

ARTICLE IV.

A PSYCHOLOGY OF THE BRITISH PEOPLE.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES WILLIAM SUPER, PH.D.

Is it possible to draw up a fairly adequate scheme of the psyche of a nation? Or, to put the question somewhat differently: inasmuch as all men have many fundamental characteristics in common, have some of these been more developed in certain nations and some in others in such a way that they can be grouped and classified into a fairly consistent entirety? M. Fouillée¹ has attempted it for the French, and Señor Altamira² for the Spanish; and, while each has given us an interesting volume, both have put into it a good deal that is more or less irrelevant.

The psychic forces that coöperate to make up the genius of

¹ Alfred Fouillée was born in 1838. He was for a number of years a professor in different educational institutions in his native France. In 1879 he retired from active life on account of his health, although he has written and published a great deal since that time. His best-known works are "Free Will and Determinism," "The Philosophy of Plato," "Morality, Art, and Religion, according to Guyau," "Psychology of the French People," and "Education from a National Standpoint." This book forms the twenty-third volume of the International Educational Series. It is an interesting fact that Professor Fouillée's second wife wrote a number of popular books for children, which, as they appeared under a pseudonym, were supposed to be the work of her husband. This lady's son, who died at the early age of thirty-four, was a young man of extraordinary ability. At the age of nineteen he received a prize from the French Academy for a memoir on Utilitarian Morality. He is best known to English readers by his "Education and Heredity." Professor Fouillée edited some of his step-son's works, and also incorporated his *idea-forces* and *hypnotic suggestion* into his own educational theories.

² Rafael Altamira is professor in the University of Oviedo. Besides his "Psychology of the Spanish People," he has published "The

a people are so elusive, so varied in their nature, they manifest themselves in so many ways, as to make it well-nigh impossible to group them so that the resulting *ensemble* shall not be wrong almost as often as it is right. Everybody who has had the opportunity to compare them knows, or thinks he knows, that an Englishman differs from a Scotchman, a German from a Spaniard, and wherein the difference lies; but, if we call for a clear-cut definition of the differences, it will usually be found that no two persons agree, except in the most general way. On some points they will very likely contradict one another.

It is generally admitted, that, of all modern nations, the Germans are the most given to the cult of royalty, the most submissive under governmental pressure or oppression, the most ready to yield obedience to authority that emanates from a personal source. *Per contra*, we find that the Swiss, many of whom are, if possible, more German than the inhabitants of Germany, were the first people of modern times to establish a republican form of government and to abolish all titles of royalty. And they did these things at a time when religious motives played no part in the drama. The conditions that constrained the Dutch to rise against their oppressors were somewhat dissimilar, for with them religion was a potent factor; yet it may well be asked, in the light of modern history, whether any German state, strictly speaking, would under any circumstances have imitated either the Swiss or the Dutch. Tacitus and other ancient authors tell us that one of the leading traits, if not the leading trait, of the ancient Germans, was their restiveness under

Teaching of History," "A History of Spain and Spanish Civilization," "The Teaching of the Social Sciences in Spain," "A Theory of Civilization," "Introduction to the History of Spanish Law," etc. None of his books have been translated into English. Professor Altamira is one of the most enlightened of living Spaniards, and is probably doing more than any other man to better the educational condition of his country.

authority, and their violent antipathy to every form of governmental tyranny. A modern observer will tell us, that, if there is one trait for which the Germans of Austria and of the Empire are not conspicuous, it is the love of liberty, as it is understood in Anglo-Saxon lands. The probability is, that, when ancient writers characterize certain peoples as being passionately attached to liberty, they are, in fact, portraying the barbarian turbulence, and hatred of all restraint, even the most wholesome, that is characteristic of every tribe in a primitive state of civilization.

Erckmann-Chatrian in their border novels frequently speak of the light-heartedness and nonchalance of the French. We are told that they are careless of their own lives and of the lives of others; that they are prone to rush into danger without reflection, and to make light not only of the sufferings of others, but even of their own. This accords very well with what Cæsar and other Roman historians have left upon record regarding the Kelts,—presentments that have been repeated times without number. The amusing feature of this portrayal by the distinguished novelists is that they are not describing Frenchmen at all, but Germans who had been under a French *régime* only a few generations. Experience has shown, that, when it is possible for a government to modify the psyche of a people, it requires much longer than three or four generations. Any one who is in the least degree familiar with the German people as a whole will readily admit that there is as much difference between the dwellers on the shores of the Baltic or the North Sea and the inhabitants of the Alpine regions as there is between a Lombard and a Calabrian, and more than there is between a Hampshire and a Dumfries farmer. Then there are the Germans of Austria, who are quite as genuinely Teutonic as the Swabians or the Saxons, yet they are wholly unlike either.

