

THE FALLACY OF FATALISM

The National Discords.

Long before the Great War broke out, a growing spirit of fatalism could be traced in the thought pervading the newspapers, literature and conversation of the day. All strife, including that of bloodshed, was definitely regarded to be inevitable. War was said to be based upon human nature. It was believed that the most that could be hoped for was the lessening of its effects when it occurred by measures of charity like the Hague Conventions, much as the Churches endeavour to gloss over the social crime of poverty by organised benevolence.

Industrial strikes and lock-outs, religious and party conflicts were alike considered unavoidable, and it was believed that the disputants could only be prevented from resorting to extremes by the wholesome fear of man-made laws or ordinances, backed by the greater violence of Government, represented by the police and the military. Society apparently owed its existence to, and was held together by, what may be described as a manifestation of organised coercion.

Legislation was the result of compromise; hence the Statute Book was bulky with enactments intended for the regulation of a complex, self-willed society. A civil army of bureaucratic officials assisted Rank, Caste and Privilege in their administration, but in spite of all this, outbreaks of individuals, or combinations of individuals, were continually taking place. These Government seemed powerless to prevent, and indeed was powerless. It was especially noticeable that unions of what was loosely called Labour had interminable wars with federations of what was as loosely termed Capital. Hopeful schemes of Parliament for the purpose of balancing these powerful interests were

continually put forward, but whether made operative after bitter contention or turned down, the result was invariably disappointing for both sides.

Labour blamed predatory Capital, Capital discussed the ingratitude of Labour, what time optimistic politicians, assisted by their partisan Press, tried vainly to prove benefits where none existed, unless the establishment of an increased number of self-satisfied bureaucrats, burdening industry, could be said to be a benefit to anyone. The infinite good intent of statesmen seemed capable of exhausting the eternal springs of hope!

By many the Government was accused of impotence, and it is worthy of remark that while physical violence was not withheld in dealing with a few outlaws in the East End of London and the militant suffragettes, the gun-running of Ulster was successfully accomplished without interference under the able leadership of an important legal ornament and Member of Parliament.

In Ireland and elsewhere there were many who thought that self-government would be a cure for this and other ills, but there were others who felt that present discomforts were better borne than the application of a medicine beneficial to the one part, while it deranged another even temporarily. In any case, could the conditions obtaining in England afford any hope that Ireland with Home Rule would avoid the discords destroying the harmony in the former country? In other European countries or in America, it could not be said without bias that their Governments were achieving any greater measure of success.

It was fashionable to think that more governmental power was necessary to keep in order the rebellious people. To make the world really fit for habitation, the natural passions, prejudices and hatreds of human beings must be severely repressed, or how otherwise was it possible to expect the people to do what was right? Without the barbarous penal code, administered with disciplinary firmness, it was considered, not without reason, that the people would insurge instantly.

Individuals even of different and remote nationalities composing the manufacturing and trading community might observe certain principles to their mutual advantage

in dealing with each other, and did regard the cumbrous legal processes of their respective countries of less than no effect, compared with the impulsion of mutual satisfaction. But no lesson was drawn from this. It was thought by the "ruling" classes that the "lower" orders had no self-respect, and the latter thought that the cause of their oppression lay in the overweening ambition of the "powerful." Each side sought to control the other by means of legislation, and thousands of mutually destructive "laws," amendments and consolidations were instituted, adding to the confusion. Things went from bad to worse.

With every fresh addition to the Statute Book, new crimes brought forth new criminals into society, which only heightened the belief encouraged by the Churches, that the Sermon on the Mount teaching was visionary and even impracticable, because man is born in sin and conceived in wickedness. "The natural man must be crucified," said present-day Pharisees, "if we are to have a healthy community."

That the community was not in a state of health was only too apparent, when the symptoms were noted. At one time there would be the hectic glow of feverish activity, to be followed inevitably by a period of depression and stupor, in which the fatalistic drugged themselves in Fabianism, Nietzschean philosophy, Rubáiyáts and necromancy.

Forlorn attempts were made from time to time by the unrestful to find a way out of the tangle into which society found itself. There was an undercurrent of enlightenment moving towards the removal of certain fundamental errors upon which the tangle had developed, but these efforts were met with flippant and almost instinctive dislike. They were side-tracked by the law-makers, screened-off by the newspaper press, or shouted down by loud Party cries above the wars of the factions.

