

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$1.00 per annum. United States & Europe—\$2.00. Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Rev. James T. Foley, B.A. Associate Editors: Rev. F. J. O'Sullivan, H. F. Mackintosh. Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to be made in advance. Where CATHOLIC RECORD is sent by mail, postage is required. Each insertion 10 cents. Usual notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 10 cents.

Approved and recommended by Archbishop Palumbo and St. Charles, late Apostolic Delegate to Canada, the Archbishop of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion. The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and convey for the CATHOLIC RECORD: General agents: M. J. Hagarty, Vincent St. Catharines, and Miss Jeanne Dore, resident agents: Mrs. W. E. Smith, Halifax; Mrs. E. Saunders, Sydney; Miss T. Hogan, Windsor; E. R. Costello, 2266 5th Ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.; Silas Johnson, 211 Rochester St., Ottawa; Miss Rose McKeown, 149 D'Aquila St., Quebec; Mrs. G. W. Smith, 2828 St. Urban St., Montreal; M. J. McKeown, Montreal; B. J. O'Donnell, Lethbridge, Sask.; E. J. Murphy, Box 135, Saskatoon. In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. A. McNeil, 510 Main Street, and John J. Dwyer. In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore. In Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Millor, 241 St. Catherine St. West.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1919

RELIGIOUS RECONSTRUCTION

Reconstruction in its various phases is a much discussed topic at the present time. In so far as it is a question of readjusting the relations between capital and labor, or of reincorporating into the commercial life of the country those who for the past few years have been engaged as its defenders, the Catholic Church has a deep and lasting interest. When problems such as these are clamoring for solution, Catholics cannot and are not remaining mere passive spectators. There is, however, a form of reconstruction in which we have no part, namely the reconstruction in religion, which is being so much spoken of, and even attempted, outside the Catholic Church. The keynote of this movement is non-dogmatic, inter-denominationalism, or, to translate it into simpler language, a sort of union of the various sects, involving the sacrifice of positive doctrinal teaching.

Church union understood in its proper sense, is indeed a consummation devoutly wished by all Catholics; but, as far as the Catholic Church is concerned, there is and can be but one possible basis of union, namely, not the discarding of true dogmas but rather the acceptance without reserve or exception of all the Church's teachings.

Whilst non-Catholic bodies may, perchance, find other means of effecting a union among themselves, the Catholic Church has one only means. It is that of her Divine Founder, namely unconditional surrender. The fact is, that the Catholic Church is the one true Church, instituted by Christ, the one ark of salvation. Hence the only union in which she can be involved, demands the unreserved acceptance of all the principles of faith and discipline for which she stands. A father can make concessions to a wayward son, but he can never cease to be the father. If religious reconstruction, in which the Catholic Church is included, there must be, it can only be on lines laid down by the Father of Christendom, the Sovereign Pontiff.

Unfortunately, this so-called ecclesiastical reconstruction, as it attains in the ranks of our separated brethren, might better be called "ecclesiastical destruction." As a recent phase of this movement, there occurred an event, calculated to shock the orthodox, namely the appearance of an actress in Worcester Cathedral in response to an invitation to give a recital from the Bible.

A writer in the Westminster Gazette observes regarding this incident, that "confusion is worse confounded, by the description given to us this morning of yesterday's service in Worcester Cathedral, at which Miss Lena Ashwell, who occupied a canon's stall, recited five passages of Scripture from the lectern within the chancel rails."

As a sample of "reconstructive" utterances in the matter of morality, we find the Bishop of Birmingham voicing opinions regarding birth-control which have been loudly welcomed by the disciples of Malthus. Thus Mr. Harold Cox, a thorough-going advocate of public instruction in "the most convenient method of preventing the procreation of unwanted children," writes:—

"Malthus himself was a clergyman of the Church of England, and though his general appeal was for what he called moral restraint, he plainly said that where this was unattainable the prudential check was better than premature mortality. Many other clergymen have taken the same view, and it is a notable fact—on which

the Dean of St. Paul's, has effectively commented—that of late years, the birth rate in the families of clergy-men has become lower than that in almost any other class of the community. The prudential limitation of families is, however, still bitterly opposed by the Church of Rome and by the Romishly inclined members of the Church of England."