Again, it is a common practice with writers on ethnological psychology to speak of a Slavic soul as if it were something at least tangible enough to be intellectually apprehended without difficulty. The one trait that is most frequently mentioned is an averseness from exertion, a passivity under all conditions, a lack of initiative. This trait is said to manifest itself sometimes in resignation to the will of God, sometimes as stolidity pure and simple, sometimes as fatalism of the crassest kind. The historical fact, however, is, that all of the Slavic peoples dwelling between the Baltic, the Ægean, and the Black Sea, chief among which are the Poles, are the most difficult to govern of the nations of Europe. The Poles were never able to maintain a stable government over themselves; but neither are they willing to submit to foreign domination. Again, the Bretons are of the same stock with the Welsh north of the Channel; albeit, they have less in common than a Chinaman and a Turk. The Welsh are progressive, wide-awake, enterprising, fond of music, devoted Protestants, emotional in their religious life, and intelligent. The Bretons are ultra-conservative, indifferent to music, bigoted Roman Catholics, stolid, and ignorant. Almost every Welshman knows English in addition to his native tongue; of the Bretons more than half have refused to learn French. There is a good deal of truth in the saying that if you stir an Englishman's feelings he at once goes to his pocket-book, while a Welshman, when similarly affected, sings hymns.

Modern historians of ancient Rome are wont to dwell upon the utter lack of the artistic instinct, the æsthetic sense, of the people whose expansion began in the city of the Seven Hills. It is a question whether this lack was inherent or the result of the conditions under which they were compelled to develop their polity. Less than a millennium after the overthrow of the empire, and almost within the shadow of the Eternal City, an art-

cult sprang up, without any external stimulus, that has not only continued until this day, but spread over all the contiguous lands. Not long after its appearance in Italy, we find it in Spain, in France, and even in the adjacent parts of Germany, as well as in the Netherlands. Some recent writers have maintained that this movement was due at bottom to the Teutonic invaders of the Italian peninsula. If this be true, how does it come that we find it in Spain, where this influence has never been potent? It is probable that a national mentality which is fairly permanent can be engendered among a people whose situation is such that they are permitted to work out their own destiny, and to develop their own institutions, with little or no interference from without; but that there is a radical and unchangeable psychic substratum which prevents different peoples or different races from becoming more or less alike seems highly problematical.

With these reservations it may be possible to distinguish some persistent forces in the life of a people, to trace the lines along which these forces have manifested themselves, and to discover to what extent they have been incorporated into institutions political and social. If from any cause there is a serious break in the continuity of a nation's life, the current is usually diverted in another direction, never to follow the old channel again. Greece and Rome both perished through internal disintegration and external pressure; but it is probable that the ethnic soul of the former underwent the greater transformation.

For the study of national character no country of Europe affords so favorable a field as Great Britain. Excepting the extreme north and west, its people are the most homogeneous, while the continuity of their national life has not been seriously unjointed since the German invaders first took possession. Foreign influences have at different times and in different de-

grees modified institutions, but have never transformed them. It is the purpose of this article to point out some of the features of the Anglo-Saxon character that are *sui generis*, or at least largely so.

TRIAL BY JURY.

First and foremost, we may place the manner in which the idea of practical justice is conceived. There is no institution of modern times that is so exclusively of British origin as trial by jury. Some writers on the history of law maintain that it is due to the Teutonic invaders, while others are equally positive that it cannot be traced farther back than the Conquest. Be that as it may, this mode of administering justice is an exotic in all other countries. It is important to remember, also, that the Normans were men of the north, and therefore not racially different from those they brought under subjection. At any rate, trial by jury was developed north of the Channel. So firmly has this mode of adjudication entrenched itself among the Anglo-Saxons, that no serious objection has ever been raised against the principle on which it rests. One of the first demands made by the French revolutionists was the establishment of trial by jury. It has been gradually adopted in various forms in nearly all the countries of Europe; though, strangely enough, in two Germanic countries, Holland and Scandinavia, it has hardly gained a foothold. The tenacity with which it is adhered to is probably due to the conviction that law and justice are not necessarily interchangeable terms; that, while a judge learned in the law may be more competent to determine the legal aspects of an act, he is not necessarily more competent to decide what is right or wrong than the average citizen. "A man's a man for a' that" is a thoroughly Anglo-Saxon maxim. Manhood is not conditioned upon attainments, or possessions, or station in life. It is the law that makes the criminal, but a

