

particular scheme for lessening the evils of intemperance, which seems to be about the extent of his offending, can hardly surprise any thoughtful person, even the staunchest enemy of the liquor traffic. All reflection must tend to suggest, as most experiments have probably tended to confirm, the utter insufficiency of such a remedy. So long as strong drinks are used by a very large part of the nation as everyday beverages, and even considered by many essentials to health and comfort, and so long as their manufacture and importation are sanctioned by law and custom as legitimate industries, the futility of any attempt on the part of a single locality of larger or smaller dimensions to prevent their sale and use within its bounds must be apparent. Local prohibition can, at best, be but very partially effective, and must, at the same time, give rise to other evils of a serious character.

Like every form of prohibition, the Gothenburg system, which Mr. Gladstone approves, can be defended only on the ground that the whole liquor question is *en sui generis*, and must be dealt with accordingly. Were the ground taken, which is that of the pronounced prohibitionist, that the use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage is evil, only evil, and always evil, but that the public welfare requires that it shall be procurable for medicinal purposes, and for use in the mechanic and chemical arts, etc., the taking over of the business by the Government might be defensible on the same ground on which the sale of poisons is restricted. But to make a Government monopoly of so vast a business as that of the production and sale of alcoholic drinks of all kinds, not for the purpose of increasing the revenue, but solely to prevent private profit and interest in their sale on the one hand, and to regulate their use by individuals on the other, would be, in a country like Great Britain, a truly novel and gigantic experiment. Yet it is coming to be more and more clearly recognized that the science of government is an experimental and practical one, and that it would be supreme folly for any people to deny themselves the benefits of what might prove to be a thoroughly beneficent method, because it was not easily reconcilable with some theory of political economy. There can be no reasonable doubt that if every liquor-seller in Great Britain, or any other country, could be put on salary to-morrow, so that henceforth he would have no pecuniary interest in the increase or diminution of his sales, the worst evils of the traffic would be at once immensely lessened. Very few men, indeed, would sell liquor to a neighbour to his manifest hurt and to that of his family, if there was nothing to be gained by so doing. It is also to be said in favour of the state management of the traffic that it would afford every facility for the prevention of poisonous adulterations, which are undoubtedly a most prolific

source of the worst evils of the traffic as at present carried on. It is evident, therefore, that there is a good deal to be said in favour of the Gothenburg system, especially when it is admitted, as it must be admitted by reasonable men who know anything of the views and habits of the British people that there is no possibility of reaching the prohibitionist's goal, the suppression of manufacture, sale, and use in Great Britain, for at least many years to come. It is probable, now that attention has been directed to the matter by Mr. Gladstone, that the Gothenburg system will come to the front as a practical proposal, as it has not hitherto done. It would be unfair that its efficacy should be judged by the success or non-success of local experiments, such as are being tried in some parts of the United States. Its strength would be largely in its national character and scope. Perhaps when it has been tried and approved, a similar method may be adopted to regulate the sale of firearms and some other articles most liable to abuse.

GLADSTONE ON THE ATONEMENT.

The spectacle of Mr. Gladstone writing on the Atonement, Mr. Balfour reading a paper at a church congress, and Lord Salisbury delivering himself on evolution and the doctrine of God, is worth pondering. It is a spectacle which could hardly be seen in any country outside of England; at least, if not confined to England, it is peculiarly Anglo-Saxon. It would be interesting to enquire whether such things are due to the English University system or to racial characteristics. Perhaps the University system has its roots in the Anglo-Saxon race, and who can say how much England owes to the social life of the college residence, or to the religious training of the college chapel. Nothing is so disastrous to the growth of character as specialization. And nothing so effectively corrects the dangers of over-specialization as the social and religious life of Oxford and Cambridge, justly called "the cradles of English statesmen." Be this as it may, England rejoices to point to the three men we have named, not only as legislators of the people and supporters of the throne, but also as defenders of the faith.

Politicians have sometimes wished that Mr. Gladstone would betake himself to Theology; theologians, that he would confine himself to "his last." But we question whether any theologian will regret Mr. Gladstone's latest theological utterance. The doctrine of the Atonement has been the butt of many a random shaft. Men who ought to have known better have revealed their moral thoughtlessness nowhere so much as here. No doubt, Christian teachers have taught false theories of the Atonement, but this does not excuse much that has been said and written by men who

are well informed on every other subject. Mr. Gladstone lays down a number of propositions, from which we single out this: "The pretexts for impugning the Divine character in connection with the redemption of man are artificially constructed by detaching the vicarious efficacy of the sufferings of our Lord from moral consequences, wrought out in those who obtain the application of His redeeming power by incorporation into His Church or Body. Take away the unnatural severance, and the objections fall to the ground." This is finely said. And surely if the hideous travesty we often see of this great doctrine were true, then Christ might have taken the world by the hand and led it into the presence of God. But such is not the case; only those go into the Eternal Presence who have found in the "pardon of Calvary" a real power helpful to the great end of sanctification." But in that case who can condemn this life-giving Atonement as unworthy of God or unnecessary for man? The whole article is well worth a careful study. Coming from the quarter it does gives it a peculiar interest, and many thoughtful men, who have regarded this central doctrine of the faith as a hard saying, will find it easier to receive at the hands of the veteran statesman, than from the pulpit of the professed theologian.

INDIVIDUALISM VS. SOCIALISM.

Considerable attention has for some weeks past been aroused in certain circles in the United States by the trial of Professor Ely, of Michigan State University, before the Board of Regents of that Institution, on a charge of economic heresy—in other words, of Socialistic teachings. After a prolonged investigation the Board have announced their verdict. They not only acquit Professor Ely but pronounce him entirely guiltless in the matter charged, in the most emphatic and unambiguous language. Professor Ely was already a well-known writer on economic and sociological questions, and this incident will have the effect, no doubt, of giving to his writings increased popularity. That he does not follow in the beaten track of the old political economists is, in the view of the Regents, a merit rather than a defect in his methods as a teacher. In pronouncing distinctly in favour of allowing teachers and investigators in public institutions full liberty of thought and expression, the Regents have given a valuable utterance in favour of freedom of scientific and philosophic research.

One of the first-fruits of this somewhat remarkable trial is a couple of articles in the current number of *The Forum*. In the first, Professor Ely, at the request of the editor, expounds, from his own view-point, some of the difficult questions which are now perplexing the minds of economists, sociologists, and statesmen. In the second, Profes-