

he too had more immediate cares. Thus it came about that during the long peace-negotiations at Chatillon, Paris and Vienna, the blackest spot in the Law of Nations to-day was not so much as touched. Public opinion, blindly enthusiastic as it was for glorious Albion, saw nothing wrong in all this."

"In face of the utterly conscienceless, everywhere wearing-out and worrying commercial policy (of England in 1840), all other civilised nations would seem to be natural allies. England was the shield of barbarism in the Law of Nations. It was the fault of England alone that Naval Warfare, to the shame of humanity, still remained organised piracy. It was incumbent equally on all nations to restore on the seas that Balance of Power which had long existed on the land, that healthy Balance which prevented any State from doing whatever it liked, and so secured to each State a humane international law.

"As soon as the Eastern question was again in full swing a far-sighted policy ought to have aimed at least at limiting the crushing foreign domination which England's fleets exercised from Gibraltar, Malta and Corfu, and at restoring the Mediterranean Sea to the Mediterranean nations. But the Prussian State had as yet no fleet, it could not, it dared not, rise to so free a view of those far distant disputes, so long as it was itself scarcely able to give necessary protection to the crushed German world, and no Italian Great Power yet existed."

Colonies.—Treitschke's greatest grievance was that England possessed so many colonies which she had "acquired by theft, robbery and treachery," which she is utterly "unable to govern satisfactorily." His attitude may be summed up in Cramb's words: "How is the persistence of a great unwarlike Power sprawling Fafnirwise across the planet to be tolerated by a nation of warriors?"

Already when a mere boy Treitschke wrote a poem about one Ambrosius Dalfinger who in 1529 tried to

conquer Venezuela's coast for his native town, the mighty Hansa-town, Augsburg :

"Tears must in very truth bedim my eye !
Our sons at that time went not out as beggars,
Exiled by the misery of their Fatherland,
And scorned by haughty foreigners
As stupid children, as notorious thieves—
No ! Dalfinger's victorious host came to those shores
Bringing destruction, death ! but also mighty deeds.
Resplendent standest thou before my eyes
Dalfinger, a German Cortez, magnificent and proud !"

In a paper on "The Future of German Secondary Education" we read : "Is it possible to provide this nation with its over-flowing forces, with its antagonism to the cowardly doctrine of the two-children-system, is it possible to provide it with a place where they have sufficient elbow-room, without being lost to the Fatherland ?"

In a speech of 1885 Treitschke said : "Who would have dreamed only twenty years ago that our German banner would be flying to-day in three-quarters of the globe ? Yes, we will be there too, we will guarantee that Germany has her proper share in ruling the heathen world by European Christianity, in order that at last what has already been accomplished on land may be attained on the sea—a real Balance of Power, in order that the world wide sway of One Power on the sea, with its memories of the barbarism of earlier centuries, may be broken."

Colonies, according to him, enable the State to provide for its surplus population without losing the working power and the capital of the emigrants, which in the past only enriched America and other countries. But not only for mere materialistic reasons are colonies an absolute necessity. Colonies are not only an economic necessity but also a moral necessity for a powerful expanding nation which can claim to be a missionary of civilisation. Treitschke, to give him some credit,

had in view with that probably only savage and semi-civilised countries. But it is England, England all the while! "In this world of ours a thing that is a sham through and through cannot last for ever. It may last for a time, but it is doomed to fall; in a world which is governed by valour, by the Will unto Power, there is no room for such a sham!" Thus spake Treitschke, the apostle of the religion of valour!

Germany and England.—In order to "explain" this unfortunate conflict between the descendants of those men whom a Tacitus admired and a Cæsar respected there have been on both sides the most frantic efforts to find scape-goats. The Emperor William II and Sir Edward Grey are amongst the favourites. No insinuation is sinister enough, no adjective vile enough but it will be applied to them by certain sections of the public and the press. Then here in our country Treitschke and Bernhardi are easy seconds, and poor old Nietzsche gets the third place. Of course this scape-goat business is ridiculous. Nietzsche despised the Germans, and if a certain enterprising bookseller in London with his big window-placard "The Euro-Nietzschean War" imagines he has solved the problem he is mistaken. The spirit of Nietzsche's philosophy may have contributed to some extent to counteract Christian influences in Germany, and thus have facilitated the catastrophe, but really Nietzsche is read very little now in Germany in spite of Gerhart Hauptmann's opinion.

Bernhardi too is much over-rated. Hundreds of German books on war are published every year, and Bernhardi is just a fortunate author whose books were borne on the crest of the wave. Treitschke himself is but one of many. His successor Delbrück is just as bad. Delbrück too objects to "other Powers" dividing up the world, and insists on a share for Germany. He calls Britain "our inveterate enemy."

The real immediate causes of this world-conflict are much more complex and cannot possibly be simplified

into the comfortable formula of a few names or catch-words.

There is the absence of an international law which commands obedience. There are vested interests. In Germany men like Krupp, Gwinner, Rathenau, Ballin, Thyssen and others are by the very nature of their business compelled to be intensely "patriotic." There are men like that here in our country too. Now such men, at least most of them, are "all honourable men," but they are unconsciously foes to the comity of nations. Then there are the aspirations of rulers and politicians; there is the greed of international financiers; there is the lauded ambition of the soldier.

Finally, there is the incredible ignorance about one another that estranges the nations. The "literary" output of war books in Germany as well as here is a proof. Gentlemen who have not the slightest knowledge of the opponents' history and traditions, often not even of their language, write the most unspeakable vitriolic nonsense about the "treacherous English," "the modern Huns"; German scholars, may-be great scholars in their line—whose knowledge of England, and English character, is based on an intimate acquaintance with the English spirit, English home-life, and the English countryside, an acquaintance acquired in Bloomsbury during their three months' reading at the British Museum—prove us to be "decadent," "materialists," "shopkeepers." And even the late Mr. Gladstone, a fine classical scholar, was so ignorant of some things modern that he condemned Göthe as an immoral writer.

It is only if we keep in mind the vastness and complexity of even direct causes, the slow poisoning influence of indirect causes like ignorance and stupidity, that we can judge Treitschke rightly and allot to him his proper share and proportion of guilt. Then, perceiving him to be only one of the growths from the teeth of the dragon Hate, only one of the giants whom Law, another Theseus, will slay—we may, though we cannot forgive Treitschke,

yet perhaps better understand his point of view when he says :

“ Our last reckoning, that with England, will probably be the most tedious, and the most difficult ; for here we are confronted by a line of policy which for centuries, almost unhindered by the other Powers, aims directly at maritime supremacy. How long has Germany in all seriousness believed this insular race, which among all the nations of Europe is undoubtedly imbued with the most marked national selfishness, the greatness of which consists precisely in its hard, inaccessible one-sidedness, to be the magnanimous protector of the freedom of all nations !