deed is not necessarily a crime because it is forbidden by law under penalty. To acquit a man of a crime charged against him is not unequivocally a miscarriage of justice, as may be seen by comparing the criminal calendar of one country with that of another, or the same country at different epochs. England has been a refuge for political and religious outlaws since the rise of Protestantism; perhaps even longer.

It may be set down as a general fact that juries are always more lenient than judges. The former represent the unresting growth of public opinion; the latter the slowly changing written statute. Many unrepealed laws are not enforced because they embody the psychology of a past era. It may be confidently affirmed that the comparatively mild administration of legal pains and penalties in Anglo-Saxon countries is chiefly owing to the fact that juries are much more prone to take into account mitigating circumstances than are judges. The jury may be regarded as a manifestation of the popular confidence in the innate sense of justice possessed by the average man. The statutory prohibition to try a person charged with a crime at any other place than where the crime was committed is part and parcel of the conviction that the administration of justice cannot be unconditionally intrusted to those who have been trained in the law. The legal aspects of a case may differ more or less widely from its moral aspects; and the average citizen, in so far as he has to do with the creation and administration of laws, assumes that he ought, so far as possible, to keep the ultimate decision in his own hands.

The Anglo-Saxon mind always clearly distinguishes between legal and moral honesty. Abstractly considered, it is evident that an alleged criminal should be tried under the same laws which made his act a crime; but the place is of no importance. It would even seem that a favorable verdict might often be ex-

pected at a distance from the scene of the crime; yet a change of venue is rarely claimed or allowed. The assumption is that twelve men can always be found who are sufficiently free from bias, prejudice, and prepossession, and whose emotions are sufficiently under control, to make it probable that they will render a verdict in accordance with the law and the facts. The Continental adhesion to Roman criminal jurisprudence, with its atrocities, was a great misfortune for mankind; and it is greatly to the credit of English ideas of justice and equity that it never became firmly entrenched among that people. A sense of self-sufficiency or independence manifests itself very early, and comes to the surface in British history from time to time. A competent authority says: "No other Germanic nation has bequeathed to us out of its earliest experience so rich a treasure of original legal documents as the Anglo-Saxon has." Although an ancestor of Sir John Fortescue is said to have saved the life of William the Conqueror, that worthy declared that the English were competent to govern themselves according to laws of their own making.

Another marked difference between the English and Teutonic mind especially, is to be noticed in their attitude toward law in general. In Germany, laws are framed on the assumption that the average citizen has a natural propensity to become a criminal: accordingly the law-making power must see to it that he is protected not only against his fellow-citizens, but also against himself. He is a constant object of suspicion and surveillance. The government, through its ubiquitous eyes and ears and hands, is ever on the alert for criminals. The most orderly and timid citizen is not allowed to move about from place to place without putting himself on record as to his plans and purposes. The police force is a vast army of delators, each member of which takes pride in showing his efficiency by his officiousness.

Hence even the petulant outburst of youthful indiscretion is liable to be construed and punished as lese-majesty. The government arrogates to itself the prerogative to decide what the subject shall do, and what he shall think and say, not only in public, but likewise in private. Conversely, English law takes for granted every man's innocence until he is proven guilty. He may go where he pleases, do what he likes, and say what seemeth unto him good, so long as he does not interfere with any one else who has the same rights and privileges. The executors of the law are not above law any more than they are superior to the moral law; they are amenable to it as much as the humblest citizen. It is a postulate that wrong may be done in the interpretation and application of the law; that the state represents a principle, not an individual or a class.

