

Reg. 2nd July 1903

Register 8th July 1903.

Reg. 8th July 190

—England Going Under.—

They were told that in many industries England was going under, and that those industries were just the things that required, not the exercise of muscle, and that could be produced by the rule of thumb, but which, if they were to be produced successfully, required that the workmen should exercise brain as well as muscle. The question of tariffs was more fundamentally one of education. Ludwig Loewe, in Berlin, and George Cadbury, Joshua Rowntree, and the Sunlight Company, in England, had successfully tried experiments based on the principle that to get the best out of men the best must be put into them. The result was that the master not only got the legal amount of work from his employes, but a sympathetic interest in the work itself.

—The Capital of a Nation.—

A political economist had said that the living capital of any nation at any particular time was six times the money value of its community. If they were to build up the importance of this country they must concentrate attention on the growing manhood and womanhood more than on golden sovereigns and silver shillings. The more resources a man had in himself, other things being equal, the less he would need outside himself; that was the basis of ideal wealth. Such wealth was mainly the result of education. Ruskin was wrong in denouncing commerce to the extent he did, for men had bodies that must be fed and clothed; but he was right when he said— "There is no way but life—life including all those powers of joy and love and admiration. That nation is the richest which nourishes the greatest number of happy human beings." The work of the teachers was to cultivate that ideal wealth. It was worth doing, and worth doing well.

Advertiser 7th July 1903

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION LECTURES.

"LEADERS OF THE MIDDLE AGES."

RICHARD I.

At the University on Tuesday evening Professor Henderson gave the first of his lectures on "The leaders of the middle ages," and dealt with the life and character of Richard I. There was a large attendance. The lecturer first outlined the life of his hero. He summarized his great crusade into the Holy Land, and more briefly his campaign in France, which terminated in the warrior's death. Then at greater length he discussed the character of the man. Sir Walter Scott had portrayed Richard in "Ivanhoe," but though many of the traits with which he endowed him were supported by contemporary historians, there were wide and far-reaching differences. No historical justification could be found for Richard's credited anxiety for the welfare of the English people, or for the union of the English and Norman peoples. However, the "Coeur de Leon" was fully capable of meanness and fierce lust of revenge, as well as of impulsive generosity. Modern research and criticism had shown that his impulses were stronger than his convictions, and that war was the dominating passion of his life. He was magnanimous when his pride was not at stake. A burning desire for glory, and a love of ostentation, were two of the most powerful influences of his life. Perhaps the key to his character was to be found in the strength of his personality. He cared little or nothing for the English people, yet they almost worshipped him. Though he reduced their land to a state of abject poverty, they gave him a splendid and enthusiastic welcome on his return from captivity after the third Crusade. This was because in him were embodied the personal ideals of the age. His achievements dazzled them, as they dazzled the world. France was terrorized by him, and Islam felt the heaviness of his hand. Add to this that he was an orator of wonderful eloquence, that he possessed in a high degree the qualities of a great general, and that his personal achievements in war alone had given him a high prestige among his fellow-men. To the student there was a tragic interest in the life of this hero. Throughout he seemed to be struggling vainly against an overwhelming destiny. He tried unsuccessfully to reinvigorate the crusading spirit which was languishing at the end of the twelfth century, and in spite of his efforts the empire of the Angevins was doomed to fall as the sentiment of nationality deepened on France. Still Richard the Crusader was a great and strong leader of the middle ages. Though personal ambition played so large a part in his career, he should be judged as a product of the time. The novelist exalted him; the historian condemned him; but in both sentiment and fact he was a noble and inspiring personality.

Professor Henderson is too well known as a scholar to require praise for his conception of the character. He showed a full grasp of his subject, and discussed the different phases of Richard's life with clearness and power. His lecture was well worth hearing if only for the beauty of its language. The professor concluded with a number of interesting views relevant to the life and times of Richard, which he had collected in England.

