CUS417/6.23

arise in the future as in the past. Let us trust that the Army League will be in full vigour and able to seize on them and insist upon a common-sense solution.

We feel sure that the proposal we have made—that the Army League, when once it has completed its machinery, should prepare a definite scheme for Army reorganisation—will be called unpractical owing to the differences of opinion among members, but all the same we do not believe that it is unpractical. In reality, there is a pretty general agreement as to the things to be asked for. These are :—(1) War Office reform of a kind which, while maintaining the supreme responsibility of the Secretary of State for War, will place below him a permanent military official—Chief of the Staff, or Commander-in-Chief—who shall be departmentally responsible for the whole technical side of the Army, as the Secretary of the Post Office is responsible to the Postmaster-General. (2) The increase of the attractiveness of the Regular Army to recruits, and the better training of officers and men. (3) The organisation of the Militia and Yeomanry, and of a true Militia and Yeomanry Reserve into an efficient and thoroughly equipped Field Army for Home Defence. (4) The organisation of the Volunteers and of a Volunteer Reserve into efficient, self-contained divisions capable of taking the field, with artillery and transport complete. (5) The organisation of a Voluntary Home Defence Reserve, composed of all persons who are trained to arms, but are not at the moment in any of the other armed forces or Reserves of the nation; the consideration for the registering of names in such a Home Defence Reserve being an old-age pension after sixty-five. We do not, of course, want to seem to dictate a programme to the Army League, and doubtless the able brains at their disposal could vastly improve our skeleton scheme, but we believe if they adopted a clear and definite ideal of the kind we have sketched, and used all their efforts to educate public opinion to ask for such an organisation, they would do a work of vast importance.

We must end as we began. While sympathising with the public spirit of the men who are considering the foundation of the League announced in the *Nineteenth Century*, we feel convinced that they are making their proposals much too wide and vague, and that they will do no good unless they take up one definite branch of national inefficiency and hammer on at that. At present the thing most needing reform is our military system, and on this they should concentrate their attention. Let them either join the existing Army League, or if they prefer it form a new Army League, and let those two bodies then amalgamate, and tackle in earnest and in detail the problem of how to obtain without excessive burden a good Regular Army for the work of Imperial police, and a Home Defence Army of Militia and Volunteers and General Reservists so efficient and so well equipped that it could be trusted to preserve us from Continental raiders even if there were not a single Regular left in these islands.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL.

THE Treasurer of St. Bartholomew's Hospital had a story to tell on Monday very different from that we have of late been accustomed to hear from the finance ministers of great charities. Permanent as land is from the physical point of view, it has in many cases proved eminently fleeting as regards profits. In respect of them it has done in its old age what in its youth was thought to be impossible,—it has run away. The recent history of many charitable foundations has been a melancholy example of this change. It has been a history of constantly declining income. But St. Bartholomew's, instead of growing yearly poorer, is growing yearly richer. It has, it is true, sustained heavy losses on many thousand acres of agricultural property. It has enjoyed no immunity from the common fate of landlords, who find it equally impossible to get a fair rent for their farms or to get a fair return out of them in their own hands. But only a portion of the lands belonging to St. Bartholomew's Hospital is agricultural; a great part of it consists of houses and land in London. And of this part the value has steadily risen. Sir Sydney Waterlow tells us that in 1869 the net revenue of the hospital was £38,462, while in 1899 it was £72,454. That is a record of marvellous prosperity, and one which seems to render such a meeting as that at which the Prince of Wales presided on Monday altogether unnecessary. How can an institution which has nearly doubled its income in thirty years be in need of outside help? What can it want more than continuous wisdom to apply its vast resources to the best uses?

