(November 8th, 1915.)

The Anglo-Saxon Tradition.

By Mr. Winston Churchill.*

AT a meeting of the Canadian Club held on the 8th November, Mr. Churchill said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I came here to Canada, to Ottawa and Toronto, in order particularly to express my admiration and sympathy with Canada, and also to express in this crisis the admiration and sympathy of a very large number of the citizens of the United States. (Applause.)

When I awoke this morning and took up the newspaper I saw on the front page something that was rather a facer. (Laughter.) I don't know that I should hold it up against any of you gentlemen here if you were to come up and say to me in surprise: "I do not blame you for dissembling your love, but why did you kick me downstairs?" (Laughter.)

Now, I don't need to call your attention to a peculiar characteristic of Anglo-Saxon government, that there are in it many shades of public opinion; governments change, and sometimes governments do not express the opinions even of majorities; these things may sometimes be distasteful to majorities. You have had, if I mistake not, that experience in Canada.

There are in the United States, roughly speaking, four elements of public opinion, irrespective of party: there is, in the first place, I am sorry to say, an element which is indifferent to what is going on in the world to-day; I think this element is growing smaller. I shall speak of the reasons a little later. In the second place, there are the pro-Germans; these are largely citizens who call themselves German-Americans, but many of them are loyal citizens of the United States, and some actually pro-Ally. (Applause.) A third element we have to contend with, is that composed of selfish manufacturers and traders. Now these are nothing new to us. (Laughter.) Perhaps, also, you have had experience with the same breed. We have had that experience, particularly in the Civil War; gentlemen who came forward and made large contracts, at

*Mr. Winston Churchill's reputation as a novelist and publicist has won for him a wide circle of admirers. His address before the Club was regarded as one of the most inspiring messages that has come from a prominent American.

the expense of the men at the front. In England, there have been manufacturers who took an unduly large share of the profits, but I am very glad to say that the characteristic ability of the British Government has totally crushed that. (Applause.)

Now there is a fourth class of public opinion in America, a very large class,—how large, I do not know, but very large,—which, irrespective of party, sympathizes with the Allies, and even in certain cases those who belong to it are sending their sons to the front. (Applause.) They realize that Great Britain and Canada and Australia and the Dominions are making the fight for our institutions and our ideals. (Hear, hear and applause.) And I may say it is that part of our public opinion which I humbly represent to-day. (Applause.) I have heard it is said that seven-eighths of our newspapers are in favor of the Allies, and I should be inclined to think, from my own experience, that that is a conservative estimate. (Hear, hear.) I have also heard it said that nowhere in any country of the world has this war been so thoroughly thrashed out as in the American newspapers, and the inevitable conclusion so logically reached as in our newspapers; anyone who has faced the arguments on both sides, and is a fair-minded man, can come to but one conclusion. (Hear, hear.)

I shall go on with my speech, which I have prepared with a good deal of care, but first I wish to mention one thing,—what happened in our Civil War, when the government of Great Britain was unfriendly to us, although we were fighting for institutions at that time which were Anglo-Saxon institutions; for the abolition of slavery, for which Great Britain had already taken her stand. I am reminded, however, that in the textile regions, where the employees were on the verge of starvation, they came to their employers and said, "We are willing to suffer because we cannot get cotton; we are willing to undergo all this suffering and privation, for the cause of humanity." (Hear, hear.) We remember British public opinion was with the North in that war for the preservation of the Union. (Hear, hear.) We remember John Bright, and above all we remember and bless your great Queen Victoria, (Hear, hear and applause), because it was Queen Victoria who stepped in there and said that there should be no strife between the two great Anglo-Saxon people. (Applause.)

It has been our custom to despise philosophies, to think of them as harmless things made for arm chairs and leisure, to forget that they may be dynamic. Especially is this true

of those philosophies saturated with humanitarianism, and hence with religion. The unrest of the masses in the 18th century, when it became self-conscious in the philosophy of the Rights of Man, burst into flame and created in Europe a conflagration that took a quarter of a century to quench. Last year even a more terrible conflagration broke out, and when the world had recovered a little from the recoil and had time to examine the causes of the explosion, a philosophy, or Kultur, was found to be at the bottom of it. A philosophy that took away the breath. For years we had heard of the German Kultur and smiled at it until we discovered, to our cost, that it was nitro-glycerine. (Laughter.)