Next week the second lecture of the series will deal with Francis of Assisi.

tryside. There is no mistaking the influence of a long historical record upon the people who preserve it. Wordsworth said of his neighbours among the dales of Westmoreland—"Many of these humble sons of the hills had a consciousness that the land which they tilled had for more than 500 years been possessed by men of the same name and blood." With the governing classes such cases are common, but even where there is no proved continuity of family the knowledge exists that it has been there through the centuries. The effect upon the national character is marked, and Emerson drew special attention to it about 60 years ago:—"They keep their old customs, costumes, and pomps, their wig and mace, sceptre and crown. The Middle Ages still lurk in the streets of London. They repeated the ceremonies of the eleventh century in the coronation of the present Queen. The English power resides in their dislike of change." How different is the position in this new land of the south, where no real antiquity is known; and yet anything which tends to comparative age is by many regarded with suspicion for that mere cause!

Professor Henderson, in his University extension lectures, begun last night, has undertaken to carry the mind back into those Middle Ages of which so much is known by repute but so little with certainty. Or, one might more accurately say, that undoubted happenings have been so embroidered upon by their chroniclers, in the centuries which have gone between, that the student aspiring after truth hardly knows how much to believe. Even supposedly sober historians like Macaulay

and Freeman have been so carried away, either by their own eloquence or by an obstinately one-sided manner of regarding things, that they have made the position difficult for those who desire to study history with a view to learning the whole truth and nothing but the truth. The German historian Ranke may be taken as a fair representative of the age which instituted the modern methods. He taught History, as Lord Acton has said, "to be critical, to be colourless, and to be new;" and it is interesting to consider that Scott's "Quentin Durward" is understood to have set him off upon that track. He found Louis XI. as portrayed by the novelist to be so unlike what trustworthy chroniclers show him really to have been, that the very skill of the presentment made it the more dangerous. So Ranke started upon his life's work of depicting historical characters from both sides. Some have deemed him dull, because he comes so often to no conclusion; but, while marshalling the available facts, declines to record a verdict. The average mind likes to have its historical characters neatly classified and labelled, so that it may be able to say, as in the simple record of the Israelitish Klugs, that this man did evil, or that the other did that which was righteous. The novelists in particular pander to this desire, and thus may arise fascinating but misleading romances, such as "The Scottish Chiefs," that shocking example of two generations past. Just now careful psychological studies are fashionable, even among the novelists, and it is worth noting that Professor Henderson admits their right to portray character as they will. He wishes, however, to set the earnest student right, and he has caught Sir Walter Scott manifestly going astray in more instances than one.

A somewhat fascinating comparison may be drawn between the Richard who is the subject of the professor's first lecture and the young Henry who fought at Shrewsbury. They stand out in the dim record of the past as conspicuous for similar qualities, although the light of exact history shows that they were as far separated in point of time as Queen Anne's age from our own. Of Henry the Fifth, Shakspeare has written at length, using the character through three plays. The battle of Shrewsbury will always be famous for the stage rendering of it, with its deadly encounter between the two Harries—prince and rebel—equally headstrong and equally brave. "We see," says Furnival, the commentator, in his cramped style, "how Hal appeard his conscience when it bother'd him by arguments which, though they sounded very grand, were really worth nothing. He had sinn'd morally—how would he atone for it? Why, he'd fight physically. When Hotspur lay dead at his feet, he thought Hotspur's honours and

The Register.

ADELAIDE: WEDNESDAY, JULY 8, 1903.

STUDIES IN HISTORY.

The old English town of Shrewsbury is to celebrate this month the famous battle which was decided there just 500 years ago. The Fourth Henry sat uneasily upon the throne he had won, and a combination of Welshmen and Northumbrians bade fair to take it from him. Marching westward, he met the rebel forces near to the Welsh border, and crushed them completely. The course of English history might have been greatly changed but for the foresight of Henry and the valour of his son, afterwards to be the victor of Agincourt. The stricken field of Shrewsbury supplied only one incident in the long and eventful annals of the border city. Going 500 years farther back, it can be found with a mint of its own as one of the chief of Saxon cities under Athelstan; and its original founding, as a defence against these same Saxons probably dates to 500 years still earlier. Welsh princes have burnt it to the ground, and English Kings have been forced to take it by storm. Simon de Montfort held it for a time, and Oliver Cromwell's forces fought around it with those of King Charles. All these things will doubtless be borne in mind in the approaching celebrations, which will rouse the old country town from its somewhat sleepy condition, and recall its vanished glories as a fortress whose possession meant the domination of a whole coun-