

## Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

Canadiana.org has attempted to obtain the best copy available for scanning. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of scanning are checked below.

Canadiana.org a numérisé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de numérisation sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- |                                     |   |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured covers /<br>Couverture de couleur  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured pages / Pages de couleur   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Covers damaged /<br>Couverture endommagée   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Pages damaged / Pages endommagées   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Covers restored and/or laminated /<br>Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Pages restored and/or laminated /<br>Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Cover title missing /<br>Le titre de couverture manque  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/<br>Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured maps /<br>Cartes géographiques en couleur  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Pages detached / Pages détachées  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /<br>Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Showthrough / Transparence  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured plates and/or illustrations /<br>Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Quality of print varies /<br>Qualité inégale de l'impression  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Bound with other material /<br>Relié avec d'autres documents  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Includes supplementary materials /<br>Comprend du matériel supplémentaire   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Only edition available /<br>Seule édition disponible  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Blank leaves added during restorations may<br>appear within the text. Whenever possible, these<br>have been omitted from scanning / Il se peut que<br>certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une<br>restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,<br>lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas<br>été numérisées. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion<br>along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut<br>causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la<br>marge intérieure. |                                     |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Additional comments /<br>Commentaires supplémentaires:  |                                     | Continuous pagination.  |

NOT PARTY, BUT THE PEOPLE.

# THE BYSTANDER.

---

---

FEBRUARY, 1881.

---

---

**T**HE Minister of Railways, in one of his speeches in defence of the Agreement, avowed his wish that a Company could be found to take the Intercolonial Railway also off the hands of the Government. The Intercolonial will soon have cost the country forty millions. It was built through an irreclaimable wilderness, not for commercial but for Imperial objects, political and military; though, as a military line, it is pronounced useless by the military authorities themselves. When the direct commercial route from St. John to Montreal shall have been opened, as it will soon be, the usefulness of the Intercolonial will cease, and in time the line will probably be abandoned.

The road along the North Shore of Lake Superior, and that through the mountains between the Prairie and British Columbia, are undertaken with the same objects, and form parts of the same enterprise as the Intercolonial. Like it, they are political and military, not commercial. Like it, they are portions of a desperate attempt to create an Anti-Continental Empire, by forcing into geographical union regions which are by nature not continuous, and cannot be made so. Like it, they belong to a policy the moral basis of which has been withdrawn by the overthrow of Jingoism in England and the simultaneous decline of Canadian antagonism to the people of the United States. Like it, they will probably be abandoned so soon as the commercial routes shall have been opened through a peopled and practicable

country. The wrecks will preach salutary sermons on the effects of Imperialism and the influence of Knighthoods; but the money will not return into the pockets of the Canadian people.

We may be under an illusion, but, judging from all that we can gather in private as to the real tendency of opinion, we should say that the people, if fairly consulted, would decide by a great majority to rest content with opening up the Prairie country on commercial principles, for its own benefit, that of Canada, and that of the continent at large, and to put off building the unproductive portions of the line, at all events, till there was a profit from operations in the Prairie country sufficient to build and run them. To assert that the country is shut out from adopting a sane policy by national faith and honour is preposterous. British Columbia has, over and over again, offered us in the plainest, not to say in the rudest, terms the alternative of separation. Separated she would hardly be, inasmuch as she would remain, with Canada, a member of the great federation of the Empire, like Newfoundland, the inclusion of which is to the Dominion an object of greater importance, and better worth the expenditure of millions, than the inclusion of British Columbia. The Columbians would carry off a round sum of Canadian money already expended on their territory: otherwise all would be as it was before the Treaty.

Such is, and has throughout been, our view. We have frankly avowed it because it seemed to us right, though with all due respect for the patriotic motives of opponents. To those who have charged us with Annexationism we have replied, and reply again, that the straight way to annexation, in the most ignominious sense of the term, lies through financial ruin. Nor have we a doubt that the tide, even among the politicians, is turning in favour of our opinion. No one can fail to see that the new leaders of the Opposition, though hampered by the former acts of their colleagues and by their own acquiescence in those acts, would, if they were at liberty to speak their minds, declare against the construction of the unproductive parts of

the road. They are, in fact, retiring from their old position with regard to the whole enterprise, under cover of a heavy fire ostensibly directed against the terms of the Agreement. It is equally clear that the members of the new Syndicate, though they necessarily tender for the whole line, would readily concur in a limitation of their project, leaving the road along the North Shore of Lake Superior to be built by the inhabitants of that region. With sure though silent step, the Continental policy, in matters commercial and economical, gains ground; and the only question is, how much more money will be wasted on the rival policy before the balance of public sentiment decisively turns. Here is a great Imperial enterprise which is forever to cut off the Dominion, commercially, from the rest of the Continent. To whom is the execution of it committed? To an American Railway Company!

But we wish to look at the question from other points of view as well as our own, and to do justice to the Government, whose general policy, though it runs altogether counter to our convictions, is not only the natural policy of U. E. Loyalists, but has up to this time been unquestionably endorsed and adopted by the other party. Nobody doubts the ability of the Prime Minister, or that of the Minister of Railways. Nobody, who is not a violent partisan, can doubt that in making the Agreement they did their best for the country. The charitable supposition that the Minister of Railways was bought by the Syndicate seems to have commended itself to the mind of Sir Richard Cartwright; but Sir Richard is in a state of high displeasure; witness his Bill enacting pains and penalties for problematical offences against a Company not yet in existence. That such men as Mr. George Stephen, and his colleagues, have been guilty of such infamy as the corruption of a Minister, we will believe when we see the proof; but we are not prepared to believe it on the mere word of prejudiced partisans in Parliament, much less on the authority of the *Globe*. By the *Globe*, Sir John Macdonald is accused of covert Annexationism, and would be accused of burglary if there were reason to hope

that the charge would stick. That the terms of the Agreement are onerous, is no wonder, since the country is paying not only for the construction of unproductive lines on a tremendous scale, but for running them at a loss for at least twenty years. We do not pretend to be so expert as many seem to be in computing the market value of land which has never been in the market and is unoccupied; otherwise we should say that the price given by Sir John Macdonald is less than that which would have been given by Mr. Mackenzie. The exemptions, about which so much has been said, are found not to be without precedent in recent grants to American Railway Companies. They might, without detriment to their reasonable objects, have been put in a less invidious form than that in which they have encountered the strong, and we must say, not unmerited, aversion of the people. In the drawing of the Agreement the hand of Sir John Macdonald seems a little to have forgotten its cunning. The most serious part of the matter, as we have always thought, is the erection in the North-west of this vast Railway and Land Corporation, the privileges legally assigned to which are of secondary importance compared with its actual power. But this risk is inherent in the plan of a private Company, to which, on grounds which appear conclusive, the whole country is manifestly inclined. The North-west, as it fills up, may be pretty well trusted to look to its own interests, and to resort to the necessary remedies, however rough, if it finds itself oppressed. It is, perhaps, to be lamented that the line was not leased for a long term, like the French railways, instead of being made over to the Company for ever: to individuals a long lease is as good as a perpetuity, while to a nation, which is immortal, its expiration may bring a rich reversion.

Not less important than the terms, in a case of this kind, is the character of the Syndicate, though this practical consideration is apt to be left out of view in mere forensic arguments against the Agreement. In this respect we cannot help thinking that the Government has done well, and even better than it

would have done had the enterprise been undertaken by the great capitalists of Europe. The necessary funds will be forthcoming, that is enough. The men at the head of the Syndicate are perfectly trustworthy; they are accustomed to act together, thoroughly familiar with the work to be done, and ready to commence operations at once. It will be strange if they do not soon add to the value of the government lands, by stimulating immigration, fully the three millions which constitute the difference between their money subsidy and that named by their rivals. Had the Government, instead of taking the course it did, formally put up the work to public competition, and accepted the lowest tender, it might have lost more in the character of the Company than it would have gained by the reduction of the subsidy. As to the intention of the Company to do the work there really is not the slightest room for doubt: if any misgivings are felt, a few months will set them at rest.

On the other hand, the duty of an Opposition is to oppose. It is in this way, according to the theory on which our political system is based—a theory from which we profoundly dissent—that, by the perpetual friction of parties, is ground out the public good. If there is to be a rhetorical prize-fight, in place of a deliberation, neither of the boxers can be blamed so long as he does not strike below the belt. The Government, if it wanted to be less mauled, had better have communicated the main conditions of the Agreement to the country some time before the meeting of Parliament, and given opinion time to simmer down. To publish the terms in a party assembly was to sound the trumpet for a battle. We cannot find fault with the leaders of the Opposition for prolonging the struggle, especially when they had reason to think that Blucher, in the shape of the Howland Syndicate, was at hand. The great error which they committed, or rather which was committed for them, was the premature condemnation of the Agreement, by which their moral position was ruined in advance. The Government was bound by the compact which it had signed, and so, according to the law of party, were the Government partisans;

but the Opposition was perfectly free. Sir William Howland's name was in itself enough to vindicate his Syndicate from the imputation of being a mere party dodge: undoubtedly he and his principal partners believed that they were rescuing the North-west from the grasp of a giant monopoly and the country at large from the jaws of a ruinous engagement. Their tender, perhaps, was not a cool commercial offer: it was the offspring in part of excitement engendered by the party struggle: that it was genuine is beyond reasonable question. It will leave its impression, especially if the article restraining the chartering of other lines shall be found to press severely on the people of the North-west. The people thought much more of that article, as tending to the creation of a monopoly, and of the exemptions, than they did of the mere difference of price.

