

THE EXPOSITION AND THE PASSION-PLAY.

BY J. S. STUART GLENNIE.

MORE than one magazine article we have had lately on the Exposition at Paris and on the Passion-Play at Oberammergau, considered separately, but none, I believe, pointing out the instructive light which these wonderfully contrasted spectacles, if both can be recalled, reflect on each other. It chanced, however, that after visiting the Exposition in August I went to Oberammergau in the middle of September for the representation on Sunday the 16th, returning again to Paris towards the end of that month. And an endeavor to supplement what others have said of each of these spectacles by what each appeared to me capable of suggesting with reference to the other, may possibly be not without interest.

I.

Among the recent Oberammergau articles, one in the *Nineteenth Century* dilated on the "vulgarising of the Passion-Play, not in any way by the actors, but by the audience." "From beginning to end," says the author, "a devotional spirit, or even a spirit of reverence, never breathed its softening influence over that crowded house. . . . Perhaps, roughly speaking, there are four hundred people who go to the Play with a devout mind and a reverent intention, and the audience numbers four thousand." No one capable of being duly impressed by the pathos and tragedy of this wonderful dramatising of the whole of the Christian Theory of History, save its later apocalyptic scenes, could, I think, but be struck by the extraordinary little emotional effect produced by this tragic World-Drama on all but, at most, a tenth of the audience. The writer, however, of the article cited does not concern himself with any inquiry into the cause of the present unaffectingness of what might have been anticipated to be the most affecting of all trage-

dies, and it remains to him surprising, or only to be explained by vulgarity of mind. But, coming as I did from the palace-resplendent quays of the Seine to the cottaged banks of the Ammer, the surprise which I shared with Mr. Morant could hardly be more than momentary. And I propose, first, to show how this most remarkable, perhaps, of all the remarkable features of the Passion-Play is illuminated by the Exposition.

The reader, however, may either not have been at Oberammergau, or may have been one of the nine-tenths of cool or even bored play-goers. And in order that he may, in the same degree, realise how very remarkable that modern unaffectedness of the Passion-Play is which we would explain, it may be desirable briefly to recall the character of the scenes which are successively presented from eight in the morning to five in the afternoon, with but an interval for the midday meal. By an admirable artifice the essentials of the whole Christian conception of Man's History from the Fall to the Crucifixion and Resurrection are presented with an unsurpassable dramatic unity. The main dramatic action begins with and derives all its motives from the triumphal entry of Christ into Jerusalem and the incidents therewith connected. But the acts and scenes of this comparatively brief action are interpolated with tableaux of more or less symbolically relevant scenes from Old Testament history interpreted by majestic choruses. Thus the main dramatic action is most artistically presented as no mere martyrdom of one of many heroic sufferers in the cause of Humanity. It is on the contrary presented as—what orthodox Christian theory has universally accounted it—that one supreme Martyrdom, the Martyrdom of the only begotten Son of God Himself, prophesied in all the past, and, in its effects, triumphant in all the future history of mankind.

But in addition to this dramatic presentation of, in its way, the unquestionably sublime conception of the Christian theory of History, there are presented in the course of this great World-Drama not only an extraordinary number of different characters, but an extraordinary number of pathetic incidents. Besides an immense and varied world of lesser characters, there appear statesmen as characteristically distinguished as Pilate and Herod, priests so typically different in the expression of their tyrannic intolerance as Caiaphas and Annas, and traitors so contrasted in their characters, yet both so pitiful in their repentance, as Peter and Judas. And besides the more personal, yet to some, perhaps, more poignantly touching incidents, such as the parting of Christ and His

Mother, there are represented incidents of a more general and profound significance, and perhaps more worthily calculated to excite in men, at least, deep emotion,—the enthusiasm, for instance, of the multitude, even though it was but temporary, for such a character as that of Jesus; His washing of the Disciples' feet; and His prayer from the Cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

With all this we are, of course, familiar from childhood in the narratives of the Evangelists. But nobly played, as it was, with every word of the Christ, and indeed of most of the other chief actors, distinctly heard, vast as was the theatre; with realistically Oriental scenery of streets and houses, etc., staged in the open air; with birds flying overhead, the blue empyrean above all, and actual forest-clad mountains as background of the scenes,—the pathos and the tragedy of, one might almost say, the too familiar incidents might well have been expected to be brought home to the spectators with a purifying and solemnising power. And yet, if one should say that a tenth of the vast assemblage was thus affected, it would be, I think, a too generous estimate.

