

country to love, no cause to serve, no loyalty to follow; there is nothing beyond a little circle of light in the little hut in

which I was housed in the far beginning. The moment I open the door and step into the world I begin to believe.

Mr. Roosevelt in England

(Staff Correspondence of The Outlook)

IF, as some of his critics assert, Mr. Roosevelt deals in platitudes in his public speeches, his platitudes have an extraordinarily electrifying effect upon his listeners. In previous letters I have given some description of the influence, not only upon the immediate audience, but upon public opinion, of the addresses he has made in the Sudan, in Egypt, in Hungary, at Paris, in Norway, and at Berlin. The record may be continued for England, for his speech at the Guildhall on May 31, when he was presented with the honorary Freedom of the City by the Corporation of London—the oldest corporation in the world—has arrested the attention of Englishmen with such an effect as has not been produced by any native or foreign orator for many years.¹

The occasion was a brilliant and notable one. The ancient and splendid Guildhall—one of the most beautiful Gothic interiors in England, which has historical associations of more than five centuries—was filled with a great and representative gathering of English men and women. On the dais, or stage, at one end of the hall, sat the Lord Mayor and the Lady Mayoress, and the special guests of the occasion were conducted by ushers, in robes and carrying maces, down a long aisle flanked with spectators on either side and up the steps of the dais, where they were presented. Their names were called out at the beginning of the aisle, and the audience applauded, little or much, as the ushers and the guest moved along, according to the popularity of the newcomer. Thus John Burns and Mr. Balfour were greeted with enthusiastic hand-clapping and cheers, although they belong, of course, to opposite parties.

The Bishop of London, Lord Cromer, the maker of modern Egypt, Sargent, the painter, and Sir Edward Grey, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, were among those greeted in this way. In the front row on one side of the dais were seated the Aldermen of the City in their red robes, and various officials in wigs and gowns lent to the scene a curiously antique aspect to the American eye. Happily, the City of London has carefully preserved the historical traditions connected with it and with the Guilds, or groups of merchants, which in the past had so much to do with the management of its affairs. Among the invited guests, for example, were the Master of the Mercers' Company, the Master of the Grocers' Company, the Master of the Drapers' Company, the Master of the Skinners' Company, the Master of the Haberdashers' Company, the Master of the Salters' Company, the Master of the Ironmongers' Company, the Master of the Vintners' Company, and the Master of the Clothworkers' Company. These various trades are no longer carried on by Guilds, but by private firms or corporations, and yet the Guild Organization is still maintained as a sort of social or semi-social recognition of the days when the Guildhall was not merely a great assembly room, but the place in which the Guilds actually managed the affairs of their city. It was in such a place and amid such surroundings that Mr. Roosevelt was formally nominated and elected a Freeman of the ancient City of London.

Mr. Roosevelt's speech was far from being extemporaneous; it had been carefully thought out beforehand, and was based upon his experiences, last March, in Egypt; for it was really his desire to say something about Egypt that led him to make a speech at all. He had had

¹ In the issues of The Outlook for June 11 and June 18 will be found extracts, summary, and editorial comment relating to Mr. Roosevelt's Guildhall speech.—THE EDITORS.

ample time to think, and he had thought a good deal, but it was plain to be seen that the frankness of his utterance, his characteristic attitude and gestures, and the pungent quality of his oratory at first startled his audience, accustomed to more conventional methods of public speaking. But he soon captured and carried his hearers with him, as is indicated by the marks of approval which were printed in the verbatim report of the speech in the London "Times." It is no exaggeration to say that his speech has been the talk of England—in clubs, at private places, and in the newspapers. Of course there has been some criticism, but, on the whole, it has been received with the greatest approval. The extreme wing of the Liberal party, whom we should call Anti-Imperialists, but who are here colloquially spoken of as "Little Englanders," have taken exception to it, but even their disapproval has been mild. The London "Chronicle," which is perhaps the most influential of the morning newspapers representing this view, is of the opinion that the speech was hardly necessary, because it asserts that the Government and the British nation have long been of Mr. Roosevelt's own opinion. The "Westminster Gazette," the leading evening Liberal paper, also asserts that "none of the broad considerations advanced by Mr. Roosevelt have been absent from the minds of Ministers, and of Sir Edward Grey in particular. We regret that Mr. Roosevelt should have thought it necessary to speak out yesterday, not on the narrow ground of etiquette or precedent, but because we cannot bring ourselves to believe that his words are calculated to make it any easier to deal with an exceedingly difficult problem."

The views of these two newspapers fairly express the rather mild opposition excited by the speech among those who regard British control in Egypt as a question of partisan politics. On the other hand, the best and most influential public opinion, while recognizing the unconventionality of Mr. Roosevelt's course, heartily approves of both the matter and the manner of the speech. The London "Times" says: "Mr. Roosevelt has reminded us in the most friendly way of what we are at least in danger of forget-

ting, and no impatience of outside criticism ought to be allowed to divert us from considering the substantial truth of his words. His own conduct of great affairs and the salutary influence of his policy upon American public life . . . at least give him a right, which all international critics do not possess, to utter a useful, even if not wholly palatable, warning." The "Daily Telegraph," after referring to Mr. Roosevelt as "a practical statesman who combines with all his serious force a famous sense of humor," expresses the opinion that his "candor is a tonic, which not only makes plain our immediate duty but helps us to do it. In Egypt, as in India, there is no doubt as to the alternative he has stated so vigorously: we must govern or go; and we have no intention of going." The "Pall Mall Gazette's" view is that Mr. Roosevelt "delivered a great and memorable speech—a speech that will be read and pondered over throughout the world."