If the real opinion of the new leader of the Opposition is what we suppose it to be, it is possible to imagine him taking a different line—giving credit to the Government for having made the best bargain in their power, acknowledging his past acquiescence in their policy, renouncing any idea of taking their places by defeating them on this question; but declaring that his mind was changed, and that in the interest of the country he must oppose an Agreement for the immediate construction of the unproductive sections of the road. We are persuaded that, by doing this, he would have made a better impression on the country than by pleadings against the Agreement, powerful no doubt, but one-sided, exaggerated, and therefore practically not very effective. Such, however, are not the ways of politicians.

Sir Charles Tupper has maintained his preëminence in the debate, both in Parliament and on the platform, though nothing can be less happy than the comparison of his oratory to that of Bright, and of the oratory of Mr. Blake to that of Gladstone. Bright's oratory is a sledge-hammer, wielded with perfect calmness: about Gladstone there is nothing forensic: occasionally he is betrayed into a subtlety which is rather ecclesiastical than

legal, but generally he presents a question in the broadest and most practical form, commanding the assent of his hearers as much by fervour and moral ascendency as by the force of argument. We hear it said that Sir Charles Tupper's prowess has assured him the succession, whenever that may be open, and whatever it may be worth. At this moment perhaps it would not be worth much if an appeal to the country were to follow. But if the Syndicate succeeds, and wealth flows into the country before the next election, the case may be changed. The retirement of Sir Leonard Tilley, which is announced, and which all who value integrity in public life will deplore, at once secures the highest place under Sir John Macdonald, with the reversion of the leadership, to Sir Charles Tupper, and confirms our impression that the Government has lost its hold on the Maritime Provinces and is conscious of that fact.

Opinion has pretty closely followed the party lines, and Tories have been nearly unanimous in valuing at one dollar the lands which Grits were equally unanimous in valuing at five. Some Conservatives were staggered by the exemptions, and by the clause restraining the construction of independent lines in the North-west. Generally speaking, the attempts of the Opposition leaders to fire the heart of the people were not very successful. The desire to be rid, almost at any price, of the burden and the uncertainty, seemed to be the predominant feeling. The petitions for which the *Globe*, assuming the leadership of the party, called, were almost a fiasco. Petitioning is, in truth, somewhat out of date; it was more appropriate to the times of Royal, than it is to those of Parliamentary, government. It was first employed systematically and on a large scale by Pym and Hampden, for the purpose of forcing Charles to put an end to the reign of Prerogative by calling a Parliament. The people are now accustomed, not so much to send up their prayers to those whom they have entrusted with power as to declare their will. In those days, moreover, there were no journals to give expression to public opinion. In recent times the Chartists and other bodies of reformers or agi-



tators have got up monster petitions, as demonstrations; but without much effect. Petitions have been signed with so much levity that signing them has come to be regarded as almost a farce. Still the paucity of signatures to those of the Opposition, on this occasion, indicates that the popular emotion was not very strong. The meetings were well attended; but any meeting would be well attended at which Mr. Blake was to speak. Upon the whole, it may probably be said, that the country acquiesces in the Agreement as the only available door of escape from a dilemma, out of which no one has resolution to lead it in a more satisfactory way.

The battle is now over; and those who are slain on the field of oratory live to fight another day. But it must be admitted that the time seems yet far off when, as we love to dream, this bitter and fruitless strife will come to an end, and the able and, as we doubt not, patriotic men who have been furiously denouncing each other as traitors will unite their counsels for the good of their common country.

—There is a debate over the number of the Exodus, placed by Sir Richard Cartwright at 90,000. That there have been many departures the sceptical may convince themselves by inquiry at any spot in Ontario; and the fact is still more manifest with regard to Quebec and the Lower Provinces. As has been said before, it seems needless to ascribe this to the N. P. or to any extraordinary cause; it is the normal flow of population from the less wealthy to the wealthier, from the thickly peopled to the unoccupied parts of what is economically the same country. Before Confederation, and since that period, in 1868 and 1869, large migrations took place from the Maritime Provinces, especially from the Lumber district, and improved railway facilities have increased the drain. Farming is said by those well acquainted with those Provinces to be still weak, the owner of the soil being often as much engaged in lumbering, mining or fishing, as in husbandry. You may call at his farm and find

that he is away working at a saw-mill or loading ships. Many of the farms are small and ill-stocked. When the owner of one of these is thrown back on it by a period of industrial depression, he finds it insufficient to maintain himself and his family, some of whom have to migrate to the States. Factories are, necessarily, on a small scale, and no amount of "energetic enterprise" or puffing will create, there or elsewhere, a market for more goods than the people want and can afford to buy. Another cause, however, of the lack of wealth and of the difficulty which the Maritime Provinces have in keeping their children at home appears to be the truck system, a barbarous and ruinous remnant of primitive times in which such barter was a necessity. The farmer who is at a distance from the principal markets, instead of receiving payment for his produce in money, has to take it out at the store, too often in the worst class of goods at the highest prices. The labourer, for his winter lumbering or his summer work at the mills, is paid not in cash but in a "due-bill" for which he gets at the store even worse measure than the farmer. Even when there is a small balance remaining, cash, we are told, is sometimes refused. The case of the lumberman is said to be the hardest. Having contracted for the delivery of his logs, he wants advances, for which he mortgages his farm; but he too gets them not in money but in supplies from the store at a fabulous price. The result is frequently hopeless debt; and the lot of the lumberman is that of the fisherman also. A few traders, it is said, monopolize the business, and hold most of the farms in their grasp while they at the same time engross political power, and legislate and conduct all government operations in their own favour. If there is truth in this account the system is enough to break the heart of any people. Nobody, perhaps, means to do injustice; things have gone on in the old way; but a change seems to be urgently needed.

—The session of the Ontario Legislature opens with the pomp of Provincial Monarchy and the "Speech from the Throne." Whether, supposing the Local Legislatures not to be Parliaments, there is a Throne to speak from, is a grave question for the consideration of jurists. The constitutional character of the Lieutenant-Governor as a ventriloquial apparatus is strikingly illustrated when Mr. Robinson, a supporter of Sir John Macdonald at Ottawa, condemns, as Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, the conduct of Sir John with regard to the Boundary Question which, if the question had come to a division in the Dominion Parliament, would certainly have received his staunch support. Even this falls short of the complaisance of a former Lieutenant-Governor who read for one set of Ministers a commendation of a measure respecting grants to railways, and for their successors a speech congratulating the Legislature on the preservation, by the repeal of the measure, of the public liberties which it had endangered. Where such customs are the last remnants of a once august power, now reduced to vanishing point, their comical character is partly veiled by their antiquity: with us it is unveiled.

In discussing the project of Biennial Sessions, we pointed out that it tended, by suspending the control of the legislature, to increase the already overweening power of the Government. In the direction of Biennial Sessions the Government is now beginning to move. The ground alleged for the change is the saving of expense, though it might be thought that if economy was requisite the articles which might best be spared were Speeches from the Throne. Independently of the consideration we have mentioned, there would be great inconvenience in intermitting legislative action, especially as there is a debatable ground between the jurisdictions of the Local and Dominion Legislatures, which will be left to the Dominion Legislature during the off years. American examples have been industriously collected. The devices by which our neighbours try to give themselves a respite from incessant lobbying and log-rolling are not very auspicious models for the constitutional re-

former. But it is forgotten that the Governors of American States, who really appoint the officers of the executive, are themselves elected by the people for short terms. This makes all the difference. The three evils which seem to call for remedies are the needless expense of the present system, the perversion of the local governments into donkey-engines of Ottawa parties, and the permanent ascendancy of a clique, the tendency to which is very marked at the present time. The proper remedy for the first evil is the retrenchment of superfluities, such as the Lieutenant-Governorship and the payment of indemnities above expenses, not the scamping of Provincial business. The proper remedy for the second and third evils we have often pointed out: it is the regular election of the executive officers by the members of the Legislature. In course of time we think this will be seen. Let us say once more, for the special information of Mr. Sinclair, that no speaker or writer, so far as we know, has proposed the abolition of Local Legislatures: what has been proposed is to make them local and, at the same time, free. In their donkey-engine state they contravene the fundamental principles of the Constitution, which evidently aims at separating the Local from the Central Legislation, and assuring to the Local Legislatures their independence. To make the severance complete was, we presume, the object of the Act precluding members of the Dominion Parliament from sitting in the Local House. If there is no objection to the party connection, and the influences which it entails, why is Ontario to be compelled to take up with mediocrities, or something less? Why is she not to be at liberty to avail herself of the services of her ablest men?

—The Archbishop of Montreal has been roundly abused as a sour and meddling priest for warning his flock against the Bernhardt performances. That priests in Quebec have meddled in political matters with which they have no concern, the readers of Mr. Charles Lindsey's valuable Essay well know. But

morality is their province, and so long as the world chooses to have a clergy, a Bishop warning his flock against what he deems subversion of their morals will be a policeman on his beat. Those who do not acknowledge his jurisdiction will, of course, treat his manifesto as waste paper and buy their tickets for the theatre with a safe conscience. That the stage is out of the pale of morality will hardly be pleaded by those who are calling on the church-going world to reconcile itself with the theatre and to accept it as an auxiliary to the pulpit. All the high language which we have been hearing on this subject is a mockery if in the drama there is no distinction between right and wrong, between a true wife and an adulteress, or a concubine. Not less suicidal would it be to proclaim that character is of no consequence in an actor or actress. Ristori, the queen of the tragic, Jenny Lind, the queen of the lyric, drama would have spurned a charter of depravity. In ordinary cases it is nobody's special duty to peer behind the scenes and scrutinize the lives of the performers; but in the present instance the social question had been forced upon public attention by persons, some of them cynosures of society, who thought fit to pay homage not only to the actress but to the woman. It had come, in fact, to something like a dead pull between those who care and those who do not care for the regular union of the sexes. We should have been surprised if in such a controversy an Archbishop had been silent or had taken what it appears some divines profess to think the more Christian side, forgetting, perhaps, that when Christ bade the woman taken in adultery go, He also bade her sin no more.

