can disregard the great risk—for there is more than a possibility that Spain may find support in Europe—then the breach opened four generations ago may at last be practically healed, and the allied English-speaking races may stand before the world as a single whole. How pregnant would be the message of that unity to the future progress of the principles of freedom amongst mankind, can be grasped fully only by those who realize the frailty, the inadequacy, and the insecurity of free institutions amongst European nations. Italy is weak through poverty; the government of France has passed practically into the hands of the generals of her army; the Austrian empire is visibly threatened with disruption; in Germany liberty, as we understand it, hardly exists; in Russia despotism is open and unashamed. The Russian Colossus impends visibly over Asia and Europe. Only within the limits of the English-speaking communion has the principle of democracy firm root and upward growth. To stand together as the barrier of human freedom against the tide of militarism and autocracy which threatens to engulf mankind: this may yet be the destiny of the descendants throughout the world of the Norman, the Saxon, and the Dane—of the men who, like those to whom Bruce speaks in Burns's song, would rather “freeman stand or freeman fa’.”

But the vastly important question for Englishmen to consider is: Where shall this stand be made? Where shall the centre of resistance be? And if I have denounced England, and even America, it is solely because I wished to make it clear that the centre of resistance to despotism cannot be in either of those countries. There is but one place where a successful stand can be made, and that is Australia.
In Australia hitherto we have neglected one great element of national union and greatness—that is, the Crown, the Monarch. What would England have been without her great kings? The free individuality of the Saxon alone did not make England great; nor did the Dane, with his “incipient feudalism;” the kingly Norman had to be added to subject the Dane and train the diverse nationalities into unity.

Federation entirely neglects the absolutely essential monarchical factor. It reminds me of nothing so much as a dugong, which is neither fish, flesh, nor fowl; which lives in shallow bays, and is of low intelligence and inoffensive, remarkable for the dense, massive, and heavy character of its bony structure (*i.e.*, its political constitution). One species (*Rhytina gigas*), Australians should note, has recently been exterminated by Russian hunters and traders, for its flesh is good eating, its oil, hide, and bones valuable. A like fate will probably overtake Australians if they neglect to oppose the unity of a free monarchy of character and merit to the despotic monarchies of the old world.

“The second condition,” wrote Mill, “of permanent political society is the existence, in some form or other, of the feeling of allegiance or loyalty. This feeling may vary in its objects, and is not confined to any particular form of government; but whether in a democracy or in a monarchy, its essence is always the same—viz., that there be in the constitution of the state something which is settled, something permanent, and not to be called in question; something which, by general agreement, has a right to be where it is, and to be secure against disturbance, whatever else may change. In all political societies which have had a durable existence, there has been some fixed point; something which people agreed in holding sacred. And the necessity of this may easily be made evident. A state never is, nor until mankind are vastly improved, can hope to be, for any long time exempt from internal dissension; for there neither is nor has ever been any state of society in which collisions did not occur between the immediate interests and passions of powerful sections of the people. What, then, enables nations to weather these storms, and pass through turbulent times without any permanent weakening of the securities for peaceable existence? Precisely this—that, however important the interests about which men fall out, the conflict did not affect the fundamental principle of the system of social union which happened to exist.” In this essential of permanence federalism is manifestly wanting. It is, as federalists admit, essentially a compromise; instead of a fundamental principle, it has merely a fundamental compromise, and it was precisely this want of principle, this compromise, which, as we have seen, brought war on America, and causes
the corruption of political life there to-day. And can there be for human beings a better object of allegiance and loyalty than a wise, firm, yet loving sovereign elected by the people themselves?

Is it treason or disloyalty to the English sovereign to point out that England's glory is passing away; that when Queen Victoria departs disruption of the empire is likely to follow, and the abandonment of the monarchical principle in England possible? Well, if it is so, it cannot be helped; the interests of the English race are greater than those of England, and it is the business of the far-seeing statesman to provide for the future. The principle of constitutional kingship is essential to the future of humanity, and if England abandons it the English race should not. If it is treason to look to the future, then Sir George Grey was a traitor when he said, in the Convention of 1891:—“I believe in my own mind that it is essential to you that every one of your officers should be elected by the people of this country. Even in the case of your Governor-General, I believe the people ought to have the right of choosing who that man shall be. Let them choose him from England if they please; let them choose him from any part of the world, I would almost say, if they pleased. They will choose well, they will choose wisely, and no nation can be perfect, and we should not be perfect, unless it were known that the really great and good men of the country could rise to the highest position, and exercise the highest duties in it.” No nation, I will say, is free unless it has the right of electing—or, at any rate, accepting or disapproving—its own national representative. And it is extraordinary that a free people like the Australians should think of accepting a constitution which does not recognize this right. “The third essential condition of stability,” wrote Mill, “is a strong and active principle of cohesion among the members of the same community or state. We do not mean nationality in the vulgar sense of the term; a senseless antipathy to foreigners, indifference to the general welfare of the human race, or an unjust preference of the supposed interests of our own country. We mean a principle of sympathy, of union, not of separation. We mean a feeling of common interest among those who live under the same Government and are contained within the same natural or historical boundaries. We mean that all parts of the community feel that they are one people, that their lot is cast together, that evil to any of their fellow-countrymen is evil to themselves, and do not desire selfishly to free themselves from their share of any common inconvenience by severing the connection. How strong this feeling was in those ancient commonwealths which attained any durable greatness, everyone knows. In modern times the countries which have had that feeling in the strongest degree have been
the most powerful countries: England, France, and, in proportion to their
territory and resources, Holland and Switzerland; while England in her
connection with Ireland, is one of the most signal examples of the
consequences of its absence.” Australia, with its natural boundaries,
common speech, law, and religion, ought to be capable of a higher unity, a
more perfect sympathy, than any other nation.

And, as a matter of fact, human sympathies amongst the people are
stronger here than anywhere else. There can only be one reason for the
predominance of petty provincialism, and that is the predominance of the
political class, which, trained up in distrust and suspicion, prevents the real
feeling of the nation from expressing itself.

Central Queensland has been blamed for wanting separation and
opposing federation; but there is no stronger argument against federation,
and in favour of the adoption of nationalism with a single responsible
personal head, than that afforded by the futile efforts of Central
Queensland in the cause of local self-government and greater freedom. Nor
is there a clearer proof of the inadequacy of the Imperial Parliament as an
amending power for Australia.

The president of the Central Queensland Separation League has a record
of the whole case, which ought to be published in the interest of all
portions of the empire, in order to prove the danger arising from the
absolute power of parliaments without a responsible head.

A fourth bond of national union Mill does not mention, likely to become
more and more potent, and that is literature. The poet, the artist, is really
the only person who represents humanity as a whole. He alone speaks to
men as men, and links the ages together by his universal sympathy. He
only can interpret the new truths and wonders of science and philosophy to
the people, and restore to men that faith in the highest elements of human
nature which they have lost. But the artists of the world are awakening to a
sense that the future of the world is theirs.

