

of dissentient Liberals of the type of the Duke of Argyll, when they cry out that the new is not like the old, that they never meant anything of this kind, that the pace has become altogether too fast for them. Nothing is easier, we think, than to show that the New Liberalism is the logical outcome, the developed offspring of the Old. The Old Liberalism stood on its watch-tower and, as it observed what was going on in the minds and lives of the people, yielded a point here and gave a modified approval there. It heard, for instance, mutterings of discontent from the people in view of the limitation of the elective franchise, and it said, "They are right. The franchise is too low. Here is a class of men who are intelligent and patriotic, and who ought to have some voice in the choosing of those who shall make and execute the laws which govern them. We will cautiously extend the franchise." Again, Ireland was in a state of disorder, amounting almost to anarchy, caused, largely, by the unequal distribution of land, and the hardships in the shape of excessive rents, etc., which absentee landlords were inflicting upon the wretched peasants, who still competed fiercely for the possession of the small allotments, on terms which hardly sufficed to enable them to keep body and soul together. The old watch-tower Liberalism said, "The crime is great and smells to heaven. Desperate diseases require desperate remedies. The circumstances warrant us in interfering, for once, with freedom of contract between landlord and tenant. We will appoint a land commission, empowered to correct the more glaring cases of injustice and to compel heartless landlords to grant to their tenants fair rents, fair allowance for improvements, and fixity of tenure." And so the Old Liberalism went on, abating grievances, reforming abuses, curtailing excessive privileges, and above all extending the franchise, many of them, no doubt, looking forward to a time when all the more glaring causes of complaint would have been removed, and they could "rest and be thankful."

But how could this Old Liberalism have been so short-sighted as not to perceive that it was making innovations, conceding principles, establishing precedents, which would inevitably carry with them much wider consequences than those immediately contemplated. Tried by the standard of sound political economy, the interference of Parliament to change the relations between landlord and tenant either were right or they were wrong. We need not now attempt to decide that question. But the principle once granted, whether right or wrong, carried with it the possibility, may we not say the certainty, of all future land acts, evicted tenants bills, and whatever else has been and may yet be declared essential to the settlement of the land question in Ireland (and in England and Scotland). This settlement, be it observed, can be permanently made only on a basis satis-

factory to the majority of an universal-suffrage electorate, no matter what violence may be done in the process to the old notions of the rights of property and the privileges of hereditary classes.

This term "universal suffrage" is the key to the whole process. So long as it was tacitly taken for granted that the chief function of legislation and government was to provide for the protection of property, and that property was the thing to be represented in Parliament, the course was clear. But the moment the Old Liberalism began to admit in a cautious and tentative way that it was men, not property, that constitute the State, and that the franchise was a prerogative not of property but of citizenship, that moment the car of legislation was started on an inclined plane down which it has been gliding with accelerated speed ever since. Property and manhood are two things so distinct in kind that there can be no permanent coalition between them such that the franchise shall belong partly to the men, partly to the property. The two elements will not mix. One extension of the franchise, on the new basis, leads to another. There is no stopping place short of manhood suffrage, pure and simple. This goal is now in sight, in the one-man, one-vote, and one-vote, one-value, watch-words. The Old Liberalism should not complain of this. The clear-sighted among its leaders must surely have foreseen the end from the beginning of franchise extension.

But given universal suffrage, and what follows? Universal suffrage is democracy, and *Demos* is no respecter of persons. His ideas of the rights and duties of property, are also very different from those of owners and occupants. Just as surely as a Parliament, or a House of Parliament, which represents wealth and rank, will legislate in the interests of property and privilege, just so surely will a Parliament representing simple manhood legislate in the interests of labour and the masses, doing violence to the old ideas of the rights of property and embodying in legislation entirely new conceptions of its duties. Our point just now is that the Old Liberals should have foreseen the consequences when they set the ball rolling, and hence should not now complain. To suppose that the leaders, especially those whose environments and traditions tend to conservatism, are going to continue to lead, and to rule without having the people with them is unreasonable. Leaders may yet wield tremendous influence, but it will only be as they gain the confidence of the people and convince their judgments. They will have to come down from the watch-towers, and, mingling with the people, seek to understand them and to help them upwards.

But what of the future? What will be the end? That we do not here undertake to say. We are not without hope. We believe in optimism. But one thing Old

Liberals and New, and Liberal-Unionists, and Conservatives should all unite to do. They "must educate their masters!" The future depends upon what kind of masters these are.

## MR. GLADSTONE ON HERESY AND SCHISM.

Mr. Gladstone, with that astonishing versatility which is, perhaps, the secret of his sustained mental vigour, has once more turned his attention to theology, the subject which of all others possesses the greatest fascination ever his mind, and has contributed an article to the *Nineteenth Century* for August on the seemingly uninteresting subject of "Heresy and Schism." Before we read very far we find that the motive which gave birth to his essay is a desire to contribute something to the all-absorbing question of Christian unity, and therefore the theoretical discussion of the nature of Heresy and Schism issues in a practical appeal to Christian men.

It may not be known to all the readers of *THE WEEK*, that Mr. Gladstone is, and throughout the whole of his long career has been a decided and consistent High Churchman. It is this fact which lends a remarkable interest to the article before us. For although the phraseology is that of the Anglo-Catholic, the ideas are those of orthodox latitudinarianism.

The question is thus stated: Assuming our Lord to have founded a visible church with an apostolical ministry, which He intended to be perpetuated throughout the ages, what is to be done with those who deny the authority of the church, and separate themselves from her ministrations? The answer to this question involves a discussion of the nature of Heresy and Schism. At first, the nearness to Christ and the Apostles made "the unity of the church" a fact as patent to those who came into contact with it as the unity of the sun in heaven." The application of our Lord's rule, "if he refuse to hear the church let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the Publican," was easy. So long as the church was pure the command to "hear the church" was perfectly reasonable. But the corruption of the church itself weakens its authority, whilst its divisions engender doubt as to its whereabouts. With the utmost sincerity of purpose, one can well understand the perplexity of a modern seeker after the true church, when confronted by the claims of Greek, Roman and Anglican Catholicism. The sin of schism cannot now be easily assigned to any body of Christians. "The guilt of any offence," says Mr. Gladstone, "varies inversely with the strength and clearness of the evidence which establishes its criminality, and surely it is not to be denied that the evidence which condemns Heresy and schism has been greatly darkened, and therefore greatly weakened since the days of the apostles."

Mr. Gladstone thinks this to have been the case, even in the days of Arianism, and other heresies of the fourth and fifth centuries, but the difficulty of ascribing guilt to schismatics has been steadily increasing since the division of the churches of the East and the West in the eleventh, and the convulsions of the Reformation in the sixteenth century.

Mr. Gladstone is very much impressed by the solidity and stability of modern as compared with ancient sectarianism. Of the Gnostic, Arian, Donatist, and other schisms he says: "When we compare their