

CORRESPONDENCE.

ENGLAND AND RUSSIA.

SIR,—As the SPECTATOR, I presume, is not pledged to one side of a question only, I shall be glad to be allowed to make a few remarks upon the present controversy between England and Russia from an opposite point of view to that taken by "Patria" last week.

That writer takes exception to the whole policy of the Beaconsfield Cabinet in Eastern matters. Evidently no good can come out of Nazareth.

He begins with the assumption that the Government has no solid basis for its attitude, but is obliged to dance about from "British interests" to "Rights of treaties," and what other convenient phrase, the exigencies of the moment may sharpen its wits to devise. How pray then is it that Russia finds it so bitter a pill to accept the limitations which England has thought fit to put upon the gratification of her ambition?

I fail to see any mystification at all about England's policy in the matter.

The simple fact is that Russia, whatever her pretensions, deemed the present a good opportunity for the advancement of her traditional designs against Turkey.

She covets Constantinople, and thought she might take a long and a sure step towards its possession. Misled by the Gladstonian froth about atrocities, of which Russia herself was the real author, she plunged into war, thinking she might reckon without England.

The common sense of the English people, however, was not to be cheated. There is a deep-seated conviction in England, that if Russia were allowed to get Constantinople, she would quickly imperil our naval supremacy, let alone the fatal blow it would be to our possession of India.

Accordingly, Russia was only allowed to enter upon her war with Turkey on the distinct pledge, that unless the necessities of war compelled her, she should not touch Constantinople. This pledge, like most of her pledges, she proceeded to break. Turkey made overtures for peace when the Russian army was at Adrianople. But Russia, notwithstanding Turkey's amenableness to any terms she might propose, kept pushing on her troops towards the Turkish Capital. This it was that induced England to send her fleet to the same neighbourhood.

"Patria" imagines that the British public has been imposed upon by Lord Derby's foolish declaration that the fleet was at Constantinople to protect British subjects there. Just as if the veriest cad in the London streets did not know, that whatever excuse might be deemed convenient to avoid importing too much hostility into the movement, the fleet was there as the representative and visible token of England's determination to stay the grasping greed of Russia.

Of course "Patria" finds the bringing of native Indian troops upon the scene a measure fraught with evil omen to the liberties of England. This really splendid move has in it about as much danger to English liberties as the importing of a Canadian contingent would be in the event of war.

For surely it is open to any Government to concentrate in an emergency the whole military power of the Empire. It is a masterly measure, which shows continental Europe, that the monopoly of immense armies is not wholly on its side, but that England, too, has the material ready to hand of entering, if need be, upon a competition that may well cause the strongest of the great military powers to pause and count the cost.

What in the nature of "persistent cavilling," "Patria" can find in the steady adherence of England to the position she has assumed in regard to the Congress, I am at a loss to understand. Russia claims to herself, by the San Stefano Treaty, the virtual dictatorship of Europe.

England says, "No. Assembled Europe has sanctioned certain treaties, and recognised a certain balance of power, and to Europe in Congress you must submit unreservedly the question of the life or death of an European power."

Nothing is simpler, or more consistent, than the attitude taken by England, and not all the wriggling and finessing of Asiatic cunning has been able to conquer the simple dignity of its integrity.

The proof of the pudding, however, is in the eating. What has been the upshot of the so-called "warlike" policy of the present Government? The probable averting of war.

What was the upshot of the feeble, vacillating, goody-goody policy of the Aberdeen Government, which had the handling of the Eastern question in 1853? War.

It is the most transparent trick of party blindness to say that if war be averted it will be "not by the policy of the Government, but in spite of it."

The fact is, the present is emphatically the day of "big battalions" and "blood and iron."

And had England been so misguided as to enter upon the discussion of this Eastern question without adequate warlike preparation, she would have been laughed at. Russia would have deliberately slapped her in the face, and then she would have been goaded into a war ten times more disastrous in its commencement than the Crimean war was, and with but slender prospect of the victorious, although too barren, result of that conflict.

Lord Beaconsfield, whatever his failings, has rendered his country, and I believe the whole civilised world, an immense service by his manly attitude throughout this crisis; and I believe the verdict of history, whatever present doubts may be thrown upon his policy, will eventually endorse this view of what may be the closing achievements of a great career.

In conclusion, let me say that I greatly admire "Patria's" power of belief in the efficacy of "arbitration to decide national issues." After our late experiences anent the Fisheries Award, one might be pardoned for regarding this solution of vexed questions with a wholesome degree of doubt. We may depend upon it that the day has not come, by many a long century, when national causes shall be judged, not by the degree of physical power which backs them up, but by the abstract right and justice that they can lay claim to. People are strangely blind who imagine that mere talk and gushing professions of mutual regard count for one fig when matters of material interest are at issue. "Might is right" will probably be the most potent truth in human affairs to the end of man's career upon earth.

PATRIA TOO.

THE AMERICAN SILVER DOLLAR—A POPULAR DELUSION DISPELLED.

"And lo! it was all a dream."