It would not be true, however, to say that the object of Monday's meeting was to ask for money. But while we say this we are bound to say also that had this been the object, the hospital would have been able to make out a very good case. If its income has grown, its expenses have grown in more than equal proportion. "There are a great many things," the treasurer told the meeting, "which require amendment. The hospital is by no means so perfect as we should like to see it." Specialisation in medicine makes immense demands on hospital accommodation. Every separate organ, and well-nigh every separate method of treatment, cries out to be separately housed. New buildings are wanted for the eye, the ear, the teeth, the skin, the throat. Electricity, which now enters so largely into the cure of disease, has to be provided for. There is a demand on the part of the medical staff for a new pathological laboratory, a new operating theatre, a new isolation block. The resident staff is not adequately housed; the nursing staff is not housed at all. The successful working of an institution which combines the free care, in one way or another, of sixty-two thousand patients a year with the scientific requirements of a great medical school, demands constant new outlay in every direction. Happily, however, St. Bartholomew's is not reduced to asking for money from the public. Sir Sydney Waterlow, indeed, asked the meeting not to forget that "the public of the present day are never unwilling to subscribe to the relief of the sick poor of this great Metropolis." That is true, no doubt, as a general statement. But in order to make it true it must be taken with a fair amount of alloy. Any new and striking appeal evokes an immediate response, and for some time it is possible to congratulate ourselves on the unfailing flow of English benevolence. It is when the accounts of the year are made up that the alloy becomes visible. The response to the new appeal commonly turns out to have been made at the expense of other charities equally in want of money, but less fortunate in the novelty of their claims. If a deficit in the funds of a great endowed hospital has to be made up by public subscription, we may be pretty sure that there will be a corresponding deficit in the balance-sheets of the hospitals wholly supported by voluntary contributions.

In the case of St. Bartholomew's, we say, there is no question of drawing upon this source. With the consent of the Charity Commission, the hospital can borrow whatever money is necessary for improvements, and, with a growing income and excellent security to offer, it would borrow upon easy terms. For the moment, however, the question relates rather to the spending than to the raising of capital. The land on which St. Bartholomew's Hospital is built adjoins the land on which Christ's Hospital is built; indeed, the ground at present belonging to the latter foundation was in part bought from St. Bartholomew's in the year 1819. Now St. Bartholomew's finds that the only direction in which it can possibly extend its buildings is by buying back what it then sold; and as Christ's Hospital is about to move to a new site in the country, the two bodies ought, one would think, to have little difficulty in coming to an agreement. As a matter of fact, however, they find considerable difficulty. In 1893 the Governors of Christ's Hospital offered to treat with St. Bartholomew's for the sale to it of so much of the site as it might wish to buy on the usual terms of arbitration. In November last they described themselves as having "still but one desire," and defined the object of that desire as to "arrive at a friendly solution of the difficulty what sum should be paid for such portion of the land as St. Bartholomew's Hospital may require." It is not very obvious why there should at this point have been any difficulty needing solution. Arbitration is a well-understood process, and all that needed doing was that St. Bartholomew's should decide how much of the land it wanted to buy, and that the arbitrators should set

to work to determine its value. St. Bartholomew's so far departed from this course as to offer a specific price for the part of the site they wanted instead of waiting to have the value ascertained. As, however, it was still open to Christ's Hospital to refer this offer to arbitration, the precise order of the steps in the negotiations seems of no importance. But while negotiations were going on in this somewhat dilatory manner the Governors of Christ's Hospital had had another and a very much more advantageous proposal submitted to them—a proposal to buy the whole site—and in view of this they simply declined to accept the offer for the purchase of a part.

The position, therefore, appears to be that Christ's Hospital wishes to sell the whole site, that it has the opportunity of doing so at this moment, that it is willing to let this opportunity go if St. Bartholomew's will negotiate for the whole, but that it can no longer entertain the offer for only a part. We assume that Christ's Hospital is under no legal obligation to abide by the original engagement of 1893, since, if it were, St. Bartholomew's could at once enforce it in a Court of Law. But an engagement may have a good deal of moral force, though it is not binding in law, and certainly the letter of December 1st, 1893, does seem to be of this character. At that date, subject to certain conditions, all of which St. Bartholomew's is ready to fulfil, the Governors of Christ's Hospital did put it on record that St. Bartholomew's might have as much of their land as it wanted, and on November 16th, 1899, they declared themselves anxious to carry out this bargain. We have not heard their side of the question, but it is conceivable that they hold that as Governors of a great charity they are bound to get as much money as they can for the charity so long as they are legally free to do so. If they sell a part only of their land the value of the remaining part will be lowered, and the chances of disposing of it to advantage will be proportionately lessened. Consequently, to take this course will, in effect, be to subsidise St. Bartholomew's Hospital from the funds of Christ's Hospital. Have they, they may be supposed to ask themselves, any right thus to sacrifice the interests with the defence of which they are charged? The obvious way out of this dilemma would be for St. Bartholomew's to buy the whole site. But the eminent surveyor consulted thinks that this is too speculative a transaction to be recommended. But why should not Christ's Hospital abide by its original offer, with a further proviso that the diminution in the value of the unsold land caused by the sale of a part should be considered by the arbitrators in fixing the price St. Bartholomew's is to pay for what it wants? After all, one charity is as important as the other. No one can seriously wish to nurse more sick if the result will be to educate fewer children. No doubt St. Bartholomew's will have to pay more than it expected to pay. But the only alternative suggested is a private Act of Parliament giving St. Bartholomew's compulsory powers of buying what it wants and no more. The getting of such an Act always costs money, and in the present case, with two wealthy foundations at loggerheads, it is likely to cost a great deal of money. We may be thought to be mere meddlers in offering a suggestion in a matter about which we are so imperfectly informed. But when the object is to prevent two great charities, each of them doing invaluable work, from a heated contest before a Parliamentary Committee, we are willing to run the risk.

