

shewing the impossibility of such works as 'The Glory and Shame of England' being published without risk of detection and exposure, or in throwing any additional light on those questions which are now agitating the public on both sides of the Atlantic." I give a passage from the thirteenth chapter as a specimen of the writer's clear and vigorous style. Lister had asserted that "English liberty had its broadest foundations during," as he chose to call it, "Cromwell's splendid administration." *Libertas* then proceeds: "Now, we never knew any man who was a genuine friend of liberty, who admired Oliver Cromwell. With such persons you will invariably find that it is republicanism, not liberty, that they admire. It is not tyranny that they dislike, but monarchy. Cromwell was, like many republicans, a seeker of power. Republicanism was with him, as with Napoleon Bonaparte, the ladder by which he reached that power. Both kicked away the ladder when the power was attained. Will our author say," asks *Libertas*, "what stone was ever laid on the temple of freedom by Cromwell after he reached his elevation? He broke up the remains of the Rump Parliament with a military force, crying out as the last vestige of popular power disappeared, 'Take away that bauble.' He summoned another Parliament, consisting of his own creatures, who went such lengths in folly that even their master was ashamed of them." Then a little further on: "We have often been astonished to hear men, styling themselves democratical republicans, praising Napoleon Bonaparte. That unprincipled man went farther lengths than Cromwell; and yet because he was not born to royalty, and because he overturned ancient dynasties, he is still looked on with respect by republicans, and all his tyranny and ambition are forgotten. The splendid administration and splendid talents of these ambitious men, only rendered them more dangerous to the liberties and independence of nations. The solution of such strange inconsistency is plainly this: that many republicans are not favourable to liberty, and many understand nothing of its genuine principles. It is too readily assumed that republicanism is synonymous with freedom, but such is not necessarily the case. Oppression by a majority is just as much oppression as by a king or aristocracy; and the oppression becomes truly fearful, when that majority delegates its power to wicked and selfish men, and is so ignorant that it is not aware when that power is abused."