

politicians, there may be need for a strong arm to shut the gates of Derry. And the arm of Orangeism may yet be strong if the Order, having been used, and flung aside by the politicians, can profit by the bitter lesson and once more be true to itself and its cause.

THE Irish rebellion is raking up again all the bitter questions of Irish history, and notably that bitterest of them all, the question of the massacre of Protestants by the Catholics in 1641. Dr. John Macdonnell, of Dublin, kinsman of that Sir Alexander Macdonnell whose life was a proof that a British official in Ireland may be the best of Irishmen, undertakes to plead the cause of the Catholic insurgents once more at the bar of history. He shows his learning and his kindness; he detects, what is easy enough to detect, untruthfulness in Mr. Froude: but he cannot much affect the principal fact. There are wide discrepancies, no doubt, among the Protestant authorities as to the number of the victims, and some of them exaggerate immensely. But we have similar discrepancies and exaggerations where nobody has any doubt as to the reality of the main event. The massacres in the prisons of Paris at the commencement of the Reign of Terror, the September massacres as they are called, were enacted under the eyes of the Parisians; the prison registers and the testimony of the gaolers must have been there to assist inquiry; the subject was, after a short interval, brought up in the Convention, which was sitting on the spot, and was there debated several times; yet the estimates of the number massacred vary from six thousand to one thousand, and it is with much hesitation that Barante sets it down at about fifteen hundred. Panic and horror always distort and multiply. A half-savage race, as the native Irish then were, rose in frenzied wrath upon the intruders who were despoiling it of its land; first proceeded to expel them, and then, its fury kindling in the process, butchered all upon whom it could lay its hands. Such is the alleged fact, and why should we refuse to believe what was believed at the time by everybody, among the rest by Clarendon, an eminently sober writer, who must have had access to the best information, and was as far as possible from being inclined to magnify the wrongs of the Puritan party in Ireland? That in the war which ensued the Irish gave no quarter, is proved by the explicit and exulting testimony of the Papal Legat Rinuccini, and this forms a sufficient answer to the charges of inhumanity against Cromwell. Nobody proposes that the Irish Catholics at the present day shall suffer any privation or disparagement on account of the massacre of 1641. On the other hand it is preposterous to charge the people of England in 1884 with the acts of the Normans, of the Tudors, or of those who fought in the Civil Wars under the Stuarts. As well might the Government and the citizens of the French Republic be charged with the massacre of St. Bartholomew or the persecution of Protestants under Louis XIV. Let the dead past rest in its grave. Much stress is laid by the exhibitors of historical sores on the fact that one of the worst of the persecuting acts against Irish priests was passed so late as the reign of Anne. At the very end of Anne's reign one of the worst of the persecuting acts against English Nonconformists was passed by Bolingbroke and his Tory crew. The only use of these investigations is to warn us what might happen in a land still divided between hostile races and religions if the Union were now repealed and the controlling presence of the Imperial power were withdrawn. Who could guarantee us against another 1641?

As in every Irish conspiracy the informer is sure to come, so in every Irish party is sure to come the split. It has long been evident that there was a divergence between Mr. Parnell, who wants to play a waiting game till the Franchise Bill shall have been passed, and the Dynamiters, who do not want to play a waiting game at all. But now Mr. Power opens fire on the Parnellites in the House of Commons, and of course receives a broadside in return. Mr. Power is more moderate than Mr. Parnell; he is opposed to terrorism and outrage; yet the policy which he advocates is practically even more inadmissible than that which is advocated by Mr. Parnell. He wants, instead of a Legislative, a Federal, union between Great Britain and Ireland. The British statesman who consents to this must be in his dotage, or a traitor. What sort of life do even Sweden and Norway lead under such a system? At this moment the tie between them is strained almost to breaking; yet between Swedes and Norwegians there is no difference of race or religion, nor has Norwegian hatred of Sweden been cultivated by a long succession of mischief-making demagogues, as has Irish hatred of England. The character of the matrimonial relations which would subsist between the Parliaments of Westminster and Dublin, after a dissolution of the Legislative union extorted by Irish agitation, may too easily be foretold. A complete separation would unbind the hands of England. She would then be at liberty to meet insult and outrage, in the last resort, with arms; to extend a frank and unre-

served protection to the Protestants of Ulster; above all to guard herself against that most fatal of all invasions, the inflow of Irish Catholic immigration into her own cities. The end almost certainly would be re-conquest and the final settlement of the Irish question with the sword. But there is a better way. Let the British Parliament only lay faction aside for an hour, allow for an hour patriotism to prevail, and by its attitude make the conspirators understand once for all that while every real grievance shall be redressed, there shall be no tampering with the Union.