Yet another episode of reconstruction occurred a few weeks ago when the pastor of a New York church, upon the unanimous vote of his congregation, declared that his church would henceforth be creedless and non-dogmatic, to the extent that a Buddhist or a follower of Mohammed might occupy its benches alongside of Hebrews or Christians.

This is indeed reconstruction with a vengeance. Nevertheless it manifests the logical outcome of the revolt of the sixteenth century, for as Cardinal Newman said, there is no halfway house between Catholicism and Agnosticism.

THE CHURCH AND ALSACE-LORRAINE

The fate of the Church in the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, should these again come under French sway, has been a matter of speculation since the commencement of the War. Now, however, that these provinces have become definitely re-incorporated in the French Republic, it remains to be seen whether the Church there will be despoiled and persecuted as in France. Doubtless the French Government would have carried out this same policy in the regained districts had not all classes therein taken vigorous means to make Paris realize that a modification of this anti-religious programme must be made in their regard. The political unions, founded by the inhabitants to safeguard their religious and civil rights, have accomplished more in the matter of religious freedom, in four months, than the Catholics of France have accomplished in forty years.

Nevertheless, it is a question whether or not the Government in respecting the rights of the Church in these provinces is merely following a policy of opportunism calculated to calm the fears and overcome the distrust of the solidly Catholic inhabitants, meanwhile meditating a repetition of what it has done in France. One cannot then afford to wax eloquent over the Government's change of heart, with the dubious words in mind of Mr. Millerand's declaration on the religious question shortly after his arrival at Strasbourg. He said:

"For the moment, the Concordat continues, but little by little, Alsace and Lorraine will enter into all the forms of French legislation. The President of the Republic and the President of the Council, Marshal Joffre, have spoken words which guarantee the liberty, customs and beliefs; this promise will be kept by me."

One delicate question, however, has been amicably settled to the satisfaction of all parties concerned, namely the appointment of bishops to the Sees of Metz and Strasbourg, rendered vacant by the resignations of Bishops Beuzler and Fritzen. These prelates, who are of German origin, for the sake of religious peace, placed their rights at the disposition of the Holy See. Thereupon the French Government, following the terms of the Concordat of 1801, nominated, with the approval of the Holy See, Right Rev. Charles Joseph Eugene Ruch, Bishop of Nancy, to the See of Strasbourg, and to the Bishopric of Metz, its Vicar-General, Mgr. John Baptist Pelt.

These nominations have been everywhere hailed as unexceptionable. Mgr. Ruch of Strasbourg has the double merit of being Alsatian by birth and of having rendered conspicuous service to France during the War. Mgr. Pelt, the Bishop-elect of Metz, has also a record which holds out hopes for the future. During his term as Vicar-General of Metz, he stood forth under German rule as the fearless and faithful defender of the rights of the French population of the diocese. When the day of deliverance arrived, he it was who welcomed the French troops in the name of the people of Lorraine.

The Echo of Paris points out that, as the French Government would not have risked making these appointments without having previously approached the Holy Father on the matter, it follows that France has at least had some sort of conversation with the Vatican. Thus a step has possibly been taken towards re-establishing with the Vatican the diplomatic relations so discourteously discontinued in 1904 by the dismissal of the Papal Legate.

The Tablet comments as follows upon the question: "Upon the larger and future bearings of the incident we need say little for they are almost too obvious to call for remark. If Rome has need of France, France has, to say the least, equal need of Rome, and, as Cardinal Gasparri has said, she is too great a personage to enter the Vatican by a back door. If the Pope's love for France were doubted, she has his recent declaration of it, which was surprising in its warmth; and now, in the acceptance and ratification of the candidates proposed by her for the bishoprics in the two redeemed provinces, she has a practical and material proof of the reality of that love, and of a readiness to treat with her for the interests of her people without reference to the bitter memories of past ill-treatment. From this preliminary conversation and understanding much benefit may flow to France. It is to be the first step that counts and counts, that step has been taken, and it is none the less creditable to Paris because it had to be taken. This first step, therefore, is a step along the right road. If that method be also applied to the school difficulty a further cause of anxiety to the Catholics of the two provinces will be removed and religious peace assured."