The air was full of fear, and there was a tendency to paralytic drift on the part of statesmen, or movement in a direction of greater severity in government. In pursuance of this gravitation towards forceful methods, there were two converging tendencies, one of which was the oligarchical tyranny of a few ephors, and the other that of many,

which may be described as State-Socialism. It was in Germany where most progress had been made in this respect under the welding influence of that barefaced despot Kaiser Wilhelm II.

International Discords.

In international affairs, interests rather than principles, even more than in national affairs, guided the policies of the Governments in their dealings with each other. Above and beyond national discords, which existed in every country, there also rumbled international discordance, which manifested itself in territorial and commercial jealousies, associated with rivalries for the possession of the "White Man's Burden."

The origins were obscure and little understood, but many saw in racial hatreds, differences in language or national character sufficient cause for "natural" animosities. But whatever might be the origins, there was a feeling that war was inevitable sooner or later. It was the duty therefore of those in charge of the destinies of each nation to make preparation, since a strong nation armed was least likely to be attacked.

Curiously enough, in general, the individuals of any one nation could not imagine themselves attacking unprovoked a friendly neighbour, but they believed that a lasting peace could only be secured by armaments. It was a German militarist's boast that by the strength of his country's arms there had been acquired a peace of forty years, a longer period than any known in history.

It was only to be expected that, in order to avoid war, all neighbouring States got themselves into a position of "preparedness," which caused a competition of armaments to spring up. This was considered regrettable and extravagant, but it was said to be unavoidable, and preferable to war itself. It was also said to be good for trade.

Furthermore, in a desire to extend security, an alliance was entered into by some of the Governments, which forced those left out to form an Entente for their own security. Diplomats were consequently engaged, usefully and otherwise, in seeking to ensure peace by means of a balance of power, while attending to the aggrandisement

of their respective countries. Owing to the continual fluxing due to invention and in output of armaments, they were kept busy balancing and adjusting, and were so far successful that the inevitable seemed delayed indefinitely.

Nevertheless, the opposing machines of destruction steadily grew, and, although restriction of output was frequently suggested, they never reached a stage of arrested development. The citizens of each country could only hope that when the impending catastrophe did take place it would occur at such a time as would be most propitious for themselves. It was this hope which was father to the disgraceful policies of European warlords.

The Militant Evolutionists and the Imperialists.

In such an atmosphere, it was the fashion to speak of war, among kindred things, as a means of human progress in evolution. By many the doctrine was mildly held that war, in breaking down antisocial barriers, made the way clear for reform, while others, regardless of reservations, glorified war as the saviour of humanity and the creator of all goodness.

It was the militant evolutionists who rushed Darwinism boldly into politics and proclaimed that "War is a biological necessity." Their favourite theory was that international rivalries were due to a desire to seek for "a place in the sun for overgrown populations."

Darwin had accepted without question the then current "over-population" fallacy put forward by Mr. Malthus, an eighteenth-century clergyman, and although it had no direct bearing upon Darwin's theory of Natural Selection propounded in *The Origin of Species*, it was gratuitously employed as an analogy by Darwin, when he stated that the struggle for existence "is the doctrine of Malthus applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms."

In a later work, *The Descent of Man*, he had cautiously to admit that man's environment had been unnaturally tampered with "by laws or customs." He pleaded that "there should be open competition for all men." Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace, collaborator with Darwin, was so

positive of the harmful effects of man's unnatural environment that in his book, *Man's Place in the Universe*, he uttered a strongly worded protest when discussing atmospheric contamination.

But the militant evolutionists observed no such scruples. They revived the discredited doctrine of Malthus, scorned Darwin's caution, and echoed from Empedocles, "War is the mother of all good things." "There must be a great struggle for existence between the older nations," said Häckel, "and the strongest, most adaptable and resourceful nations will win."

Such an authoritative lead inspired the Pan-German propaganda: "Every nation seeks space for the affirmation and development of its peculiar character. The result, of course, must be a squeezing, a jostling, a jumping upon one another, and much consequent battling. But let us remember that such struggles for room are not reprehensible, and that, notwithstanding the pain they bring, they are necessary struggles. Nature gives the nations their peculiar characteristics, and it is the duty, the sacred duty, of each to assert these. This can only be done by the acquisition and use of power."

In Great Britain the imperialists adopted the same views, less brutally expressed possibly. "Freedom must be fought for," said the mildest of them. Bernhardt's effusion—*Germany and the Next War*—and Treitschke's adulation of war as "the medicine of God" can be matched by Major Stewart-Murray's book, *The Future Peace of the Anglo-Saxons* and Lord Roberts's tribute that "war is as inevitable as death; it is salutary, it is necessary, and the only natural tonic that can be prescribed."