Thus, A. Togazzaro writes:—“We aspire to the supreme honour of taking
our place in the front ranks of a humanity which is fighting its way
upwards towards a radiant future, of ranking among the Thousand Knights
of the Holy Spirit, whom Heinrich Heine—really more one of them than
might be thought—described thus to his fair-haired, amazed little
woodland maiden”—this fair-haired maiden reproached Heine with not
holding the old articles of the Christian creed, and this was his reply:—

“Ah, my child, while I was yet a little boy, while I yet sate upon my
mother's knee, I believed in God the Father, who rules up there in heaven,
good and great;
“Who created the beautiful earth, and the beautiful men and women thereon; who ordained for sun, moon, and stars their courses.

“When I got bigger, my child, I comprehended yet a great deal more than this, and comprehended and grew intelligent; and I believed on the Son also;

“One the beloved Son, who loved us, and revealed love to us; and for his reward, as always happens, was crucified by the people.

“Now, when I am grown up, have read much, and travelled much, my heart swells within me, and with my whole heart I believe on the Holy Ghost.

“The greatest miracles were of his working, and still greater miracles doth he even now work; he burst in sunder the oppressor's stronghold, and he burst in sunder the bondsman's yoke.

“He heals old death-wounds, and renews the old right; all mankind are one race of noble equals before him.

“He chases away the evil clouds and the dark cobwebs of the brain, which have spoilt love and joy for us, which day and night have lowered upon us.

“A thousand knights, well harnessed, has the Holy Ghost chosen out to fulfil his will, and he has put courage into their souls.

“Their good swords flash, their bright banners wave; what, thou wouldst give much, my child, to look upon such gallant knights?

“Well, on me, my child, look! Kiss me, and look boldly upon me! One of those knights of the Holy Ghost am I.”

Is there no work for a new chivalry to-day? The old titles of honour are discredited and become a laughing-stock. Why should not Australians originate a new order of knighthood, the “Knights of the Southern Cross,” a new band of “immortals,” to fight against tyranny and oppression, and intolerance and injustice, wherever it is found, whether in palace or parliament, church or street, for it is present in them all; to fight for the freedom which England has given to the world; to maintain the principle of unity and monarchy which is the best hope of liberty and progress for one and all. The foes of freedom are many and powerful, and the bonds of the monied Titans, if spread out, would conceal the sun, but, like Leonidas and his thousand Spartans, when the Persian tyrant Xerxes sent to them to deliver up their arms, warning them that the Persian host was so prodigious that their arrows would conceal the sun, we should reply—“So much the better, we shall then fight in the shade.”
“Better be
Where the extinguish'd Spartans still are free,
In their proud charnel of Thermopylae,
Than stagnate.”

In George Ebers's novel, “An Egyptian Princess,” the ambassador of the Massagetae addresses the Persian King, Cambyses, thus:—“In our country all are equal in death, and the soul of a dead king is not more important than that of a poor servant. Your father was a great man, but what we suffered for his sake is monstrous. Know, O king, that I have not told you all the misfortunes which came upon our land after that dreadful war. After Tomyris’ death dissensions broke out among us. Two men thought they had equal rights to the throne. Half the people fought for one, half for the other. A dreadful civil war, followed by a devastating pestilence, thinned the ranks of our followers. If you make war on us we cannot resist you, and we therefore offer you peace and heavy loads of gold.”

“Then you will submit without a blow?” cried Cambyses. “The size of my army assembled in the Median plain will show you that I expected greater things of your heroes. We cannot fight without foes. I will dismiss my warriors and send you a governor. I welcome you among the subjects of my realm.”

At the king's words the hero coloured over face and brow with burning red, and answered in an agitated voice:—

“You are mistaken, O king, if you think we have forgotten our former courage, or are anxious to become slaves. But we know your power, and know that the small number of our people whom war and pestilence has spared cannot resist your countless hosts. Honestly and frankly we confess this, but at the same time we declare that we will continue to govern ourselves, and never submit to receive laws and commands from a Persian satrap. You look at me in wrath, but I can bear your glance and repeat what I have said.”

“And I,” cried Cambyses, “give you this answer: You must choose one of two things. Either you submit to my sceptre, join the Persian empire under the name of the Massagetean province, and receive a satrap as my representative with all due respect, or you will consider yourselves my enemies, and my army will force you to accept the conditions I now offer you in kindness. To-day you may still gain a master who wishes you well; to-morrow you will have to fear me as conqueror and avenger. Reflect well before you decide.”

“We have considered everything beforehand,” answered the warrior, “and have seen that we, the free sons of the steppes, would rather die than
be slaves. Hear what the council of the elders tell you through me. We Massagetae have become too weak to resist you Persians, through no fault of our own, but through the great visitation of our god, the sun. We know you have prepared a great army against us, and we are ready to purchase freedom and liberty by an annual payment of gold. But if in spite of this you try and conquer us by force of arms, you yourselves will be the greatest sufferers. As soon as an army approaches the Araxeres, we, our women and children, will all depart and seek another home, for we do not dwell in fortified towns and houses as you do, but are used to wander about on our horses and live in tents. We will take our gold with us, and fill up and destroy the hidden mines, where you might find new treasures. We know all the places where the precious metals lie, and are ready to give them to you in great quantities if you grant us liberty; but if you wage war on us you will find nothing but an uninhabited desert, an inaccessible foe who may prove terrible to you as soon as he has recovered from the heavy losses which thinned his ranks. Grant us peace and freedom, and we are prepared to send you every year gold and five thousand swift horses of the steppes, and whenever serious danger threatens the Persian realm we will assist you.” The ambassador ceased.

Cambyses looked down thoughtfully, hesitated long before he answered, and at last, rising from his throne, said:—“We will take counsel at the banquet to-day, and tell you to-morrow what answer to take to your people. Gobryas, see that these men are well treated, and to him who wounded my face send a portion of the best food from my table.”

When federation is accomplished in Australia, and Premier Reid, who may for a long time hold together by the force of his majestic character the scattered units of the Australian provinces, has passed away to where beyond these voices there is peace, then the great labour war will break out between the north and south, exhausting the nation. And then the Russian autocrat, having subjugated China and Japan, will swoop down upon Australia and command us to receive a Russian governor with all due respect. Let us hope that then an ambassador will be found as bold as the hero of the Massagetae.