Of more than passing interest to Catholics is the recent press despatch from Cologne which states that the entire German episcopate, headed by Cardinal Hartmann, the Archbishop of Cologne, has requested Pope Benedict to use his good offices in securing a mitigation of the terms of peace and to intervene in the situation between the Allied Powers and Germany, in order to protect the latter from the complete breakdown which threatens her. The appeal furthermore states that the peace conditions would mean the total ruin of Germany and would be a cruel violation of the rights of the seventy million inhabitants of that country.

There is a certain nemesis about this piteous petition to the Holy Father when contrasted with the erstwhile confident utterances to the contrary of the haughty consolidator of Prussian militarism, Prince von Bismarck. He it was who, having torn away Sleschwig-Holstein from Denmark, South Germany from Austria, and Alsace-Lorraine from France, whilst at the zenith of his power, tried to conquer the unconquerable Church of Christ.

All Germany was then enthusiastic over the new-born imperial unity. Militarism was supreme. It seemed, therefore, that the psychological moment had come to stamp out that Church which steadfastly refused to be shackled as a creature of the State and to be used as a political tool. The Church, thought Bismarck, should only be under the supervision of the State and should politically serve its purposes.

Bismarck's anti-Catholic policy soon led to the inauguration of a period of persecution for the Catholics of Germany. Bishops, including Cardinal Ledochowski of Gnesen-Posen, were cast into prison; and priests and nuns exiled. The remonstrances of Pius IX. were repulsed by the famous boast: "Nach Canossa gehen wir nicht." (We shall not go to Canossa, or, in other words, we shall not go to the Pope.)

Canossa is the name of a castle in the Apennines, about eighteen miles from Parma, where took place the dramatic penance of King Henry IV. of Germany, in the presence of Pope Gregory VII. The King, excommunicated February 22nd, 1076, would have been utterly abandoned by the German princes unless he made his peace with the Father of Christendom. The Pope, hearing that Henry was in the neighborhood, feared for his own safety and took refuge in the impregnable and almost inaccessible burg of Canossa. Henry, however, did not meditate any harm to the Pope. He really wished to perform the penance necessary to lift the excommunication. For three days (25-27 January) he stood constantly before the castle gate, in the dress of a penitent, beseeching with many tears the Pope's forgiveness, which Gregory, moved by his compunction, finally granted.

Lutheran Germany, then, which but a few years ago proclaimed to the world as its watchword—"We shall not go to Canossa," now goes thither in very deed, and with tears beseeches the successor of that same Pius IX., whose requests for toleration were so rudely repulsed, to intercede for her in this hour of trial

and affliction. That Germany, which a short while ago cast a cardinal and bishops into prison for their attachment to the Chair of Peter, now urges a cardinal and his episcopal brethren to plead with the present occupant of that same chair to speak in her behalf.

This is but one of the many such instances which history affords of that supernatural strength, given by God to His Church on her Pentecostal birthday, whereby she is enabled to survive all the storms and persecutions which have been raised against her, and ultimately to triumph over her enemies.

The famous Napoleon is an outstanding example of this same fact—"What!" he explained when notified of the sentence of excommunication pronounced against him, "Can it make the muskets drop from the hands of my soldiers?" A few years later and in that disastrous retreat of his troops from Moscow, that retreat which marked the beginning of the downfall of Napoleon, the muskets did drop from the frozen hands of his men.

DRESS AND MORALS

By THE REAPER

The dress problem is as old as original sin. In the history of the human family the influence of the fashion-plate has always been recognized for good or for bad. To analyse man's craving for dress would be as difficult as to account for his primitive instinct for ornamentation. The costume of Helen of Troy and Cleopatra of Egypt contributed in no small measure to the witchery they exercised over the men of their time. It is said of a noted general of the last century that civilian attire took all the light out of him, and that he could only get back his martial spirit when he arayed himself in military uniform. Mindful that dress appeals to man's imagination and affects his sentiments woman has led the fashions since the Fall.