Here and there, once or twice, there was a blowing of noses, occasioned no doubt by involuntarily tear-filled eyes. But operaglassed curiosity, critical approval, and, at last, yawning boredom were incomparably more generally evident among the audience than religious or even deep human emotion. Yet this wonderfully composed Drama with which, as a whole, no single nameable author can be credited, has unconsciously complied with all the requirements of Victor Hugo's analysis: "*La foule demande surtout au théâtre des sensations; la femme des émotions; le penseur des méditations; tous veulent un plaisir; mais ceux-ci, le plaisir des yeux; celles-là le plaisir du cœur; les derniers, le plaisir de l'esprit.*" Especially of meditations the Passion-Play might surely be anticipated to be suggestive. I heard, however, no remark afterwards in conversation which testified to anything of the sort,—trivialities only about the impersonation of the Mother of God, etc. Meditations, however, doubtless there were, and one able editor present, an old acquaintance, but undiscovered in the throng, has published his. Christ, he tells us, with what some may think a blasphemous humorousness, personified to him the Boers; Caiaphas, Mr. Chamberlain; Annas, Lord Salisbury; Judas, Mr. Rhodes, Pilate, the European Concert. But such meditations, characteristically ingenious as they are—for not only the greater but all the lesser personages are similarly identified—appear to me to testify,

more even than would no meditations at all, to the loss now by the Passion-Play of any purifying and solemnising power, save on an almost inappreciable minority.

Why and how is it that such a World-Drama—a representation of the theory of Man's history—still professedly believed by all Christians; a Drama alive with varied characters and touching incidents excellently acted and so admirably staged that Madame Patti, who was present on the same 16th of September, declared that she had never seen in any opera house anything better managed than certain of the more crowded scenes,—Why and how is it that, for all that, the most remarkable feature about this World-Drama now is its unassumingness?

Easily explicable, however, to one who had just come from the Exposition on the Seine appeared that twofold phenomenon of worldly curiosity and sceptical indifference which at first excited surprise, seated amid the witnesses of the Passion-Play on the Ammer. For this last Exposition, a more artistically splendid show than any of its predecessors, was also much more than that. In its Street of the Nations, and generally in the sympathetic impartiality of the immensely varied lesser shows of which the whole was made up, it was a concrete exposition of the New Morality of Internationalism. And it was yet more than that. In its Congresses and Conferences—not merely in the Palais des Congrès and its Sous-sol opening on the terrace along the palace-lined river, but in the Petit Palais of Historical French Art opposite the Grand Palais des Beaux Arts in the Avenue leading to the magnificent Alexander III. Bridge, in the Halls of the Sorbonne on the heights of the Latin Quarter, in those of the Trocadero above the Pont d'Iena, in the neighboring Musée Guimet in the Place d'Iena, and in the Salle Wagram in the Avenue of that name running up to the Arc de Triomphe—there was not only a concrete exposition of the contemporary results of Scientific Research in the universality of its many-sidedness, but some prophetic dawning also of the New Ideal which will yet arise in sun-like splendor as the synthesis of these underworld Results of Research.