But, seriously, we should make an alliance with Japan, who is to-day said to be labouring under the illusion of European greatness, and desirous of joining the European discord. Japan could help us to open up the East to our trade, and in case of danger of invasion the Japanese fleet could render invaluable assistance, and set a limit to the ambition of the Russian bear. It is certainly to the interest of Japan to form an alliance with Australia and trade with us. And she cannot maintain her present fighting efficiency
without help, without crushing her people with excessive taxation. If the Russian bear knew that Australia would help Japan in case of danger, he would think twice before venturing to attack Japan; and, really, bears, as Dr. Nansen found, are not very dangerous animals. Australia should dominate the Pacific, and make it worthy of its name. And the Japanese, instead of imitating Europe, should cultivate and develop their own peculiar and unique style of art. Japan has every reason to throw in her lot with us, and we with her. We have no good reason to fear her once a good government is established here, and Japan can teach us and help us to do some things much better than we do them now. Here is a slight sketch of the Japanese, abridged from Arnold's "Seas and Lands," which may help to show us the little people in a truer light:

"To the Western visitor, filled with the hurry and unrest of a great but incomplete civilization, Japan conveys a lesson in the art of living, and makes one feel how much is lost in the hurry of desire to become rich." Arnold is tempted to say: "Better twenty years of Asia than a cycle of the west." "Japan, the land of gentle manners and fantastic arts, is far from being Europeanized as yet. Like all the rest of Asia, she has caprices of fashion, but never really changes. In the veins of this delightful people Mongol and Malay blood have mingled to form a quite special and unique race. Everything is curious, little, delightfully absurd; the jinriksha, their funny hansom cab, makes you almost die with laughter when you take your first ride. And the little shops, little goods, little funny impossible articles bought and sold, little placid pleasant folk darting about the ways, little trees growing in every nook, little absurd cakes and morsels of food, little cups and bowls. Everything seems small and fantastic, a playing at existence. A jocund spirit animates the people; they take life gladly, go chattering and laughing along, the porters singing; the air full of pretty salutations; the children in the streets for ever breaking into a dancing run for pure glee of existence. Their speech suave, their manners courtly, the deep reverences the little people make to each other in the street are charming; the commonest coolie bends with the air of a finished teacher of deportment when he meets a friend. To foreigners they are invariably gentle and courteous; there is a ceaseless grace in the popular manners, a simple joy of life, a sweetness of disposition which, I believe, places Japan in these respects higher than any other nation. And their delightful babies, placid, plump, are everywhere. Slung upon the back in a fold of the kimono, where they sleep, eat, and drink, they see everything, and take their part in everything. The children are the friends of everybody; they play in the most crowded thoroughfares, and are never rebuked or ill-
treated. The people, too, are cleanly, perpetually bathing in almost boiling water. How they love flowers! flowers are everywhere, are a necessity of existence—above all, the imperial chrysanthemum, the national emblem. Their banquets are graceful and delightful; they have made eating a fine art. Their speech is musical. Simplicity, conservatism, and courtly polish are the characteristic features of their poetry, which in one unchanging and natural melody dwells upon the simple themes common to all mankind. It seems to transport us to some less substantial world, where the deeper and wilder aspect of things is forgotten, and where politeness and a sort of tender grace reign supreme. Japan is a land peopled by artists; everybody has a trace of aesthetic comprehension, instinctive and innate. Tea-drinking is a fine art; the teacup is to-day the central fact of this fair and gentle land, its fragrance is everywhere, all drink and enjoy it. There are little gracious ceremonies even about the most ordinary tea-drinking in the humblest houses. Above the playing of this child-like race, above this delicate, fantastic world, Fugi-San, the sacred mountain, rises, majestic in form and gorgeous with colour, a grand and perfect peak, towering above the rosy clouds of sunset, dominating the life and art of the people, ever present as a majestic background, as a deep undertone of solemnity and awe in the gay song of national existence.”

We who boast of our high civilization have evidently much to learn from the restful spirit of the East. We are yet mere tyros in the graceful art of life. But, of course, there is another side to Japanese life. Beneath the gay exterior licentiousness lurks; robbery is not infrequent; few of the common people own their houses, their household goods are few; food, rice, is often scarce.

Sir Thomas Wade, who was ambassador in China, when asked, in 1894, what motive was instigating Japan in her war against China, said:—“Experts tell me now that, as in 1874, the reformers are striving to divert the generality from home politics by war abroad. Even without this we have to reckon with the over-excitability of a young race that has acquired new strength and wishes to put it to the test. Japan has an old quarrel with China. But the factor of domestic complications is not to be ignored, and it may indeed be the mainspring of the war. The recent elections in Japan, and the need of the Government to gain prestige in face of their critics, all these are influences of which it is difficult to estimate the importance at this distance.”

Our old friends the politicians seem to foment discord in Japan as elsewhere, and to be more anxious to reform the outside world than to reform their own state. Perhaps in Japan as elsewhere they are directly
interested in maintaining a state of things unjust to the majority of the people.

Sir Thomas Wade thought that annihilation of Chinese nationality by Japan would in due time have been followed by a like suppression of her conqueror. He also said:—“The crucial question of the future will be which western nation will absorb China. For whichever among the great powers has the Chinese to serve him is in a fair way to devour all the rest.” But why should China be absorbed at all? “I like the Chinese,” said Sir Thomas Wade,” and honour them in many ways, and it would go to my heart to see them stamped out as a nation. They possess some undoubtedly great moral ideas, upon which their civilization has really been based, or it would not have continued for so many centuries. . . . The political system is based on the idea that government is not for the governors but for the governed.”

This Chinese idea Australia is in danger of forgetting, and another: “Their governors and civil servants are chosen by a test of merit.” Cannot Russia help to develop China without destroying Chinese nationality. England is too little sympathetic to develop China, and ought to take the stranding of the steamship *China* as an omen pointing to the conclusion that China is best left alone. As E. Reclus pointed out:—“The Russians are own brothers of their Far East neighbours, akin in blood, in instincts, and in ideas. If needful, they can become Mongols, Tunguses, or Chinamen. Having, so to speak, two souls, our own and that of the Oriental, they are the natural mediators between the two worlds; and we may also rely upon them, with perfect assurance, to effect the union into one body of the two halves, as yet strangers to each other, of the human race. From Russia to Japan there is a chain of populous tribes, which, in different degrees, but all to a considerable extent, are allied to one or other of the two civilized nations which occupy the extremities of the vast northern plain of the old world.”

If the nations could but put aside their petty jealousies the “organism humanity” would soon become more than an idea. The great Siberian railway completed, it is said, “the Anglo-Asiatic mail will be landed in Japan in fourteen days after the departure from London, as against thirty-eight days via the Suez Canal, or twenty-eight days via the Canadian Pacific railway.” If the Russian mail train travelled forty miles an hour over the great Siberian line the journey would be reduced, it is said, to nine days two hours from London to Vladivostock.

But before all this comes about Australia has to organize her society in a more perfect manner than other societies, so as to make herself a worthy head of a world-wide organization, the seat of the sovereign soul of the
human race. “There is a Divinity that shapes our ends.” There are a law and a plan which we carry out unwittingly, of which we are not fully conscious till it is accomplished.