The nuances in dress and the varieties in fashion are a reflection of her ever-changing tastes and predilections. Love of dress is a feminine instinct that easily runs into a passion. Restaurant teas, tango teas, ball rooms, music halls, bridge parties, "first nights" at the theatre, and race course meets, reveal an innate weakness in woman which the tyranny of fashion uses to shameful effect. To the unsophisticated the patrons of all these assemblies appear like star performers at a gayety theatre, whereas their morals may be as different from their dress as a mushroom is from a toadstool. They claim they are largely the victims of circumstances; that they are forced to wear vulgar and immodest dress unless they have the time and possess the art to make their own costumes. While this may be true in some instances, it cannot be true generally. For, despite the declension in female decency both as regards dress and deportment it can yet be maintained that a vast number of good women still remain, who, if stimulated with a high sense of sisterly love, can wrest the fashion-plate from the demimonde of Paris, and bring back feminine attire to the law of order, simplicity, proportion and harmony. But no; they follow a false rule of ethics by presuming that all is decent that the best people adopt. They seem to forget that in a spirit of worldliness we often accept the manners and ways of the idle rich out of respect for their wealth more than their morals.

If we take into account the curves, variations and excesses of the sartorial art without a single thought to suitability or artistic effect, it can readily be seen to what pagan extremes dressmaking has gone. If as is generally admitted the function of dress is to protect and comfort the body by concealing the form with garments that add to its shapeliness, dignity and modesty, it cannot but be apparent to everybody that that office has been woefully vitiated. The present modes of dress reveal rather than conceal and expose rather than protect; for those are the days of unblushing naturalism. The whole tendency in feminine apparel is down-grade. In order to lure the eye and furnish sex attraction there is nudity of busts and arms as in the days of pagan Rome. Dress nowadays is made a disguise for lasciviousness.

Modesty and refinement are so sacrificed on the altar of fashion that it is almost impossible to distinguish a decent woman from a drab. The most respectable lady in the land because of her freakish attire may be mistaken for an underworld specimen. O tempora! O mores! Woman

is the natural custodian of morals and the defender of modesty. How can she guard this sacred trust which nature and society have confided to her if she dresses in a manner to invite curiosity and arouse the lower instincts of youth?

By all means, dress in good taste, conform to the canons of comfort and beauty. A garment can be graceful and useful without being dowdy. Let parents have a say and exercise a little common-sense in the dress their daughters wear. Let their attire serve the interests of good morals. The Christian proprieties and decencies should never be invaded by the fashion-plate. Dress is a weapon of purity or impurity in as much as it can be either becoming or shameless.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

IN THE estimation of the Washington Post, Herr Ebert's threat to turn Germany once more loose upon the Allies would have more weight if he did not wear paper clothes, a blotting-paper derby, isinglass spectacles, sea-weed socks, pulp shoes, and a near-rubber collar. Than which acute observation there could be no more effective tribute to the effectiveness of the great blockade.

IF THERE is one city in North America more than another that prides itself on being in the very forefront of civilization it is Los Angeles. With its salubrious climate and its facilities for luxurious living the Southern Californian city may not ineptly be termed the Mecca of the well-to-do. A recent visitor, just returned—one possessing a keen and highly impressionable mind—gives it as his experience that one of the outstanding features of Los Angeles life is the scarcity of children. If we are to accept this as an indication of "high civilization," the world might better relapse into barbarism.

IN THE pathetic passage with which Lord Morley ends his recently published "Recollections" there is a note of anxious doubt and enquiry. He says: "A painful interrogatory I must confess, emerges. Has not your school—the Darwins, Spencers, Rennans, and the rest—held the civilized world, both old and new alike, in the hollow of their hand for two long generations past? Is it quite clear that their influence has been so much more potent than the gospel of the various churches? Circumspice."

LORD MORLEY himself has been termed the "high priest of agnosticism." No man certainly has done more (though withal in terms of refinement and urbanity) to undermine belief in Christianity. Evidently, as with so many others, the evening of life has brought with it doubt and misgiving as to its outcome. Had Lord Morley a clearer vision, or were his horizon not clouded by the maze of uncertainties and contradictions presented by the eclectic Christianity of his day and country he might discern the true remedy. As it is he but joins the great company of the disenchanting.

THE THREAT of the Italian delegates to withdraw from the Peace Conference unless Italy is assigned the territory she claims is designated by New Europe as "deliberate blackmail." The fulfillment of the threat would, in the estimation of the same periodical, "reveal its authors in their true colors as the leaders of European reaction, and unworthy of admission to the new League of Nations." This is strong language which is hardly likely to find universal endorsement. But coming from a land which accorded to Mazzini the highest reaches of hero worship and placed an aureole about the brow of Giordano Bruno it is at least instructive. New Europe qualifies its remark to the extent of saying that Italy as a nation fought for ideal motives, has nothing in common with the "sacred egoism" of its rulers, and "may be trusted to deal faithfully with the men who thus exposed it to an unmerited affront." Would it not be well for this philosopher and those who think with him to at the same time revise their ideas as to the position of the Holy Father?