813
N. “ Now, at last our eyes begin to be opened, and we recognise what clear-headed political thinkers have never doubted, that England's State-policy since the days of William III has never been anything else than a remarkably shrewd and remarkably conscienceless commercial policy. The extraordinary successes of this State-policy have been purchased at a high price, consisting in the first place of a number of sins and enormities. The history of the English East India Company is the most defiled page in the annals of modern European nations, for as the shocking vampirism of this merchant-rule sprang solely from greed, it cannot be excused, as perhaps the acts of Philip II, or Robespierre may be, by the fanaticism of a political conviction.

“ England's commercial supremacy had its origin in the discords on the Continent, and owing to her brilliant successes, which were often gained without a struggle, there has grown up in the English people a spirit of arrogance for which “ Chauvinism ” is too mild an expression. Sir Charles Dilke, the well-known Radical member of Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet, in his book *Greater Britain*, which is often mentioned, but, alas ! too little read here, claims, as necessary acquisitions for “ Greater Britain,” China, Japan, Chili, Peru, the La Plata States, the tablelands of Africa—in short, the whole

world. In spite of the outrageous ill-usage of Ireland, and the bestial coarseness of the London mob, he calls Great Britain the land which from the earliest time exhibits the greatest amount of culture and insight, together with the least intermixture of ignorance and crime. He looks confidently forward to the time when Russia and France will only be pygmies by the side of England. In only three passages does he deign to make a cursory mention of the Germans.

“Thus, then, the manifold glories of the world’s history, which commenced with the empire of the monosyllabic Chinese, are to conclude their melancholy cycle with the empire of the monosyllabic British !”

CHAPTER IV

UNITY

Outlines.—One of the best stories that Kipling ever told us is that of *The Ship That Found Herself*. The *Dimbula* had just had a bottle of champagne cracked over her bow and looked very fine indeed. Said the skipper: "She's no so bad. But she's just irons and rivets and plates put into the form of a ship. The parts of her have not learned to work together yet, and nothing but a gale will do it." And on her first voyage the *Dimbula* went through a gale. The deck-beams grumbled at the capstan, the weight of which had suddenly become doubled owing to a big wave sitting on it. The stringers grumbled at the deck-beams and threatened to chuck work. The frames and thousands and thousands of little rivets talked at the stringers. The screw had a brawl with the thrust-block, and the screw-shaft with the screw. The high pressure cylinder, the garboard-stroke, the sea-valve and all the hundreds of plates of the outside skin, everybody complained about his neighbour's wrong-doings, everybody thought himself the one indispensable part of the ship and there was a frightful hubbub. But at last, especially owing to the wise counsels of their friend Steam the Philosopher, all the rebels began to work together, even cheerfully. Everybody had learned the wisdom of the give-and-take policy. The clamourings and squeakings and shriekings of the turbulent folk had died down and only a deep humming note was to be heard! It was the voice of the ship. "For when a ship finds herself, all the talking of the separate pieces ceases and melts into one voice, which is the soul of the ship."

The Society of Nations is like Kipling's *Dimbula*. Only that this planetary ship of ours, we might name it *Harmony*, has not found herself yet. It is in the midst of a violent gale and the voice of reason—our friend Steam from the *Dimbula*—is still unheeded. There are still discontented plates and beams and stringers—some of our nations—who want to shift or are swollen with the ridiculous conceit that they are the one indispensable part of the ship.

An even worse state of affairs existed a little more than a century ago on that ship of State called Germany. There were, besides a few larger state-communities, 285 small principalities absurdly self-conceited and all warring and quarrelling with one another. Napoleon the First made a clean sweep of a very great number of them. But there were still too many. One cannot read the story about Knyphausen in the second volume of Treitschke's *History* without smiling. There they were, these powerful potentates, like a Knyphausen, swaying vast realms quite equal in size to the borough of Kensington, with mighty armies of a few dozen picturesque clowns. And woe if anyone dared to curtail their sovereignty! Did not Hanover patriotically intend calling in the aid of France rather than sacrifice part of her sovereignty for the benefit of a Prussian Central Government? Did not Knyphausen, that important member of the family of European sovereigns, harass for ever so many years, his minor cousins the Emperors of Russia and Austria, the King of Prussia, because his "empire" had been taken from him; and because the flag of Knyphausen's fleet was no longer to be seen on the Seven Seas, nor could he any longer maintain a special chargé d'affaires who might add lustre to the crowd of loafers haunting the antechambers of the European courts and proud to represent the hundred-and-one German Lilliputian principalities?

Keeping this in mind, one can understand why Treitschke is considered in Germany as one of the Makers of the New Empire. Men like Dahlmann, Droysen,

Sybel and Treitschke are the intellectual forerunners and collaborators of Bismarck's policy of "Blood and Iron" that welded all those jarring and jostling principalities into a powerful whole.

Considered from the point of view of international unity, Treitschke is a reactionary, almost a savage. His knowledge of foreign nations was scanty and superficial. His national conceit blinded him and he did not see all the short-comings of his own people, and lacked the sense of proportion, forgetting that his nation, after all, represents but a mere fraction of mankind. Treitschke blamed England for its "barbarous views regarding maritime law," but his own opinion regarding international law and faith respecting treaties and war would, if strictly and generally acted upon, result in a war of all against all.

As a German, Treitschke certainly deserves the admiration of his own nation, for he has done for them within the realm of thought exactly the same thing which the authors of the various Acts of Union have done for Great Britain, and his aspirations after empire are, from the German point of view, but parallel to those of a Chamberlain and a Cecil Rhodes. As a member of human society, from the point of view of the comity of nations, Treitschke is an arch-enemy of the progress of reason and law. We are toiling painfully towards the establishment of a satisfactory international law which will be obeyed. Treitschke, however, scornfully denies the possibility of international harmony and unity, the possibility of an international tribunal. He would bid us tear up the "mad" books on permanent peace written by "weak minds," and change the palace at the Hague into a mansion for Lamachus, "the boaster with the mighty plume."

A. TREITSCHKE AND GERMAN UNITY

"The Apostle of Prussia."—Against the parochial and provincial patriotism of the numerous small principalities

which threatened to disintegrate Germany entirely, Treitschke raised his ideal of national patriotism. Against the argument of the particularists that the variety and diversity of German political life were more beautiful than the deadly monotony of a highly centralised State, and that Germany was the promised land of Decentralisation, Treitschke pointed out the pitiable political weakness of such a collection of samples. It is their weakness for which he never forgave the small States. On account of their weakness he condemned the small States. And for that reason he, the "Apostle of Prussia" worked for the establishment of a Prussian hegemony. Throughout his *History*, his historical papers, his essays and pamphlets, this is the key-note, there is but one Salvation for us, Prussia!