It is coming to be deemed very morose and narrow to say anything against the *Dame aux Camellias*. We are told that in London, as well as in Parisian society, she has made her way through the old social barriers which were respected even in the Duke of Grafton's time, and secured recognition as an object of legitimate interest. In France the highest literary talent has been devoted to her glorification. There is something fascinating in the idea of a vein of good lurking beneath a surface of evil and

people take pleasure in backing up warmhearted and spirited vice against cold pharisaism or seraphic insipidity. Possibly under this social rebellion there may be a movement of ethical transition, though it presents itself in a very questionable guise. But the *Dame aux Camellias*, if she really exists anywhere but in the fancy of Dumas *filis*, is the glittering apex of a pyramid the base of which does not glitter. In Montreal we are told there are one hundred and eleven houses of ill fame; and the lives and ends of the wretched creatures who fill these houses are of all the depths of human misery and shame the very lowest. A true history of the career of a low prostitute ought to be bound up with the *Dame aux Camellias*.

—Montreal has been the scene of a singular divorce suit, in which the chief cause of quarrel was religion, but the husband was the devotee and the wife was the free-thinker. Divorce is one of a number of social questions which are coming up for solution in the light of the new opinions. That two people who detest each other, and interchange glances of deadly hatred in court, should continue chained together by an indissoluble bond, seems cruel and against modern principle. But then there is the interest of the children, for whose existence the couple are responsible, and to educate whom they pledged themselves before the community in return for the privileges of legal marriage. Besides, it is certain that if the gate of divorce stands wide open, husbands and wives, instead of making up their quarrels, will be always rushing in. After all, the world is wide and there is the alternative of a quiet separation which will not brand the children in addition to making them worse than orphans. A public divorce suit is a hideous outrage on the memory of a dead love.

—In the United States the interest of politics still centres in the struggle between the Machine and Independence. The

Machine is tenacious of life and has elected a Senator for New York, though it can hardly recover the blow which it received at Chicago. Our sympathy is, of course, with the Independents; but we believe, that, as they go on, they will become aware that, the breaking of a single Machine will not do their work. Nothing will do their work but the abolition of party government. Party, as long as it prevails, will make Machines. In that respect the Machinists have a case. They say, in effect, party is faction, and faction, talk as finely as you will, cannot get along without patronage, or a bribery fund of some kind to buy support when there is no exciting question before the country, wirepullers to manage the organization, and a system of discipline for the coercion of mutinous opinion. They have on their side the verdict of universal experience, which no good resolutions can annul. If all the members of a party were active, the result might be different; but the mass are necessarily passive; the few act, engross the management, select the candidates, and become a Machine. No process of nature is more certain. So the Reformers will have to gird their loins a little higher.

—We wish we could think there was a strong popular movement in favour of Civil Service Reform. We fear that there is not. The people have taken it into their heads that a body of permanent office-holders would be an "aristocracy." This, of course, is nonsense. Where the government is despotic and bureaucratic, as it was in France under the Empire, and as it is in Russia, the officials are pretty sure to form a caste and to become insolent and tyrannical, because they feel that the Government is identified with them and that whatever they do they are sure of its support. Under the Empire, the French officials knew that their acts could not even be called in question before a court of law without the permission of their employers. But in the United States the Government is elective; it would have no conceivable inducement to support a local official in misconduct of any kind; probably it would be only

too ready to throw him overboard, both for the sake of popularity, and in order that it might get the appointment into its hands. Aristocracy, besides the sins which can directly be laid to its door, is answerable indirectly for a number of unfounded alarms. We cannot help fearing, however, that there is something besides the apprehension of aristocracy at work, and that the evil game of party politics, of which the offices are the stakes, is taking a fatal hold upon the popular mind. Be that as it may, the people will have to make their choice. They cannot have at once a colossal bribery fund and a pure government. If the latter course is chosen the only effective measure will be a Constitutional Amendment prohibiting the dismissal of public servants except for cause. Statutes forbidding the levying of political assessments upon office-holders are mere child's play.

—It is impossible for any one but a citizen of the United States to take an interest in the making of slates for the Cabinet, which at present is the chief political occupation of our neighbours; more especially as the question in each case seems mainly to turn, not on the merits or opinions of the candidate, but upon the place of his residence, it being regarded as essential that all the quarters of the compass shall be duly represented in the Administration. What chief of industry, wishing to form an efficient staff, would allow himself to be swayed in the slightest degree by the consideration which is permitted to prevail in selecting the servants of the nation?

—In the meantime, it seems that the maker of the Cabinet himself has been in some jeopardy, and the Union has run a risk of being once more presided over by an Accident instead of an Excellency, with, perhaps, the same bad results as on the last occasion. General Garfield was reported to be sick: a few days afterwards we were told that he was better, "the number of his visitors having decreased." This, in appearance a petty, is, in reality, a serious evil. No man can be a statesman who does not think; no man can think without time for think



ing ; and no man can have time for thinking who is exposed through the whole day to the irruptions of all whom private interest, fussy self-importance, or silly curiosity may bring to his door. Such license is called democratic : it might be more justly called the very reverse, since it is an unwarrantable encroachment for personal objects upon time which belongs to the people. Access can never be obtained to a European statesman by any but those who come on important public business, and American statesmen will never equal those of Europe until they are treated with the same consideration.

—Life has been put into the question of ex-Presidential pensions by the awkward position of General Grant, who is now suspended, like Mahomet's coffin, between the political and the military sphere. Few will doubt that the public pension is the right thing : the private pension would be inconsistent with national dignity, to say nothing about the danger of undue influence. The feeling of the people is against pensions altogether ; but there is a middle course between a monarchical pension-list and the other extreme : it is not seemly that one who has been at the head of the American nation should be seen struggling with penury, as Monroe struggled, during his closing years. Perhaps the best course of all would be so to raise the President's salary that he might have a chance of putting by something during his tenure of office ; but to enable him to save, it would be necessary, at the same time, to extinguish the mimicry of a Court which certain Administration ladies have been apparently trying to get up at Washington. Perhaps if the Americans are in a reforming mood they may, at the same time, think of extending the term and forbidding reelection, a measure not the less desirable because it was adopted by the Confederates. But reforming the elective Presidency is, we fear, amending the unamendable. It was originally a mistaken reproduction of the British monarchy in a republican form ; its effect is that of a succession to the Crown disputed every fourth year ; and the struggle for it is an unarmed,

and has once become an armed, civil war. The abolition of it will some day be found essential to the salvation of the Republic.

—There is also a proposal, connected with the name of Mr. Pendleton, to give the members of the Cabinet seats in the Senate, though without votes. Here again we come upon the traces of the errors into which the framers of the American Constitution were led by conventional notions about the Constitution of England. They did not see, nor did Blackstone or Montesquieu see, that the British Government was parliamentary; the Prime Minister, who was the real head of the State, being in Parliament and virtually appointed by it. Their minds were also filled with the notions of Montesquieu about the vital necessity of keeping the executive apart from the legislative, when, in fact, the British Prime Minister was the head of both, and with those fears of the undue influence of the Crown in the Commons which gave birth to the English Place Bills. The consequence was, that instead of producing a Parliamentary Government, they produced what is, of all free governments, the most unparliamentary in existence. The present proposal would be a step towards making the Government parliamentary; but it would be an awkward and equivocal step. Without votes, sitting only, as it were, upon the door-step, the Ministers could not lead. The relations between them and the real leaders would have to be managed through a telephone. Then supposing them to be defeated on a great question, would they, like the British Ministers, resign, or pocket the affront? If they resigned, would the President, who is the head of the Cabinet, resign with them, or would he keep his place after being condemned in the persons of his colleagues? The American Constitution is made up of two elements, a rational embodiment of the exigencies of a new situation, which is chiefly found in the Federal portions, and a perverse imitation of British precedent. The first element will have to be retained and strengthened; the second will have to be swept away.

It may be said that it is unpractical to raise these questions, and to talk of changes which nobody is prepared to make. But it is not unpractical in a writer, though it may be in a politician. Statesmen are prepared by such discussions for the opportunity of useful change when it comes, and in the meantime knowing the real root of the evil, they are saved from wasting their labour on misdirected or inadequate reforms.

—Just fears are excited by the amount of money expended in the Presidential Election. The *New York World* too truly says that the revelations of electoral corruption in England might be fully matched in the United States. The sum collected from office-holders was in itself enormous, and though a good deal is spent in torch-light processions and other excitements, much must also be spent in corruption. Where money reigns the rich are masters. Suppose the Vanderbilts and Astors should take it into their heads to turn their money into power, might they not in the end play in the United States the same game which the great commercial house of the Medici played at Florence? When you speak of the political danger which attends these vast accumulations of wealth, the answer of optimists is that in the last resort the people have the taxing power in their hands, and that the millionaires, aware of this fact, have always been careful to keep themselves politically in the back ground. Hitherto, no doubt, such has been the case, but will it continue to be so when the millionaires find that by buying the elections they can secretly filch the taxing power, and all other power, away from the people? The peril is increased by the growing connection of the American plutocracy with the aristocracies of Europe. If the Europeanized millionaires had their way the life of democracy would not be very long.