Here is a poetic account of the evolution of the human body, from the pen of A. Togazzaro, which we may apply also to the movements of the nations, as they, though pursuing their own ends, yet fulfil the Divine behest:—“When, therefore, we inquire how the human body was formed, and find that it was probably not formed without law, or without the regular action of forces directed and ordered to this end, we are certainly upon the right road. Let us go onwards. We find then that there are forces at work within species after species, from the very lowest forms of animal life—a mere cell, a mere stomach. They begin by preparing it a head, a place of honour for one who shall come, who shall receive power and glory and reign over the earth. They make ready for him the instruments of his dominion, first forming the nervous fibre, then the different lines of nerves; gathering them into groups, concentrating them in the head, until here we have the framework of the throne of the future prince; here, small and humble and weak, is the first brain. This brain goes on growing continually, and as Darwin has observed, continual mysterious modifications, corresponding to its phases of development, are noticeable in the shape of the other members. It goes on growing until it reaches a point of development at which there is a corresponding modification in the organs of the voice. Then comes the unloosening of the first concept, and its transmission by the first word; the answer which has cost infinite ages, efforts, pain, and lives to produce; the answer, I say, to the first word, to the order of God.” And when the first concept is unloosened, then, and then only, does humanity become “a living soul” and know itself as one.

Two other sentences from the same pen are worth consideration:—“Some think that when the force preservative of old forms is stronger than the progressive force, the latter accumulates by degrees till it gains the predominance, and that then there is a sudden movement onwards, a remarkable and abrupt transformation. . . . There is no doubt that between scientific progress and the idea of God there is some spiritual correlation, similar to that mysterious correlation which we observe in the organic world, causing the development of one organ to correspond to the development of another.” We have always to remember, what scientists are inclined to forget, that law is not an external something which we and other beings obey, but the outward expression of an internal purpose which we ourselves wish to carry out. “Man is man and master of his fate” is an ideal truth, not yet true. Man is not yet master of his fate, and cannot be until he
has freed himself from subjection to the laws of lower nature, and formed a law for himself. As Hegel wrote:—“In history an additional result is commonly produced by human actions beyond that which they aim at and obtain. They gratify their own interest, but something farther is thereby accomplished, latent in the actions in question, thought not present to their consciousness, and not included in their design.” An instance of this is seen in commerce when men by competing with one another in the end establish a monopoly which deprives them of profit. The desire of individual profit has brought into operation all their energy and invention, the results of which are appropriated by others, and finally, when the monopoly is taken over by the state, used for the common benefit. So it is in history: the movements of peoples, each seeking national profit, bring all nations into connection and interdependence, and this is really profitable to all, for the surplus products, the skill and energy and inventiveness of each nation can be transferred from place to place where there is the greatest need for them. Thus with the increase of means of communication famine should become a thing of the past, pestilence be quickly checked, and loss from flood or fire or tempest speedily made good. “This solidarity of humanity in the struggle with its environment,” wrote Karl Pearson, “is no less a feature than Individualism or Socialism of the law of evolution. We may, perhaps, term it Humanism.”

How little good results from mechanical communication without a growth of human sympathy corresponding with it may be seen in London, or any great city, where the poor starve almost within touch of all the luxuries of life, and if perchance they steal a loaf to satisfy the gnawings of hunger, the law pounces down upon them and inflicts punishment. Those, then, whose human sympathies have not grown callous have a perfect right to cry, halt! to the march of a civilization which brings growing injustice in its train and to say—“Thus far and no further shalt thou go.” And a nation burning with a generous enthusiasm has a right to say—“We will take our destiny in our own hands, we will close our borders and make ourselves self-sufficient, and admit or reject whom we please, so that a finer race may grow up for the future amendment of the world.” “Nothing great in the world,” wrote Hegel, “has been accomplished without passion.” Evil is a fact in the world, and a powerful fact, and nothing but a passionate resistance can overcome it.

But the world is so constituted that while men “develop themselves in accordance with their natural tendencies, they build up the edifice of human society, and fortify a position for right and order against themselves.” Every system of things has two limits, that of the centre and
circumference, and between these is the region of conflict and competition. So in society it is that every act of competition, while tending to build up social structures, such as the banking business and organization, which benefit the few, tends, at the same time, to benefit the many, for as man is more than a commercial animal, organization does not stop at the banking system, but must continue till a higher organization is complete, a human government, the aim of which must be to reverse the competitive tendency. If no existing government has accomplished this, it is simply because it was not the true or final centre of the system, because a higher organ was possible, to which the surplus could escape, and therefore rigid resistance and complete coalescence of the governing organ was impossible. Thus, in the case of England, surplus wealth has overflowed to the colonies instead of being returned to the English people.

But the case of Australia is different. There is no higher centre possible on the earth; it is the last state to be formed; it has to meet, therefore, world-wide competition. Once its legitimate purpose and ambition is known—that is, to alter and amend every existing state of society—the whole world will naturally be against it, and this opposition is absolutely necessary, for otherwise it could never organize itself socially after a human manner, and without such an organization the nation cannot fulfil its duty to the world or its true destiny. These are the hard but indispensable conditions of supremacy and rule.

A period of great danger appears therefore to be before Australia, for immediately her ambitions are understood the great powers of the earth, at present disunited, are certain to attempt to unite against her. It is, therefore, fortunate that all the old governments of the world are merely federations, incapable of resisting the action of a rigid unity. For the result of the want of a rigid national centre of unity is that with the growth in power and importance and wealth of the ruling class the people become poorer. Unless a government is absolutely just, progress and poverty must go hand in hand, so that the majority of the people are opposed to their rulers. The danger, then, to Australia is purely imaginary; the rulers may command and lead, but their armies would refuse to follow.

What I want to make clear is that the only safe course for Australian statesmen to follow is to ally themselves with the people all over the world—that is, to abandon the narrow national standpoint altogether. The common enemy of the people everywhere is the aristocracy of wealth, which is really what parliament is or represents everywhere. The proper course, then, is for the people everywhere to reinvigorate the sovereign as the rigid central point or centre of distribution of wealth. Then between
themselves as the circumference and the sovereign as centre, they can institute the squeezing process before alluded to, and bring about world-wide socialism. But the difficulty is that in Australia there is no sovereign—the squeezing process cannot be set up. Once the middle classes of Australia see that the institution of a sovereign power here must inevitably bring about their ruin by pressure between the upper and lower millstones, they will promptly decline to have any central government at all. But they cannot possibly prevent character using its influence to persuade people disgorge for the benefit of the poor. Against the use of persuasive reason there can be no objection, for if people willingly become socialists all objection to socialism has gone. The peculiar circumstances of Australia then, once they are understood, utterly preclude government by force, and make it necessary for Australians if they unite at all to unite and form a nation in accordance with the pure Christian idea of spiritual sovereignty.