How, even centuries ago, Prussia and her rulers worked for the future unity of Germany, Treitschke tells us in his *History*:

"Prussia, the born foe of the old European system, which was based on the weakness of Germany, stood in a world of enemies, whose mutual jealousies were her only safety, without one natural ally, for the recognition of this new Power had not yet dawned on the German nation. And this in that period of hard State-logic when the State meant power only, and regarded the destruction of its neighbours as its natural duty. As the house of Savoy forced its way through the superior power of the Habsburgs and Bourbons, so Prussia, though far more heavily oppressed, had to make herself a way between Austria and France, between Sweden and Poland, between the Sea-powers and the slothful bulk of the German Empire, with every resource of absolute selfishness, ever ready to change her front, ever having two strings to her bow.

"Brandenburg felt to the marrow of her life, how deeply foreign conditions had eaten into Germany. All the undisciplined strength of provincial rights, which were hostile to the stern regularity of the new monarchy, relied on foreign support. Dutch garrisons were

quartered on the Lower Rhine, and helped the struggle of the Diet of Cleves against their German lord; the provincial Assemblies of Magdeburg and Kurmark counted upon Austria; the Pole-favouring nobility of Königsberg called in the Polish feudal lord to their aid against the tyranny of the Mark. The State-unity of these scattered districts, and the importance of their Sovereign were founded on the struggle against foreign rule. Frederick William destroyed the barriers of the Dutch in the German North-west and drove their troops out of Cleves and East Friesland; he freed East Prussia from the feudal vassalship to Poland, and curbed the provincial council of Königsberg under his rule. Then he shouts to the deaf nation his word of warning: "Remember that you are Germans," and endeavours to push the Swedes off the soil of the Empire. Twice the opposition of France and Austria succeeded in cheating the Brandenburger of the reward of his victories, of the sovereignty over Pomerania: they could not rob him of the glory of Fehrbellin. At last, after long centuries of humiliation, a brilliant triumph of German arms over the first military power of the time taught the world that Germany was again venturing to be mistress in her own house."

It is only natural that Treitschke in his *History* should fondly dwell on that period, when Germany under the leadership of Prussia shook off the yoke of Napoleon. Here speaks the enthusiastic historian, whose force and incisiveness Lord Acton compared with that of Mommsen, here speaks the patriot, whose brilliancy and partiality certainly equalled that of Macaulay. His pen weaves magic glamour around the chief actors of that time. Fichte, the Treitschke of that period, especially interested him and exercised considerable influence over the foe of the small States, the champion of Unity. We read how even then there existed vague longings for national unity, German unity:

"It was fateful for our political life, and clings to us to this day, that the thought of national unity did not

ripen with us slowly through the centuries as it did in France, was not the fruit of a constant monarchical policy always directed to the same object, but woke up suddenly out of a long slumber, in angry tears and dreams of past times. Hence that touching ideal enthusiasm, that true-hearted inspiration, which makes the German patriots of the generations immediately after Napoleon appear so amiable. Hence their morbid bitterness; for even after the fierce hatred of the French of that awful time had cooled down, a deep resentment against the foreigner remained behind in the hearts of the inspired Teutons; people could not dream of Germany's future greatness without vituperating the foreign nations who had so often and so deeply sinned against Central Europe. Hence, too, the wonderfully confused indistinctness of the political hopes of the German.

“An enthusiasm, heated by indefinite historical pictures, intoxicated itself with the idea of a great fatherland in the clouds, that was to renew somehow the splendour of the Ottonides and Hohenstaufen, greeted everyone who shared the same lamentations and the same longings, men of the most different political views who were ready to become comrades, and scarcely noticed the living strength of the real German unity, which was stirring in the Prussian State. Hence, finally, the unstable weakness of the German national feeling, which has not attained to this day the infallible certainty of a simple popular instinct.

“The dream of German unity percolated very slowly through from the educated classes into the masses of the people; and even then the great name of the Fatherland remained for the common man an indefinite word, a mysterious appellation, and the honourable love of United Germany was quite compatible with a narrow, obstinate separatism. In Prussia the old loyalty stood too firmly for the hopes of the patriots to vanish so utterly in the illimitable. It is not by accident that the publicist and popular orator who showed the most

sober and solid political insight at that time was Schleiermacher, the born Prussian; when he spoke of the Liberation of Germany, he presupposed always the restoration of the old Prussian power. When Schenkendorf preached in inspired verse of the Emperor and the Empire, when Heinrich Kleist implored the Germans to march to the holy war, 'the Emperor at their head,' they silently assumed that Prussia must maintain a worthy place under this new Empire. In the gymnasium, in the circles of Jahn, Harnisch, and Friesen, one heard the confident prophecy: 'Prussia has always wielded Germany's sword, and must wear the crown in the new Empire.' Fichte, on the other hand, only accepted these Prussian views very gradually; and not before 1813 did he recognise that 'only the King of Prussia can achieve Germanism.'"

The German Confederation, 1815-1866.—To improve the deplorable hotch-potch of petty principalities a compromise was made between the two biggest States, Prussia and Austria, both jealous of one another, both contending for the hegemony in Germany. The result of this compromise was the German Confederation. From the very beginning it was a failure. Its constitution was an absurdity and its position with respect to foreign powers stamped it a nonentity. Treitschke made a special study of the history of the German Confederation. In spite of several short-comings of his work he has left very little for the future historian to do, as far as the period goes which he covered. For months at a time Treitschke buried himself in the archives of various States, and he became better acquainted than any other man with the miserable reactionary policy that swayed Germany for many decades after the magnificent years of the War of Liberation. He became convinced of the necessity of German Unity under Prussian leadership. He became convinced of the futility and weakness of small states.

Austria, of course, would have to be eliminated from the community of German States, and with delight

therefore Treitschke hailed the establishment of the Customs Union which was a step in that direction :

“ While the constitution of the German Confederation could be held upright only by the friendship of the two great Powers, and the Prussian Ambassador in Vienna, to the great delight of the old King, expressed the main idea of Prussian policy in the phrase : ‘ Not under, but always with, Austria,’ the King had already entered upon a path which was bound to lead to a separation from Austria. The proud work of this newly adopted Frederician policy, the Customs Union, was already so firmly established, the mutual labour of the Germans outside of Austria appeared already so indestructible, that Michael Chevalier, after a tour through Germany, said admiringly : ‘ In European politics, I know of nothing more wonderful than the restoration of the Unity of Germany. What a grand spectacle, that of a great People, the fragments of which are being reunited, which returns to nationality, that is, to life.’ ”

“ The sharp contrast between this youthful and vigorous economic life, and the formality of the stiff law of the Confederation, which laughed at any improvement, could not but confuse public opinion. Some were still dreaming away in the quietude of an unthinking localism, which was already overcome by the grand scale of the new national market ; others were still repeating, as ten years before, the catchwords of radical world-citizenship ; but in the best classes of the people was awakening gradually a passionate, sensitive, national pride. They felt that now a monstrous popular force was being artificially bound down by a thousand knotted and distorted political considerations. Bold claims, such as only isolated dreamers had ventured on, became objects of newspaper discussion. People began to ask why this young Customs Union did not, as formerly the Hansa did, unfold its flag upon the ocean, and protect it with its warships, why it did not take its part in the conquest of the transatlantic world.