—In spite of the good temper and address of the British Foreign Minister, the Fisheries Question remains in a somewhat angry state, and threatens us with quarrels in the future. The

alleged disclosures of Professor Hind may be, as is suggested, the dark offspring of a brooding imagination; but inquiry is demanded by the honour of the Empire. For anything traceable to the incapacity of the American Commissioner, on the other hand, the Americans are responsible; and they have too much good sense to imagine that the question can be reopened on such grounds. A member of Congress has proposed a Joint Commission. The *American* suggests that the action of the Commission should be extended to the other issues open between the two countries, though not as yet so sharply defined, such as equalisation of tariffs, canal systems, and transport of goods in bond, power being given to settle the Fisheries question, and, as to the other questions, to pave the way for settlement. The Fisheries question, the *American* remarks, puts the people of the United States in the position of petitioners, and gives them an opportunity of initiating the movement, while the rider attached to the Canadian tariff, providing for reciprocal amendments, virtually opens that question on the Canadian side. It is proposed that the Commission should consist of five members from each country, and sit at intervals till the questions are settled. An International Commission dealing with purely commercial questions could hardly be supposed in any way to threaten the political independence of Canada. It is to be hoped that the suggestion will take a definite and authoritative form. Sure we are that no politician or journal in this country would be able to prevent our people from giving it a fair consideration. In England, the party in power is the one which cultivates friendship with the whole English race upon this Continent, and in that quarter no opposition is to be feared.

—The Agnostics want, it seems, to secularize Illinois. It might have been thought that secularizing Illinois was adding perfume to the rose. But we suppose the State Legislature has a Chaplain, and there is some sort of Sunday law, and Bible reading with perhaps a hymn in the public schools. We sup-

pose also that Illinois observes Thanksgiving on the day named in the proclamation of the President of the United States, and participates generally in the sunset hue of Protestant Christianity which lingers over what was once the polity of the Puritans. These are concessions to the weakness of a crowd still in the theological stage of its Evolution which the philosophy of Evolutionists and Necessarians might be expected to endure with a compassionate smile, provided that opinion was perfectly free. Opinion can hardly be otherwise than free in a community which not only allows Colonel Ingersoll to tickle the ears of irreverence to any extent he pleases without legal interference, but evidently visits him with none of those social penalties on which persecuting bigotry, when the sword is wrested out of its hand, is apt to fall back, since he is seen in the most correct circles, and his assistance as a stump orator is coveted by his party in elections. We are for a complete and thorough severance of the alliance between Church and State, and not only between Church and State, but, as far as possible, between Church and social power, being firmly convinced that religion can be worth nothing unless it is perfectly sincere, that it can be perfectly sincere only when it is entirely unconstrained, and that all the deadliest and most dangerous enemies of Christianity, with Voltaire at the head of them, have been made by intolerance. Yet it must be acknowledged that there are difficulties and reasons for caution, apart from religious bigotry, if the clinging of the people to national Christianity deserves so harsh a name. If the public school system is brought suddenly into sharp antagonism with the sentiments of the people, will not the schools be deserted, and will not public education, the indispensable safeguard of democratic institutions, be placed in peril? Besides what Mr. Van Buren Denslow and Mr. Ingersoll, who introduces Mr. Van Buren Denslow's work to the public, want is not only the secularization of Illinois but its demoralization, if we may use that term in a purely philosophic sense. They want to have nothing taught in the public schools or recognised by

the Legislature at variance with the theory that morality is merely "the law of the upper dog," and that lying, incontinence, theft, and other criminal habits are not wicked, but merely natural varieties of tendency, the prohibition of them being the invention of interested persons who had got power into their hands. They also want plutocracy, to which they adhere, after giving up religion and morality, to be inculcated, or at least respected. After them, perhaps, will come some unlimited free thinker who does not believe in plutocracy, and who will demand that this also shall be swept away. There are difficulties, we repeat, in the secularization of Illinois.

We cannot very keenly sympathize with those who feel themselves aggrieved because, while they enjoy unqualified freedom of discussion, they are not allowed publicly to insult the religious convictions of their neighbours. Freedom of discussion we uphold without limit or exception; but it is a different thing from want of feeling and bad manners. Agnostic orators are at liberty to employ all the legitimate weapons of ridicule, to say the least, as well as those of argument, against Christianity. In preventing the representation of the Ober-Ammergau Passion Play at New York, the authorities cannot be said, at all events, to have done more by their interposition than ought to have been done spontaneously by good taste. At Ober-Ammergau the Passion Play is the simple expression of peasant piety; it has been so at least hitherto, though it is in a fair way to be sophisticated by the craving for sensation which will soon leave no cool and quiet corner in the world. But at New York it would be the coarse and vile indulgence of a craving for stimulants which, having exhausted all common kinds of intellectual whiskey, finds a new fire-water in a travesty of the Crucifixion. The mere peace of the community is a sufficient reason for asking the lovers of the the vicious drama to content themselves for the present with the Black Crook and the Opera Bouffe. But any man of sense, however free-thinking, will see that in *The Cotter's Saturday Night* there is something which, even on economical grounds, it may be just as well not to shatter in a moment for the sake of one night's pastime.

—The Sunday Question is coming upon us all. It was raised the other day in Toronto by an attempt to open a Concert Hall on Sunday evening. Few social problems are either more important or more perplexing. The old theological reason for keeping Sunday can no longer be pressed. But the effects of Sabbath stillness does not depend on the Mosaic account of the creation. "The end of action is rest," says the greatest of the Greek philosophers, and his saying is the philosophical equivalent of the theological expression—"God rested on the seventh day." Rest is at the heart of all. A man who never reposes, and never withdraws into himself, runs a risk of going mad; it is the same with a nation, and assuredly never were the chimes which announce a respite from busy toil, care and excitement, more necessary than they are to a civilization like ours. Setting moral and religious considerations aside, brain and muscle need repose, and will fail if they have it not. Moreover, the Sabbath is the renewal of affection, which is suspended by the husband's occupation abroad and the dispersion of the family during the week. Yet, assuming that the theological ground is no longer tenable, it is difficult to see what is henceforth to be the basis, and what the scope, of legislation. In the United States, that austere and precise observance of the Sabbath, which was the Puritan substitute for sacraments, has ceased to exist. New York is rapidly becoming assimilated in this as in other respects, to Paris. In other cities, there is a stricter Sunday law, the degree of strictness being generally in reverse proportion to the strength of the foreign, and especially of the German, population. In the Quaker city the street cars run on Sunday without bells, and there are Sunday journals. There are no Sunday amusements, nor is there any trading, except in the German quarter, and in a clandestine way, though the aspect of Fairmount Park in summer would have startled William Penn. In the rural districts, so far as we have observed, there is, outwardly at least, little change. But on the whole relaxation visibly gains ground, and will continue to gain ground in proportion as the Puritan element of the population

or that which derives its character and traditions from Puritanism, grows relatively smaller and weaker. The question respecting the restriction of work is different from that respecting the restriction of amusement. Supposing it to be ascertained that the worker, to preserve his health and efficiency, needs rest to the extent of one day in seven, here is a solid ground, sanitary and economical, on which surely no Legislature need hesitate to act. But with regard to amusements, the case is different. We have no right to interfere with each other's tastes, nor are we likely to gain anything by doing so. People cannot be made spiritually-minded by law; though they may be made dull and morose if you debar them, in the name of religion, from secular amusements on Sunday evenings. In the first place, they will probably indulge their own tastes in secret, and in a worse way, as the Sunday life of English cities proves; in the second place, they will hate religion. Then there is the inequality of all such legislation, which shuts up the poor man's tea gardens or music hall, while it does not interfere with the piano in the rich man's drawing-room. The upshot will probably be a growing rebellion against restrictions on Sunday amusements, against which religious legislators will contend in vain. Strong Sabbatarians will perhaps regard this as a sign of the approaching end of the world. Practical men will measure possibilities, keep what they can, and try to lay new foundations, since the old foundations have failed.

—In England the Session of Parliament has opened, as was expected, in storm, and the barque of government rolls heavily; yet it seems likely to weather the gale. All sections of the Opposition show weakness. Among the Home Rulers, the split, which is the invariable end of Irish combinations, has come. Mr. Parnell, of course, decries the seceders as without influence among the people; but the actions of Irish members are not apt to be independent of the temper of their constitu-



ents. Mr. Parnell's own character stands clearly revealed as that of an agitator who dreads nothing so much as the healing effect of measures of justice. The English Radicals who voted for his Amendment were very few and very Radical. The Mohawks, as Lord Randolph Churchill and his band of raving Tories are called, can do nothing by themselves but rave, while the Conservative landowners generally, though bitterly hostile to Mr. Gladstone, appear to be held in check by the fear, perfectly well founded, that if the land question in Ireland is not speedily settled the agitation may spread to the English tenant-farmers, whose distressed condition at the present moment is likely to make them apt hearers of agrarian preaching. Nor, so far as we can see, is there any reaction against Mr. Gladstone in the country at large, though there might be if the Conservatives were Conservatives indeed, and if Lord Beaconsfield were Sir Robert Peel instead of being the Minister who, by his unquiet policy, involved the Empire in danger on every side, and helped to excite even in Ireland the spirit of unrest. Among the wealthier classes, even by those who are counted as Liberals, the Government is loudly blamed for not having resorted earlier to strong measures for the repression of conspiracy and outrage. It is the first duty of a Government to protect life and property, and a Government which fails to perform that duty, to the utmost of its strength, and without regard to its own political interest, is a soldier deserting his post. We cannot help thinking that at the commencement of these disturbances the British Government ought to have taken powers, if it had them not, to prevent the importation and sale of arms, to seize arms wherever they might be found, and to arrest persons carrying arms, especially at night or for the purpose of drill. It is idle to say that this would have been an interference with anything which can truly be called liberty. The term "coercion" is surely very improperly applied to enactments necessary for the prevention of murders, outrage, and intimidation; a relapse of the Irish people into savagery can hardly be desired by any sane friend of their cause. On the other hand, right-minded men will re-

joice that the Government has turned a deaf ear to those advisers, aristocratic or philosophic, who have been urging it to excuse the violence of the people by still more culpable violence of its own. To train Ireland in respect for law and in the habits of constitutional government is the highest object of statesmanship in dealing with Irish questions. An overwhelming majority will now carry the strongest measures of repression which the Government may think fit to propose. Mr. Parnell will obstruct the passage of them. He will also obstruct the passage of any Land Bill, and the more violently the more the Bill is likely to satisfy the people. But Parliament and the country appear to have been wound up to the point of dealing resolutely with obstruction. To curtail the general liberty of debate, when the members in general have shown no disposition to abuse it, is a weak proceeding. If a member comes to the House avowedly with the purpose of obstructing, and carries his determination into effect, the proper course is to expel him. In doing so the House of Commons would be merely obeying the law of self-preservation, and would be supported by the moral sense of the world: for no fair onlooker can fail to see that the Government and the Parliament are fully minded, if they are allowed to legislate, to do justice, though it is absurd to expect that they will proclaim a reign of public plunder or countenance an attempt to break up the unity of the kingdom.