If the middle classes of Australia are wise, then they will have nothing to do with federation, for if it remains a true federation it means that they must continue to be exploited by the absentee capitalist until they are all reduced to mere wage-earners. If the federation merges into a national union in the old sense of the word the result will be that they are squeezed between the people and the sovereign. Thus the middle classes of Australia are between Scylla and Charybdis. They can escape by adopting the socialistic principle and giving up the competitive, but they are not ready to do this unless it turns out that their indebtedness is such as to make this advisable. If this is not the case, the course is for those who are willing to adopt socialism, either because of their sympathetic character, or because they are totally in debt, to get possession of a central province in Australia and develop it on socialistic lines. The evidences, then, of the higher profit arising from their higher social organization will soon become so evident that everyone else will be gradually led to adopt it. This seems to me to be the practical solution of the political problem in Australia. It will relieve the states of discontented, dangerous elements, leave their vested interests intact, and give the higher civilization a fair chance to spring up and prove itself superior by practical results. The success of a socialistic state of a purely peaceful character cannot harm Australia, and is certain to bring it profit, for travellers from all parts of the world are certain to be anxious to visit a state where such an extraordinary and superhuman thing as absolute justice and a fair distribution of wealth prevail. And as they must pass through the provinces to get to the centre, they are certain to spend money in them. And in a socialistic state artistic activity of all kinds is certain to
spring up, and as the world is certain to value artistic products more and
more, and be willing to pay a high price for them, and as the socialists
cannot spend all they make in their own province, the surrounding states
are sure to benefit.

Then, again, such a state is sure to become a great educational centre, and
as the children and their parents must pass to and from it via the provinces
around, there is another grand opportunity for the provincials to make
money. Again, as the old world nations have the most hearty contempt for
the idea of a purely spiritual rule, and as the Papacy appears to share this
contempt, there is not likely to be any danger of invasion, journalistic or
military. This practical solution, then, appears to be absolutely free from
objection, and to be best for all parties. The only things wanting are a
personal centre of unity, a leader, and money to start with. And I have little
doubt that both these wants can be supplied. Considering that all other
circumstances are propitious, to disbelieve in the presence of the money
and the man at the right place, when the hour strikes, would be to exhibit
the utmost disloyalty to the Power whose will is expressed in the
constitution of the universe, would be to display a scepticism to which the
agnosticism of Spencer is mere child's play.

It is always by a similar fortunate conjunction of circumstances, internal
and external, that a new start in progress is made. When man first came to
self-consciousness in Eden he found instruments ready to his hand. “It is a
remarkable fact,” writes the Duke of Argyll, “that every one of the
domesticable mammalia, with all their special properties, had not been
developed in geological time until those ages came which immediately
preceded the advent of man. We may adopt what words or phrases we like
for our conception as to the causes of this particular result of the creative
evolutionary process. But there can be no doubt of the fact that in the issue
of it the very possibility of wealth depended. The ox, and perhaps above all
the horse, are highly specialized creatures, invented and contrived by
nature as it were for most special uses. We may say, if we please, that the
‘survival of the fittest’ is the best explanation we can reach. But the
question remains: The fittest for what? And then the answer comes: The
fittest for a use which was yet to be—the fittest for the service of the
possessor who was about to appear.”

And who is the fittest to possess? Simply the being who responds to the
universal need, who best realizes the fundamental purpose and will of the
Creator—that is, the progress, amelioration, and ascension of life for one
and all. All higher births of time appear first on a tiny scale, apparently
weak and powerless, as man himself appeared, as Christ appeared. Just as
the seed of a tree, taking refuge in the cleft of a rock, grows, lifting into the
air its translucent leaves as a flag of victory, till with the expansive force of
its life it splits giant rocks asunder, so the tiniest co-operative
community, taking refuge in the cleft of world-wide federalism, must
eventually split asunder the most powerful social systems of the world. It is
“not the lower forces of rapacity and sensuality that win in the race, but the
higher forces of intelligence, patience, forethought, and even those soft
saplings of the human heart, affection and compassion.” Is Australia
prepared to receive the conquering seed, the seed of the Rose of Art, to
make a home in its heart for a new poetry? Material is not wanting. The
poets have barely touched the real world as yet. There is the history of man
for material, not English history merely. Our land is not, like England,

“All the stately repose and lordly delight of the dead.”

So much the easier should it be to plant a fair red rose in the earth of the
present, and tend it and water it, till it “stretches and swings to the slow,
passionate pulse of the sea” of the deep ocean of humanity. Art can never
endure when it has lost touch with the hearts of the people, as it has in
England. A whole nation must love art and share it and practise it if the
human race is to arrive at its possible perfection.

London as a city of art is a rank absurdity. Think of a London fog! Those
who have not swallowed it can get an idea of it from Hall Caine's
description:—“Do you know what a London fog is—it's smoke, its soot, its
sulphur? It is darker than night, for it extinguishes the lights, and denser
than the mist on the curragh, and filthier than the fumes of the brick-kiln. It
makes you think the whole earth must be a piggery copper, and that
London has lifted the lid off. In the midst of this inferno the cabs crawl, the
'buses creep, and foul fiends, who turn out to be men merely, go flitting
about with torches, and you grope and croak and cough, and the most
innocent faces come puffing and snorting down upon you like the beasts of
the Apocalypse.” Does not the cry of the prophet rise naturally to one's
lips?—“Come out of her, my people, lest ye be partakers of her sins.”
Come! But to the shame of the world, there is no nation yet that can give a
home and a refuge safe from the horrid clang of war, where the spirit of the
artist can pursue its divine work of reconciliation; for art is a mockery and
delusion and a snare while the people perish with hunger in the streets.

The practice of art is not incompatible with industrial pursuits; even in
England the miners delight the ear of royalty with sweet music. And
horticultural and pastoral pursuits are particularly congenial to the artistic
nature. It is not to the interest of Australia to become a great industrial or
manufacturing nation. As Stuart Mill points out, the prime necessaries and final luxuries of life are not subject to the law of competition in the same degree as manufactures. “The tendency, then, being to a perpetual increase of the productive power of labour in manufactures, while in agriculture and mining there is a conflict between the two tendencies, the one towards an increase of productive power, the other towards a diminution of it, the cost of production being lessened by every improvement in the processes, and augmented by every addition to population it follows that the exchange values of manufactured articles, compared with the products of agriculture and mines, have, as population and industry advance, a certain and decided tendency to fall. Money being a product of mines, it may also be laid down as a rule that manufactured articles tend, as society advances, to fall in money price. The industrial history of modern nations, especially during the last hundred years, fully bears out this assertion.” Of course, to speak of money as the product of mines is absurd; money is a social product. But those who devote themselves to the primary industries are, when a certain point is reached, necessarily freed from the law of competition, because the minimum is sooner reached, while those who devote themselves to art are above competition and can get their own price. A nation that devotes itself, then, to the primal and ultimate activities has the advantage over others. Australia should leave manufactures to America. She cannot hope to rival America in her special line; she should devote herself to a special line of her own.