“ The yearning looks of patriotic writers were turned

to all the estranged daughterlands of our people, to Flensburg, to Riga and Reval ; and when in this summer of vicissitudes, the Rhine-frontier seemed to be threatened once more, there rose with elementary might a storm of national anger which showed clearly enough that the spirit of the war of Liberation was not dead, that the time of fulfilment was at last drawing nigh for our struggling people. With national pride grew also the hopes of freedom. After so many combats and disappointments the Liberals now began to form for themselves the theory of the Parliamentary State, which they held firmly henceforth, until in the year 1866 the monarchical idea again gathered strength. One of their leaders, Steinaker of Brunswick, now declared plainly, 'The Government in a Representative State is always the creation of the majority in the State.' The thoughtful, well-meaning man never suspected that with this doctrine he was robbing the monarchy of every independent power, and smoothing the path only for the republican ideas, which were getting the upper hand among the exiles, and among the excited young men."

Poets like Hebbel, who extolled the Germanic religion of valour in his *Nibelungen*, like Uhland, who was full of

"The yearning, that a Germany might be established—
Free in its laws, powerful and undivided in its people,"

were naturally lauded by the historian of German Unity, and in the completion of Cologne Cathedral he saw a favourable omen :

"When Görres once said that the unfinished gigantic Cathedral of Cologne was a legacy which the grand old Imperial times had bequeathed to the new liberated Germany for completion, only a few listened to him. In 1842 everybody spoke in the same strain ; here on the long-contested left bank of the Rhine we would show the foreign nations what the might and the agreement of the Germans could do. As the half-forgotten legend of Kyffhäuser won new life in those years through

Rückert's poem, so now antique-sounding Cathedral legends were circulated of which the Middle Ages would never have dreamt, all productions of the patriotic yearning of the last generation. The old crane on the stump of the tower was a "gigantic note of interrogation," a symbol of the divisions of the fatherland; only some day when it had vanished, and the two towers rose, completed, into the air, then would the dream of centuries, the unity of Germany, be fulfilled.

"And now happened what Schenkendorf had prophesied. The architect Zwirner, a Silesian of Schinkel's school, handed to the King a well thought out plan for the completion of the whole Cathedral, a gigantic undertaking that even Boisseree had formerly thought impossible. Meanwhile the citizens of Cologne combined to further the work. At first they could not agree, because many zealous Catholics thought that as long as the Throne of the Archbishop in the choir remained empty, no one could stir a hand. Then the young Reichensperger stepped forward, himself a strict Churchman, but at the same time a good Prussian, and a warm admirer of ancient Rhenish art; he warned his countrymen in an eloquent pamphlet to forget all misunderstandings, and to use the favourable opportunity of a new King's accession.

"The opposition was overcome, and the great Building Association was founded to collect money and to work for the completion of the House of God. Nothing could be more agreeable to the King. At the laying of the second foundation stone, he expressed the joy of his artistic soul in an eloquent speech: 'Here where the stone lies, and there with those towers, the most beautiful doors in the world are to rise. Germany builds them: let them be by God's grace doors of a new, great time for Germany! The spirit that builds these doors is the spirit of German unity and strength. May the portals of Cologne Cathedral become doors of the most lordly triumph to that spirit. Let it build, let it complete. And let the great work tell the latest genera-

tions of a Germany by the union of its princes and peoples great and powerful, yea, and compelling the peace of the world without bloodshed.'

"And if only a small portion of the King's hearers cherished distinct liberal wishes, all at least believed that he was announcing with his words of promise, a new order of things, a time of fulfilment, which must at length do justice to the nation's impulse towards freedom and unity. The King, however, thought that the united Germany which compelled peace without bloodshed existed already, and he had no thought of ever touching either the Confederation or the sovereignty of the small princes."

In his brilliant and powerful essay, *Bundesstaat und Einheitsstaat*, Federalism and Centralisation, Treitschke is decidedly in favour of the *Einheitsstaat*. He knew too much of the *Staatenbund*, the Confederation, to give it any further serious consideration; he acknowledged the advantages of a *Bundesstaat*, Federal State, but did not think that the American plan would work in Germany; he wanted the *Einheitsstaat*, the Unitary State, brought about, within which the governments of all the smaller States were abolished. As a matter of fact the German Empire born in 1871 turned out to be a *Bundesstaat*—consisting of over twenty individual states—although owing to the overwhelming preponderance of Prussia it is practically an *Einheitsstaat*.

German idealists and doctrinaires tried to bring about German Unity in 1848. The King of Prussia was offered the Imperial crown. A representative German parliament assembled at Frankfort and it sat for six months. Then the beautiful scheme fizzled out. The vested interests of the small dynasties proved to be stronger than mere ideal and intellectual aspirations.

Treitschke, although but a boy then, had lived through those days of disappointment, and he drew the moral that only "blood and iron" would establish German Unity. He knew that there was "very little ground for hoping that the German Federal State can be founded

peacefully," that the "petty German principalities will have to be abolished." After the war with Denmark, 1864, he objected therefore to the establishment of yet another principality, Schleswig-Holstein, and in 1866 after the war between Austria and Prussia, he demanded that the kingdoms of Hanover and Saxony as well as the Electorate Hesse should be annexed by victorious Prussia. And Hanover and Hesse were annexed.

The North German Confederation (1866-1870) and the Empire.—The result of the war of 1866 was the North German Confederation. This confederation comprised only the North German States. But within this Confederation Prussia was the undisputed leader. A secession of any of the smaller States from the Confederation was an impossibility. Moreover, the three greater South German States, Baden, Württemberg, and Bavaria, had to make alliances with Prussia, and were brought into still closer contact with it through Bismarck's Zollverein (1867), a tariff-union comprising all Germany. The years 1870-71 realised Treitschke's dream. The new German Empire was founded and the King of Prussia crowned Emperor. The Empire was not a Unitary State as Treitschke desired it, but came as near his ideal as was practicable. He, of course, was one of the first to demand the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine.