—If the Land Bill comprises the three F's, as they are called—fair rents (which must be fixed by some superior authority) fixity of tenure, and the free sale of the good-will by the tenant—it will amount to a transfer of the real ownership. Such a measure can be justified only by the peculiar circumstances of Ireland; and as the sole mode of terminating an agrarian war between a native peasantry and an absentee proprietary representing alien invaders, which has now been going on for centuries, and is fraught with perpetual danger to the Empire. It is necessary to insist on this, because, if it were laid down as a

general principle that real property is specially liable to confiscation, the necessary labour and capital would cease to be invested in land. Under ordinary circumstances there can be no more reason or justice in forcibly transferring the property in a farm from the owner to the tenant than in transferring the property in a house or in any article that is hired. If, in any country, there are too many people to live on the land, it is preposterous to say that they have all a right to live on it. The Irish in their misery, have multiplied recklessly; they have, in fact, though crushed in the field by superior power, terribly avenged their wrongs on the conqueror by the mere growth of their numbers, and have invaded his cities in turn with masses of anarchy, disaffection, ignorance, and disease. Over-population is certainly a part of the evil, and for this the only immediate remedy is depletion: hereafter the possession of property may generate habits of prudence. Besides the tenant farmer, in whose interest the Land League is formed, there is a number of people subsisting by daily labour, whose case no reform of the land laws will touch. Nor will any reform of the land laws transform the Catholic of Connemara into a counterpart of the Ulster Protestant. Energetic and intelligent industry is not the creation of law. A religious system will produce in Ireland the same effect which it has produced in other countries, and notably in the States of the Church. The drain of absenteeism may be cut off; but the drain of the priesthood, the monasteries, and the Papacy, will not cease.

—It is announced that a great Fenian conspiracy has been discovered, and it is assumed that this will add to the embarrassments of the Government. It will not add to, but rather diminish them. The reason why it has been so difficult to put this Irish movement down is that it has not got up. Let it, instead of being a mere passive refusal to pay rent, assume the character of a political rebellion—let it show itself in the field—and all would soon be over. The Government could then bring

its military force to bear, whereas it cannot collect rents with the bayonet, or undertake a wholesale process of eviction. The gradual revelation by Mr. Parnell of his political aims must be watched by his opponents with malicious delight. The English people care not what becomes of the absentee landlords; but they are unanimous, or as nearly as possible so, in favour of the maintenance of the Union, and would arm any government with the force necessary for that purpose. Those whom we have been accustomed to regard as the wisest and most patriotic Irishmen are on the same side. They desire a large measure of local self-government; they want Ireland for the Irish; but they see that, with the mixture of races and religions in Ireland, with the total absence of any traditional centre of authority, with the complete unfitness of the mass of the people for republican institutions, an independent Ireland is out of the question; and that, if it were set up, its brief career of anarchy would probably soon close in blood. Those who cordially detest, as we do, all Jingo and Carlylese doctrines of domination, who heartily believe that no nation ever tramples on another nation without suffering more itself, who hold that neither the greatness nor the happiness of England depends on extent of Empire, may surely, without disloyalty to their principles, wish, at any rate, to see the Liberal party in the British Parliament try its hand at remedial measures, before the signal is given for a civil war. O'Connell, before the end of his life, had practically, if not ostensibly, given up Repeal as hopeless; and Mr Parnell is neither a wiser man nor better friend to Ireland than O'Connell.

—Panaceas are, of course, innumerable. Lord Dufferin, in a letter written strongly on the side of the landlords, recommends a great measure of emigration to our North-west, which he wishes to see organized by the British Government in conjunction with that of Canada. He says, that the Roman Catholic religion being supreme in the North-west, the priests would not oppose emigration in that direction. But the supremacy of the Roman

Catholic religion has already ceased with that of the half-breeds; and as a mixed population flows in the tables are likely to be completely turned. We can hardly imagine any people less qualified for the part of agricultural pioneers, in a remote territory with a very severe climate, than the potato-growing peasants of the West and South of Ireland. Even in the United States they cling to the cities, and rarely go out into the country as farmers before the third generation. Set down in Manitoba, without money and with insufficient clothing, they would probably die by thousands. The Canadian, the American, the German, the Scandinavian, and the hardiest and most self-reliant class of Englishmen, are the colonists needed in that region. Even the English farmer, accustomed as he is to all the aids and appliances of a thickly-peopled country, and little gifted with the power of adapting himself to new circumstances, will find himself better placed on the farms in old Canada, vacated by the emigration Westward, than on the raw lands of the North-west.

—It is said that the Conservative leaders mean to throw open their drawing-rooms and try to redeem the fortunes of the party by a social campaign. This, like the appeals to the British Lion, is an imitation of Palmerston. But Lord and Lady Palmerston were at the head of English society, and by their invitations conferred social grade. The imitation, like the Chinese copy of a steam vessel, would lack the steam. However, the day of drawing-room rule is over. The masses, and even most of those who guide the masses, are beyond the reach of any such influence. When the late Lord Derby boasted that he had dished the Whigs by his Reform Bill of 1867, he did not know that he had dished the drawing-rooms and the clubs at the same time. By bribery, beer, and platform claptrap, the multitudes may be moved, but not by social intrigue. London needs no influence to make it Jingo: from the drawing-room to the Music Hall and the pot-house, it was as Jingo before the election as any influence could make it, and its opinion

was utterly set at naught by the country. If the aristocracy should owe its fall to the manœuvre by which, with apparent success at the time, it turned the ignorant populace against the intelligent and responsible middle classes, it will surely present an example, as signal as any in political history, of retributive justice.

Rumours are also afloat of communications between the Opposition leaders and the Court. If the suspicions are unfounded they are not unnatural. By publishing in the Fourth Volume of the "Life of the Prince Consort" passages manifestly intended to back the Anti-Russian policy of Lord Beaconsfield, and by lending itself to the attempt to exclude Mr. Gladstone and induce Lord Hartington to form a government, the Court showed that it had been persuaded to take up a new and more personal position. That the Sovereign ought not only to reign but to govern and appoint his own ministers is the avowed theory of Lord Beaconsfield. Stories of stormy interviews on the Irish question between Mr. Gladstone and the Sovereign, and of rejections by the Sovereign of the first draft of the Speech from the Throne, may be merely the shapes taken by a widespread and not altogether unfounded suspicion. A Minister who should attempt to climb back into power by Royal favour would not only meet with a fall, but run a risk of breaking the ladder. It would be hard if the Court were to embarrass its Ministers in dealing with the crisis in Ireland. It has itself been the great absentee. Nobody who knows the Irish character doubts that, by spending a portion of the year in Ireland, the Sovereign might have won the hearts of the people and in all probability have torn this dark page from the history of her reign. Dublin would have been a capital, and the cravings for independent nationality, which its deserted aspect breeds, would have been allayed. The loveliest of parks, as we think the Phoenix may be called, would not have been a very dreary place of exile. But it is hard for Royalty, nursed in the indulgence of every wish, to sacrifice taste to duty.

—Mr. Gladstone, while he lives and can bear the strain of Government, is likely to be master of England. Through the mist of the remoter future begins to loom a Moderate Liberal Government under Lord Derby, who, conscious of his destiny, declines to resume his position as a lieutenant of Lord Beaconsfield. Perhaps, though unemotional, he also remembers "Titus Oates." He is the typical Conservative of the Agnostic and plutocratic era, entirely free from the least vestige of the Anglican or the Cavalier, and is regarded by cautious opulence as its polar star. There can be little doubt that the letter which he published before the election, proclaiming the Empire in danger from the rash enterprises of the Government, sent to the polls thousands of electors who usually do not vote. Nothing in his mind or character interferes in the least degree with the perfection of the Opportunist, who is the man for the crisis when nobody knows his own mind. It is not unlikely that he may become Prime Minister and reign long. The prospect is a pleasant one for the Marquis of Salisbury, who has made so many moral sacrifices in the hope of giving the country a worthier chief.

—From Madeira, whence he hurls his flaming thunderbolt at John Bright, Lord Carnarvon, we are told, will extend his voyage to South Africa. He will go, as was said in the case of another unfortunate administrator who visited the scene of his catastrophes, to show that he is not afraid of ghosts. He will also go to take his lesson, after having played his part "*Les gens de qualité savent tout sans avoir rien appris.*" Lord Carnarvon, when he determined to carry into effect his magnificent project of a Federal Empire in South Africa, probably knew no more of the country than was to be learned from the returned Colonists who hover about the Colonial Office and applaud the inspirations of the Minister. At the Cape, the wisest men protested throughout against the policy of Downing Street, maintaining, on the best possible grounds,

that Federal institutions would not suit a group of provinces filled with people of half a dozen different races, some civilized and others savage. The upshot was that the most virtuous and benevolent of statesmen, in pursuit of the most beneficent of objects, found himself presiding over the councils of iniquity and wading knee-deep in innocent blood. The invasion of Zululand was a buccaneering enterprise undertaken to round off the territory of the South African Empire that was to be. That the Transvaal was not annexed with the consent of its inhabitants, as was pretended at the time, has become painfully clear. As regards the Transvaal, there is now, between the demands of policy and morality, a perplexing dilemma. Is England to persist in what she at last knows to be a course of wrong? Are the just remonstrances of these people to be heard at once, or are the people to be killed first and their remonstrances to be heard afterwards? Empire has always answered such questions in the same way. But a Christian Empire sends missionaries with the cannon.