ASKS THE REV. EDWARD SHILLITO in the Sunday Times: "Is there a religion great enough to gather into it all the truth and light diffused throughout the world and to bring the scattered fragments into one final spiritual unity? Is there any-

where a centre to which all nations may come? There is one in such where truth has ever existed in its integrity, in contradistinction to the "scattered fragments" which have fallen from the exercise of a perverted sense of human freedom. And there is a centre to which all nations may rally—one whose portals are ever open to receive them.

MR. ROBERT SELLAR of the Huntingdon Gleaner is nothing if not a mental hypochondriac. For well nigh two generations he has been filling the land with his wall in regard to an imaginary conspiracy in Quebec to crowd out its English-speaking and non-Catholic population. Its latest emanation is a fourth edition of his book, "The Tragedy of Quebec," which is nothing more or less than an ill-disguised attack upon the priesthood of that Province. The best refutation of Sellar's monomania (for it amounts to that) is the testimony of other English-speaking residents of Quebec—members of Parliament, journalists, private citizens of position and influence, not excluding members of the Protestant clergy—that they never met with other than kindly and courteous treatment at the hands of their French-speaking neighbors and that in the matter of civil rights they have had even more than their share. The fact that Mr. Sellar has an Ontario audience, of a kind, which has ear for his grudge, and is willing to pay for it, is perhaps the real solution of his "fourth edition."

BRITISH PRUSSIANISM

MERCILESSLY EXPOSED BY EMINENT ENGLISHMAN

THE PRINCIPLE OF LIBERTY

To the Editor of the Times.

Sir,—No one has ventured to propose in your columns that Ireland should be given freedom to choose its own form of government. I hope you will allow me to do so. There is an unreality in the discussion of a question of national freedom when the word self-determination, now shaking and remoulding the world, is systematically evaded, and when it is known that the Irish people itself is now claiming this very right, and pronounced for independence by an overwhelming majority in the elections of last December. Irrevocable things have happened in Ireland during the last five years; things it is useless to be discreetly silent about in the hope of reviving the dead embers of the constitutional movement for Home Rule. The Convention of 1917 is buried among these dead embers. Interesting expedient as it was, and valuable work as it did, it never had any pretence to being an organ of self-determination. It contained no representative of the party which afterwards swept Ireland in the elections, and it was literally kicked into oblivion by its own authors, the War Cabinet, when they announced conscription on the day the Chairman presented its Report. Sir Horace Plunkett wisely recognizes that it is impossible now to build upon that Report, and ranges himself with other advocates of Dominion Home Rule.

But even the Dominion Home Rulers seem to shrink from the logic of their own generous convictions. Do they really propose for Ireland the full Dominion status of a sister nation, with the free choice inherent in that status of seceding from the Empire, if ideals or interests diverge? If they do not mean it; if they are unwilling to recognize that this power of choice is the living essence of freedom, and is the very thing that gives vitality and permanence to the Imperial relationship; if they prescribe compulsion in the background and propose to proceed by way of an imposed Act, do not they perceive the peril of encountering all the old political obstructions in an intensified form and of ending in the old heart-breaking sterility? But if they do mean the full Dominion status, with free choice inherent in it, why not begin by asking Ireland to choose?

By free choice I mean a decision made after the complete withdrawal of the army of occupation, the restoration of civil liberty, and a pledge, registered with the League of Nations, that armed British force would never again be employed to uphold any form of government in Ireland as a whole or in any part of it. The use of external force, parent and sustainer of all Irish internal divisions, would be finally repudiated and Ireland would make her choice with the primary immunities of a Dominion guaranteed. So much could and should be done without an Act.