Henceforth we find Treitschke busy as a publicist, as a professor, as a member of Parliament, to consolidate and strengthen the unity of the new Empire. For that purpose he fought the Socialists, the Jews, the Papists, in short anybody and everybody who, in his mind, was hostile to his ideal. His haughty aristocratic attitude, his stubborn one-sidedness, his unfair methods of warfare in these fights may be explained by a passage in one of his letters to Freytag: "But the patriot in me is a thousand times more powerful than the professor."

Even after the establishment of the Empire, Treitschke, the "Apostle of Prussia," never ceased to point out to the Germans and to the world in general

what Prussia had done for German Unity, that in Prussia alone was to be found the only guarantee for the permanence of the vast edifice of the Empire.

“Prussia has erected our New Empire, and freed us from Austria. Consequently, with regard to the constitution of the Empire, as a matter of fact, however carefully this may be veiled under the wording of constitutional terms, Prussia quite justly occupies an entirely different position to that of the other States. The Prussian State alone has remained a real State. It alone cannot be forced by execution to fulfil its Imperial obligations because only the Kaiser, who is at the same time King of Prussia, can put the execution into effect. The entire Imperial Policy rests upon the silent assumption that the will of the Empire and the will of the Prussian State cannot, in the long run, be in opposition to each other.

“Before Prussia had attained supremacy in Germany, the world, astounded by the brilliant military success of the little State, was wont to regard the realm of the Hohenzollern as an artificial creation, an error which still prevails among Englishmen and Frenchmen. But since the foundation of our new Empire, it is clear that the progress of National Union in Germany has followed the same historic law as in all other great civilised States. As the Anglo-Saxon State grew out of Wessex, the French out of the Isle de France, the Russian out of the Varangian Principality, so Brandenburg-Prussia formed the firm core to which divided Germany gradually attached itself—only that this development followed in our case later, and in face of greater hindrances than elsewhere, and therefore showed the political will in question with unusual distinctness.

“And as the growth of the Prussian State was natural and necessary, it gave the most considerate treatment to the peculiarity of the small communities which it adapted to its system, and thus manifested its German character. Prussia alone among Great Powers possesses provinces in the full sense, which, while subject to the State-power,

still maintain their independence by raciality and historic tradition. While the rigid centralisation of the French or Russian State could tolerate only administrative bodies, and Austria, on the other hand, for want of a dominating nationality, had to grant a dangerous independence to its Crown-dominions, the policy of the Hohenzollern held a happy middle course. They subjected the provinces to the common obligations to the State, but in other matters acted with such consideration towards the old traditional institutions of the localities that even the useless old provincial councils, though deprived of their powers, were nowhere abolished.

“This characteristic of historic piety, though little recognised, shows itself in everything down to the smallest externals of the Prussian State-system, down to the coat-of-arms of the Kingdom, which is, as it were, a picture of modern German history. In vain shall we look in Prussian annals for that war on objects of stone or metal, which, as waged so eagerly by the French, is a sure sign of political incapacity. In every town of Silesia, the Austrian two-headed eagles still adorn the public buildings, and before the main-guard of Posen the Prussian soldier still stands sentry under a great royal shield of Poland. It never occurred to the State to oppose these old memories, it waited patiently until they had lost their charm over men’s minds.”

B. TREITSCHKE v. THE COMITY OF NATIONS

The Philosophy of the “Unconquerable Will.”—The “human intellect” had its vogue, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Everybody swore by it. The Rationalists, the Encyclopædists “knew” everything, and during the French Revolution, Madame Reason was solemnly enthroned. She did not reign long, though. Spinoza had reduced ethics to a kind of mathematics. Kant, philosopher-surveyor of the realms of reason, scoured the heavens and evolved a new “theory.” From the days when Newton pro-

mulgated his laws of gravitation to the days of the theory of Kant and Laplace, very many people were convinced that Reason was the best guide through the lands of the unknown to, if not into, the lands of the Unknowable.

But since the time of Kant—who himself already enunciated the “primacy of the practical over the pure reason”—men began to forsake their idol Reason, perhaps influenced to some extent first by the meteor-like phenomenon of the man of action, Napoleon, then, later on by the wonders of the steam-engine and the electric telegraph. Some became romantic dreamers with their eyes fixed on the glamour their fancy threw over the past, or gazing into far-distant unattainable Utopias of the Future. Others, however, the stronger minds, had found another idol, the human “will.” Fichte, who stirred his students to the depths of their souls asking them to *do* things, to fight Napoleon; he wrote: “Only above, and even beyond Death, with a Will which nothing, not even Death itself, can bend or discourage, does man become of some real worth.” And throughout the century men arose who taught the supremacy of the Will, who preached “Let us then be up and doing!” who relegated Reason to the position of a mere subaltern and made the Will the “Captain of the Soul.” Schopenhauer’s whole philosophy is based on the assumption that the Will is supreme. In fact the Will is his Cosmic Cause. Nietzsche “willed” the superman. James’ Activism is but a philosophical elaboration of “*Do noble things not dream them all day long!*” The whole school of voluntarism is a protest against enfeebling Hamletian introspection. Of course there were and are thinkers of a different frame of mind; but Treitschke and many others hold, “*Sic volo sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas!*”

Fichte.—Although Aristotle and Hegel have coloured Treitschke’s thought, it was Fichte who probably exercised the greatest influence over him. In his paper on Fichte, Treitschke said, “If Kant had found that things appear to us according to our capability of

perception; Fichte his successor goes beyond that, and says: 'things are only created through our own Ego, there is no "being" but only "doing." The moral Will is the only Reality.' " Treitschke was influenced by the Greek conception of the State as a purpose in Itself and to a lesser degree by Hegel's creed that the State is the incarnation of the Idea; Fichte, however, with his Will as the only Reality, with his fanatic gospel of the absolute necessity of the individual's self-sacrifice for his country swayed Treitschke completely. If we consider this peculiar "bias" of Treitschke's mind; if we realise that till the Austrian and the Franco-Prussian Wars he never troubled himself much about other countries' rights, since his mind was absorbed with the task of Germany's Unity; if we remember that his knowledge of international law was mainly based upon the study of these two wars which by their vary nature were breaches of law, and that apparently he never made a study of the labours of a Grotius, a Hobbes, a Puffendorf, a Bentham, a Mill; we can somehow understand the incredible crudity of his pronouncement on International Law. Blinded by his belief in the State as a purpose in itself, he would not acknowledge that the Sovereignty of Law is to be held superior to the artificial Sovereignty of the State. Only half-heartedly granting some claims of the Society of States but selfishly always subjecting such claims to those of his own State, the State *par excellence*, Treitschke became the implacable foe of the Comity of Nations.