And when she takes to her true business, she will see that the system of cut-throat competition is merely a temporary feature of a manufacturing age, necessary to produce a sufficiency of the good things of life, so that the human race can rise above the chrysalis money-grubbing stage. She will realize this, return to the old forms of co-operation, and reinstitute the old guild system on a better basis.

But the pressing need of the present time is to put a limit to the ambition of politicians; to say to them, “No further shalt thou go;” to knock federation on the head. If the politicians are allowed to have their way, they will, no doubt, adopt all the hints I have given as to how to improve the condition of society. But they will improve by forcible means, and appropriate the resulting profit for their own benefit instead of distributing it for commonwealth purposes. And instead of conciliating, they will, by their protective measures and narrow national aggressive spirit, set all the world against Australia.

If the politicians are allowed to have their way Sir Henry Norman's prophecy will come true. He said, as he was leaving Queensland, that he
“regarded it as an absolute certainty that before all those present were dead Australia would have to resist an attack. It was impossible, in the present state of the world, for a great, prosperous, and growing country like this, with, comparatively speaking, no army and no navy, to expect immunity in the event of war. Trained troops were required; money must be spent liberally and well. Without England Australia was powerless.” Sir H. Norman was one of the best governors we have had, but he was a soldier, and in the above passage the military bias is plainly evident. It is just the connection with England that endangers Australia. England's illegitimate ambitions and Jewish proclivities are just what makes the world jealous of her. England had legitimate aspirations, but these have been overwhelmed by the illegitimate. Australia should adopt the legitimate, and carry on the true traditions of England while rejecting her corruptions.

“Russia in 1885 had plans laid for invading Auckland and Wellington, whilst she had everything prepared to force the Heads at Port Phillip and seize the wealth held by the Melbourne banks.” Well, the Melbourne banks should have their wealth in paper, while gold should be in the vaults of the National Central Bank.

Japan at one time talked of annexing Australia. She would find it a tough job. Japan admitted into the Anglo-Saxon alliance would make Russian invasion impossible.

We hear of the “Downing-street crime against Australia” in the case of New Guinea; but Germans and English work together in Australia—why not in New Guinea too? All our dangers arise from the exclusive national spirit of politicians. Make the sovereigns responsible to their people, then the sovereigns can co-operate without danger. Particularly in the matter of peace or war is the referendum desirable.

I have endeavoured to make it clear that it is to the interest of all classes to oppose federation, and I have spoken the truth without respect of persons. The truth that government should be completed in a single person is a necessity of a true commonwealth, is one that our politicians of themselves will never admit. It is interesting to notice that, as T. H. Green says:—“The final breach of Cromwell with his parliament was due to its insisting on a discussion of the basis of government by a single person.” In Australia, too, the politicians will fight against unity all they know. Cromwell had to remove an absolute parliament. He made no objection to a reduction of the army. But the Rump Parliament insisted on the retention of its power. “Not only,” says J. R. Green, “were the existing members to continue as members of the new parliament, depriving the places they represented of their right of choosing representatives, but they were to
constitute a Committee of Revision, to determine the validity of each
election, and the fitness of the members returned. Monarchy had vanished
in the turmoil of war (to-day the war of politicians). Cromwell's experience
of the Long Parliament confirmed him in his belief of the need of
establishing an executive of a similar kind, apart from the power of the
Legislature, as a condition of civil liberty.” And it is that belief, held by the
greatest thinkers, which I have expressed and illustrated to the best of my
power. Cromwell dissolved the Rump by force, but only when no other
course was open. “He sat quietly in his place till the motion was put from
the chair that the bill do now pass,” says Green. “It was then, at the last
moment, *i.e.*, at which it was possible to stop the establishment of a
permanent oligarchy under the forms of law, that he broke into a violent
speech, which ended in his calling in the soldiers.” History repeats itself,
and I, as a lover of liberty, am in a similar position to that in which
Cromwell was placed. I have not the slightest wish for notoriety, but if the
sham Commonwealth Bill is passed here, “a permanent oligarchy under the
forms of law” will be established in Australia. And as Australia is the last
state, with the establishment of an oligarchy here the last chance of the
peaceful establishment of a just government upon Christian principles will
pass away from the earth. If I have delayed speaking until the last moment
it is because the independence of nations is such to-day that the issues
opened up by this question of federation must affect all the nations of the
earth, and particularly England, my own birthplace and early home. But it
is impossible to delay any longer. Seeing things as I do, and as other
persons fail to speak, it is clearly my duty to express my views, without
regard to the consequences.

As Herbert Spencer wrote:—“Not as adventitious will the wise man
regard the faith which is in him. The highest truth he sees he will fearlessly
utter; knowing that, let what may come of it, he is thus playing his right
part in the world—knowing that if he can effect the change he aims at—
well: if not— well also; though not so well.” Not so well, that is, for the
nation that cannot see and respect the truth. The single change which I am
pleading for, the single change of which Plato spoke, means higher life and
national independence to Australia, instead of dependence and subjugation
to a foreign yoke. And it is not really a change at all. It is the politicians
who seek to make a change in a retrogressive direction, who wish to put
the hands of the clock backwards, and abolish that essentially English
institution constitutional kingship. It is they who are the conspirators,
against England, as the common-sense of the worker perceives, and as the
plain sense of the soldier, Colonel Lasseter, also saw. The difficulty of the
position lies in this, that the death of Queen Victoria is likely to be the
death of constitutional sovereignty, unless Australia is prepared to preserve
this great institution; for the decline of England is an unmistakable fact to
those who have political vision.

And personal sovereignty is the most essential safeguard of liberty and
progress. To preserve the continuity, then, of liberty, Australia should be
prepared to make personal sovereignty a reality when the hour comes
which must endanger the unity of the empire unless provision is made to
meet it. For my part, I have sworn the oath of allegiance to the Queen, and
therefore to the ideal of monarchy, and deem it my duty to uphold the idea,
and to fight for it against all enemies. But, should the Queen die, I am
loosened from my oath, and am not bound to renew it, for then the time
will have come for Englishmen to choose their sovereign. Character is the
rightful lord. If heredity and character are found together, well and good,
but heredity alone cannot claim allegiance. If this is treason, well! the
Danes can do their worst. Character, and the people in conjunction, can
confound even the Danes.

Having had to speak plainly and unreservedly, I have had to throw down
the glove, to challenge the greatest power on earth—the combination of the
Jew and politician.