The foreigner in Great Britain is constantly impressed with the almost universal respect for law, though its officers make little display of the insignia of their authority. That the same thing cannot be said of the United States is due, in some degree at least, to the mixed character of the population. In this respect, Canada, except in the Province of Quebec, more nearly represents the mother country. It is an interesting fact in the history of international opinion that both Frenchmen and Germans, who for at least two centuries past have had the opportunity to study English political institutions, without exception have been their warm admirers. Even those Germans who for the last two decades have been most severely afflicted with Anglophobia—and they are neither few nor far between—have manifested a hatred of the English people rather than of British institutions. Their thought, if not their parole, is: "If you would only quit meddling where we want to meddle we should get along very well together."

A FEW CHARACTERISTIC WORDS.

It has been observed by more than one student of comparative linguistics that no language contains an exact equivalent of our word "fair." Evidently, then, the idea which it connotes is uniquely English. "A fair field and no favor" is all the typical Englishman asks. The thought is based on the conviction that with these conditions granted he can hold his own against the world. It is this sentiment that Shakespeare has "englished" in the words he puts into the mouth of Macbeth when his wife urges him to kill Duncan clandestinely,—for the original character upon whom the great dramatist has modeled his hero murders his rival without compunction. While assassination was, until in comparatively recent times, a favorite method of getting rid of a rival among the Latin races, it has rarely been resorted to on English soil. A St. Bartholomew's Night could not have occurred where British notions of fair play prevailed. Give your opponent the same chance you ask for yourself, whether it be in a commercial transaction, in an athletic contest, in a trial of wits, or in anything else; then, if you lose, take your defeat like a man. This consciousness of personal worth and power sometimes makes the Englishman, if he happens to be lacking in culture, a rather disagreeable person. He is self-contained and self-centered; he does not like to have his individualism broken in upon. This same trait is largely responsible for making him unpopular with foreigners. Yet the fact is, if he is understood, and approached in the right way, no man can be more ready to do a favor or is more genuinely altruistic.

What has been affirmed of "fair" is equally true of "manly" and "gentleman." Who but an Englishman would think of writing a book on the Manliness of Christ? The Tom Brown books have become recognized classics far beyond the circle for which they were written, not because their hero is a par-

ticularly good student, but because he is a fine, manly fellow. We find the same spirit in the pedagogical ideas of Thomas Arnold, England's most revered teacher, and in the Cecil Rhodes scholarships. A thoroughly English view of life underlies a remark attributed to Lord Thurlow, that a judge must first of all be a gentleman; if he knows a little law, so much the better, but the essential qualification is that he be a gentleman. Thackeray says: "What is it to be a gentleman? Is it to be honest, to be gentle, to be generous, to be brave, to be wise, and, possessing all these qualities, to exercise them in the most graceful outward manner? Ought a gentleman to be a loyal son, a true husband, an honest father? Ought his life to be decent, his bills to be paid, his aims to be noble?" Long before Thackeray had asked this question, Steele had answered it: "In a word, to be a fine gentleman is to be a generous and brave man." Coleridge and Burke agree "that our manners, our civilization, and all the good that is connected with manners and with civilization, have in this European world of ours depended upon two principles,—I mean the spirit of a gentleman and the spirit of religion."

EDUCATION.

Owing to the wide-spread feeling that every Englishman ought to provide for the education of his children, popular education has made slow progress in that country. That the government has negatively encouraged abuses is painfully evident to any one who reads the economic history of England. Some years ago a gentleman, when speaking of compulsory education, remarked: "It is un-English and therefore unpopular." Either of the old universities has probably done more for the cause of letters than any other half-dozen institutions in the world. Knowing this, it is not surprising that modern English sentiment is favorable to the encouragement of higher education,

but decidedly averse to forcing it upon any one, no matter what its grade. Possibly this conservatism or individualism is, at least in this regard, out of date. But who shall dare so affirm with the full conviction that he is right? Compulsory education has hardly passed the experimental stage. Many persons who once had implicit faith in it as a panacea for all moral, social, and political ills are no longer as optimistic as they once were. Besides, constraint in this direction may not be equally suited to all nations, or equally necessary everywhere. One fact is incontrovertible: we may instruct and inform by compulsory means,—we cannot educate.