Contradictions.—The patriot in Treitschke certainly outmatched the professor. Otherwise the great number of palpable self-deceptions and contradictions to be found in his writings would be incomprehensible. Treitschke's attitude is rarely consistent, his fanatic belief in Prussia's mission always excepted.

Now he speaks of "the absolute independence of the State of any other power on earth"; now he admits "the concept of sovereignty cannot be a rigid one; it is flexible, and relative as all political concepts." In

one place we read "there will arise the consciousness that each State is bound up with the common life of the States around it" and in another place, "the essence of the State consists in this, that it cannot allow any higher power above itself." One cannot have it both ways, but Treitschke when writing this probably thought of the old proverb: "Qui a compagnon, a maître."

We are told "the State is Power," yet we also hear that "this doctrine of mere power is self-contradictory." Moreover, Treitschke, who says that "in the State the influence of ideas is but of limited importance," could hardly deny that the "Power" of the modern State, based on dreadnoughts, huge howitzers and nimble aeroplanes is mainly the result of ideas.

Again, "even the most oppressive despotism is to be welcomed provided it tends towards strength and unity of the country," but "limitations must be imposed upon the freedom of those in authority." The fact of the matter is, that at times Treitschke, the man steeped in Greek culture has the upper hand, to give way however at once again to Treitschke, the despiser of the idea, the adherent of the philosophy of the Will.

Most of his conclusions are exclusively arrived at by crude empirical methods and he often loses sight of the insignificance of incidental phenomena. Amongst other things he seems to be under the delusion that the present form of State as well as a few forms in the past are the permanent archetypes of human communities for ever and ever, and that "nationality" will always be considered as the highest ideal in collective life.

The Law-Book of Might.—"The doctrinaire exponent of International Law fondly imagines that he need only propound a few aphorisms and that the nations of the world will forthwith, as reasonable men, accept them. We forget that stupidity and passion matter, and have always mattered in history.

"In questions that touch the very life of a State, the other members of the Community of States cannot possibly be impartial. They must take sides just

because they belong to the Community of States and are drawn together or forced apart by the most diverse interests." "All the limitations which States lay on themselves in treaties are merely voluntary, all treaties are concluded with a mental reservation—*rebus sic stantibus*—so long as circumstances remain unchanged. If conditions have been imposed on it which cripple it or which it cannot observe, the nation honours itself in breaking them.

"When a State has been wounded in its honour, the breach of treaty is but a matter of time. England and France had to admit this in 1870. In their arrogant pride at the end of the Crimean War they had compelled their exhausted enemy to agree to remove all her warships from the Black Sea. Russia seized the opportunity offered by the Franco-Prussian War to break the agreement, and she was fully within her rights. The ancient Athenians were therefore obeying a right instinct when they decided to limit the time during which their treaties with other nations held good."

"Positive Law when the common good requires it must be abrogated." "If a State is not in a condition to maintain its neutrality, all talk about the same is mere clap-trap."

"An international tribunal is an impossibility"—
"One cannot lay down the law, but out of the spirit of an individual state."

Treitschke also held that *a distinction must be made between public and private law*. It goes without saying his spirit of scorn for the majesty of Law is not shared by all Germans. But to show that there are disciples of Treitschke at the present day it is sufficient to refer to *The Morning Post* of January 8, 1915 where we read that in a recent issue of the *Vossische Zeitung* Karl Scheffler discredits the doctrine "the State must act like a moral individual" and says, "The principle is false, because, while practical civic morality is rendered possible by the authority of the State and of Law, the State itself has no authority above it. . . . It is, there-

fore, a misapprehension of reality for a people in war-time to be morally indignant."

It is only fair to quote a few words to show that Treitschke, inconsistent as he was, sometimes had a glimpse of the Ship that found herself, the perfect "Society of States": "Every State will nevertheless show of its own accord a real regard for neighbouring States. Prudent calculation and a mutual recognition of advantages will gradually foster an ever-growing sense of justice, there will arise the consciousness that each State is bound up with the common life of the States round it, and that, willingly or unwillingly, it must come to terms with them as a body of States." "It is a crime against the human race to urge the view that force alone governs international law to-day."

Outlook.—Treitschke was preaching the Gospel of Valour, the Religion of Force. With all the fanaticism and fervour of a Hussite priest he proclaimed that fortune will favour the strong. The old gods of Walhalla were his tutelary deities. Poet, historian, publicist, and professor, he devoted all his manifold gifts to realise his dream of German Unity. On the altar of his ideal he sacrificed everything; scholarship, judgment and justice were scorned by him if he thought it would benefit that ideal. One of his enemies said: "He has pulled down the Muse of History from her seat of judgment and put her on the battlements of parties." But he lived to see his dream realised.

He was unjust to other nations. His views on international relations and International Law are worthy of a semi-savage. How a man who was acquainted with the spirit of Roman Law could frankly recommend lawlessness is difficult to understand. His teachings, owing to the great influence they apparently exercise over a great section of his people, will remain for some time dangerous impediments in the way of Law's progress.

But all over the earth there exists now a tendency for unification within each nation. And from that point

of view a Treitschke has not lived in vain. He helped to weld together the almost disintegrated German nation, and the smaller the number of States which will one day voluntarily combine to form a terrestrial Federal State Society the better! That State Society will not imply the loss of nationality; there will be no barrack-uniformity; the greatest possible artistic variety of life will still be found, but everybody and everything will be subservient to the common needs of the Great Community. It will come about, although scarcely within this century. But come about it will! The religion of Force will be transfigured and will rouse men to fight the elements and the cruel forces of nature and not their—fellow-prisoners. The religion of Love, hitherto but a badly realised ideal, will find general acceptance and will soothe man's suffering when no knowledge can help him. The religion of Law—Reason's noblest dream—will then sway the earth and the prayer will be answered which more than two thousand years ago Aristophanes addressed to Irene:

“Most august goddess queen, venerable Peace! Put a stop to our over-nice suspicions with which we babble against each other; and blend us with the balsam of friendship and temper our minds with a milder fellow-feeling!”

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. ENGLISH

- Acton, Lord.—*Treitschke* ; in "German Schools of History." 1886. "The English Historical Review," vol. i., pp. 33-34.
- Anonymous.—*Treitschke, His Life and Work*. 1914. London.—p. 327.
- Barker, E.—*Nietzsche and Treitschke*. 1914. Oxford.—p. 28.
- Cramb, J. A.—*Treitschke* ; in "Germany and England." 1914. London.—pp. 67-97.
- Davis, H. W. C.—*The Political Thought of Heinrich v. Treitschke*. 1914. London.—pp. viii. + 295. (Good index.)
- Dawson, W. H.—*Treitschke and the State as Power* ; in "What is Wrong with Germany?" 1915. London.—pp. 22-52. (Valuable.)
- Gowans, A. L.—Selections from Treitschke's "*Lectures on Politics*." 1914. London.—p. 128.
- Headlam, J. W.—*Treitschke* ; in "The English Historical Review." Dec. 1897. pp. 726-747.
- McCabe, J.—*Treitschke and the Great War*. 1914. London.—p. 287.
- McClure, E.—*Germany's War Inspirers, Nietzsche and Treitschke*. 1915. London.—p. 44.
- Treitschke, H. v.—*Life of Frederick the Great*. Edited by D. Sladen. 1914. London.—p. 83.
- Ward, A. W.—*Treitschke's Deutsche Geschichte*. 1886. "The English Historical Review," vol. i., pp. 809-815.