And what was the Thought that inspired, and was demonstrated by these many-sided researches? It was the Thought of Evolution as arising from the conflict of forces in the Kosmos itself, and therefore in Mankind as part of the Kosmos; it was the Thought more particularly of Man's History as incomparably longer in its process, and more complex in its elements, than imagined in the Jewish legends which form the basis of that Christian

theory dramatised in the Passion-Play; and it was the Thought of Man's possible Kingship of Nature and Mastership of Fate through ever-increasing knowledge of those conflicts of Natural and Humanital forces whence Evolution, Natural and Humanital, arises. And this various-sided Thought, thus expressed in halls and amid surroundings of such unsurpassedly suggestive instructiveness and stimulating splendor, was no new, and merely tentative, idea; it was a Thought which, in its later, more definite, and hence more verifiable, form has been, for more than forty years, producing revolutionary effects, not only of an affirmative and reconstructive kind among men of Science, but of a negating and destructive kind among hitherto believing Christians; and it was a Thought of whose merely temporary predominance opponents could have no reasonable hope, seeing that the last forty years have been demonstrably the epoch, not by any means of its advent, but rather of its culmination after a history millenniums long, a history of stormful vicissitudes, but of vicissitudes by which, like a sturdy oak, it has only been the deeper rooted, and the more aspiringly invigorated. Such is the atmosphere of Thought in which the Passion-Play is now performed. Can we wonder, therefore, at the mere worldly curiosity and sceptical indifference with which it is now witnessed by nine-tenths of the vast assemblages which, during the decennial season, fashion rather than faith attracts weekly to Oberammergau?

Remarkable it no doubt is—nay, at first, almost astounding—to find nine-tenths of these thousands of assembled Christians unmoved spectators of a realistically presented Passion so momentous as that which accomplished their redemption from the eternal damnation, the furnace of fire that never shall be quenched, the outer darkness, the wailing and gnashing of teeth, in a word, the Hell into which Christ himself again and again asseverated that his angels would cast them that do iniquity.¹ And yet how could anything else be rationally expected when, in consequence of that great movement of Thought to which I have just referred, even a Christian Champion and Conservative Chief finds himself obliged candidly to admit all that the most daring of Biblical and Church History Infidels have ever urged? “When,” says Mr. Balfour,² “we reflect upon the character of the religious books and of the religious organisations through which Christianity has been built up; when we consider the variety in date, in occasion, in author-

¹ Compare Matth. viii. 12; *ibid.*, xi. 41, 42; and Mark ix. 43, 44.

² *Foundations of Belief*, p. 246.

ship, in context, in spiritual development which mark the first, the stormy history and the inevitable division which mark the second; when we further reflect on the number of problems, linguistic, metaphysical, and historical, which must be settled, at least in some preliminary fashion, before either the books or the organisations can be supposed entitled by right of rational proof to the position of infallible guides, we can hardly suppose that we were intended to find in these 'the foundations of our beliefs.'¹ Thus, this Christian champion. And, I ask, "when we reflect upon and consider" this scepticism both as to the Protestant's Bible and the Papist's Church as being, though in a more or less vague and second-hand manner, in the minds of the vast majority of the witnesses of the Passion-Play, can we wonder that, however often the Gospels may tell us that Christ insisted on the reality of Hell, it is not actually believed in by nine-tenths of these professing Christians as being, if a reality at all, either eternal or otherwise very terrible; or wonder that, the Hell preached by Christ, as by modern Salvationists, not being believed in, neither the need nor fact of redemption from it by so stupendous a sacrifice as that of the Son of God Himself is really believed in; or can we wonder, finally, that a Passion presented however dramatically as such an unbelieved-in Atoning Sacrifice, is viewed with cool indifference as but a fine spectacular performance?