The rising—a rebellion morality cannot call it—of the Boers will, of course, sooner or later be put down, and the Basutos will collapse, as savages always do. But the danger is sufficient to breed reflection, and the English people will consider what might have happened had they been at the same time engaged in a war with Russia. It is not unlikely that this South African business, together with the bill of seventeen millions sterling sent in for a scientific frontier, and the fiasco of Cyprus, the immediate evacuation of which “magnificent possession” nothing but shame prevents, may produce an important change in English sentiment. Twenty years ago, the policy of moderation was in the ascendant, and Palmerston ceded the Ionian Islands to Greece, though the Tories denounced as treason the abandonment of an alien and distant dependency not less costly than invidious, in which, had war broken out, some fifteen thousand men must have been locked up as a garrison, while a battle of Dorking might have been going on at the gates of London. In the interval between that time and this there



has been one of those reactions of which students of politics have learned to take the measure, recognising them as natural, and tracing them to their causes without supposing that they will last for ever. The chief cause of revived Imperialism has been the intoxicating effect of a vast influx of wealth. This is now beginning to abate; disaster has waited on the policy of aggrandizement, and the outbreak of the Irish conflagration, in the heart of the Empire, must have awakened the people to the difficulty of combining the objects of a far-reaching ambition with that of safety at home. At the same time they are made conscious of the narrow limits of a military power which can hardly supply soldiers enough at once to hold down disaffection in Ireland and combat an insurrection at the Cape. Their good sense, no doubt, has tacitly passed a true judgment on the fanfaronade of bringing up Sepoys who, even if it were possible to employ savages in civilized war, are known from experience to be incapable of facing European troops. Englishmen may once more begin to think that real strength is to be found in the concentration, not in the dispersion, of force, and at the same time that it is possible for a nation, like a man, to be respected as well as happy without domineering or threatening to domineer over other people.

—In France the expulsion of the Jesuits has passed off quietly, and it has been made pretty clear that the Order, though dear to the party of political reaction, is not particularly dear to the people. Jesuitism is a nettle which stings when fingered, but has been several times grasped with impunity. Everybody is now looking forward to the elections, at which practically a vote will be taken whether Gambetta shall be the head of the nation. Gambetta is a man of great ability, represents the Moderate Republic, and has played his own game exceedingly well, but he is personally a sensualist and materialist. We cannot say that we desire to see France transformed into his likeness. A transformation, however, is going on, if not the

direction of Gambetta's character and opinions, at least in the direction opposite to those of the Religious Orders and the Faubourg St. Germain. In this respect the Second Revolution, as we may call the present movement, is more radical and likely to be more lasting than the first. The First Revolution must be said to have failed, since the upshot was the re-establishment of the Monarchy, with increased powers, in the person of a military usurper, the creation of a new aristocracy, and the restoration of the Catholic Church. Why did it fail? This is a question which historians generally, even those who, like Carlyle, pretend to give you the very soul of the history, hardly attempt to answer. The answer is, that while the Government was violently overthrown, and a group of men full of wild political theories, mounted for a moment to power, in the mass of the people the spirit of society and its fundamental beliefs remained unchanged. The Jacobins, though they were themselves fr̄e-thinkers and persecuted the priests, on political grounds made no systematic attempt to introduce a new religion or abolish the old. Robespierre's worship of the Supreme Being, and Lareveillere's Theo-philanthropy, were mere flashes in the pan. Thus Bonaparte was able, without encountering any serious resistance to restore the old order of things, based on the Church. The leaders now, at all events, perceive that a mere political revolution will not be enough, and they are trying accordingly to change the spirit of society and the fundamental beliefs of the people. They aim at substituting science as a social basis for religion. Gambetta, the other day, in addressing the University, proclaimed the Positivist Auguste Comte, the greatest thinker of the age, and congratulated his hearers, perhaps somewhat prematurely, on having discarded philosophy and the spiritual view of things for positive science. No doubt he, like the Comtists, think that there are only two bodies of opinion of any consequence, Roman Catholicism and Positivism, that these divide the world between them and that Positivism is sure to prevail. Such is the natural impression of a Frenchman who has seen no religion of any consequence ex-

cept the Roman Catholic. Gambetta may be mistaken : it may yet prove possible for society to rest upon a basis of spiritual belief which is not superstition. If such a possibility exists, it will not be lessened by the expulsion of the Jesuits. However, it is its radical character as a transformation, or attempted transformation, of the spirit of society and of fundamental belief, that lends surpassing interest to the new Revolution : this it is that accounts for the profound antagonism between the party of the past and that of the future : in this we have the real key to the events which are passing before us.

French finance flourishes marvellously, notwithstanding the phylloxera. This, it is said, is the effect of peasant proprietorship. So in a certain sense it is ; not so much, however, because peasant proprietorship increases production, as because it increases thrift. The French are the richest people in the world because, on the average, they spend the least. That, we take it, is the account of the mystery. Any other nation which would be as self-denying would be as rich. But the mere introduction of peasant proprietorship in Ireland, by a stroke of legislation, will not at once endow the tenant of an Irish cabin with the saving and hoarding tendencies of the peasant proprietor of France.

—In Germany the Jew question is still burning, and it is not unlikely to burn elsewhere. Our paragraph on it has drawn from the *New York Sun* a reply, the fairness of which, as well as the literary ability (not unwonted), we are bound to acknowledge. We may say that the pen which wrote our paragraph had earnestly advocated and, if need were, would again advocate, the political enfranchisement of the Jews in England. To make them as far as possible citizens, is, as we are thoroughly convinced, not only the most liberal but the wisest course, and the one which affords the best chance of divesting them of the exclusive character which has made them odious in all ages, and ridding civilization of that strange survival of the tribal

state, modern Judaism. It is of Judaism that we speak, not of Jewish blood, which runs in the veins of many who have completely thrown off tribalism and become excellent citizens of the countries in which they dwell. We have already expressed ourselves as strongly as possible against the re-imposition of political disabilities, and we entirely agree with the *Sun* in thinking that the Germans are estopped from any such proceeding since they have allowed Jews to perform the duties of citizens. But while we deprecate the retrograde measures proposed by the Germans, and heartily condemn the violence into which some of them have been hurried, we can understand their alarm and do justice to their motives, of which we cannot help thinking that disdainful philosophy takes somewhat too unfavourable a view. There are questions on which, as Lord Melbourne said, all the clever fellows are on one side, all the fools on the other, and the fools are right—at least the fools have something to say for themselves against the clever fellows. That there is something about the Jews which may possibly provoke antagonism, and that they are not merely the mystic doves depicted in Daniel Deronda, is proved by their refusal to intermarry with the people among whom they live. The world has been awakened from a delusion. It fancied that the Jews were merely a dissenting sect, and that, like other dissenting sects, when enfranchised they would become patriots. But it is now seen that in their case the religion was the least part of the matter. Enfranchise them as you will, they remain a separate nationality, or rather a separate tribe, with a strong tribal sentiment, not blending as other immigrants do with the people of the country, but refusing intermarriage, forming a community within the community, a state within the state, and using political power when they get it into their hands with a constant regard for the special interests and objects of their tribe. They are a great money-power, and their ascendancy would be a dominion of wealth in the most oppressive as well as the least august form. Nor are they quiet and innocuous, but intriguing

and aggressive. They are creeping behind the European press, and giving the world an inkling of the danger to which it will be exposed when money-powers learn the art of secretly manipulating in their own interest the organs of public opinion. "The Semites," says one who knows them well, "now exercise a vast influence over affairs by their smallest but most peculiar family, the Jews. There is no race gifted with so much tenacity and so much skill in organization. These qualities have given them an unprecedented hold over property, and illimitable credit. As you advance in life, and get experience in affairs, the Jews will cross you everywhere. They have long been stealing into our secret diplomacy, which they have almost appropriated; in another quarter of a century [this was evidently written long ago] they will claim their share of open government." During the late European crisis the Jews used to the utmost their influence over the Vienna press to prevent the emancipation of the Christian communities from the Ottoman yoke, and they are now opposing by the same means the resurrection of Greece. The effect on the policy of Germany would soon be seen if a controlling influence over the Government were to pass into the hands of the Jews. The Americans deem it perfectly lawful and consistent with liberal principles to debate the expediency of excluding the Chinaman from their hospitable shore, on the ground of danger to the integrity of the national character. Yet the Chinaman, besides being a producer, which the Jew seldom is, and adding to the wealth of the community, which the Jew simply absorbs, is in point of influence on the political, or even on the commercial, spirit of a country, little above a mangle or a spade.