B. FOREIGN

Baumgarten, H.—*Treitschkes Deutsche Geschichte*.
1883. Straszburg.—p. 59.

Guilland, A.—*L'Allemagne Nouvelle et ses Historiens*.
1899. Paris.—pp. 226–295.

Hausrath, A.—*Zur Erinnerung an H. v. Treitschke*.
1901. Leipsic.—pp. vi. + 140.

Marcks, E.—*H. v. Treitschke*. 1906. Heidelberg.—p. 85.

Petersdorff, H. v.—*Treitschke*. In vol. iv. of the
“Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie.” 1910.
Leipsic.—pp. 263–326. (Most comprehensive.)

Schiemann, Th.—*H. v. Treitschkes Lehr und Wanderjahre*. (1834–66). Munich.—pp. vii. + 270. (Good.)

Treitschke, H. v.—*Vaterländische Gedichte*. 1856.
Göttingen.—p. 122.

Do.—*Deutsche Geschichte im XIX. Jahrhundert*.
Leipsic. Vol. i. published 1879, pp. viii. + 790 ;
vol. ii. published 1883, pp. vi + 638 ; vol. iii. pub-
lished 1885, pp. vi. + 778 ; vol. iv. published 1889,
pp. vi. + 753 ; vol. v. published 1894, pp. vi. + 774.

Do.—*Historische und Politische Aufsätze*.—1886–
1897. Leipsic.—vol. i., p. 449 ; vol. ii. p. 569 ;
vol. iii., p. 645 ; vol. iv., pp. x. + 664.

Do.—*Deutsche Kämpfe*. 1896. Leipsic.—pp. vi. + 421.

Do.—*Reden im deutschen Reichstage*. 1896.
Leipsic.—pp. viii. + 223.

Do.—*Politik*. 1897–1898. Berlin.—Vol. i. pp. viii. +
395 ; vol. ii. p. 652. (Good index.)

Do.—*Ausgewählte Schriften*. 1907. Leipsic.—Vol. i.
p. 337 ; vol. ii. p. 357.

Do.—*Briefe*. 1912–13. Leipsic.—vol. i. pp. viii. +
485 ; vol. ii. p. 496.

Umfrid, O.—*Anti-Treitschke*. 1907. Eszlingen.—p. 75.

INDEX

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>ANGELL, 30</p> <p>Aristophanes, 5, 30, 89</p> <p>Aristotle, 31, 45, 84</p> <p>Army and Navy, the English, 60-64</p>
<p>BERNHARDI, 31, 37, 50, 66</p> <p>Bismarck, 21, 23, 38, 72, 81</p> <p>Burke, 51</p>
<p>CHAUVINISM, 68</p> <p>Clausewitz, 31, 37</p> <p>Cologne Cathedral, 49, 78-80</p> <p>Colonies, 64</p> <p>Cramb, 30, 50, 64</p>
<p>DAHLMANN, 13, 14, 71</p> <p>Delbrück, 51, 66</p> <p>Dilke, Sir Charles, 68</p> <p>Droysen, 71</p>
<p>FICHTE, 37, 38, 44, 74, 76, 84</p> <p>Frederick the Great, 31-34</p> <p>Freytag, 19, 23, 49, 62, 81</p>
<p>GOLTZ, Von der, 31, 38, 39</p> <p>Goethe, 30, 31, 49, 67</p>
<p>HEBBEL, 78</p> <p>Hegel, 41, 84, 85</p>
<p>INTERNATIONAL Law, 86-88</p>
<p>KANT, 30, 31, 84</p> | <p>Klee, Dr., 12, 13</p> <p>Knyphausen, 71</p> <p>Krupp, 67</p>
<p>MACAULAY, 28, 56, 74</p> <p>Macchiavelli, 33</p> <p>Milton, 18, 53</p> <p>Moltke, 31, 38</p> <p>Mommsen, 52, 74</p>
<p>NAPOLEON, 34-36, 61, 63, 71, 74, 84</p> <p>Newton, 31, 83</p> <p>Nietzsche, 20, 66</p>
<p>OVERBECK, 20</p>
<p>PALMERSTON, 59</p> <p>Plato, 31</p>
<p>RANKE, 28, 29</p> <p>Rückert, 48, 79</p>
<p>SCHARNHORST, 34-37, 46</p> <p>Schopenhauer, 30, 31</p> <p>Sybel, 29, 72</p>
<p>TIRPITZ, 62</p>
<p>UHLAND, 78</p>
<p>VICTORIA, Queen, 57-60</p>
<p>WELLINGTON, 61</p> |
|--|---|

THE PEOPLE'S BOOKS

General Editor—H. C. O'NEILL

"With the 'People's Books' in hand there should be nobody of average intelligence unable to secure self-education."—*Sunday Times*.

