

intensity. Another question forces itself upon us. What could not the *Œuvre Antiesclavagiste* have done, had it remained unsectarian, to destroy slavery in Africa, to improve the relations between all bodies of Christendom, to uphold some of the best interests of mankind and of civilization? It is with irrepressible melancholy that we contemplate possibilities that have been thwarted by unscrupulous sectarianism.

Cardinal Lavigerie is a great man, an adroit leader, one of the most distinguished representatives of the Roman Catholic Church, and one of the most liberal—though honest liberalism is no longer possible in that church. Few bishops have revealed more independence in reference to the Holy See, and probably none have burned more incense before it. His education, more rhetorical than scientific or philosophical, has prepared him for quick rather than prolonged action upon intelligent audiences. His addresses in England, Belgium, France and Switzerland sent a thrill of horror through his audiences as he related the harrowing scenes of carnage and barbarism attending the slave trade. The Cardinal stirs up the feelings of his hearers by the appropriate force of his utterances, the sympathetic glow that warms them, and the felicitous use of his surroundings. Still, his pictures of slavery are from documents rather than observation; it is easy to see that he has not witnessed the curse of man-hunting and man-selling that desolates Africa. His addresses are full of repetitions, not only of facts but of forms. Even his *beaux mots* are ever the same. Compare him with another anti-slavery orator whose voice was heard in England a quarter of a century ago. How witty, brilliant, quick and spontaneous was the American; how elaborate in method and restrained by religious forms is the French. How matter-of-fact was the Brooklyn preacher; how poetical and emotional is the primate of Africa. What singleness of purpose in the Plymouth pastor; what constant effort on the part of "the pastor of Africa" to win sympathy for the Church, the Pope and his missionaries. What absence of personal concern in the American patriot; what frequent allusions to age, to fatigue and self-sacrifice on the part of the Catholic philanthropist. The one, how modern in address, how fond of democratic simplicity; the other, how riveted to the past by his ideals, his ecclesiastical rank, his delight in high-sounding titles and aristocratic pretensions. The one must be humanitarian because he is a Christian; the other a Romanist because he is humanitarian. Both men have in common great popularity and great zeal for the highest interests of the colored race.

There are traits in Mgr. Lavigerie that we would not discuss. His shrewd diplomacy, his extensive land speculations, and his lotteries, permitted by the French Government on conditions that were not fulfilled, need no comment. His love of personal *mise*