Far be it from us to make an idol of nationality, or even to assume that it is the ultimate state, though at present it is the law of our existence, the condition of our public virtues, and the organ, as Mazzini says, through which man serves humanity. But if nationality is to be discarded as illiberal, let the Jews begin: theirs, we believe, is the only nationality so strict and narrow as to shun intermarriage. In the meantime, the Ger-

man people are entitled to be judged by the rule of patriotism. It was for a German, not for a Jewish Germany, that they faced the hail of death at Gravelotte. The philosophy which is above patriotism, therefore, must be kind, at least provisionally, to their feelings and their fears. When the Fatherland was being trampled under the foot of Napoleon, and all German hearts were bleeding, Goethe, the sublime and serene, said that the French were agreeable people, whom it was impossible to hate, went to pay his homage to the conqueror and received with pleasure, some think with too much pleasure, a bauble from the conqueror's hand. This may have been an anticipation of the cosmopolitanism of the future, though Napoleon was a cosmopolitan only in the sense in which a highwayman is a communist. But it was not the spirit of Goethe that liberated Germany from the stranger's yoke, and gave to Europe and humanity the great Teutonic nation. Probably there are German scientists who care little what Germany is, so long as she is scientific. We do not blame them: their sentiments have been formed in regions of intellect into which political sentiment hardly finds its way, and we always bear in mind the possibility of their being, in this respect, precursors of that which is to come. But it is not from their point of view that a fair judgment can at present be pronounced on the actions of a nation which has just gone through a mortal struggle for its unity and independence. Perhaps the philosophers owe more to the "Philistines" who have fought for Germany than they imagine. English culture now delights in pouring contempt on the memory of the Puritans, but where would English culture have been if the Puritans had not made England free?

We have before us the pamphlet of Herr Stöcker, the clerical leader of the movement. He says not a word against the Jewish faith; on the contrary, he falls in with the common habit of exaggerating the religious importance of the "Chosen People;" though he complains of the hostility of the Jewish press to Christianity, giving quotations which show that the antagonism of Tribalism to Humanity is nearly as strong as it

was on the day of the Crucifixion. In truth, Christianity was the offspring of Judaism as much by antagonism as by evolution: it came from a quarter from which Judaism said that nothing good could come. Stöcker's points are, the exclusiveness of the Jews, their anti-national position, and their aversion from manual labour, which particularly offends the Christian Socialists, and which would certainly seem to unfit those who cherish it for sympathizing with the sentiments, or guiding the destinies, of industrial communities. If, in the matter of religion, he brings any charge at all, it is not that of misbelief but of unbelief, and of stifling the spiritual life of the community by the propagation of wealth-worship and greed. In fact, what is called "a great religion" has apparently sunk into a set of obsolete forms, combined with a materialistic optimism and a lingering tribal notion that other races are Gentiles. There is no sort of resemblance between a modern Jew and the devout and simple husbandmen who went up to the Courts of Sion. All the declamations, therefore, of American preachers about the revival of religious persecution are out of place. In the Middle Ages, and long after the close of the Middle Ages, intolerance was the law. The Jews did not suffer as much as the Albigenses and other Christian heretics, who, be it remembered, were natives, not intruders, and had never been the ministers of extortion or the grinders of the people. In England, the Jews were relieved of their political disabilities almost as soon as the Dissenters. Nor did they outstrip in tolerance the rest of the world. They were all the time reading in their synagogues a law which punished religious offences with death, even in the case of a stranger. It is irrational to impose political disabilities on a man now because his forefathers took part in the crucifixion of Christ, and it is equally irrational to allow him to do wrong because his forefathers were persecuted in the Middle Ages.

The Jews are beginning to assume, and are encouraged by Judæomaniacs in assuming the airs of "a superior race." Even if they were a superior race, we should think it better for

Germany, in her own interest and in that of humanity, to develop in her own way and on the lines of her own character. But to dub a race superior, in such a sense as to make it the fit guide of our destinies, there must be superiority of character as well as of intellect. The Scotch are a superior race all round, and the absence of any serious feeling against them, in spite of their success, and their occasional clannishness, is a confutation of the theory that the feeling against the Jews is merely envy. But the Jew has for eighteen hundred years subsisted upon the labours of others by arts which are proverbially identified with his name;] and whether it was his misfortune or his fault, the inevitable result has been a sharpening of the wits at the expense of the moral qualities. The effect would have been the same in the case of a tribe of seraphs. Of the extraordinary services which the Jews are alleged to have rendered to civilization during the Middle Ages, we desire clearer proof. Commerce was developed not by Jewish usurers, but by the merchants and mariners of the great trading cities of Italy and other countries. The exclusion of the Jews from England did not hinder her from being the England of Elizabeth. One branch of commerce indeed the Jews did help to develop: they were great slave dealers: and though such fables as that of Hugh of Lincoln are, in their most odious features, fanatical slanders, it is not unlikely that they had a partial foundation in cases of kidnapping. If Jews added to the wealth of the countries in which they settled, Poland would hardly be so poverty-stricken as it is. Nor do we see the ground for the assertion that they have "saved nations from bankruptcy." As money lenders they have helped Governments to run nations into debt, and to carry on wars at the expense of posterity, but for this service civilization owes them scanty thanks. Much has been said about the services rendered by the Jews as scientific discoverers: but what were the discoveries, and what had become of them when the Middle Ages closed? Rabbinism, seen not in elegant extracts, but in the lump, appears to be the very dregs of the human intellect;



and it would severely tax our respect for the literary authority of the *Sun* to assign a high place among the agencies of mental progress to the philosophy of Philo Judæus. The Jewish Mystery about which Daniel Deronda rhapsodizes is pure fiction. In the case of Miss Martineau, the nemesis of Positivism was Mesmerist superstition: in the case of George Eliot it was an hallucination about Judaism. The Armenians are like the Jews, a wandering and money-broking race, though on a smaller scale; some day, we shall have an Armenian mystery. To dally with such stuff, is only to confirm the Jew in his addiction to what is worst in him, and prevent him from coming into the allegiance of Humanity. That the world has, in later times, owed much to men of Jewish race, such as Spinoza, Neander, and Mendelssohn, we cordially and gratefully admit; but these men had left the pale of tribal Judaism.

This view of the case may seem illiberal; but we recognise no liberality which denies facts, nor do we see why justice should not be done to Germans as well as Jews. The question is a serious one. Apart from this struggle of races in Germany, there is reason to fear that Judaism, with political power in its hands, having the European press under its control, and acting in the interests of accumulated wealth, may some day become a formidable combination against the interests of humanity. To all measures of disfranchisement, we repeat, we should be utterly opposed; and not less so to social injustice or contumely of any kind. To limit immigration is inhospitable; though in very extreme cases it is lawful, as the new treaty of the United States with China affirms. The German is, of course, at liberty to combat Jewish influence at the polls, and, by his vote, to put true Germans at the head of the nation. Jewish Mammonism must be combatted by the general agencies which sustain and quicken spiritual life in a community. To keep themselves out of the hands of the Jewish usurer, the people must practise the industry and thrift which have guarded Scotland; and now that Germany is united and has become a

great nation, the native chiefs of her commerce will learn to operate on a larger scale. The fresh life infused into her veins by her liberation from a brood of petty despots will enable her gradually to throw off alien accretions, which gathered on her when in her king-ridden and torpid state. It is open to the Germans also to set their diplomacy at work for an object to the advantages of which we have more than once referred—the restoration to the Jews of their own land. The faces of the Jews in the Turkish Empire and of those in the Lower Danube might thus be turned eastward instead of westward, and the west might be saved from an impending immigration, while the fact would be made clear to all that the Jews in their present condition are not a religious sect but a wandering and parasitic nation.

—In Ethics the bottom seems to be reached by Dr. Van Buren Denslow. In politics the bottom seems to be reached by “The Anarchist,” a periodical in a sulphureous cover, published at Boston, which, as its name imports, devotes itself to the assertion of individual sovereignty and the abolition of the State. Avowing that its work for the present is destructive, not constructive, it proclaims that “since the beginning of history force has been the *accoucheur* of any serious reform” and sets to work “to impart to the masses the conviction that their only salvation is in Revolution.” It accordingly furnishes very practical directions for the construction of barricades. But it also suggests the use of “chemicals,” and all possible instruments of destruction. “Killing, burning—all means are justifiable. Use them; then will be peace.” Peace with a vengeance! A special appeal is addressed to the Irish, who, it is taken for granted, are “agin all government;” but it may be doubted whether the comparatively well-to-do Irish of Boston would be quite as ready to kill and burn as the starving peasantry of Connemara. The “Anarchist” will find that popular suffering and a general sense of oppression are not less essential to the accomplishment of its strategical objects than barricades

or dynamite. If this periodical had been printed at St. Petersburg or Berlin, its appearance would at once have set all the police in motion ; it would have been suppressed ; then it would have circulated secretly and become an explosive force. Printed in a perfectly free country, and among an educated people, it causes no anxiety even to the most sensitive : it is as harmless as gunpowder exploded in the open air. Man is not a revolutionary animal, but the reverse : no appeals however inflammatory will induce him to leave a good or even a tolerable dinner for the purpose of constructing barricades or blowing up governments. If he ever puts himself so far out of the way, it is because he has a very serious grievance, and if he has a very serious grievance it ought to be redressed. Stifling the cry instead of redressing the grievance, is a policy which has been often tried and has left its mark in history.

