

onward by a forceful impulse. If, then, we find that the direction in which we are thus being impelled is towards what is, in itself, obviously good and desirable, should we not be wiser, instead of standing stubbornly athwart the impulse, to throw our whole selves in with it, to immerse ourselves in it, to let it permeate us through and through, and to utilize our intellects to give this general impetus practical, definite effect?

Instead of fostering isolation, acquiescing in seclusion, and encouraging unneighbourliness in Tibet, in Afghanistan, and all along our frontier, would it not be better to work whole-heartedly with the great World-Impulse towards more and more intimate union combined with ever-increasing freedom? Independence, indeed, we may respect, but surely not isolation. To individuality we may allow the fullest play, but hardly to unsociality.

Further, recognizing that forceful impulses mean flux and movement, and that therefore we can never expect finality, should we not place less and less faith in settlements and treaties, and repose increasing trust in personal contact, flexible and adaptable, ever ready for change in details, but ever deepening and tightening the essential attachment of man for man? It is through personalities that individuality is brought out, association fostered, and harmony attained. It is through living human beings that suspicions are dispelled, jealousies melted, prejudices dissolved, and peoples united. The Tibet Treaty was good; would not an agent at Lhasa have been better?