"LEST WE FORGET."

RATHER to our surprise, Mr. Morley in his speech of Friday week on the completion of the "Dictionary of National Biography" missed the point which, more than any other, makes of that great undertaking a work of national importance. It will by degrees and in course of years correct a great national fault,—the tendency to forget men who are worthy of remembrance. The English live mainly in the present, and a little in the future, and forget the past too readily. They like to move forward unencumbered, care nothing about legends, keep up no traditions, forgive their enemies in a way that to the rest of the world seems weak—who stops to curse Philip II. or Napoleon?—and forget their benefactors with a rapidity which, but that every man thinks that he himself will be an exception, would chill alike patriotism and philanthropy. With the exceptions of Alfred and Elizabeth they scarcely remember their great Sovereigns, even William III. being no longer to them the Deliverer. Among their great Admirals they recollect only Nelson, their only Generals of the past are Marlborough and Wellington, and in their long list of illustrious statesmen only Sir Robert Peel is still a household word. Who in the street really knows anything of Simon de Montfort, or the first Cromwell, or Cecil, or Danby, or Sir Robert Walpole, or the second Pitt, or even—this is, we believe, true, though it is so nearly incredible—of the group of men who in the teeth of Peel and Wellington carried through that greatest and least bloody of revolutions, the first Reform Bill? A vaguely pleasant memory is all that is left of men who in most countries would be household words perpetually used to dispense with the necessity of describing new aspirants. If at the next Election some elector who admires Sir E. Grey's policy says, "There are in him the materials of a Cecil," how many citizens of Berwick will even comprehend the praise? As for the smaller benefactors of the country, the men who have founded or enlarged cities, or established great industries, or utilised new and beneficent inventions, their very names have passed into an oblivion only less deep than that which has fallen on the great men of America before Columbus. Mr. Sidney Lee at the Mansion House breakfast gave as an instance of such men the founder of Sandhurst, Mr. Jarry, but there are a hundred stronger. Ask any man in the street the name of the man who made the canals; or the history of Hargreaves, who invented the spinning jenny and so saved England from bankruptcy; or of Stephenson, who began the great system of railways; or of Brunel, who created steam traffic across the ocean; or of Waghorn, who showed the true route to India and the Far East, and so practically reduced the size of the world by one-third,—and he will give you replies that do but conceal a nearly perfect ignorance. Who, not being an architect, knows the names of that long succession of great builders who have covered England with palaces? The very patients whom his discovery has saved from extremities of agony remember of Sir James Simpson just his surname, and will not remember even that about Lord Lister. As we have said before, the Englishman's regardlessness of the past sometimes disburdens him, but we cannot believe that this forgetfulness of persons has any compensating advantage. It must, to begin with, destroy one of the strongest incentives to energetic effort. The hunger for fame is not the noblest of impulses, but it is one of the most instinctive, no man, however disinterested, being quite content to be "thrust foully in the earth to be forgot," and even Leigh Hunt, who said "Write me as one who loved his fellow-men," wishing to be remembered for that Christian aspiration. In the second place, the knowledge that a man in one's own chosen line has succeeded before, has triumphed over difficulties, has filled up Chat Moss, makes the usual fate of the competent, which is waiting, ever waiting, for the crop that so often is blighted before reaping, more endurable, and acts as a deterrent against despair. If it is well to recollect the deeds of men—and if not, why study history?—it must be well to recall what manner of men they were who did them, and not from ignorance to fancy that they possessed powers which render emulation impossible or absurd. At least, we all say so when we put up statues, and no statue will recall an eminent individual as this Dictionary of Biography will recall them all. It is more than a great monument to the eminent, for it is also what a monument can seldom be,—a record of their deeds. To have designed and completed such a work is creditable to all connected with it, to the editors of the Dictionary, Mr. Leslie Stephen at first, and then Mr. Sidney Lee, and to the capitalist who found the great sum required—£150,000—with little hope of repayment, except perhaps in this,—that he has established a perfect claim to be remembered in the next edition.