Nor, I will add, can we wonder that some at least of the more or less believing tenth, like apparently the writer whom I have first quoted, should regard the indifference of the nine-tenths as insulting and even blasphemous, and should think that this Passion-Play, the fulfilment of a religious vow, and intended to deepen the emotion and strengthen the faith of believers, ought no more to be permitted to be degraded into a source of entertainment for Worldlings, and of profit for Tourist-Agents. For very similar to the Neo-Platonic is our present Neo-Christian Period, and very instructive is the study of the former in relation to the latter. No more than was then the Olympian, is now the Christian mythology literally and unequivocally believed by nine-tenths of professing believers. Hence, just as an occasional revival of the old Mythological Drama would have been in the Neoplatonic Period a source of such entertainment rather than edification as the believing few would have resented as blasphemous, so is it with a similar revival now. And just as was then the New Comedy of love and intrigue,

¹Or, in Mr. Balfour's more wordy language, "the logical foundations of our system of religious beliefs."

so is the so far similar New Comedy now incomparably more to the public taste than a revival, save very occasional and remotely local, of the old Mythological Tragedy. But only an old Mythological Tragedy is the Passion-Play? It is, indeed, reduced but to *that* by the "philosophic doubt" both as to the Protestant's Bible and the Papist's Church which is the only side of the new movement of Thought which Mr. Balfour, humorously enough, considering his position, appears to have been capable of assimilating. And, the entertaining rather than edifying effect of it testifies, it is but as an old Mythological Tragedy that the Passion-Play is now regarded, not perhaps openly, yet secretly, by nine-tenths of those who make the fashionable pilgrimage to Oberammergau.

II.

And yet, though in full sympathy with, and accepting all the more verified results of, that great movement of European Thought, which is the direct or indirect cause, as I have shown, of the unaffectedness now of the Passion-Play, I was *not* one of the majority thus unaffected. On the contrary, my surprise at the little effect that the great Christian World-Drama appeared to have on others was chiefly due to the powerful effect which it had on myself. But only after it all, in the course of a long night stroll, more or less in the shadow of trees or mountains, but under a frostily brilliant sky a Day of the Universe of surpassing splendor—did I become in some degree articulately conscious of what the thought had been that had subconsciously caused, and that, as I then saw, justified the deep feeling occasioned by the Passion-Play. It was a corollary from that Law of Historical Intellectual Development, discovery of which has, for more than a century and a half, been quested by scientific students of History, and a statement of which, more approximately verifiable, at least, than previous statements, was enunciated at one of the Conferences under the auspices of the Paris International Assembly, or "École Internationale de l'Exposition."¹ But, before stating this corollary, a word or two on the history of the efforts which have been made at discovery of such a Law may be desirable.

Profound has been the contribution of Germany to the discovery of a law of Historical Intellectual Development, and especially in the Philosophies which logically succeeded each other from Kant to Hegel. Yet, not only in chronological priority, but in verifiable definiteness, the contributions of France and Scotland

¹ At the Petit Palais, Friday, 21st September.

stand foremost. Great foundations were first laid in France by Bodin (*Methodus*, 1557, and *Res publica*, 1567), Montesquieu (*Esprit des lois*, 1748), and Turgot (*Sur les Progres successifs de l'Esprit Humain*, 1750). Then, in Scotland, came Hume (*Dialogues on Natural Religion*, about 1750, though only posthumously published, and *Natural History of Religion*, 1757), with his contemporaries and friends, Adam Fergusson (*Origin and History of Civil Society*, 1766), Millar (*Origin of Ranks*, 1771), and Adam Smith (*Wealth of Nations*, 1776). The next contemporaneous steps were, first, that theory of the *Begriff* in which Hegel generalised the categories of Kant, and stated that Law of Differentiation and Integration now recognised to be the general form of Evolution; and, secondly, that "Law of the Three Periods" in which Comte formulated the generalisations of Turgot and of Hume. But since then, since 1822, when Comte, as he so often affirms, discovered this "grande loi philosophique,"¹ the results of scientific research bearing on every single problem involved in the real discovery of such a law have been of the most anti-Comtist character. These results of research—in obtaining which Scottish scholars, MacLennan, Robertson Smith, Fraser, etc., have again been prominent—have led to quite new conclusions with respect especially to (1) Primitive, or Relatively Primitive, Conceptions of Nature; to (2) The Origins of Civilisation, and hence of Intellectual Development; and to (3) the stages distinguishable in the history of such Development and of Civilisation. Hence the Law stated at the meeting of the International Assembly at Paris, above referred to, was simply an attempt to generalise these later results of research in their relations to each other. And whether, as thus stated, the Law of Historical Intellectual Development is found fully verifiable or not, the above notes may at least suffice to make it seem probable that such a Law will, sooner or later, be thus verifiably stated.