Mr. DIKE, the investigator of the Divorce question, has an important paper in the *Princeton Review*. The disintegration of the family is apparently going on apace. Statistics showing the rapid increase of divorce cases have already been given. It appears that there were in a year in twenty-nine of the fifty-two counties of California 789 divorces to 5,849 marriage licenses, or one divorce to 7.41 licenses. It is safe, in the opinion of Mr. Dike to say that divorces have doubled in proportion to marriages or population in most of the Northern States within the last thirty years, while present figures indicate a still greater increase. It is, in fact, in the recent indications that the serious part of the case consists. Instances of fraud and collusion in obtaining divorces continually come to light. Causes are disposed of with haste, on frivolous evidence; in the courts of one State fifteen minutes is the average time spent on a divorce suit. A dozen families will be broken up in far less time than it takes the same court to decide a five dollars-suit. The example thus set in the higher grades of society is leading, as might be expected, to loss of respect for marriage all down the scale, the poor thinking that they are morally at liberty to do without expensive forms that which the rich do with them. The increase of licentiousness Mr. Dike says is marked; as are the lowering of the tone and the growth even among married women of the opinion that adultery is a mere peccadillo. The physician and the student of social life discover in some quarters immorality both in sentiment and practice which was unknown half a century ago. A partial loss of capacity for maternity has already befallen American women, and the voluntary refusal of its responsibilities is the lament of the physician and the moralist. That the majority of American homes remain yet untouched and happy is a fact which does not annul the significance of a growing tendency. Such are the phenomena which present themselves, and may well present themselves to Mr. Dike and to any one to whom the vital tissue of society is an object of interest as matter for anxious investigation. If the case is not overstated, Mormonism, when it is denounced and threatened by New England preachers and moralists, may hold up its monstrous head and fling back the accusation upon its censors. It at least does not discourage maternity; it even upholds the family in its own strange and barbarous way. Perhaps it may have the effrontery to maintain that the simultaneous polygamy is not more licentious than the successive or even has the advantage, inasmuch as it does not cast the children adrift. Mr. Dike ascribes the evil largely to the relaxation of divorce laws. But it appears that the tendencies of which he speaks run very much with that particular element which, though Puritan in its origin, has been most affected by the march of Radical ideas generally and especially by the progress of sexual revolution. The headship of the family and the family itself are being battered or undermined by a variety of subversive agencies of which direct alteration of the marriage law is one, while others are the changes in the political, educational and economical relations of the sexes which are being pushed on, generally with the effect and sometimes with the object of rendering the family less a unit, separating the interest of the wife from that of the husband and making the woman the competitor instead of the partner of the man. This does not escape the notice of Mr. Dike, who treats his subject with philosophic breadth of view. At this moment there is before the British House of Commons Radical legislation in respect to the guardianship of children manifestly directed against the headship of the family. The Radical is wise in his generation who acts on the conviction that while the headship of the family continues to exist and to be regarded as sacred, authority will not be extinct. Lawyers cannot help favouring the change from the bond of affection, or *status* as they choose to call it, to contract. Affection does not pay fees, but contract does. We are all so absorbed in politics that we pay little heed to the progress of sexual and domestic revolution, though it must affect things more precious than any civil rights, inasmuch as the home is the centre of our moral being. Professed Conservatives even allow themselves to tamper with it, and to borrow from it female suffrage, that they may steal a political victory, albeit the movement is directed against the very type and root of that principle of authority on which Conservatism rests. Collot d'Herbois, the frantic Jacobin who in the French Convention first proposed