I shall not go into the evolution of a Kultur; it is needless to go into it. According to Professor Dewey, who has analyzed it in a masterly way, it has its origin in Kant, with elements of Fichte and Hegel and other German thinkers; it also contains some distortions of Nietzsche—the Superman idea—and it was developed by von Treitschke and Bernhardi. Prussia was responsible for this Kultur, and it was developed by a class largely for the benefit of a class. It is significant that when the war broke out this class did not have the courage to go to the people and say, "We believe that Germany is destined to rule the world; Germany has the finest people in the world." What did they say? "We have been treacherously attacked and by the English, and it is necessary to go out and defend the Fatherland." But at any rate, and this is already astonishingly shown in Germany, they were proud of their wonderful army, they were healthy and happy, they had had no reasons to complain of industrial conditions, of poverty, and their commercial progress had been remarkable. The invasion of Belgium did not shock them; they were imbued with the idea, begot by marvellous efficiency, that the Germans were the chosen people and were of right the rulers of the earth.

Nothing could be more antagonistic to the Anglo-Saxon idea of government than this mixture of monarchy and of collectivism, of socialism. When in a flash it lay revealed, it aroused in us every instinct of antagonism and self-preservation. But we had no Kultur, we were not unified and crystallized by a conscious and deliberate idea. We had traditions, but we neglected them, we had not developed them into a definite principle applicable to problems that beset us. Neither the British Empire nor the United States was prosperous and unified in the German sense. Here was a nation which had thought things out, ready to adopt itself with

remarkable efficiency to any situation, and which could turn its resources and enthusiasm to war as well as peace.

Now that sudden attack of the Germans found the Anglo-Saxon democracies absolutely unprepared for war, with the single great exception of the British fleet. (Applause.) It found our democracies not only wholly unprepared, but without any formative principles or policy, such as the Germans had, suitable to the task of the organization of a national system of defence. Democracy had lapsed into a haphazard, go-as-you-please experimental affair. Its ideals were vague. The problem of industrialism, like an evil genie, hung above us like smoke, threatening us. And England had the Irish question on her hands. Unlike the Germans, we possessed no definite creative principle harmonizing with our form of government, but we were in a state of moral anarchy.

Democracy had not kept pace with industrial development. We had freed ourselves of political slavery, only to find it replaced by industrial slavery, a slavery as real as that in which the master was individualized. Statistics also reveal a considerable element of the populations of England and the United States existing on a standard of living far too low. This has a direct bearing on the problem of national defence, because patriotism cannot be hoped for from citizens who are overworked and undeveloped; they cannot be expected to show enthusiasm for a government that does not treat them better than that.

Another evil with which we had to contend, and which was not contemplated in our institutions, was class antagonism of an economic nature. We were torn by industrial disputes, class disputes, that also strained patriotism. We were not prepared to tackle intelligently the problems of poverty. We had become so intent upon the pursuit of wealth—which we had mistaken for the pursuit of happiness— that we could think of nothing but balances of trade, and we forgot that that nation is the greatest nation which contains the greatest number of healthy, happy and sane individuals. (Applause.)

When we awoke in the United States, some dozen years ago, to the dangers of these evils, we did not attempt even then to go to the sources of the disease, or to reflect whether there were not some principle, peculiar to the Anglo-Saxon temperament, that might be applicable to the cure of these evils. What we did, both in Europe and in America, was to seek to apply to them a collectivism, borrowed from continental Europe, from Germany, and uncongenial to the temperament of the Anglo-Saxons. I think the

majority of the laws passed in the past dozen years in England and America, and brought forward as solutions of a situation rapidly becoming intolerable, are really unsuited to our temperament. It is a question whether, in view of our racial character and traditions, they are more than temporary palliatives. The road to self-respect—and I think self-respect is absolutely inherent of democracy—does not lie through pensions. The minimum wage is only a poultice, not a cure; an indication that something is radically wrong with the spirit of a democracy that is compelled to resort to it. (Hear, hear.)

Democracy in essence is contributory. The tendency to right evils by class solidarity, and even by class revolution, kills individual initiative. The motto of democracy is, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Then the war began. It was realized that Anglo-Saxon institutions, Anglo-Saxon democracy, were at stake. And the question has been presented to our minds, What kind of democracy is it that is being fought for?

Professor Dewey quotes Heine to the effect that "nations have an instinctive presentiment of what is required to fulfil their destiny." Now we Anglo-Saxons have such a presentiment, but it is little more than a presentiment—we have never made it self-conscious.

Democracy is of course an adventure, an experiment to be worked out by degrees through the conflict of individual wills. But this does not preclude the notion of an inner, constant, guiding principle of development, of progress, based on the character and history of Anglo-Saxon peoples.