Although the English people have always shown a certain aversion to government control of education, the literature of no other country is so permeated with the didactic spirit. Notwithstanding Goethe's dictum that art and ethics have not necessarily anything in common, British writers have for five centuries maintained a higher uniform level of excellence than those of any other nation, ancient or modern. Yet they have put into their productions a great deal of what may be called preaching. Poets, novelists, historians, scientists, art-critics—all have written with ethical ends in view. Sometimes the teaching and exhortation is rather too prominent or obtrusive, as in Wordsworth,—a characteristic for which Taine ridicules, and Lamb mildly censures, him; still, has become a well-recognized fact that Wordsworth is one of the half-dozen greatest British poets of the nineteenth century. Possibly even this limitation is unjust to his fame.

Notwithstanding his temporary popularity and his extraordinary talents, Byron's hold upon his countrymen was not enduring. This is due, not so much to his having written some rather immoral verse, as to his flippant and sneering manner. An Englishman does not take kindly to a moral cynic. And

Byron did not take life as seriously as his countrymen expect everybody to do, although in his later years his views underwent a marked change. The world is bad, but no man has a right to consider it hopeless. It is probable that Swinburne has done his reputation an irreparable injury by some early publications that were regarded as of questionable propriety. Those who remember the vigorous and violent opposition made by the evangelicals to the evolution theory two or three score years ago will readily recall that it was based solely on its supposed detriment to morals. Carlyle took the same ground, though his position was outside the pale of orthodoxy. Assuming that morality is based on the Bible, it was taken for granted, that whatever doctrine tended to undermine its authority was, of necessity, inimical to upright living. Yet Darwin was a man of almost saint-like gentleness of disposition. Later the conditions gave rise to a great mass of reconciliation literature. Its purpose was to prove, that, if the evolution theory be true, it cannot, taken by and large, be at variance with the teachings of Scripture, since the natural world and the spiritual world must, from the very nature of the case, harmonize with one another.

RELIGION.

These reflections naturally bring us to the consideration of an English characteristic that is conspicuous throughout the entire history of the country: it is what Carlyle calls "religiosity," and Baxter "religionism." This trait begins to manifest itself on British soil before the dwellers thereon can properly be called English. The conquest by Christianity of the greater part of the island was rapidly and peacefully consummated almost two centuries before Charlemagne "converted" the Saxons of the mainland by his drastic methods. It will perhaps always remain an unsolved problem why the Germans that separated

from their kindred on the Continent embraced the new religion so much earlier and so much more heartily than those who remained behind. Everybody knows how sincere and disinterested was King Alfred's desire to spread a more profound knowledge of its tenets among his subjects. In this respect the Conquest wrought no perceptible change; it added little, if anything, and probably subtracted nothing.

With the Lollards and Wiclif we find this spirit coming prominently to the front. It scarcely admits of a doubt that the real beginning of the Reformation is to be sought and found in England. So far as such a movement can be traced to one man, Wiclif is the central figure. His teachings and his preaching produced permanent effects; for his doctrines were accepted by large numbers of his countrymen. It is a matter of history that he was the chief inspiration of Hus and Jerome of Prague. That the fate of the men and the spread of their doctrines were so widely different is due mainly to the comparative independence of the church in England,—a status that was affirmed by the Constitutions of Clarendon, and in other ways. Bohemia was forced back into the mother church, and the two foremost champions of reform were executed. Wiclif was permitted to end his days, if not in peace, at least without being subjected to bodily constraint. During the era of Cromwell, English orthodoxy appeared in its most fanatical but also in its most vigorous form, though it was more or less confused with the desire for political liberty.

After the reformed religion had become firmly established, a period of comparative indifference settled down upon the ruling classes. Although they preserved and observed the outward forms of religion, its spirit was almost wholly lacking. But it is a mistake to suppose that this indifference permeated all classes. It is probable that a considerable majority were

unaffected by the prevailing latitudinarianism. "Constitutional historians are constantly perplexed by this question: How did it happen that whilst the government was from 1688 onwards all but avowedly based on a system of corruption which often took the form of bribery, yet from some influence of which it is hard to assign a cause, the public spirit of England improved as time went on; and while the anomalies of the Constitution remained unchanged the moral tone of the country so changed as to reform the working of the Constitution? How was it, to put the same inquiry in another form, that a generation which had been guided or corrupted by Walpole was succeeded by a generation which adored Pitt; how was it that Chatham handed on his ideal of public spirit to his son; how did it happen that before the reign of George III. had come to an end, a kind of corruption had become impossible which, when he ascended the throne, statesmen might still practice without blame? The answer surely is to be found in the increasing influence of a middle class, the members of which had been aroused by evangelical teachers to a new sense of both public and private duty."

