

the attitude of such narrow-minded persons, Mr. Wells has a very keen mind, and can be very sound at times. He rightly points out that when people spoke about Democracy in Greece affairs were so simple that politics could be discussed and the statecraft examined by the human voice in an assembly of all the citizens. The same conditions might be found to-day in little States like San Marino or Monaco; but in larger States the problems of politics have grown so complex and so vast that the old terms can only apply to the new conditions by a remote analogy. This sort of traditional acceptance of an old word as if it could still bear its old force is perhaps responsible for a good deal of the confusion that lies at the bottom of most modern thought about Democracy. No little study of modern conditions and no little analysis is necessary before we can arrive at anything like a clear notion of what different interpretations may be put on the word Democracy to-day. Approaching the subject as it concerns government, we find that views may be very broadly divided into two classes: some think that the common man can govern; others think he cannot. Following from this starting-point we next find that some think the common man is wise enough and good enough to act rightly for the common good if only he is left alone. Others, not prepared to go so far, think that the common man can be depended on to express himself wisely and rightly by a majority vote—on the principle that "you cannot fool all the people all the time." Those who hold that he cannot govern may hold that he needs stirring up by education, and that political facts must be thrust upon him to secure his assent to proceedings of the able people who manage affairs. Others regard him as a person to be ruled and not consulted at all. With his customary clearness Mr. Wells thus analyses the problem:—

Class I.—It is supposed that the common man can govern:

- (a) Without further organisation (Anarchy).
- (b) Through a majority vote by delegates.

Class II.—It is supposed that the common man cannot govern, and that government therefore must be through the agency of Able Persons who may be classified under one of the following heads, either as—

- (1) Persons elected by the common man because he believes them to be persons able to govern—just as he chooses his doctors as persons able to secure health, and his electrical engineers as persons able to attend to his tramways, etc.
- (2) Persons of a special class, as, for example, persons born and educated to rule (e.g., Aristocracy), or rich business adventurers (Plutocracy) who rule without consulting the common man at all.
- (3) A sort of intermediate class of persons elected by a special class of voter.

Now from this table it is evident that we often use the term Democracy to cover a section which comes under the class of those who even hold that the common man cannot govern. (1) in class II. and (b) in class I. cover what is commonly meant by most people who speak of democratic government at present. The latter may be called "delegate Democracy" and the former "selective Democracy." When we simply say "Democracy" we may mean either; but they are two entirely different things, based on two entirely different ideas. We may take it for granted that a good government on the lines of "delegate Democracy" is not possible under modern conditions. The Democracy of which President Wilson is the ablest and most authoritative exponent is that which demands personality and initiative in the elected representatives. The trend of the movement in England is on the same lines as in America. The tendency here, where we are a wowsler-ridden community, represented by politicians who for the most part do not know what a man means when he talks about principles, is the other way. Progressive countries elect sound men and ask them to use their brains; wowsler-ridden New Zealand elects the men who pander most to the bigots of the hour, and, not expecting them to have either brains or principles, looks on them as puppets.

Out of the Fulness of the Heart

A gentleman recently told us that while walking up Princes Street he could not help hearing the conversation of two schoolboys in front of him. To say he was shocked would be putting it mildly. The obscenity and the indecency spoken on the public street, loudly enough for a man walking behind to hear easily, were appalling. We have more than once heard in the trains language from sober, well-dressed men that would be rightly punished by imprisonment with hard labor; and these people are usually so lost to shame, so corrupt and debased that they care little who hears them. There are very few travellers whose ears have not been offended in like manner on many occasions. And when we add to the obscenities the curses and blasphemies heard so frequently we have one further clear proof of the state of affairs in this country for which schools that banish God and indirectly teach children that it is a matter of indifference whether the Ten Commandments be broken or kept are responsible. Of old it was written: The things that proceed from the mouth come forth from the heart. . . Out of the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witnesses. Judging society by these words, what a rottenness obtains to-day! What Our Lord said of the corruption of the individual seems only too true of society nowadays. The verdict that one is compelled to pass on the people is terrible; and in the light of all that students of sociology in our time have written the evidences of the perversity of the heart are too obvious to be mistaken. The radical cause of evil language—be it blasphemy or obscenity—is the weakness of the religious sense; and that is, certainly due to the Servile Schools established and maintained in our midst by injustice and outrage on liberty. If the sanction of religion is removed as it is by our legislators, what power will teach boys and men self-control, what will save them from corruption, what will make them speak reverently of God, in a word, what will train them to be gentlemen? The answer is, nothing on earth can do it. Therefore every parent who cares for the honor of God and for the salvation of his children will avoid the godless schools as if they were infested with leprosy; therefore every true Christian will, for the honor of God's Holy Name and for the sake of purity and decency, strive by every means in his power to help on the penalised private schools which are struggling to save this country from its political place-hunters and adventurers. Another cause of the rottenness is the prevalence of evil literature and the laxity of the press. Of this phase we will only make one remark: even clergymen have openly advocated the introduction of a book which a member of Parliament said that only a blackguard would allow his children to read. That fact shows how far the plague has eaten into society and how great the need of reform. That book was one that dealt almost professedly with subjects that "only a blackguard would allow into his home"; and when clergymen attack the authorities for prohibiting it, what zeal for decency and for clean literature can be expected from them? The writer of the book was himself a clergyman, and what can one say of him except the words of St. Matthew already quoted? The book was written expressly to calumniate Catholics, and apparently it is considered permissible to introduce a vile book and to corrupt the young provided that by doing so No-Popery gets a boom. Could there be greater evidence of the intense perversity of heart and mind than that one fact? What could such a guide do to uplift the unfortunate people committed to his charge? What is he likely to care for decency or purity among them? Apart from obscene books recommended by clergymen there are others always procurable and always in circulation, as every confessor knows. We have heard how young girls who read these books speak, and how unblushingly they lay bare to everyone who hears them the corruption within them. From minds fed on filth what cleanness or wholesomeness can one expect? And how much of what the modern boy or girl reads or hears to-day can be described by any other words than filth? The evil is indeed appalling. The