It seems as though we need such a principle, which will be consonant both with our temperament and with our institutions. It seems we have become so bewildered by the problems thrust upon us by industrialism that we have lost sight of our history, that it did not occur to us to go back into the past to attempt to discover whether such a principle once existed, and whether, if it did exist, it were not as capable of development and application to industrial evils as it once had been to political evils. In other words, whether there may not be evolved from our history and traditions a Culture of Anglo-Saxon democracy with the spirit of which our children may be inoculated from early years. If so, our laws and the conduct of our government should be remoulded in harmony with that spirit, or Culture. For we have found out by experiment that laws must precede, and not follow, public opinion. (Hear, hear.)

The history of the Anglo-Saxon race has been one of gradual emancipation from political coercion, to which the Magna Charta, the Act of Settlement, the Declaration of Independence all bear witness. The characteristics of the Anglo-Saxon are impatience of coercion and a desire for individual liberty. We are jealous of any acts of government that seem to encroach on personal freedom. We lay stress on individual initiative, and the much abused phrase "the pursuit of happiness" is merely a recognition of the fact that happiness lies—and lies alone—in self-realization. (Hear, hear.) Every citizen in other words, must be free to develop the gifts within him. It is individualism—but such is our nature. The leopard cannot change his spots, and so we must make the best of it, remembering always that all good people are not alike, and we may become quite as good as other people but in our own way. (Laughter.)

Individualism must go through a period of materialism before it can be refined: that does seem to be the law, the way things work, that material development must precede the realization of the higher values of life: in other words, that the pursuit of wealth must precede the pursuit of happiness.

Another thing: we are a race of volunteers—and I do not use this phrase in reference to war alone, but in reference to every contributory act by the citizen to his government. We resent being forced to serve: we wish to serve of our own free will. This being the fact, any political program that does not recognize it is doomed to failure. We do not take kindly to a collectivism involving the idea of coercion or benevolence. Our national, and indeed our racial unity is dependent upon the hope that development and eventually unity come through differentiation, through the conflict of wills and ideas. Such a development would naturally be slow. As General Grant said, "We shall have to fight it out on this line, if it takes all summer." Perhaps we might hasten it a little by the adoption of a philosophy, or national creed, that is made self-conscious. But, I think that it is not only the relation to this war, but to democracy, that the British people chose as its war song, "It's a long, long way to Tipperary,"—there is magnificent Anglo-Saxon faith behind such a spirit as that! (Applause.)

Now nothing can be more at variance with the German solution than these beliefs. The German solution is a *short cut* to national efficiency. But our system of control is not imposed by a wise government that knows what is good for the people, but by the people themselves, who are finding out

what is good for them. (Hear, hear.) Our universities are centres of free thought, our professors are free to seek the truth, they are not bound to prove *a priori* principles that involve the divine excellence of a fixed form of government, as the Germans are. Democracy grows, and must grow, as the soul grows, through trial and error, through mistakes and suffering. (Hear, hear and applause.)

Now, if this be the spirit of the Anglo-Saxon, if our development depends on it, it remains for us, as I said, my friends, to inculcate it into our children until it becomes a conscious national ideal. We shall have to give it to our children, because there is a great deal of truth in what Dr. Osler said, that after an individual passes the age of forty he is crystallized, and you can't do anything with him. (Laughter.) A great many of our reform movements are abortive, for that reason. We must look to the coming generations.

Our task is to apply the Anglo-Saxon ideal to the two great problems of democracy.

The first is that of national defence. The coercion of conscription is abhorrent to us. Conscription may be necessary in England now, just as in our Civil War; it may be necessary in a transition period; but any military system we eventually adopt must be dependent upon the free will of the citizens to serve. This is not the Jacksonian idea, that any dog catcher may become a General if he be an American; any system we develop must be made efficient, but primarily, I think, it must be made voluntary, and based upon public spirit, on public opinion, and on what may be called the spirit of emulation. Such a spirit cannot, of course, become widespread until there is a general satisfaction in government, until equality of opportunity is largely restored, and this depends upon the solution of the industrial problem. We, of the United States are waking up to the realization that military training should be begun in the schools and colleges, (hear, hear and applause)—should be continued by brief but adequate terms of service, but public opinion must be such as to shame any individual who does not accept that training. (Applause.) I need not add that this emulation principle is strong with you here in Canada. And in the United States, in spite of our national lack of realization of the meaning of this war, it has already begun to show itself in the voluntary service of our school boys, university undergraduates, and business and professional men, who are flocking to the military training camps. Just before I left to come here, I learned that Yale University had raised voluntarily, a battery of nine hundred men for service. (Applause.)