Incapable of differentiating between the bracing, enjoyable effort misnamed "struggle" for existence in nature and that Black Hole of Calcutta struggle going on among mankind, the militant evolutionists see in war the highest expression of a cruel, remorseless force, which in the course of unnumbered ages has evolved all the infinitely diversified and wonderfully adapted forms of teeming life on this planet. War the great destroyer, according to this doctrine, "is the mother of all good things"! The fittest to survive are the fierce, brutal and power-lustful.

Frightfulness and ruthlessness are the attributes of the "superman," mercy and pity are but the virtues of the weak. "We . . . believe that Will to Life had to be intensified into unconditional Will to Power; we hold that hardness, violence, slavery, danger in the street and in the heart, secrecy, stoicism, arts of temptation and devilry of all kinds, and everything evil, terrible, tyrannical, wild-beast-like and serpent-like in man contributes to the elevation of the species just as much as its opposite—and in saying this we do not even say enough." (Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche.) This apostle of ruthlessness was of opinion that "every strengthening and elevation of the type 'man' also involves a new form of slavery": we thus gather that the superman is a slave-owner!

It is a logical sequence that, just as there must arise supermen possessing these characteristics, so super-nations must follow, and, if the imperialist might be said to idealise a millennium, it would be one super-nation finally having in bondage all the others as subject nations. "The weak nation is to have the same right to live as the powerful and vigorous nation!" ejaculated Bernhardi, who regarded the efforts directed towards the abolition of war as immoral and as "unworthy of the human race"—"The whole idea represents a presumptuous encroachment on the natural laws of development."

To provide room for the superman, it was proposed that the "Germanoid" races organise great forced migrations of the inferior races of South America to "reserves" in Africa. This may be an extreme example, but it is only the logical carrying of theory into practice. The proposer (Colonel Reinhold Wagner) believed that such forced migrations might appear superficially hard, but it was the only solution of the race-question that was worthy of humanity. Thus alone could the "over-population" of the earth be controlled and the efficient peoples secure elbow-room. In the narrow "reserves" where the inefficient would have no room to grow, discouraged and rendered indifferent to the future by the spectacle of the superior energy of their conquerors, they would crawl slowly towards the peaceful death of weary and hopeless senility!

South America is the most thinly populated of all the

continents, but these experts in international affairs saw no method for dissipating the unpleasant symptoms which obtained there except the application of organised violence by "Germanoid" supermen.

Once the principle is admitted there is no escape from such conclusions; the militant evolutionists have the merit of never shrinking from carrying their theories to a logical termination.

Governments and War.

One of the most important current beliefs with regard to war was its civilising influence upon mankind. It was taught and believed that all government is based upon force. Intelligent mankind during the ages of unceasing warfare had invented powerful Governments to restrain individual ferocity, so that benevolent measures could be promoted for the welfare of the nations, affording security to life and property.

The stronger and more powerful the Government, therefore, the happier the fortunate nation basking in the sunshine of its blessings. But the possession of these advantages of civilisation entails corresponding sacrifices. The balance of nature being thus upset, it was natural to expect that for periods of peace and prosperity, which caused stagnation, overproduction of wealth, luxury and gross materialism, war periods must come to prune, rectify and purify the nations.

That the greater portion of the populations were not afflicted with this superabundance of goods was generally forgotten, but it was believed by those subscribing to this theory that the poverty-stricken were improvident, and preferred, even enjoyed, their state of riotous discontent and misery to any other.

It could not be denied that there was much in appearances to encourage this incongruous belief in war purification. Civilisation could be likened to an organism suffering from sporadic inflammations, how caused it was not clear, but by our deep thinkers they were believed to be due to "overgrown populations" and by our theologians to "original sin." These inflammations came at length to a head, and the enormous eruption of war was necessary to dissipate

the suppurations, enabling Society, weak and convalescent, to regain its health and morality.

The High Moral Feeling upon Entry into War.

Many of these ideas found their most pronounced expression immediately before and after the outbreak of war in 1914. Influenced by high moral feeling, men and even women have committed the most remarkable acts of noble self-sacrifice and bravery in the face of the greatest dangers. Under the same influence they have also committed atrocious deeds of cruelty, but which they justified according to our authority Paley: "If the Cause and End of War be Justifiable, all the means that appear necessary to the End are Justifiable also," a statement which cannot be refuted. As Bethmann-Hollweg, quoting Carlyle, expressed it, "Necessity knows no law."

