

Disunionist agitators, who in fact have never shown real zeal in the cause of practical reform, even of such a practical reform as Disestablishment, preferring to let grievances remain in existence that there might be fuel for disaffection. To Coercion he has been even above measure opposed, and one of the most doubtful steps in his career is the vote which he gave against the Coercion Bill of Sir Robert Peel on that night on which the great Free Trade Ministry was overthrown by a coalition of the Whigs and Liberals with the Tory Protectionists bent on revenge for the repeal of the Corn Laws. But he has done all this from love of the right not because he wanted the Irish Vote. Therefore when the right changes sides he changes sides also, and no doubt if it were to change sides again, again he would be "a renegade." His downright deliverance of truth and justice is odious and confounding not only to Parnellites but to that class of politicians whose character is a compound of metaphysics with intrigue, and whose policy on the Irish question may be described as a philosophic pursuit of the Irish Vote. To fasten upon John Bright the charge of Jingoism will not be so easy. Of him, at all events, it may safely be said that he would rather that his country should become the least of all the nations than that it should remain the greatest through injustice. As a Liberal and a friend of humanity he is not bound to leave out of sight the consequences which would follow to European civilization from the dismemberment and destruction of the foremost of Liberal powers. But he knows very well what to Ireland as well as to Great Britain would be the result of Separation. He knows that instead of an increase of liberty there would infallibly ensue a tyranny of demagogues; that this would be followed by a war of races and religions; that the relations between the two islands after the divorce would be hostile from the beginning; that hostility would end in an open quarrel, and that re-conquest with all its attendant calamities would close the scene.

SINCE the strange manifesto of the *Pall Mall Gazette* upholding the vested interests of prostitution, misgiving must have arisen in the minds of high ecclesiastics as to their wisdom in identifying themselves with an editor who with passionate eloquence describes himself as "standing in the belfry of the world and ringing a tocsin whose peal clashes discordant upon the ear of civilized mankind." Nor will they, who have no interest in the circulation or the advertisements of any journal, be much reassured by the gratifying announcements that this collection of "awful truths" was "reprinted in America before it was reprinted in England"; that "of English reprints, authentic and pirated, over a million and a-half have already been sold"; that "one hundred thousand copies have been sold in Paris, where the report has been reproduced in book form, as well as in innumerable newspapers"; that "it has been translated into Danish, and is now in course of republication in German, Russian and Polish." We can conceive nothing more decisive as to the real motives of the *Pall Mall* than this boasting. Supposing the revelations to be necessary in order to awaken the conscience of the nation in which the vices prevail, what ground or excuse can there be for disseminating the filth over other communities? This reflection may perhaps occur to the excellent Bishop of Durham who, in an article in the *Contemporary* on "The White Cross," defends the conduct of the *Pall Mall*, though in so doing he associates himself, it should be remembered, not only with the publication of unclean matter, but with the deadly and cowardly practice of half-veiled libel. We are not sure that in these questions ecclesiastics are our best guides, though they are laudably anxious to put themselves at the head of moral movements, and thus to strengthen the hold of the Church upon the people. Their strong convictions as to the general depravity of human nature are not favourable to exact measurement of the evil with which they have to deal. In the language of the pulpit and in the imagination of the preacher the whole community becomes guilty of acts which are really confined to the few, and London is a Babylon or a Gomorrah because in some dark dens of the city with a population of four millions nameless vices have made their lair. The minister of religion feels himself, as it were, placed in direct and personal antagonism to the Power of Evil, whom he thinks of attacking only with spiritual weapons. But the Power of Evil, as well as the Power of Good, acts through secondary causes, with which we are practically concerned, the careful study of which is the indispensable condition of success, and with which wisdom will often deal in a manner such as the General of the Salvation Army would denounce as a compromise with vice. The redundancy of a fierce and dangerous but natural passion, and the circumstances of a wealthy and luxurious society, are sources of mischief which no ringing of tocsins in any belfry, editorial or ecclesiastical, will do much to remove. Violent and spasmodic treatment of a social malady sometimes only drives in the eruption and makes bad worse. Theology denounces sin, but science must investigate disease, and frequently that is in part disease which theology can only look