With the advent of the Wesleys and Whitefield the forces of orthodoxy again became aggressive, though in a different form from the previous century. It is a peculiarity of the English religiousness that it has always, as it still does, spurred its votaries into activity. It was in a measure a return to primitive conditions. Although the Methodist doctrine of personal conversion, in modern times at least, originated among the Germans, it never shared the tendency toward mysticism and quietism. The convert's first question was to be not so much, How must I feel to be saved? but, What must I do to be saved? Wesley and Luther preached justification by faith with equal insistence, but they made very different demands on those who professed to have accepted it. There is little doubt that for

decades German morals were a good deal the worse for the Lutheran upheaval; on the other hand, all authorities are agreed that the Wesleyan revival had a wholesome effect on English public life. "Those who ask why it was that the passions evoked on the whole so little sympathy among the English middle classes find a true though partial answer to their inquiry in the consideration that the evangelical revival enlisted under the standard of religion those who felt most keenly the enthusiasm of humanity. Philanthropy, which on the Continent was the opponent, became in England the ally of religious enthusiasm, So close was this connection that it is absolutely impossible to say whether toward the end of the eighteenth and in the first half of the nineteenth century, philanthropy or religion did most to promote every effort for the diminution of human suffering. . . . To evangelicalism may be justly ascribed a revival of earnest, practical piety amongst the middle classes, the moralization of English public life, and the triumph of English humanitarianism."

It is not therefore surprising that within recent years several writers have found the influence of three men chiefly responsible for the slight impression made in Great Britain by the revolutionary spirit which appeared in France with such violence at the close of the eighteenth century. This trio consisted of Dr. Samuel Johnson, Edmund Burke, and John Wesley. The amount of influence attributed to each of the three varies with the personal equation of the writer. The salient fact, however, is that all three were thoroughly evangelical in religion, the last two obtrusively so.

THE IDEA OF RESPONSIBILITY.

The English-speaking people are the only ones on the face of the globe who, rightly or wrongly, feel that they are their brother's keeper; that they have in good faith a burden to bear

that is as broad as human injustice and misery. The feeling that is unconsciously present in the mind of almost every thinking Englishman is that life is burdened with responsibilities; that living is a serious business; and that this responsibility embraces not merely those about him, but almost the entire human race. We find this note of seriousness, and even of sadness, dominant in the earliest Anglo-Saxon poetry. But this poetry is also negatively distinguished by the absence of moral grossness and sensuality.

Among no other people can one find so many individuals who practice and preach the doctrine that one ought not to do any act, however harmless in itself, which may become a stumbling-block for a fellow-man who is weakly striving to walk in the path of rectitude. "I am my brother's keeper." Therefore is the white man's burden voluntarily and patiently, if not cheerfully borne, whether there is any governmental responsibility or not. The latest utterance upon this great problem is President Roosevelt's interpretation of the Monroe doctrine. It is an assumption that the country he represents is in a large measure responsible for the good behavior and honesty of the nations on this side of the globe. But coupled with it is the thought that we are the best judges of what is right, fair, and equitable; we are therefore in duty bound to see that all parties in interest receive their due. The same sentiment finds utterance in the recent address of Lord Curzon,—sentiments that are worthy of the man and of the nation for which he spoke. Said he: "If our rule in India is to last, it must depend upon eternal moralities of righteousness and justice. Unless we can persuade the millions of India that we will give them absolute justice as between man and man, equality before the law, freedom from tyranny, injustice, and oppression, then your empire will not touch their hearts and will fade away. To me, the message is

carved in granite, it is hewn out of the rock of doom, that our work is righteous and that it shall endure." The British mind for at least a century shows pretty clearly marked symptoms of pessimism, especially among its thinkers; though Gladstone and Browning were, in widely different spheres, marked exceptions. This undertone of seriousness is as evident in the utterances of the scientists as in the writings of persons who have concerned themselves with social problems. This feeling of responsibility is further most strikingly exhibited in the missionary zeal of the English-speaking Protestants. We may think of its wisdom or unwisdom as we please, we cannot refuse to believe that it is a practical exhibition of disinterested devotion. The latest statistics report an expenditure of about seventeen millions for foreign missions in one year,—verily a colossal sum when we remember that all of it is a purely voluntary offering. And it is quite within bounds to say that nineteen-twentieths of this money is contributed by persons whose native tongue is English, though Germans are to some extent co-workers in the cause.