NOW READY (March 1915)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The Foundations of Science | By W.C.D. Whetham, M.A., F.R.S. |
| 2. Embryology—The Beginnings of Life | By Prof. Gerald Leighton, M.D. |
| 3. Biology | By Prof. W. D. Henderson, M.A. |
| 4. Zoology: The Study of Animal Life { | By Prof. E. W. MacBride, M.A., F.R.S. |
| 5. Botany; The Modern Study of Plants { | By M. C. Stopes, D.Sc., Ph.D., F.L.S. |
| 6. Bacteriology | By W. E. Carnegie Dickson, M.D. |
| 7. The Structure of the Earth | By Prof. T. G. Bonney, F.R.S. |
| 8. Evolution | By E. S. Goodrich, M.A., F.R.S. |
| 10. Heredity | By J. A. S. Watson, B.Sc. |
| 11. Inorganic Chemistry | By Prof. E. C. C. Baly, F.R.S. |
| 12. Organic Chemistry | By Prof. J. B. Cohen, B.Sc., F.R.S. |
| 13. The Principles of Electricity | By Norman R. Campbell, M.A. |
| 14. Radiation | By P. Phillips, D.Sc. |
| 15. The Science of the Stars | By E. W. Maunder, F.R.A.S. |
| 16. The Science of Light | By P. Phillips, D.Sc. |
| 17. Weather Science | By R. G. K. Lempfert, M.A. |
| 18. Hypnotism and Self-Education | By A. M. Hutchison, M.D. |
| 19. The Baby: A Mother's Book | By a University Woman. |
| 20. Youth and Sex—Dangers and Safe-
guards for Boys and Girls | By Mary Scharlieb, M.D., M.S., and
F. Arthur Sibly, M.A., LL.D. |
| 21. Marriage and Motherhood | By H. S. Davidson, M.B.,
F.R.C.S.E. |
| 22. Lord Kelvin | By A. Russell, M.A., D.Sc., M.I.E.E. |
| 23. Huxley | By Professor G. Leighton, M.D. |
| 24. Sir William Huggins and Spectro-
scopic Astronomy | By E. W. Maunder, F.R.A.S., of the
Royal Observatory, Greenwich. |
| 26. Henri Bergson | By H. Wildon Carr, Litt.D. |
| 27. Psychology | By H. J. Watt, M.A., Ph.D., D.Phil. |
| 28. Ethics | By Canon Rashdall, D.Litt., F.B.A. |
| 29. Kant's Philosophy | By A. D. Lindsay, M.A., of Balliol
College, Oxford. |
| 32. Roman Catholicism | By H. B. Coxon. Preface, Mgr. R.
H. Benson. |
| 33. The Oxford Movement | By Wilfrid Ward. |
| 34. The Bible and Criticism | By W. H. Bennett, D.D., Litt.D.,
and W. F. Adeney, D.D. |
| 36. The Growth of Freedom | By H. W. Nevinson. |
| 37. Bismarck and the Origin of the
German Empire | Professor F. M. Powicke. |
| 38. Oliver Cromwell | By Hilda Johnstone, M.A. |
| 39. Mary Queen of Scots | By E. O'Neill, M.A. |
| 40. Cecil John Rhodes, 1853-1902 | By Ian D. Colvin. |
| 41. Julius Caesar | By Hilary Hardinge. |
| 42. England in the Making | By Prof. F. J. C. Hearnshaw, M.A.,
LL.D. |
| 43. England in the Middle Ages | By E. O'Neill, M.A. |
| 44. The Monarchy and the People | By W. T. Waugh, M.A. |
| 45. The Industrial Revolution | By Arthur Jones, M.A. |
| 46. Empire and Democracy | By G. S. Veitch, M.A., Litt.D. |
| 47. Women's Suffrage | By M. G. Fawcett, LL.D. |
| 51. Shakespeare | By Prof. C. H. Herford, Litt.D. |
| 52. Wordsworth | By Rosaline Masson. |
| 53. Pure Gold—A Choice of Lyrics and
Sonnets | By H. C. O'Neill. |
| 54. Francis Bacon | By Prof. A. R. Skemp, M.A. |
| 55. The Brontës | By Flora Masson. |

THE PEOPLE'S BOOKS—(continued)

56. Carlyle	By L. MacLean Watt.
57. Dante	By A. G. Ferrers Howell.
60. A Dictionary of Synonyms	By Austin K. Gray, B.A.
61. Home Rule	{ By L. G. Redmond Howard. Preface by Robert Harcourt, M.P.
62. Practical Astronomy	By H. Macpherson, Jr., F.R.A.S.
63. Aviation	By Sydney F. Walker, R.N.
64. Navigation	By William Hall, R.N., B.A.
65. Pond Life	By E. C. Ash, M.R.A.C.
66. Dietetics	By Alex. Bryce, M.D., D.P.H.
67. Aristotle	By Prof. A. E. Taylor, M.A., F.B.A.
68. Friedrich Nietzsche	By M. A. Mügge.
69. Eucken: A Philosophy of Life	By A. J. Jones, M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D.
70. The Experimental Psychology of Beauty	{ By C. W. Valentine, B.A., D.Phil.
71. The Problem of Truth	By H. Wildon Carr, Litt.D.
72. The Church of England	By Rev. Canon Masterman.
73. Anglo-Catholicism	By A. E. Manning Foster.
74. The Free Churches	By Rev. Edward Shillito, M.A.
75. Judaism	By Ephraim Levine, M.A.
76. Theosophy	By Annie Besant.
78. Wellington and Waterloo	By Major G. W. Redway.
79. Mediaeval Socialism	By Bede Jarrett, O.P., M.A.
80. Syndicalism	By J. H. Harley, M.A.
82. Co-operation	By Joseph Clayton.
83. Insurance as a Means of Investment	By W. A. Robertson, F.F.A.
85. A History of English Literature	By A. Compton-Rickett, LL.D.
87. Charles Lamb	By Flora Masson.
88. Goethe	By Prof. C. H. Herford, Litt.D.
92. The Training of the Child	By G. Spiller.
93. Tennyson	By Aaron Watson.
94. The Nature of Mathematics	By P. E. B. Jourdain, M.A.
95. Applications of Electricity	By Alex. Ogilvie, B.Sc.
96. Gardening	By A. Cecil Bartlett.
98. Atlas of the World	By J. Bartholomew, F.R.G.S.
101. Luther and the Reformation	By Leonard D. Agate, M.A.
103. Turkey and the Eastern Question	By John Macdonald, M.A.
104. Architecture	By Mrs. Arthur Bell.
105. Trade Unions	By Joseph Clayton.
106. Everyday Law	By J. J. Adams.
107. R. L. Stevenson	By Rosaline Masson.
108. Shelley	By Sydney Waterlow, M.A.
110. British Birds	By F. B. Kirkman, B.A.
111. Spiritualism	By J. Arthur Hill.
112. Kindergarten Teaching at Home	{ By Two Members of the National Froebel Union.
113. Schopenhauer	By Margrieta Beer, M.A.
114. The Stock Exchange	By J. F. Wheeler.
115. Coleridge	By S. L. Bensusan.
116. The Crusades	By M. M. C. Calthrop.
117. Wild Flowers	By Macgregor Skene, B.Sc.
118. Principles of Logic	By Stanley Williams, B.A.
119. The Foundations of Religion	By Stanley A. Cook, M.A.
120. History of Rome	By A. F. Giles, M.A.
121. Land, Industry, and Taxation	By Frederick Verinder.
122. Canada	By Ford Fairford.
123. Tolstoy	By L. Winstanley, M.A.
124. Greek Literature	By H. J. W. Tillyard, M.A.
125. The Navy of To-Day	By Percival A. Hislam.
128. A French Self-Tutor	By W. M. Conacher.
129. Germany	By W. T. Waugh, M.A.
130. Treitschke	By M. A. Mügge.
131. The Hohenzollerns	By A. D. Innes.
132. Belgium	By A. W. Evans.
133. The British Army of To-day	By Captain A. H. Atteridge.