The problem of the gradual democratization of industry likewise depends upon the extent to which the ideals of democracy are realized by all elements of citizens. The principles of individual initiative, individual development and individual realization must be retained; for economic class solidarity, class consciousness tend to weaken, to reduce individuals to the level of the common mass. It is a great question, of course, whether economic emancipation and independence can ever be attained, whether the democratization of industry can be arrived at without a class struggle similar to that which took place in the 18th century in the battle of political liberty. But I can tell you one thing, that our chief concern is, especially in the United States, to avoid that class struggle, (Hear, hear) to do everything in our power to inoculate all elements of the people with a sense of the gravity of the situation that confronts us.

There are signs already that this new spirit is making itself felt, that the new type of employer is arising, an employer who is showing a tendency to meet the situation half way, a concern as to the welfare and safety of his workmen, who is willing to give labor a fairer share of the profits and even some voice in the affairs of the industry. I hold it does not make any difference how far such a man may go, if the spirit is there,—whether his performance satisfies the extremists or not. So far this tendency is noticeable among large employers rather than among small ones. It is likewise beginning to dawn upon them that such a course may develop, strange as it may seem, into a paying policy, that Chistianity may possibly be practical. (Laughter.) But we must give them credit for the higher motive. In short, a public opinion is growing up among employers that condemns practices that formerly existed, just as bar associations and medical associations haven arisen in the legal and medical professions, condemning malpractice and quackery, and creating a professional spirit more terrible to evil doers than any laws.

This is the true spirit of the Anglo-Saxon tradition, which counts upon emulation and not upon coercion. Enlightened, educated public opinion, arrived at by a gradual realization of existing evils, will do more to cure these evils than all the laws on the statute books. The Anglo-Saxon ideal has always pinned its faith to education, for education is fundamental to equality of opportunity. We do not believe any more—even if we ever did believe in our hearts—that all men

are equal, but we do declare that all should have equal chance to develop what is in them. (Hear, hear and applause.) And of all the signs that we are beginning to make serious attempts to solve our modern problems, what may be called the New Education of the direct application of thought to action, holds the most promise. It is exemplified in the Gary schools. I shall not have time here to go into that movement, much as I should like to do so.

The Anglo-Saxon principle—this, as you will be pleased to know, is the last section of my address (Cries of "Go on!")—may be described, as has been said, as one of development through differentiation. Its ultimate success depends absolutely upon the willing, and not the enforced, co-operation of the units, not only the individual citizens, but also the units of the State, such as the Dominions of the British Empire, and of the fifty-two States of the Republic—which Mr. Roosevelt once aptly referred to as fifty-two water tight compartments in which we might try experiments, (Laughter) and we have tried a good many!

It is a system that leads to conflict; nevertheless good emerges; through trial and error permanent contributions are made; paradoxically, out of temporary discordance comes a higher feeling of unity. Nearly all of the internal troubles we have had in the Union have been due to what we call the doctrine of States' rights. And the Dominions of the British Empire have been given still greater liberty. Canada has raised up tariffs against the mother country, and later has accorded her preferences. There have been, as you know, dissensions and differences between the Dominion and the mother country. And each of the divisions of the British Empire is forging out a civilization of its own, suitable to its environment, and making its contribution to the whole. This differentiation applies also to the States of Canada itself.

Now, what shall be said of the United States? We have not been a part of the British Empire since the 18th century, and our quarrels with Great Britain, perhaps, have been all the more bitter because they were family quarrels, just as the English Civil War and the Civil War of 1861 were family quarrels. Nevertheless it has been recognized by many minds in England and America that our very dissension with the mother country has been contributory on the whole to Anglo-Saxon civilization. (Hear, hear.) If Burke and Fox had had their way the principle for which the American Colonies fought would have been granted; and I believe that we

shall live to see the time when Canada and the other British Dominions shall be represented in some equitable and satisfactory manner in an Imperial Parliament. (Applause.) Conversely, British suppression of the slave trade and of slavery, as I have said, has had a tremendous influence on public opinion in the Republic.

We, too, in the Union, have been striving for Anglo-Saxon ideals.

It may be said that we are no longer an Anglo-Saxon country. We are still at least two-thirds Anglo-Saxon, and I believe I am in harmony with the best modern opinion and thought when I say that environment and tradition, and above all ideas and ideals, are stronger than race when these are predominant. (Hear, hear.) A rather striking indication of this has been shown in the war in South Africa, where that great Boer leader has arisen and saved that Dominion to the Empire, (Applause) so rapidly have Anglo-Saxon ideals been absorbed by the Dutch. Our earlier immigrants in the United States were all attracted by the Anglo-Saxon ideals of personal freedom, of the liberty to develop. Their emigration was a protest against the coercive conditions in which they lived in continental Europe, and they became good Americans. We have, of course, a large proportion of what are known as German-Americans, of which I have sufficiently spoken.