It is often charged against the Anglo-Saxon people, more especially against the American branch, that Mammon is its God. Unfortunately there is much truth in the charge. Most Americans set a high value upon money, and many resort to questionable methods for acquiring it. Albeit, plenty of evidence is attainable to prove that they are on the whole the most liberal givers on the face of the earth. It would be no easy task to estimate with an approximation to accuracy the sums collected for the support of a free church in Anglo-Saxon countries, but that they exceed a hundred million dollars annually is highly probable. A free church in a free state is an Anglo-Saxon experiment and a successful one. Everybody will watch with interest the results of the tentatives in the same

direction now being made in France. Aside from donations for purely religious enterprises, the gifts for various philanthropic and benevolent objects are annually enormous. The English temperament is somewhat heavy; it is certainly serious. It has often been said, and with a good deal of truth, that the English take their pleasures sadly; without question they take most of them strenuously. An English Voltaire with his *Ecrases l'infame* is impossible and even unthinkable.

The transformation that a view of life may undergo when transplanted to British soil from a foreign country is strikingly shown in Carlyle's attitude toward Goethe. Whilst the one declared that ethics and æsthetics have not necessarily anything in common; that the mission of the latter is to illuminate and delight, but not to preach or teach, his Scotch disciple wished that the devil might fly away with the fine arts, and hardly took up his pen except to preach. This moral earnestness, this implicit faith in a cosmic power that makes for righteousness, which neither individuals nor nations can disregard without paying the penalty, is evident in English writers in all departments. We see it in Carlyle's denunciation of shams, and in his glorification of the hero who may temporarily act counter to all canons of justice as popularly conceived if he will but save men from their sins of short-sightedness. We find much the same spirit in Froude, with whom history is one long and solemn lesson of human responsibility. It is plain in Arnold with his plea for a higher conception of Christianity, for culture and conduct. It pervades English poetry from Piers the Plowman to Rudyard Kipling. Of the first of the distinguished trio, Darwin, Spencer, and Wallace, I have already spoken. Spencer repeatedly, and at times with indignation, repelled the charge of materialism, whilst Wallace shows a tendency toward mysticism. It is to be noted that the one great British historian

who occasionally falls into a tone of flippancy when dealing with a serious subject, was so strongly under French influence that he was for a time in doubt as to the language in which he should write his great work.

That the moral life of the Anglo-Saxon people perennially renews itself through religion is strikingly shown by the temperance movement. Total abstinence seems to have been first practiced by the Quakers; then John Wesley began to urge it upon his converts. In Great Britain the cause has not made as much headway as in the younger settlements, because it has to contend against strongly entrenched financial interests. But outside of the island almost all of the dissenting churches have in the course of time become temperance societies. Every church building in the United States and Canada is a sort of fortress from which sallies are frequently made against the drink evil. *Per contra*, in Germany almost the entire hierarchy is opposed to the movement. It seems almost impossible to arouse the English-speaking people to permanent effort, for they have not a little of the Roman *gravitas*, except through the stimulus of the religious emotions. Its latest phase is the Salvation Army. Here, too, moral regeneration is expected to follow the passage of the individual through an emotional crisis. However little sympathy we may have with the noise and fanfaronade, the testimony of all who have taken the trouble to investigate for themselves is in the highest degree favorable to the results achieved by this unique organization. The most pronounced atheists, whether native or foreign, have recognized the self-sacrifice, the benevolent intentions, and the beneficent results already achieved and still in the process of achievement by the Salvationists.

