

foolishness, the only way to correct him is by giving him a thorough thrashing, and,

"his punishment must not be diluted by hesitation, nervousness or compunction on the part of the punisher. The experience then becomes one from which the dog is capable of learning, and if the sense of mastery conveyed to him is unmistakable, he can assimilate the lesson without reservation or the desire for revenge."

And, since it's beyond question laid down that Germany's social system is that of the dog and wolf, THEREFORE she too must be beaten to a frazzle or she will have a desire for revenge, etc., just like Topsy, if the master spares the knout. Of course, Trotter is not guilty of "reasoning by analogy"! Oh, no.

"When I compare German society with the wolf pack, and the feelings, desires, and impulses of the individual German with those of the wolf or dog, I am not intending to use a vague analogy but to call attention to a real and gross identity." (191.)

We insist we may agree that Germany's tactics are like a wolf's. BUT, we most decidedly refuse to accept that as a dictum of science derived a la Trotter by pernicious reasoning.

All along we are given to understand it is the psychology of the Germans that makes them what T. tells us they are. And before urging our own scientific, I think, objections, let me quote the author's opinion about his own country, England. It is:

"The most complete example of a socialized herd (201);

"England has taken as her model the bee" (201);

"the spirit of the people makes the great wars, but it leaves the statesmen to conduct them" (206).

How the author can so flagrantly say the last in the face of conscription of her own subjects and of those of Ireland who protests she does not want conscription, that the "spirit of the people" is against it, is difficult to see.

As to England being the "most complete example" of a socialized herd, we envious Americans might flatly call the author a—well, slightly mistaken. The beehive business is not new. Huxley used it to show Socialism's a dream. It took the Socialists to inform Huxley as we now inform Trotter that the only thing in the beehive the English accept as a model is the category of "Drones." Were we to build our argument on analogy we would say: Drones exist in the hive. Since England has as her "model the bee," drones exist in England. Now the bees sting out the drones, THEREFORE the workers must sting out the drones in England.

But levity aside. No society is strictly aggressive or defensive, today. Even in lupine Germany it is not. Germany did not arouse the masses to fight by telling them to conform to their "psychologic" needs as Mr. Trotter thinks. If the German individual had the gregarious needs of the wolf then it would have been unnecessary for the military clique to arouse them in another way. Mr. T. says nothing on this. Yet it follows with a good deal more logic than he has mustered that if their instincts were aggressive, only this type of stimulus might have been utilized by Kaiser Wilhelm, and with tremendous success.

But the world knows, Wilson and Lloyd George said it, that the Kaiser duped the people, made them feel that they fight a "war of defense" when in reality the Kaiser entered the war for aggression. Why is it, that these people had to be aroused by a "defensive" stimulus if they were a pack of wolves who fight when they are not threatened but do so for aggression in itself?

Will Mr. T. reclassify England and other nations in the light of the secret treaty revelations by the Bolsheviks? France, Italy, Russia, England, had imperialistic aims these treaties show. Therefore they too were "lupine" in type. And further about England, that country modeled on the gregariousness of the bee, does the treatment accorded the Indians fit in with a "socialized gregarious" habit? It seems to