But, if it should be so, would not a logical deduction from such a Law be the conception of the Intellectual History of Mankind as a sublime, though tragic, struggle, through vicissitudes the most terrible, yet a struggle ever onward to a truer World-Consciousness? Should we not, by such a corollary, be further led to regard this struggle as not so much ours, as the local struggle on this earth-ball, of which the chief flower and fruit is Man,—the local struggle of the Kosmos itself towards truer self-consciousness? And would not such a view so transform all our ideas of Nature, and of History, as to create a New Ideal, a New Religion, and a

¹ See, for instance, *Philosophie positive*, LIV., p. 653, and Appendix to *Politique positive*, LIV.

New Art, no more opposed to, but inspired by, Science? Apply, for instance, to the Passion-Play such a corollary from the discovered Law of Historical Intellectual Development. False as, both in the place given to Hebrew Legends and the connexion therewith of Christian Myths, the theory of Man's History dramatised in the Passion-Play may be recognised to be, will it not, by those who accept a Law of Historical Intellectual Development with such a corollary as suggested, be viewed, as by nine-tenths now, with anything but merely worldly curiosity and sceptical indifference? Will not, on the contrary, all that is sublime in that theory of history, which dogmatic Christianity is, be, from this higher point of view, not seen only, but felt, in all its tragic pathos? And will not, from this higher standpoint, the idealised character of the God-Man: the enthusiastic love and fanatical hate He excited; and, finally, His forgiven Crucifixion, justly disturb with an emotion which, in its purifying and solemnising power, may shame those nine-tenths of professing Christians?

III.

We have thus seen how instructive is the light thrown by the Exposition on the Passion-Play in explaining, not only what is, perhaps, its most remarkable feature, its unaffectingness so far as nine-tenths are concerned, but also how it may come about that those who most fully accept, in their constructive as well as destructive aspects, the results of research set forth at the Congresses of the Exposition, may be profoundly affected by this Christian World-Drama. But no less instructive shall we find the light thrown by the Passion-Play on certain remarkable features of the Exposition. For as definite are the reciprocal variations of Shell and Organism in the human, as in the molluscous, animal. Hence, human clothes generally, and especially Architectures, are involuntarily, and often humorously, expressive, and become, indeed, a physical symbolism which greatly aids the historical student in penetrating to psychical conditions. And looking across the Seine from the river terrace on which opened the *Sous-Sol* of the *Palais des Congrès*, the Headquarters of the National Assembly, one was struck with a very significant, though probably quite unintentionally significant, juxtaposition,—up the river, from the *Pont de l'Alma* to the *Pont des Invalides*, the “*Rue des Nations*”; and down the river, from the *Pont de l'Alma* more than halfway to the *Pont d'Jena*, the far extending Palaces of the “*Armées de Terre et de Mer.*”