SIR,—I read with amazement the extraordinary articles which appeared in the SPECTATOR in defence of the new dollar in the United States; and was lost in the haze of Mr. Brown's arguments in favour of this cure for "all the ills that flesh is heir to." I was not convinced, and I continued to differ from Mr. Brown *toto caelo*. His notion that this "beautiful, shining piece of silver" was, by some extraordinary underground railroad, likely to find its way into Canada, and was afraid to question the wisdom or sanity of Congress in passing the Silver Bill, and I knew that the Cincinnati *Commercial* had said that as soon as the issue of the dollar was authorized it would jingle in the pockets of the people everywhere, and its sound would renew confidence, and set the wheels of commerce again in motion, &c., &c.

Alas! Mr. Brown's glowing picture has its reverse side; the pet dollar is unpopular amongst the very portion of the community which was said to be so eager for it. In the New York *Evening Post* of 31st ult. we are told:—

"What is the result? The Silver Bill has been a law almost three months, but who wants any of the dollars, or who has any of them? For a few days after their first issue a few of them were in demand as pocket pieces, but the demand soon ceased. Our despatch of Wednesday from Washington shows that with more than five millions of the dollars on hand, certificates issued, \$313,000 have been paid back at once into the Treasury, the only use made of them being to save the difference in their value and that of gold in paying customs duties. The Treasury is therefore in a quandary what to do with the coin on hand. The law them they will only accumulate to encumber the Treasury vaults. Secretary Sherman hopes to get them out by distributing them in the country districts, but the country districts are precisely the places where a cumbersome coin is most unpopular. The United States Treasurer wherever they may be called for; but unless a demand which does not now exist is created for them this plan will not be effective, and the Government can only get rid of them by paying them in the way of salaries and to contractors."

It seems that of all the shams which Congress is responsible for, the scheme of the remonetization of silver, and the coinage of this unpopular dollar will probably prove the worst. The coin on its first appearance was stigmatized by one of the English papers as a "white lie," and it seems doubtful whether it can be let off even so cheaply as that.

NUMMUS.

THE FUTURE LIFE.

SIR,—It is possible that some of your readers may not have perceived fully what is involved in the fact that man's *will* is really his *life*; nor the inevitable conclusions in regard to the future existence which must result from it. Future life is simply an expansion of our present existence.

"That which may be known of God is manifest to us, for God hath showed it to us. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by (or through) the things that are made." So says St. Paul; and we are justified by the whole tenor of the Bible in reasoning from things natural to things spiritual till we gain, by the study of material things, true and rational light regarding our spiritual powers. This Physical world is but the "shadow of things to come." Every rock or mineral, every ocean and river, every mountain and valley, every tree and flower, every bird and animal, every insect and butterfly, are but the patterns or symbols of things and existences in that spiritual realm in which they find their *raison d'être*. Man himself in the present state of physical existence is, as regards his body, composed of material substances which we can analyze, examine and separate into their component parts. Kill him, and the dead body retains still all its physical substances. Yet not a limb, not an eyelid even retains one iota of *life*. That has left its every fibre. The real complete man, therefore, must be wholly spiritual, and spiritual in every part. Man, in fact, must have—or rather man *is*—a spiritual form inhabiting every organ of his physical body. This spirit, therefore, is not without form and void, but underlies every portion of him to the minutest nerve or organ,—a corresponding spiritual form as real, substantial and recognizable to other spiritual men as his physical form is to its fellow men. When, therefore, the *glove* of matter is withdrawn from the spiritual hand, that spiritual hand still exists, none the less a hand, nor in any way deprived of its power or deftness. Man, therefore, exists now as a spirit within a physical covering, drawing to himself, from the Great Source of all Life, spiritual life whereby to animate and use the physical frame which he inhabits while in this world. Is this an irrational or unscriptural belief? "In God (or from God) we live and move and have our being" was quoted by St. Paul at Athens from one of the ancient Poets, and confirmed by him as true regarding himself and other men living in this material world.

The change, therefore, from the present life to the future state of existence is not so great as some suppose. It is but the continuance of our present life, with powers and facilities for working out our will, as much excelling our present powers as will and intellect excel matter. Is this extended power a rational conclusion? Does any one in this age of great engineering exploits, railways, electric telegraphs and telephones need to be told of the transcendent power and of mind over matter even in this world where the will must, perforce, act on and through matter?

Behold then the tenderness, the infinite gentleness and compassion of our Creator and Saviour in beginning the development of our spiritual faculties in a material world. Here in this world, clothed in the grosser form of matter, we learn to use them more safely, because our powers are limited by our physical form. Mis-use of these powers here does indeed bring that consequent misery which is the inevitable result of departure from the laws of our being; but that misery is tempered and lessened by our feebleness in working out our will. The lesson is more easily learned. The wrong more readily righted. The spiritual man within us sees and feels at once where error tends, can cease at once to do that evil physically by ceasing to *will* to do it, thus ceasing to do it spiritually also. Thus physical good and evil are readily discerned "by their fruits," and spiritual good and evil in the inner will, or life, because at once perceptible. Thus we are gently, tenderly taught by a tempered, though often