Is it certain that the choice would be for independence? I only venture to affirm that under these conditions alone it is still possible to achieve the aim of a self-governed Ireland within the Empire. To the great majority of Irishmen Great Britain now signifies "Prussianism" incarnate, and with good reason. Acceptance of the Empire would involve an almost miraculous revulsion of sentiment. On the other hand, the conditions I have named would imply an equally profound

revelation of sentiment on the part of Great Britain, a reversal of immemorial policy, and a *modus vivendi* that would touch the imagination of all mankind. No one can measure the result of these profound changes for good, beyond affirming that a new era of friendship and mutual respect between the two countries would be bound to follow. But there would be two incentives for something closer on the Irish side: the pressure which would probably come from the Dominion, and the urgent necessity of conciliating North-East Ulster, so as to ensure the utmost possible measure of unity in this "new birth of freedom." The materials for this reconciliation do not exist as long as a British army is able to sustain minority government in Ireland. They begin to exist when Irishmen, like other races, are thrown upon their own resources and have to choose between ruinous dissension and peaceful co-operation. A compromise placing Ireland in the position of Canada might well result. Close observers of the stubborn Ulster character, and its defiant attitude towards England, would not be dumfounded if the decision went further.

But action must be based not on anticipations, but on principle. Here is a principle—self-determination—whose efficacy it is idle at this point in history to deny, and to which Great Britain is in honor committed. The revolting scandal presented by Ireland at this moment cannot in common decency be permitted to last. Great Britain is making war, literally, on the principle of freedom. I think it is true to say that in no country has the innermost inspiration of a national movement been so divorced from materialistic motives or so pure an outcome of a people's passion as will to be master of its own soul and destiny. Force, simple force, is the reply; a military terror; machine-guns, tanks, bombing aeroplanes; soldiers ignorant of law dispensing justice by Court-martial; a rigid censorship; and permeating society, a host of those detestable if indispensable products of military government, police spies and informers.

Ireland is an almost crimeless country in the ordinary sense. Judge after judge has been receiving white gloves for a blank assize, while the Courts-martial fill the gaols with State-created criminals guilty, or suspected of being guilty, of offences, many grotesquely trivial, and all directly attributable to the absence of the first condition of an orderly society, a government chosen by the people. A very few, a marvellously few, serious crimes occur; for the whole system is an invitation, an incitement to crime. In truth, these people are in effect being challenged to something far more serious than sporadic crime, to action in which the inequality of force would lead to scenes that sicken the imagination. Before risking this terrible responsibility, the English people should make a final reckoning with their conscience.

Why do they keep Ireland in subjection? I mean fundamentally why. I think it will not be denied that the fundamental reason is "military necessity." It comes out clearly in the letters of Sir John Butcher and others of your correspondents, and they only give the expression to what has been the secular policy of Great Britain. Perhaps we should add "economic necessity," without making too much of Admiral Lordy's naive prophesy that the port of Liverpool would decay through the competition of a free and prosperous Ireland. But the economic argument, though widely used in disrepute, is not so fundamental and too crudely selfish to be decisive. We can concentrate on the common view that the independence of Ireland is impossible because it would endanger the safety of Great Britain.

I venture to oppose three considerations—two of principle, one of plain objective fact.

(1) It is denied that if any ideals lay behind the war against the Central Powers they were all summed up in the ideal of smashing this principle, that the supposed military necessities of a strong nation can be allowed to control the fate of a weak one? Let Sir John Butcher and his friends come into the open and either deny it or show overwhelming reasons for excluding Ireland from this just and merciful charter.

(2) Ireland is now the only white nationality in the world (save the unenvied possessions out of the discussion) where the principle of self-determination is not, at least in theory, conceded. It is the last of the "problems" which were left in 1914, and it is incomparably the simplest. It is simplicity itself compared with those resulting from the collapse of Russia, Austria, and Germany, where the intermixture of races speaking different tongues and the absence of clearly-defined or maritime boundaries do cause difficulties of real complexity. Nevertheless, Great Britain is fixing and guaranteeing the boundaries of these new States, of which so little is known here that the Prime Minister can joke in Parliament about his ignorance till yesterday of the position on the map of one of the numerous "Uistere." Is she in the same breath to decline to deal with Ireland, whose unimpaired historical identity and boundaries nobody can mistake? Ireland, the last unliberated white community on the face of the globe?

(3) Principle apart, would a free Ireland in fact be a danger to Great Britain? Great Britain's power at this moment probably exceeds that possessed by any nation in the history of the world. She can if she