It was to the "Rue des Nations" I went first. Most interesting in themselves, but still more deeply interesting in their effects, were the characteristic exhibitions of the successive National Pavilions. For the effects on the many-nationed visitors to these palaces were manifested in both visible and audible expressions of interest in, and admiration of, what they found—with much surprise in most cases—that other peoples had done, and what other peoples, in capacity and aspiration, were. And I may note by the way that so great was the interest shown in the British Pavilion, that barricades had to be erected to prevent its being altogether overcrowded; and that the remarks I heard among the good-humored crowd as I stood at the barricade were chiefly expressive of admiration, by the women particularly, at the excellent French of the stalwart and helmeted English policeman who was firmly but courteously keeping us back. But to have to pass from the immensely varied but overcrowded scenes witnessing to, at least some initial realisation of what I have ventured to call the New Morality of Internationalism—to have to pass at once from such scenes as these by merely crossing the end of the Pont de l'Alma to such Palaces as those almost equally far-extending along the river as the "Rue des Nations"—Palaces devoted to the exhibition of the weapons of every kind of the "Armées de Terre et de Mer," the most elaborately and ingeniously contrived machines, some of the most gigantic size, for wholesale fratricidal slaughter—to have to pass at once from the "Rue des Nations" to these other, yet immediately adjoining Palaces, struck me as almost demoniacally humorous.

But "accidental" (or what is so-called) though this juxtaposition no doubt was, it was not, on that account, less significant of a very real conflict of Social Forces. The New International Morality to which the Pavilions of the "Rue des Nations" testified is the correlate of that New General Theory of History set forth in the Congresses of the Exposition; and the fratricidal weapons exhibited in the adjoining Palaces belong to the Arsenal of the established General Theory of History. For with the conflict of economic and political forces there goes always a conflict of moral and religious Ideals; the latter, indeed, holding the former together, and inspiring them with whatever conquering power they may possess. Hence, a vibrant concrete symbol of the Ideal inspiring one set of the economic and political forces of a revolutionary conflict will illuminate for us its every manifestation. And such a symbol is the Passion-Play, not only in itself, but in its re-

lations. For, in itself, the Passion-Play is nothing less than a vividly dramatic presentation of what the Creed of Christendom with respect to Man's History and Man's Salvation has been, still is, and, so long as a Christendom exists, will, and must be. And, in its relations, the Passion-Play is especially associated with economic conditions and political institutions menaced by other economic and political forces which are more definitely and enthusiastically inspired by another and incomparably more verifiable theory of Man's History and Man's Salvation.

A profoundly important question is thus suggested. What are the relative strengths of the Historical Theories, and thereon founded Ideals which respectively marshal and inspire the opposing economic and political forces of our revolutionary epoch? If we assume, as probably we justly may, that the Passion-Play, in the Pilgrims it attracts to the banks of the Ammer, accurately enough samples the relative numbers of genuine, and of but ostensible, Christians in Christendom—meaning, of course, by genuine Christians, not merely persons of genuinely good life, but of genuinely orthodox belief—we may be tempted to think that, in Beliefs which the unaffectedness of the Passion-Play showed to be, in the case of nine-tenths, ostensible rather than genuine, there can be but little potency of inspiring with their Ideal one militant side of so terrible an underlying Conflict as that so strikingly indicated by the juxtaposition, on the quays of the Seine, of the Pavilions of the New International Morality and the Palaces of the "Armées de Terre et de Mer." Excusably one may be thus tempted to underestimate the potency of Sham-beliefs. But History—to those at least whose eyes have been duly opened to its facts by practical experience of great movements, political, religious, and social—disillusioningly shows that, even in the greatest of such movements, heroic souls, believing to their inmost core, and even to their defeated death, in what they fight for, are always in a minority; that the majority of those taking part in movements of a heroic character, whether Conservative or Progressive, are individually the reverse of heroic; and that this majority is brought into such movements chiefly by the material bribes with which are backed what would be otherwise the ineffective persuasions of the recruiting-officers of the True Believers.