upon as sin. A heavy responsibility would no doubt attach to any one who should attempt to suppress truth, however hideous, if its publication could lead to reform, above all in a case in which the treatment of women was concerned. But the means of regular, trustworthy and decent investigation were not wanting, nor, so far as we can see, had the Government and Parliament shown any indisposition to use them. We feel confident, for our part, that the almost unanimous decision of the Press, both in England and on this Continent, against the republication of these scandals has been wise, as it certainly has been disinterested. That no good purpose could have been served by sending through our streets a host of newsboys with their arms full of filth to be thrust into the hands of persons of all ages and both sexes is at least an opinion which we may be permitted to hold without exposing ourselves to the imputation of sympathy with monstrous vice.

BOSSUET eloquently, and with effect, dilated on the divisions of Protestants. Cardinal Manning seems to have been treating the same delightful theme, and perhaps with almost equal eloquence. If in religious discussion retorts were of any value Protestantism might not lack materials for a retort. The unity of Rome is not perfect, nor has she really remained unchanged. Widely different is the spirit of her earlier doctors from that of the Jesuits and Ultramontanes of the present day. Bossuet, as a Gallican, would now be under a ban: under a ban died the chivalrous champion of free Catholicism, Montalembert, and no one can suppose that the acceptance of Papal Infallibility by Bishop Strossmeyer was anything but an outward submission. But it would be curious to hear what Cardinal Manning had to say about the practical effects of perfect unity of faith in the case of Spain. The fearful ravages of cholera in that country are mainly the consequences of a total neglect of cleanliness and of all sanitary precaution which strikes the eye of every traveller. And whence does that neglect arise? Has it not probably the same root as the indolence, the ignorance and the superstition which are also characteristics of Spain? Apologists for the Spanish Inquisition tell us that it saved Spain from religious war which was the lot of those countries in which the Reformation was allowed to acquire strength; a singular plea, since it treats as totally out of the question the idea that the Church of Rome might have obeyed the precepts of Christ and forborne attempting to exterminate with the sword those who conscientiously differed from her in opinion. Religious war it is true was avoided, though at the cost of atrocities more hideous and more depraving to national character than any war. Unity was preserved by force; but what has enforced unity produced? In the earlier period of her history Spain gave every promise of greatness. Why was her promise not fulfilled? Why did she sink after the complete triumph of the orthodox faith within her realms to the very lowest place among the nations? Of her wealth, an enormous portion was devoted to the enrichment of the Church and monastic orders; the very palace of her kings was half a monastery: why was she not blessed in proportion to her orthodoxy and her piety? Her sons lacked neither the spirit of enterprise nor the sinew for achievement; why then did her colonization produce nothing better than Mexico? If the decadence had been only material, not moral, the Church might perhaps have been able to ascribe it to untoward accident and wash her hands of it; but the annals of Spain from the triumph of the Inquisition over heresy down to the commencement of the revolutionary movement are not less full of moral degradation than of material wretchedness. Hope of national regeneration has dawned with the diminution, by advancing Liberalism, of Church influence and with the confiscation of Church domains. This surely affords a fruitful subject for study as well as the divisions of the Protestant Churches.

"DEATH—AND AFTERWARDS" is the title of an article by Mr. Edwin Arnold in the *Fortnightly*. The theme is attractive, but the writer does little more than dally with it in graceful style and in a half-poetical vein. His most serious argument is that thought and will are forces, and that we must suppose them to be included with all other kinds of force in the general law of conservation. This will not help us much. We have no reason to believe that thought and will in men as mere forces are essentially different from thought and will in animals; and we are certain that among the most forcible, both of thinkers and of writers, have been some of the worst and most noxious of mankind. But what we mean by immortality is the continuance after death of our individual and conscious being, not the conservation under other forms and perhaps in other animals of the matter and force of which our organism is composed. No tracing of transformations and transfigurations in nature therefore affords us any comfort or in any way corresponds to our hopes. The spirit finds no satisfaction whatever in the thought that its elements will re-appear and perhaps be scientifically traceable in the kneaded clod. The momentous thing, however, is the