In regard to the great war that is now in progress, I think in the United States we are beginning to realize more and more that there is a large section of public opinion which thinks that what we ought to have done was to have protested at once against the invasion of Belgium. (Cheers and applause.) There were some of us who thought so at the time. There is, however, a large portion of the population—I do not know how large—which regrets that we are not definitely ranged on the side of the Allies (Applause), and there is undoubtedly an overwhelming individual sympathy in their favor. (Applause.)

And I would say something here, if I can adequately express my thought, that war is generally preceded, if not always, by a long period of suspicion and distrust between the peoples. England and Germany had been experiencing this. England is in juxtaposition with Germany. I remember very distinctly, when I went to England in 1910, being tremendously surprised that there was any chance of war with Germany; it did not seem possible to me, as an American. Another thing: Americans had gone through no snch period

of antagonism; there had been no friction between Germany and the United States; hence we were so tremendously shocked to hear war had burst out; we could scarcely believe it.

Another thing: I do not think that the people of Canada realize how deplorably little we Americans knew of what was going on in Europe. I had read Philips Oppenheim and others. (Laughter.) Many of us did not know what the "balance of power" was. We were not familiar with the delicate situation which was so much the care of foreign Chancelleries.

The war has had a tremendous educative effect upon us. We have seriously set ourselves to studying what it all means, and what was the cause of it all. But I do say this—and say it without hesitation—that if Germany had menanced the Monroe Doctrine, if she had sent ships to Venezuela instead of to Agadir, American public opinion would have been aflame. Because the Monroe Doctrine existed in our minds as something real and vital.

Now, whether it is true or not, I do say that I think we have missed our opportunity—I frankly say that—that we are not definitely ranged on the side of the Allies. (Applause.) I think the purging effect would have been great, if we had so declared ourselves. This would not necessarily mean that we should be belligerent. It is a question whether as belligerents we should have been of service to the Allies, but I sincerely hope we may have the consolation of being of some use as it is. That is the hope of those who sympathize with the Allies. (Applause.)

In the meantime, as Mr. Croly, editor of "The New Era Republic," points out, Canada has set an inspiring example to other democracies. "She has not shirked her responsibility, she is making the necessary sacrifices loyally and uncomplainingly, and of all the countries engaged in the war she is the most disinterested. She has nothing to gain from her expenditures of money and blood, except the continued vitality of an imperial political system which allows her full opportunity for local self-development. Her sacrifices are being made on behalf of a political system which, precisely because it calls for a larger allegiance without doing away with home rule, is the best existing experiment in a really international political organization." (Hear, hear and applause.)

Now, every thoughtful and far-seeing American should rejoice because this war is knitting together the British Empire. Our policy in regard to Canada has been puerile in the extreme, but it must be remembered that our economic

policy for years has been dictated by and organized for the benefit of great manufacturers, who until recently arranged tariff schedules to suit themselves. There are signs that this economic dictatorship is weakening, that a larger and more wholesome view is replacing it. To quote Mr. Croly once more, "The co-operation on the continent of Canada and the United States, instead of dividing Canada from Great Britain, would have the very different tendency of drawing Great Britain closer to the United States." (Hear, hear and applause.)

Finally, one result which this war is bound to have on both the British Empire and the Republic is to compel the peoples of the Empire and the Republic to develop, out of their past traditions, a definite Idea or Culture of Anglo-Saxon democracy applicable to the problems of the present day. The war must make our democracy self-conscious. It has been said that blood is thicker than water, but the cementing power of common ideals cannot be overestimated. (Applause.) Always retaining the tradition of individual freedom and opportunity, we shall have to develop along the lines of our native institutions, and I think it is inevitable, after the differences have been thrashed out, after the policies of self-interest shall have been shown to be blind ones, after the various Anglo-Saxon units have developed through these differences up to a certain point, that a common interest and responsibility and ideal will draw us all together for the peace and progress of the world. (Applause.) There are those who have thought this, long before the ontbreak of the war. The safety and future of our institutions, of our culture, depends upon it.

And so I have come here to-day as an American and an Anglo-Saxon to pay my tribute to Canada for her splendid and unselfish contribution to the ideals and traditions of our race. (Long applause.)