Now, Christianity is, by hundreds of millions sterling, the wealthiest Institution the World has ever seen. Even suppose, therefore, that nine-tenths of the population of Christendom are, like apparently nine-tenths of the Pilgrims at Oberammergau, but

ostensible believers in the Historical Theory dramatised in the Passion-Play, we should take far too optimistic a view of human nature if we imagined that, on that account—because of their unbelief in the Historical Theory which is the intellectual backbone of Christianity—they are not, save perhaps a small minority of them, enthusiastic adherents and supporters of an Institution possessed of so incalculable a number of posts to appoint to, and incomes to endow with. Thus we may again see what is so tragic, yet so constantly recurring, a feature in Human Conflicts—the little difference in moral character between the heroes of the Conservative and Progressive sides respectively; and the little difference, save in moral character, between the Believers in the new, and the Sham-believers in the old views of Nature and of History. They differ only in the facility which the latter, and the impossibility which the former, find in reconciling themselves, for the sake of goodly loaves and fishes, to equivocations, and prevarications, evasions, reservations, and mystifications as degrading to moral character as they are deadening to intellectual insight. And facility in reconciling consciences to such lies is so general a human characteristic that, though the Passion-Play may show failure of belief now in Christianity as a Religion, it cannot, for such a reason as that, be taken to show any failure of belief in Christianity as an Institution worthy of all possible support.

But the Passion-Play Theory of History and the Ideal thereon founded has a third element of strength. Besides the moral potency of genuine believers, and wealth enough to recruit overwhelming armies of mercenaries, the Christian Theory of History and thereon-founded Ideal is backed by a kind of Authority in accordance with present intellectual and moral conditions. It is no new discovery—though lately put forward as if it were—that Beliefs are, in general, mainly due to Authority defined as the “causes moral, social, and educational, which produce their results by psychic processes other than reasoning.”¹ This is a characteristic which, *pace* Mr. Balfour,² Man shares with all other Social Animals. But Authority, like everything else, has had its history. In the Earlier Ages of Civilisation it was, as it still is where its earlier stages survive, Immemorial Custom; in the Age which may be dated from the Sixth Century B. C., the causes indicated by the term Authority have characteristically been Sacred Books and their Guardian-Interpreters; and, in the New Age, the causes which

¹ Balfour, *Foundations of Belief*, p. 219.

² *Ibid.*, p. 230.

will mainly influence belief will be Laws of Nature and of History discovered and verified by Methods of which the principles approve themselves to all. In our present Age, however, intellectual and moral conditions are such that only exceptionally appreciated is the sufficiency for heart as well as brain of the Laws of Nature and of History, even as already discovered. Generally acceptable, in contemporary conditions of historical ignorance and uninquiring belief, is only the Authority of some Pope, some infallible interpreter of Scriptures. And it is in these conditions that we find the life enshrined of that Passion-Play-Theory of History which is the backbone of Christianity as a Religion.

In comparison with such elements of strength as these—sincere beliefs (of at least a minority), boundless wealth, and appropriate conditions—what elements of strength are there in that other Theory of History, of which either the principles were implied, or the special or general results were expounded, in the Congresses of the Exposition? As the first element of strength in this New Theory we may note its definite historical evolution in a more and more verifiable form. First, there was its early synthetic period which may be associated with the names more particularly of Hume, of Hegel, and of Comte, the period of "Philosophies of History" innumerable, just because facts enough were not as yet known to make possible anything more than suggestive hypotheses. Then, the great analytic period of the last half century, in which a just reaction against General Theories of History as altogether premature has forced the majority of scholars to limit themselves to special departments of research. And now there is the opening of that later synthetic period which marks the history of all great Theories, the period in which (as in the paper above referred to as read at the *École Internationale de l'Exposition*) there is an attempt to generalise in their relations to each other the more important of the vast and varied accumulations of facts, which we owe to the more characteristically analytic period of scientific historical research. Contemporaneously also the Socialism of the end of the century is distinguished from that of its beginning as an Historical is from an Utopian Ideal. Surely it were futile to imagine that, however fundamentally opposed it may be to the Historical Theory of the Passion-Play, this New Historical Theory—to the elaboration of which all the greatest European intellects of the last century and a half have, in one way or other, and even sometimes involuntarily, contributed—has not before it, though a desperately opposed, a triumphant future?