Germans, feeling surrounded upon all sides by enemies, believed they were fighting for their existence, and Britons rushed nobly to the rescue of the stricken Belgians and French, as the Russians did to the protection of the Serbians. All fought for self-preservation, instinct being intermixed with an intelligent sense of repressed shame.

This secondary emotion, which became stronger as the Great War proceeded, found expression in moralising protests. "It is necessary for us to make it clear to the neutral world why we can be content with nothing less than a victorious peace. It is not for the love of fighting, though we may seem for the moment to have converted ourselves into a military nation." (Mr. Asquith at Ladybank.)

The Churches, in their National Mission of Repentance and Hope, explained "that the repentance is not for the part the nation has taken in this great war. Militarism is not one of our national faults, as witness our unpreparedness, but for which the war might have ended long ago, if, indeed, it had ever commenced. We have therefore no blood-guiltiness, so have not to repent for that. We have entered upon this war in the spirit of chivalry on behalf of the liberties of the smaller peoples. Let us seek to cleanse our nation of the evils that contaminate it," a list being given of these evils, chiefly neglect of religious observances.

The writer of the above was unnecessarily regretful concerning the extent of our preparedness,¹ and was strangely inconsistent in referring to militarism as a "fault," when it might have prevented the war taking place! He continued: "So that, inspired by self-sacrifice so gloriously presented by the flower of our race, the nation may set its mind on righteousness, and so become worthy to turn the victory for which with all our might we are contending to the purposes of God, of liberty and of the highest civilisation."

The Churches in Germany referred to British hypocrisy, and the Kaiser wrote to his Chancellor to say that, "It is clear that the peoples of the enemy countries, who are kept in a morbid war-atmosphere and are labouring, owing to lies and fraud, under delusions induced by fighting and hatred, possess no men who are able, or who have the moral courage, to speak the word which will bring relief—to propose peace. What is wanted is a moral deed to free the world, including neutrals, from the pressure which weighs upon all. For such a deed it is necessary to find a ruler who has a conscience, who feels that he is responsible to God, who has a heart for his own people and for those of his enemies, who, indifferent to any possible misinterpretation of his action, possesses the will to free the world from its sufferings. I have that courage. Trusting in God, I shall dare to take this step."

Neither side credited the other with sincerity, although their protestations were made under what appeared to be genuine moral emotion. All "sacrificed" themselves, and the Kaiser Wilhelm, in his rôle as prince of peace, was obviously not conscious of blood-guiltiness.

But the situation was such that any interference, however well intentioned, only added fuel to the fire. The excitement had to be discharged, and those popularly thought able to bring hell upon Europe by merely pressing a button were least able of all to restore peace.

Out of the belief that the Kaiser Wilhelm, the late Emperor of Austria or the ex-Czar of Russia was able to bring about a horrible war, was born a wonder that millions

¹ Great Britain spent more per head of population upon military establishment than any other country in the world.

of people should be found willing to die at their bidding and for undisclosed aims.

It is necessary to remind ourselves of the spark which began the Great War. From the Vienna *Reichsbote* is taken the following: "Austria declared war on Serbia because our splendid heir to the throne had been murdered, and because it was necessary to root out the nests of the conspirators. How absolutely moral was such a motive for war! How grand is the Austrian idea of State!"

Why such a comparatively insignificant spark should produce the great conflagration is the question we have to ask ourselves and seek for solution. We have to discover why mankind has become so dry and sapless that far-reaching destruction is possible as the result of a trifling incitement. In our search, the dictum of Baron von Gebattel, one of Germany's ruling class, may afford some enlightenment: "Political and human rights have nothing to do with one another." Since when was the divorce effected?

What is meant by Militarism.

Mr. Arthur Henderson also believed that Great Britain was not a militarist State before the war. In reply to an American interviewer who had asked, "What is meant by militarism?" he replied, "An army not kept in its proper place," and added, "Either German military power must be effectively controlled by a Government which has adequate regard to moral restraints, or that power must be so weakened as to cease to be dangerous. What the Allies contend with regard to Germany is that its great military power is not subject to proper moral constraint; that it has not been used in accordance with such constraint."