Somewhat older, but equally based on the religious sentiment, is the Young Men's Christian Association. Of its founder,

Sir George Williams, it is said he was "a member of the Church of England of the evangelical type, very earnest and at times emotional in public address, but broad-minded in accepting the more practical and less directly pietistic or devotional developments of the Association's progress." Though in its inception a purely religious organization, the "activities of the Young Men's Christian Association have been extended until they have reached almost every phase of spiritual, mental, and physical endeavor." In its threescore years' existence its membership has risen to nearly a million, and its property to the value of forty million dollars. Verily, this is a remarkable record; but it is safe to say that it was possible only under Anglo-Saxon auspices, and with the religious sentiment as a bond of union. On the other hand, the various ethical societies that have at different times been called into existence have not flourished, however worthy and disinterested their objects. The mere exhortation to do right because it is right is not a sufficiently powerful incentive. It must be joined with the call to repentance, to conversion, to a change of heart as well as of life. To the Anglo-Saxon, conversion rarely means an immersion into quietism; it is rather an incentive to renewed activity, to missionary effort at home or abroad. The convert not only feels that he is a better man, but is convinced that he is called upon to share his blessings with others. He becomes conscious that his religion ought to permeate, to purify, and to stimulate his whole secular life.

The contrast between the "Puritan" and Continental Sabbath is so well known that it needed not to be mentioned here except for two significant reasons. One is that in many of the large British cities foreigners have begun to open their shops on the first day of the week, and the natives, in order not to lose trade, are following their example. The other is that a bill was

recently laid before Parliament, and vigorously championed by a noted liberal thinker, the object of which is to restore to the Sabbath its former place as a day of rest. Herein we have another symptom of the traces orthodoxy has left upon English thought after the foundations on which it is based are crumbling to decay.

ART.

It has often been remarked that Great Britain has never produced a sculptor, a painter, or a musician of the first rank, and not even of the second rank, until comparatively recent times. It would seem that in certain directions the artistic instinct is lacking in the British people. This becomes easily evident when one takes a promenade through London or any of the larger insular cities, after the most cursory glance at Paris or Berlin or Munich. Art is prized in the main only so far as it ministers to utility; consequently, while England has produced many skillful artisans, it is the native land of not one artist of supreme genius. Perhaps this arrested development is due to some extent to the prevailing belief that at least the plastic and pictorial arts are generally sensuous, often sensual.

On the other hand, no people of ancient or modern times has shown a keener appreciation of art when applied to speech. It is a matter of common knowledge and altogether beyond cavil that the body of English oratorical literature embraces a larger number of productions of the highest excellence than all the rest of the world's literature combined. This coldness toward art is also manifested in the English indifference toward the stage. In fact, the popular attitude may be designated as hostile; many volumes have been written in denunciation of it. It is well known that many of his own countrymen did not recognize the greatness of Shakespeare until it was revealed by the Germans. We have here the curious anomaly that the

world's greatest dramatist belongs to a nation that lightly regards the stage. Preëminent as Shakespeare is, he has had no successors by a long interval. Unique conditions seem to have been responsible for the appearance of a unique man; hence it has been often affirmed that the Bard of Avon belongs to the world rather than to any one people. His works are read and studied, for the insight they display into the secret springs of human motives, by thousands who use the same language, but who have never seen his dramas on the boards, and who have no wish to see them.

It would hardly occur to a representative Anglo-Saxon that the stage could be made a medium of moral instruction and enlightenment. This was, however, the belief of Schiller and Goethe, a belief that is still held by a large majority of their countrymen. Among the English-speaking people the stage is regarded as essentially a minister to pleasure, and to pleasure of a somewhat questionable kind. Hence those who wish to enjoy it are expected to pay for it, not the government. Ruskin persistently and vehemently insists on finding the moral and religious in art. But it is God's art rather than man's. For him it is man who is incessantly desecrating and disfiguring what the Creator has made beautiful. Ruskin never tires of displaying the wonder-world of sky and cloud, of mountain and tree, of water and grasses, of sunshine and shade. Like most Englishmen, however, he violates Goethe's canon, for he always finds the moral in art. In his eagerness to open the spiritual eyes of his countrymen to the lessons of benevolence and kindness, he not only preaches but often denounces. He would have every one see the beautiful, do the good, and strive after the true. Though his teachings are pervaded by a strongly utilitarian spirit, it is a utilitarianism far too lofty for the great majority of his readers. Whilst it is true that his voice was not quite the voice of

one crying in the wilderness, for there are always some choice spirits who will listen to him who is in deadly earnest and who shows by his works the sincerity of the faith that is in him, his proposed commonwealth was far too Utopian for the mass of his contemporaries. Whatever may be the destiny of Ruskin's works, he will always hold an important place in the history of modern thought, because he was a true type of the English character at its best, as shown by his untiring efforts to harmonize the useful with the ethical and the æsthetic.