If this is doubted, then note further, that the New Theory of History is by no means merely of a higher intellectual, but of a more largely sympathetic, and hence higher moral, character. For, from the standpoint of this New Theory, every Religion, and among these—as above seen at the Passion-Play—Christianity, is given full recognition and sympathy in its due place in Man's tragic struggle towards a truer World-Consciousness and hence juster Socialisation. Nay, what is best in the New Theory is admitted to be only a development of the moral element in Christianity. But this admission is without partiality. For the moral element in Christianity itself is recognised as but one of the developments of a Moral Revolution, five hundred years earlier, and embracing all the peoples of Civilisation. And this higher moral character, which is the fit correlate of the higher intellectual outlook of the New Theory of History, will have the more effect, considering the narrowness and even ferocity of that Morality of Christians with which the Morality of Internationalism is now constantly found contrasted. I have no space here for recent illustrations of this contrast among ourselves. But I may recall the *saigner à blanc* with which the French were menaced by Bismarck, should there be another Franco-German War; the recent "No Quarter" speech of his master, the Kaiser, the other most prominent and most powerful of modern champions of Christianity; and the protest made against this ferocious speech in the great debate in the Reichstag led, in an oration four hours long, by the Socialist Bebel (Friday, the 23rd of last November). A debate more significant there could not have been of the *moral* conflict between the opposed forces, not of the German Empire only, but of Christendom.

Finally, if in Great Britain, where the very idea of a Science of History, a discipline aiming at the discovery of General Laws is academically tabooed—if here, there is not, in favor of the New Theory, the education, as elsewhere, of Sociological Chairs, there is the education, at least, of political conditions. For the conception of the probable future of Humanity to which the observer of political conditions will, I think, be more and more led, is identical with that which the student of Historical Development deduces from his discovered Laws. More and more clearly the former will see in present conditions, as the latter more and more clearly sees in past inheritances, forces driving towards the union of all human races and peoples. Nor will the present Imperial Stage of such union be regarded as the last, but rather as a preparation for the higher union of a freely constituted Organism in which varieties of

capacity have their due scope in recognised and needed functions for the Common Good. For instance, may we not see even already that the Imperial Powers of the West are rousing to a new national life the oldest of all civilised peoples, and preparing a counter-balance to Western, in renewed Eastern, Civilisations? Can it be imagined that these Eastern Civilisations will renew themselves on the bases of Christian Gospels and Hebrew Legends rather than on the bases of their own older Histories, and equally moral sacred Literatures? And if so, then, must not the all-comprehensive Historical Theory of Science, with its justice to every people, rather than the exclusive one of the Passion-Play, with its Jews as the only "Chosen people," and its Christ as the only "Saviour," be the intellectual basis of the New Ideal common to all the peoples of an organised Humanity?

To sum up. The Exposition and the Passion-Play, when brought together, reveal to us, as by an electric flash, the opposed Theories of History, and consequent Ideals, with one or other of which all the economic and political forces of the time are more or less closely, if not exclusively, connected. They reveal to us two utterly different and antagonistic views of Nature, of Man's History, and of the Kosmos. Such differences of view are no mere intellectual Theories and Ideals. They are each associated with all the material, as well as spiritual, needs that rouse human passion to the utmost. Along with these different Theories and Ideals there are in antagonism two different Worlds of Institutions, the one established, the other aiming at getting established. It is with the established Historical Theory and Ideal and the established World of Institutions that the "Armées de Terre et de Mer" are associated. But the fear to use them, which is the most powerful guiding motive of European statesmen, arises from instinctively feeling, or more intelligently seeing, that to use these Armies in Europe would but give occasion for the outburst of a far profounder Conflict, and one which all the European Powers are equally anxious to postpone. That ever-menacing Conflict, however, of the majesty and terror of which we may now, perhaps, have some glimpse—that, it may be hoped, Last War—will, with its lulls, probably occupy the whole of the Twentieth Century.