Mr. Henderson's candour did him credit, but his contention was precisely that of the Central Confederation with reference to the "military preparedness" of the Allies. Mr. Lloyd George, speaking of the confidence the Germans place in their Army, said, "The Germans put their trust in it in a way you can hardly conceive, as we all put our trust in our great Navy." Yet Mr. George contended that the German people hated their Army, because it bullied and terrorised them, but they put up with it so

long as it intimidated their neighbours. He said, "We have to demonstrate that the Prussian Baal is a false god, that its pretensions are a sham, that its priests are a cruel fraud."

Each side called the other hard names, and Professor Gramzow, after calling the French a nation of madmen, said: "The English are not mad, nor are they hypnotised. What they do is done with cool consideration and reckoning. But there can be no peace or reconciliation with them. The man who believes this possible is neither a psychologist nor a student of history. Behind the English nation lies a history of seven hundred years of crime. The old Norman pirate spirit has never permitted a rival. The ruling caste in England lives and struggles for its money-bags. Righteousness is unknown to it, and moral considerations it has thrown to the winds. The British ruling classes are versed in every vile and knavish trick, and practise unexampled persistence and cruelty. If the power of these people is to remain, they will never rest until they build up fresh coalitions against us. What hate and greed can do, will be done by them. We will therefore not risk future wars. This must be the last, and the political instinct of the German nation says, 'Down with England: this is the solution!'"

We might multiply quotations indefinitely from the publicists of all the warring nations to show that each saw in exaggerated form the faults, believed to be wilful, of the other competitors in the struggle. Each national egotism was afflicted with mental blindness correspondingly with regard to its own faults, and magnified what it conceived to be its own national virtues. We, the Entente, represented ourselves as protectors of the weak, and refused to believe that even "inadequate" preparedness was nevertheless militarism, while the Germans believed they were the chosen people of God sent to chastise surrounding nations into righteousness.

Moderate councils in each country were repressed, and so far as they were expressed were not allowed to find their way into opposing camps to vitiate the will for war. The individuals of each belligerent nation believed themselves to be attacked by unscrupulous antagonists, while

each in turn deemed themselves peace-loving and inoffensive. Base actions were called by unfamiliar names in a desire to hide their real nature. Unspeakable atrocities were carried on under the name of reprisals.

High moral feeling decomposed into immorality, and considerations of humanity were more and more disregarded on every hand as all sought, assisted by the incantations of the war-priests, accompanied by hymns of hate, to cast out devils by the aid of Beelzebub, the prince of devils.

Fighting for Freedom.

There was a definite belief fixed in the minds of all combatants that they were fighting either for their own freedom or to secure or to preserve the freedom of others. The freedom fought for was never defined clearly, and so far as it was expressed was generally limited to a statement that freedom from the aggression of militarism and brute force was intended, or that it was necessary to secure the freedom of the seas.

It was not clear from other statements made that the "freedoms" each aspired to were intended in every case to be universal. Indeed, there were many indications which tended to show that forceful discrimination would be made.

By some it was stated that they were "fighting to make the world safe for democracy." Why democracy was unsafe was not satisfactorily explained, but it was sufficiently obvious that democracy was everywhere unsafe. Fighting, however, seemed as ineffective a way to make it safe as the father and mother fighting each other to make the home safe for the children.

That it was necessary to fight for freedom was an implication that we were in a state of captivity. The alleged restraints, curiously enough, were found upon examination to be in effect greater upon those who appeared to menace their neighbours than upon those who believed themselves to be menaced. For example, Prussian Militarism was resented by surrounding nations, but it was only remembered at rare intervals that it was a far greater danger to the Germans themselves.

The mental blindness of those most enslaved in this

way was only intensified by the haste of neighbours as they sought to enslave themselves in a similar or improved manner. Each competitor nation loaded itself much as Sinbad shouldered the Old Man of the Sea, believing that after the passage of the deluge the burden would be easily unshipped. How it would be disposed of was variously believed to be by the imposition of the charge upon the backs of the losers by the victors.

"Peace without Victory," or "No Indemnities, No Annexations," meant that each should accept responsibility for their own burdens to their own moneylenders, and as this unpopular war-aim provided, or seemed to provide, a ruinous outlook for many in the future, the limitless gamble was continued in a desire to transfer the constantly increasing load upon an insensible competitor after "the Knock-out Blow."

These fears and hopes operated like the action of the blast upon a furnace. The Great Bonfire of the Nations burnt ever more furiously, and as the fires burnt down, new faggots were laid upon the dying embers so long as fuel was available.