I spoke of the Cuban-American war as really commercial. Here is fresh
evidence of the fact:—50,000 Jews have volunteered for active service on
behalf of America. Having challenged this combination on behalf of the
people, I claim the protection of the people if these pages attract any
attention, for both Jew and politician know very well that a movement
dangerous to themselves is best met by striking at the leaders. I do not
value my own life very much, but am vain enough to believe that it is
worth preserving for the benefit of others. Like Socrates, I have a daemon
which warns me when danger approaches, but that is not enough; when
danger approaches one has to act without proof, say to shoot the enemy
before he has time to shoot you. And shooting a man without apparent
provocation is murder. The people, as the politician allows, is sovereign,
can make and unmake law. What I want, then, is to have the right to shoot
when the daemon says, “Shoot,” and yet to be exempt from the penalty of
murder. This is only fair, and, I think, will meet the necessities of the case.
No one can doubt that both politician and usurer are unscrupulous enough
to resort to assassination, but, as the combination is only a federation, there
is likely to be a deadlock when the discussion comes on as to which shall
shoot, and if both decide to shoot, why, dual control of the trigger is not
conducive to straight shooting, so it may not be necessary to make use of
the special privilege of shooting without visible evidence of its necessity.

I alluded above to the soldier. The soldier certainly ought to vote for constitutional sovereignty and royalty, and against parliamentary federalism. The Duke of Cambridge, I am told, took special interest in the common soldier, and was unpopular with officers on that account. Evidently the army wants a nonprofessional, independent, and human head.

This is how an official department treats the soldier. A military correspondent wrote to the London Daily Telegraph as follows:—“A most absurd instance of enforcing the letter of a regulation must surely be the case of Colour-sergeant Walker, of the Royal Scots Fusileers, who was taken prisoner by the Afridis. After being in their hands for six weeks, Sergeant Walker was released, and on returning to his regiment was promptly tried by district court-martial for being absent without leave. Of course he was acquitted, but, grotesque as it may sound, was sentenced to lose his pay during the time he was absent. This is quite in accordance with article 954 of the Royal warrant, which, however, also provides that the whole or any portion of the arrears of pay may be restored by the Secretary of State, after the inquiry into the circumstances of the soldier's character.” I should like very much to know whether the Secretary of State has refunded. My experience of State departments in Australia is that, when asked to refund, they either decline to answer or reply with a non possumus.

There is another numerous body of men who, if they consult their true interest will vote against federation and parliamentary absolutism. I mean the Freemasons. Their fundamental principles are brotherhood and religious tolerance. Parliaments generally set their face against secret societies, and denounce them as dangerous, just as the Roman Church has. The Jew's religious intolerance, his defiant monotheism, are well known. A combination of Jew, parliament, and perhaps Pope, would make Freemasonry illegal. Cardinal Beaufort prohibited Masons from holding assemblies and chapters in England by an Act of Henry VI. The Act, however, was never enforced, as Henry VI. countenanced Masons, and Henry VII. became Grand Master. Freemasonry is prohibited in Austria, Poland, Russia, and Spain. Laws against combinations of workmen in England have made exceptions in favour of Freemasons. Generally Freemasons owe much of their liberty, and their freedom from religious control, to the direct action of English sovereigns. Other despotic monarchs have not favoured them. Parliaments, if they could, would probably suppress the order. The order has become rather speculative than
practically useful in Australia, but still it could, if it willed, exert great power, and it ought to use it against federation, and in favour of the single change I am advocating, for this change is perfectly in accordance with the principles of Freemasonry. If Freemasons fail at this critical moment it will be necessary to found a new order. If the world-reviewer succeeds in founding a new Holy Roman empire in Australia, or if the Reid-cum-Barton reign is established, one of the “phenomena of the accession” will be the flight of the pelican to New Guinea or some lonely rock in the Pacific, there to raise a new brood, a new order of freemen capable of dominating an emasculated race and overthrowing the political despotism in Australia. And the sign and password of the new brotherhood will be progress—amelioration for one and all by means of continuous action and reaction. And the initials of the path, E. N. R., and the new name, Amine. Knights of the Rosy Cross, if you value life and freedom, shield with your presence the tower and throne of David, and the person of a master-builder greater than was Solomon! Protect the keystone of the Royal Arch, without which the temple of Humanity can never be raised upon this earth! “All those who love liberty and light rather than bondage and darkness will advance against the infidel of federal distrust.”

I trust I have made it clear by this time that government without a single person at the head of affairs, responsible directly to the people, and quite independent of the professional political class, is pretty certain to become either inefficient or despotnic, and therefore that it is to the interest of all classes to make this addition to the Commonwealth Bill. Of course the value of this addition depends on the existence of high character, but at all events provision should be made for giving character its right position in the state when it does appear. The party or presidential system does not bring the right man to the top except in times of danger, and even then he does not get there until numberless blunders have been committed. He ought always to be there, and exercising a continual influence. The good old title king is the right one for the head of the state. It is a better word than president, and meant originally father of a people, or steersman, or regulator, or able man. To what extent parliamentary government can be superseded is a matter of time and place, and degree of civilization; but the higher the degree of civilization the less is it necessary.

It is obvious that of all political institutions that of kingship is the last that can be done away with; it must be kept as a visible symbol of rule if as nothing else, as it is the crown of the representative structure, the last organ which unites the lower organs and makes them subserve the interest of the whole. Suppose government done away with altogether, if a grievance
arises in any locality it can only be removed by reference to a higher authority, and if this fails to amend, by reference to a higher authority still. In the absence of the Crown it might be necessary to recreate the whole representative structure which had been abolished. With the Crown the matter can always be settled directly, or the next highest governing structure be recreated without going through the building process from the bottom upwards. Of course, with the general adoption of the co-operative principle, and the cessation of war, the industrial and political functions would coalesce.

Central Queensland, which has not got parliamentary government at all, might very well jump this stage of political evolution. If she can do this, while the other colonies cannot, she is likely to have the whip-hand of them all, especially as she is naturally one of the richest of the states. The absentee incubus at present keeps her down, but this removed the Cinderella of the states might take the place of honour at the national gathering. New South Wales aspires to the place of honour, but how little she is fitted to rule others may be judged from the fact that she cannot rule her own plutocrats.

It was recently enacted in New South Wales that all coal should be weighed at the pit's mouth, and the miners paid on the full weight. As this clause has never been enforced, miners demand its enforcement. The owners of the mines reply that they will close all the mines rather than comply with the law. The object of the law was perfectly just, was to ensure that the miners were paid for small coal, for all coal they hewed. The miners propose a new hewing rate, as the owners say they cannot pay for all coal at the old rate. But the owners will not have this. The clause of the Act, they say, must be ignored or repealed. Thus they are acting in precisely the same way as the employers did in England in the engineers' strike. And as in that case so in this, the Government is either impotent, or unjust, or indifferent—in any case, discredited. Obviously New South Wales is in need of a fatherly despotism. The sun is a great ripener, and no doubt this has something to do with the sweeter disposition of the inhabitants of Central Queensland. Central Queensland is tropical or semi-tropical, but the south must not forget that she can produce characters as hard and as tough as her ironbarks.