The London "Spectator," which is one of the ablest and most thoughtful journals published in the English language, and which reflects the most intelligent, broad-minded, and influential public opinion in the British Empire, devotes a large amount of space to a consideration of the speech. The "Spectator's" position in English journalism is such that I make no apology for a somewhat long quotation from its comment:

Perhaps the chief event of the week has been Mr. Roosevelt's speech at the Guildhall. Timid, fussy, and pedantic people have charged Mr. Roosevelt with all sorts of crimes because he had the courage to speak out, and have even accused him of unfriendliness to this country because of his criticisms. Happily the British people as a whole are not so foolish. Instinctively they have recognized and thoroughly appreciated the good feeling of Mr. Roosevelt's speech. Only true friends speak as he spoke. . . . The barrel-organs, of course, grind out the old tune about Mr. Roosevelt's tactlessness. In reality he is a very tactful as well as a very shrewd man. It is surely the height of tactfulness to recognize that the British people are sane enough and sincere enough to like being told the truth. His speech is one of the greatest compliments ever paid to a people by a statesman of another country. . . . Mr. Roosevelt has made exactly the kind of speech we expected him to make—a speech strong, clear, fearless. He has told us something useful and practical, and has not lost himself in abstractions and

platitudes. . . . The business of a trustee is not to do what the subject of the trust likes or thinks he likes, but to do, however much he may grumble, what is in his truest and best interests. Unless a trustee is willing to do that, and does not trouble about abuse, ingratitude, and accusations of selfishness, he had better give up his trust altogether. . . . We thank Mr. Roosevelt once again for giving us so useful a reminder of our duty in this respect.

These notes of approval are repeated in a great number of letters which Mr. Roosevelt has received from men and women in all walks of life, men in distinguished official position and "men in the street." There have been some abusive letters, chiefly anonymous, but the general tone of this correspondence is fairly illustrated by the following:

Allow me, an old colonist in his 84th year, to thank you most heartily for your manly address at the Guildhall and for your life-work in the cause of humanity. If I ever come to the great Republic, I shall do myself the honor of seeking an audience of your Excellency. I may do so on my 100th birthday!

With best wishes and profound respect.

The envelope of this letter was addressed to "His Excellency 'Govern-or-go' Roosevelt." That the "Daily Telegraph" and that the "man in the street" should independently seize upon this salient point of the address—the "govern-or-go" theory—is significant.

Readers of *The Outlook* are sufficiently familiar with Mr. Roosevelt's principles regarding protectorate or colonial government; any elaborate explanation or exposition of his views is unnecessary. But it may be well to repeat that he has over and over again said that all subject peoples, whether in colonies, protectorates, or insular possessions like the Philippines and Porto Rico, should be governed for their own benefit and development and should never be exploited for the mere profit of the controlling powers. It may be well, too, to add Mr. Roosevelt's own explanation of his criticism of sentimentality. "Weakness, timidity, and sentimentality," said Mr. Roosevelt in the Guildhall address, "may cause even more far-reaching harm than violence and injustice. Of all broken reeds sentimentality is the most broken reed on which righteousness can lean." Referring to these phrases, a correspondent a day or two

after the speech asked if the word "sentiment" might not be substituted for the word "sentimentality." Mr. Roosevelt wrote the following letter in reply:

Dear Sir: I regard sentiment as the exact antithesis of sentimentality, and to substitute "sentiment" for "sentimentality" in my speech would directly invert its meaning. I abhor sentimentality, and, on the other hand, I think no man is worth his salt who is not profoundly influenced by sentiment, and who does not shape his life in accordance with a high ideal.

Faithfully yours,
THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

No one could have traveled through the Sudan and Egypt with Mr. Roosevelt, as I had the pleasure of doing, without being profoundly impressed with the vital truth and the practical common sense of the Guildhall speech. It is as applicable to American problems in the Philippines and Porto Rico as to English problems in Egypt. Cable despatches here say that the New York "Evening Post," quite consistently with its well-known anti-imperialist views, bitterly assails Mr. Roosevelt and calls for the evacuation of Egypt by the British. All I can say is that, if the British ever do evacuate Egypt and the Sudan, I hope that the editor of the "Evening Post" may have to live at Wady Halfa or Omdurman on the Nile for one year under Turkish-Egyptian rule. I venture the assertion that before six months were over the alarm and agitation with which he would call for the protection of the British army would be as heartfelt as the enthusiasm with which he is now calling for its retirement.

LAWRENCE F. ABBOTT.

London, England.



THE SPECTATOR

It was an ancient Coptic doll which lay staring unpleasantly in the Spectator's palm—a miniature monstrosity in time-darkened bone or ivory, a rudely bifurcated body, grotesque face, and flowing tresses of real Egyptian hair. As the curator (this was in the Boston Art Museum) was busy running down a particular scarab, the Spectator was free to indulge in rumination over this darling of some little Egyptian maiden who dated her diary—"B.C." Two thousand years and more this little maid had been non-committal mummy, yet