A Durable Peace.

At no time did there seem hope in the victorious war-aims of either side for a durable peace in the future. Each clearly saw that a "shameful peace" for themselves could not be durable, yet indicated that they were determined to impose a "shameful peace" upon the other. To the Central Confederation only a "German" peace was supposed to be durable, while the Entente Allies believed that the only durable peace was "Peace by Victory," one as shameful as the other.

War indemnities as "compensation" were discussed by the implacable property worshippers of the belligerents, but this meant a larger scale of "dumping" upon the victors and stimulated industry for the losers.

"War after the war" by means of tariffs could be shown to hurt those who employed such a weapon (except a few favoured individuals) more than those against whom it was directed. Nevertheless, in face of this offence no permanent settlement was likely, for the same reason that

a man who cuts off his nose to spite his face perpetually offends his neighbours by doing so.

Territorial aggrandisement from the point of view of the victors was seen to be the only thing worth striving for, which accounted for the secret treaties of partition and the sentimental introduction of the Alsace-Lorraine bone of contention; but neither in these war-aims could there be said to be hope for an ultimate durable peace, any more than in the short-sighted and brutally selfish action taken by the German Government in Russia, Finland, the Ukraine, and in Rumania, especially after the professions made by them at Brest Litovsk.

Even "Peace without Victory" contained its dangers. Let us refer to Mr. Balfour's Note sent to the United States of America while they were yet neutral. He said: "His Majesty's Government entirely share the President's ideals [with regard to peace], but they feel strongly that the durability of the peace must largely depend upon its character, and that no stable system of international relations can be built upon foundations which are essentially and hopelessly defective. This becomes clearly apparent if we consider the main conditions which render possible the calamities from which the world is now suffering. These were the existence of a Great Power consumed with the lust of domination in the midst of a community of nations ill-prepared for defence, plentifully supplied, indeed, with international laws, *but with no machinery for enforcing them*, and weakened by the fact that neither the boundaries of the various States nor their internal constitution harmonised with the aspirations of their constituent races or secured to them just and equal treatment."

Mr. Balfour would scorn a suggestion that his views in any way approximated to those held by Colonel R. Wagner for the segregation of peoples into "reserves," but since this is a time for inquiring into many things believed to be indispensable, we may well ask why are frontiers of States considered any more important than those of counties or provinces?

Mr. Balfour did not put forward any definite proposals of boundaries and constitutions suitable, and likely to meet the aspirations of the constituent races, securing for

all just and equal treatment, but he certainly presented an ideal for attainment, towards which the Allies might have fought for all eternity without solution, apart from the negative one of ultimate extinction !

Fatalism is Opposed to Common Sense.

Mr. Balfour was happy in his observation that "no stable system of international relations can be built upon foundations which are essentially and hopelessly defective," but he was obsessed by the fatalistic belief in a yet Greater Power supplied with machinery for enforcing the plentiful international laws against any Great Power filled with the lust for more power.

How could we be guaranteed that this Greater Power would not also be consumed with the lust of domination ? Experience teaches that there can be no guarantee, because presumably the underlying system of founded credence is essentially and hopelessly defective.

The Anarchists, who regard government in itself as evil, are not more unreasonable than the imperialists and militarists with their belief in unlimited autocracy, or the Socialists of the militant type with their doctrine of divine right of the majority to tyrannise over the minority. There must be some middle way by which the regulation of society can be effected without tyranny.

That there is something fundamentally at fault which necessitates monstrous, inefficient and top-heavy Governments we are convinced. The regulation of a steam engine would not excite any admiration if its governor absorbed about one-third of the total output of energy, and to show pride in the political mechanism which absorbs this proportion of human activities in what is known as government is an offence to any reasonable mind.

The Problem.

Our problem is not only to investigate the origin of civil and international hatreds and wars generally, but especially to scrutinise the underlying cause or causes of modern strife. We should then be in a position to indicate the specific remedy or remedies called for.

We shall clear away, so far as we can, the debris which strew the path over which we must tread, composed of the fragments and boulders shattered from mountainous fallacies long ago exploded by giant pioneers. These have discouraged former research parties.

On our way towards the source, we may examine certain tributary theories to see where they lead, but not every one. The time is short, our friends remaining behind are anxiously awaiting our news. Guided by the finger of Truth, our expedition must not halt, therefore, but press forward, sustained by the conviction that fatalism is opposed to common sense.