I have in the preceding pages denounced a good many things and accused whole classes of selfishness and conspiracy against the commonwealth, and if these remarks of mine attract any attention I shall no doubt be accused in return of ambition and selfishness and conspiracy. Well, to be perfectly frank, I admit that I have an ambition, too. Everyone tries to
make his will prevail, and I am trying to make mine. And I feel quite sure of this, that the will which must prevail in the end is that will which identifies itself with the commonwealth, the goodwill of the greatest number of persons. In the struggle of wills the fittest, the most representative, prevails, and is worthy of the highest esteem and place of honour. I have been looking about for a long time in Australia for a man whom I can give my full respect and admiration and loyalty to, and have not been able to find one quite up to my standard, so have at last concluded, like Sentimental Tommy, who looked for the absolute within, that I have a natural right to try and impose my own standard upon others. Confounded cheek, of course; but if those who have good standards within them had more cheek, it would be much better for everybody, and the world would be a much pleasanter place to live in that it is. If I cannot do any good in Australia, I am thinking of trying Damascus, as soon as those barbarians of Europe have done cutting one another's throats, and dissipated enough of their superfluous brutality in war to make it safe to go any nearer to them. For in reading Disraeli's "Tancred; or, The New Crusade," the other day, I came across this passage:—"London is a modern Babylon; Paris has aped Imperial Rome, and may share its catastrophe. But what do the sages say to Damascus? It had municipal rights in the days when God conversed with Abraham. Since then the kings of the great monarchies have swept over it; and the Greek and the Roman, the Tartar and the Arab, and the Turk have passed through its walls; yet it still exists and still flourishes; is full of life, wealth, and enjoyment. Here is a city that has quaffed the magical elixir, and secured the philosopher's stone; that is always young and always rich. As yet the disciples of progress have not been able exactly to match this instance of Damascus, but it is said they have great faith in the future of Birkenhead." I wondered greatly as to what the explanation of this strange youthfulness and gaiety could be. Reading a little further, I at once understood: "There is not a form of government which Damascus has not experienced, excepting the representative (i.e., the parliamentary), and not a creed which it has not acknowledged except the Protestant. Yet, deprived of the only rule and the only religion that are right, it is still justly described by the Arabian poets as a pearl surrounded by emeralds." In Damascus too, they used to make sword-blades so perfectly tempered that the point could be made to touch the hilt, and to fly back to its former position. I fear the sword of my wit is not sharp enough to decapitate the federal giant at present, but perhaps in Damascus I shall be able to fashion a rapier so keen, and flexible, and perfect as to drive the devil of distrust back into the "illimitable inane" from which he came
ruining along. I cannot do better than close these pages with a few selections for the Australian Bible from the poets, which seem suitable to the occasion.

‘One great clime,
Whose vigorous offspring by dividing ocean
Are kept apart and nursed in the devotion
Of Freedom, which their fathers fought for, and
Bequeath'd—a heritage of heart and hand
And proud distinction from each other land;
Still one great clime, in full and free defiance
Yet rears her crest, unconquered and sublime.”

—Byron

“And you, good yeomen,
Whose limbs were made in England, show us here
The mettle of your pasture; let us swear
That you are worth your breeding; which I doubt not;
For there is none of you so mean and base,
That hath not noble lustre in your eyes.
I see you stand like greyhounds in the slips,
Straining upon the start. The game's afoot:
Follow your spirit; and upon this charge,
Cry—God for Harry! England! and Saint George!”

—Shakespeare

“Unless to Thought is added Will,
Apollo is an imbecile.”

—Emerson

“You shall not love me for what daily spends;
You shall not know me in the noisy street,
Where I, as others, follow petty ends;
Nor when in fair saloons we chance to meet;
Nor when I'm jaded, sick, anxious, or mean.
But love me then and only, when you know
Me for the channel of the rivers of God
From deep ideal fontal heavens that flow.”

—Emerson

“Has God on thee conferred
A bodily presence mean as Paul's,
Yet made thee bearer of a word
Which sleepy nations as with trumpet calls?”

—Emerson

“But to our shame doth all our thinking tend,
Your genuine common folk alone conceive.”

Goethe's Faust

The lofty dower
Of wisdom's power
From all the world concealed!
Who thinketh not,
To him, I wot,
Unsought it is revealed.”

—Faust

“She's beautiful, and therefore to be woo'd; she is a woman, therefore to be won.”

—Shakespeare
AUSTERITY OF POETRY.

“That son of Italy who tried to blow,
Ere Dante came, the trump of sacred song,
In his light youth amid a festal throng
Sate with his bride to see a public show.
Fair was the bride, and on her front did glow
Youth like a star; and what to youth belong—
Gay raiment, sparkling gauds, elation strong.
A prop gave way! crash fell a platform! lo,
‘Mid struggling sufferers, hurt to death, she lay!
Shuddering, they drew her garments off—and found
A robe of sackcloth next the smooth white skin.
Such, poets, is your bride, the Muse! young, gay,
Radiant, adorned outside; a hidden ground
Of thought and of austerity within.”

—Matthew Arnold

Poetry has generally been raised aloft on the platform of the supernatural: the prop has given way, but the bride still lives, and shall arise again from her couch of sickness, radiant and adorned, yet still with a hidden ground of thought and austerity within. But if she is to find in Australia a home, the youth of Australia must rouse themselves, and leave for awhile their bicycles and barmaids, their football and their cricket, their racing and their yachting, and give their sanction and allegiance to the wholly human ideal of the poet, who loves the shining limbs, the vigour and elasticity of youth; the fleet limbs of the racehorse, and the sound of the swish of the bicycle as it races over the earth; the fair breeze and the white foam and the furrow following free; who loves the rich red cattle of the Oxus, which the fiercest sun cannot harm, and the fleet Arabian steed which never tires; who loves the sweet fragrance of tobacco as it scents the air, and the taste and aroma of the light wines of the South. Before life can become a poem and a fine art, industrial and political affairs must be much better ordered than they are at present, and thought and speech must be absolutely unfettered and free. As Faust sang—

“Could I my pathway but from magic free,
And quite unlearn the spells of sorcery;
Stood I, O Nature, man alone 'fore thee,
Then were it worth the trouble man to be!”

HUMAN HOPE.

“Toiling amid the fruitless desert sand
And rugged rocks of theologic lore,
A doubtful view behind us and before—
Yet hoping still to reach the promised land
Of truth, which might inspire us and command
The soul's allegiance, and so more and more
Fill, warm, and penetrate its inmost core,
We heard at last your voice. We seemed to stand
Upon a mountain's brow. A new light shone:
While some recoiled, and feared to break the bond
Of childhood's faith, our prospect opened free,
Until we cried aloud, ‘The sea—the sea!’
As when the joyous Greeks with Xenophon
Marched down to the Euxine shores and Trebizond.”

—C. P. Cranch

* Mr. Fidel G. Pierra wrote to the Forum that there were between 60 and 70 millions of American dollars invested in Cuba—30 millions in sugar estates and 20 millions in mortgages.