To give a general opinion as to the merit of the record thus prepared is, we think, impossible. It is for such a work singularly full, probably when the supplement is issued will be found to be almost without a flaw in the way of completeness. The biographies, too, so far as we have been able to test them, are accurate, with much

white light in them, and with a remarkable sense of the proportion between one life and another. The editors have, perhaps, been over merciful in their distribution of censure, and have sometimes avoided that "general estimate" for which the common reader hungers with needless scrupulosity. But as a whole the work, which involved an infinity of labour, much judgment, and some shrewd insight into character, has been marvellously well done, so that the great book will probably never be superseded, and will possibly for centuries give the first impress to the judgment of the inquirer into the history and doings of all English notables. It is a great thing to have completed it within the lifetime of its designer, and we can but hope that he will never feel as if he had wasted his substance upon a noble whim. We think he will not. The appreciation of his great book will grow as it is more consulted, and both in England and America it will be felt that he has done much to rescue the marked men of our common race from the oblivion in which, owing to the national fault above described, they would otherwise have been submerged. Millionaires are apt to be mindless, but Mr. George Smith's generous expenditure has lifted the tombstones from thirty thousand graves, many of them those of forgotten people, and we see once more, to our great instruction, if not to our pleasure, the actual features of the dead. The general effect is variety, such as exists in the leaves of a tree, but now and again the sculptor has used his chisel so as to produce the effect that the form to which he gives new life concealed no common man.

THE ZEPPELIN AERIAL MACHINE.

THE interest taken by human beings in their own efforts to fly, or rather to travel through the air, is untiring and incurable by experience. Ever since the first kite was flown, probably on the plains of Chaldæa, the attempt has been constantly renewed, and has always failed; but the ... of failure has hardly discouraged, much less ex-

Clearly there is no reason as yet for the alarm which has often been excited by the accounts of similar partially successful experiments. There is, to begin with, no grand secret in the matter, nothing which an evil-minded capitalist or ambitious Government could use while right-minded capitalists or Governments remained ignorant how to manufacture the new weapon. Any one with the means and the control of skilled mechanics could build a similar aerial ship just as he could build a gunboat, and the richer the State the more of such machines it could keep at its disposal. They will be very costly to build, they will take time in building, and they can hardly, when Governments are once awake to their existence, be built in perfect secrecy. Certainly none could build them without official observation, a final check upon Anarchists, who, moreover, never possess much capital. The machines cannot carry large bodies of men or large quantities of munitions, and we may, we think, lay aside the idea of their use for a sudden and great invasion as impracticable. They would not be more useful for a raid than heavily armed cruisers are. If the recently passed rules against dropping dynamite from balloons were disregarded they might effect a certain amount of destruction, but not of the kind which Governments seek for because it will help on conquest. For similar reasons the chance of the Zeppelin machine greatly furthering the relief or storm of beleaguered places may be put out of the mind. It could help in one way, as we shall directly point out, but not in the way of carrying reinforcements or food for a population, or of carrying away a beleaguered garrison. Sir Redvers Buller, for example, could not have cleared Ladysmith by the use of such machines, or even have removed the sick. As for contests in the air, the "grappling of aerial navies in the blue," that would, even if the dream were realised, make little difference, all Governments equally possessing the machines, and the chances with cruisers in the air ... me as the chances with cruisers i... chines seem no do... oing ma... 'd