—A correspondent desires us to discuss the theory broached in "Modern Thinkers," that Tom Paine wrote "Junius." When we begin to write about the authorship of "Junius," we shall be in our dotage. Francis, as we believe, had a confederate, his obligation to whom, perhaps, helped him to keep the secret, which his own vanity would almost certainly have disclosed ; we think it probable that the confederate was that most intriguing and subterranean personage, Lord Temple : we are quite sure it was not the "rebellious needleman," Tom Paine. It is more likely that Paine may have had a share in drafting the "Declaration of Independence," and that we may hear the voice of this rather questionable Moses in the Political Decalogue of the Republic. What is certain is that his "Common Sense" was one of the greatest hits ever made ; that it had an immense effect in deciding the Americans, and notably in deciding Washington, to declare for Independence, and that its language is not less vigorous and telling than its reasonings, in the main, are sound and the step which it advocated was wise. The revolution of opinion in the midst of which we live extends to

the characters of the past, and the famous dead, after being consigned to their quiet abode, are being all summoned before the tribunal of Minos to be judged over again. Tom Paine, both as a publicist and a writer on religion, is called up among the rest. We cannot love him, but are willing to do him justice. As a member of the French Convention he bravely voted against the execution of Louis XVI., and we believe him when he assures us that he opposed violence throughout: he drew upon himself thereby the hatred of the Terrorists, was thrown into prison, and actually set down by Robespierre for the guillotine. Thus he risked, and all but lost, his life for the highest interests of humanity in general, and the Liberal cause in particular. He was not the halcyon of a summer calm, but the petrel of a terrific storm, by the blast of which he was driven to and fro, from England to America, from America to France, from France back again to America, labouring without rest at the destruction of tyrannies and the regeneration of mankind. His violence and vituperativeness were the ways of his time; and if his life was loose, as is alleged, it was not more so than those of Tory statesmen, leaders of society, and political defenders of religion. His political philosophy, like that of other reformers of the period, was metaphysical, not evolutionist, and his theory of governments was that which, after ages of misgovernment, naturally prevailed: he fancied, with the other prophets of the Revolution, that if kings could only be pulled down the people would be happy; but he can hardly be called a fanatic, much less a maniac. "Society," he says, "in every state is a blessing, but government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil—in its worst state an intolerable one. . . . Government, like dress, is the badge of lost innocence, the palaces of kings are built on the ruins of the bowers of Paradise. For, were the impulses of conscience clear, uniform and irresistably obeyed, man would need no other lawgiver; but that not being the case, he finds it necessary to surrender a part of his property to furnish means for the protection of the rest; and this he is induced to do by the same prudence which, in

every other case, advises him out of two evils to choose the least. Wherefore, security being the true design and end of government, it unanswerably follows that whatever form thereof appears most likely to ensure it to us with the least expense and greatest benefit is preferable to all others." This is not the truth as now seen in the light of historical philosophy and general science, yet it is nearer the truth than either Hobbes's "Leviathan," on one side, or Rousseau's "State of Nature" on the other; and the conclusion is practically safe. Paine is not made deaf by theory to the counsels of political prudence. "It is always better policy," he says, "to leave removeable errors to reform themselves than to hazard too much in contending against them theoretically." He was as far as possible from being a Nihilist or an Anarchist. The government of law was his aim. He upheld the Bank against demagogic violence, and our National Currency friends will be rather startled when they hear that, having seen the fiscal ruin and moral depravity begotten by paper currency during the Revolutionary War in the United States, he solemnly declared his opinion that any one who should propose a renewal of that system ought to be punished with death. The most unseemly passage in his life is his quarrel with Washington, whom, having once eulogized, he afterwards denounced with his usual truculence. In denunciation of Washington, however, he could not possibly go beyond other writers and speakers of the ultra-democratic and French party, to which he belonged. In this case he had a personal as well as a public grievance: when he was lying in a Jacobin prison, he had in vain solicited the interposition of Washington, who abhorred the excesses of the Revolution, cordially detested the Jacobins, and, perhaps, without being very accurately informed as to the particulars of the case, fancied that Paine had been taking part in the crimes of the Terrorists, and had met his deserts. Paine lived in an age in which his destructive forces had work to do and were doing it. He was one of the acrid solvents of an obsolete system. For the special odium attaching to a name which has become almost a

synonym for disreputable radicalism, he has mainly to thank his attacks upon Christianity. They are ignorant and shallow, as well as coarse, virulent and offensive. But we must remember that Christianity presented itself to him under the form of corrupt and intolerant establishments, which made religion the handmaid of misgovernment. Though a Freethinker, he was a strong Theist, and avowed his belief in Providence as the upholder of the righteous cause, in language which would make him a scandal to all Agnostics of the present day.

So far as the French Revolution is concerned, though we do not particularly covet Paine's record, we prefer it to that of Burke, whom, because his reverence for precedent and hatred of theoretic change seem congenial to Evolution, Liberals of that school, such as Mr. John Morley, whose biographical sketch we have all been reading with interest, seem inclined to set up as not only the eloquent sage of the past, but the guide of the future. To these worshippers of Burke we shall seem to utter blasphemy when we say that nothing appears to us more creditable to the rhetorician or more discreditable to the political philosopher and statesman than the "Reflections on the French Revolution," with its astounding sequel, the "Letters on a Regicide Peace." Its violence was in part, we are persuaded, the offspring of spleen, bred of Burke's estrangement from his Liberal friends, and of the mortifications which he had brought on himself by the outbreaks of his temper in the House of Commons, where he flung down a knife, as the symbol of eternal enmity between himself and those who did not concur with him, and was told by Sheridan that he had forgotten to bring the fork. The philosopher ought to have understood the causes of the revolution, political, social and economical, which were plainly visible even to Chesterfield, but of which Burke, treating the movement as a mere outburst of chimerical aspiration and wicked ambition, shows himself totally ignorant, as in his wild shriekings against "Atheism," he shows himself ignorant of the great movement of European opinion. The statesman ought to have known that his duty at such a juncture

was to calm the public feeling, not to inflame it, especially when a moment's reflection would have assured him that in England the privileged class, with all its wealth, patronage, sinecures and titles, was fearfully liable to selfish panic. His raving denunciations of the whole French nation, saving the Emigrant Aristocracy, as a pack of cannibals and demons, show that he had utterly misread human nature, as well as that his mind had lost its balance. Arthur Young's *Travels in France* told plainly enough the tale of the oppression and misery which had goaded the French people to madness. But, as Mr. Morley admits, Burke seems profoundly unconscious of the facts. He fancies that the States General, in the changes which they made, were acting without instructions from their constituents. This Mr. Morley frankly admits to be an enormous blunder: it is a blunder which betrays the total absence of careful inquiry. The charge which Burke levels against the French, of presumptuously discarding all precedent, breaking with the historic past, and attempting to construct a polity with no guide but a chimerical fancy, is preposterously unfair. For a century and a half the political life of the nation had been completely interrupted by the despotism of encroaching kings; the path of constitutional progress had been lost; but in calling the States General the nearest historic precedent was followed, and the leaders had the model of Parliamentary Government in England always before their eyes. Burke had seen France, yet he seems wholly blind to the difference between its case and that of England. He arraigns the French Commons for sending notaries and physicians, whom he regards with supreme contempt, as their representatives to the Assembly. Whom could the French Commons send? Did Burke think that there was in France a class of country gentlemen like those who sat in the British House of Commons? Did he not know that the landowners there were nobles? What had he himself been, after all, but an adventurer and the retainer of a grandee, Lord Rockingham, from whom he had stooped to accept large sums of money under the name of loans? He is

very eloquent about the wrongs of Marie Antoinette, but the slightest acquaintance with the history of the French Court would have told him that the scandals about her were to no small extent the natural consequences of her own folly, and that, at all events, the first whose "looks threatened her with insult" were denizens not of the Faubourg St. Antoine, but of Versailles. He might have known, too, the political part which she played. For that hideous catastrophe, and all the woes that it entailed on mankind, the person really responsible above all others was the unhappy Queen. The Assembly was inexperienced, but it was patriotic, and when it came together thoroughly disposed to act cordially with the King, childlike confidence in whose goodness and power to set everything right was still the ruling sentiment in France. The King, on his part, benevolent and conscientious, though lamentably weak, was not less disposed to act cordially with the Assembly, and while this harmony continued not only was there no reason to despair, but there was every reason to hope that a Constitution would be founded. The Queen it was, who, by her baneful influence, drove her vacillating husband, as Henrietta Maria had driven Charles I., to the courses of violence and perfidy which wrecked her and him, France, and the fortunes of Humanity. The assent of the King had been scarcely extorted when she and her Camarilla brought up the army to disperse the Assembly, if not with a still worse intent. The army, infected with popular feeling, refused to act: but the Assembly, in the hour of peril, had been compelled to place itself under the protection of the armed populace of Paris, which, the army having melted away, was thenceforth master of the situation. Then all was over: by the Queen's most criminal folly the avalanche had been set loose from the mountain side and nothing was left to stop its fatal descent into the abyss.

Not to admire Burke's zeal as a reformer is impossible; but it is difficult to see his immense sagacity. The root of all the self-seeking, corruption and caballing in the House of Commons of that day was the unreformed state of the representa-



tion. Members for rotten boroughs having no constituents, were responsible to nobody, and unchecked by public opinion, even the debates not being published at that time, the inevitable consequence was that each member fought for his own hand, and for all the pelf that he could get. The remedy, as reason clearly pointed out, and as experiment afterwards proved, was a measure of Parliamentary Reform. But not only did Burke fail to promote Parliamentary Reform, he opposed it to the utmost of his power, and defended the rotten borough system with arguments which the intellect of Croker might have disdained. He actually wished to make the franchise even narrower than it was. His grand remedy for the evil was "connection," or, in other words, more of faction and cabal. Perhaps even religion, if well advised, would prefer Tom Paine's honest hostility to Burke's political advocacy of Tests. Burke was a magnificent writer, and in his better mood a great political teacher; though, like other men who are essentially rhetoricians, he, to some extent, makes his philosophy as he goes along. But save us from his dictatorship in the politics of the future!

— We trust that in speaking of the rupture between Dr. Thomas and the Methodist Church at Chicago we did not convey the impression that the responsibility rested on Dr. Thomas: it rests on the Rock River Conference, which condemned his views as "at variance with the history and theology of the Methodist Episcopal Church," and "kindly but firmly requested him to withdraw." It seems that his expulsion has not yet been ratified by the Church at large, though he is provisionally ministering to an independent congregation. Let us say once more that the responsibility is grave, not only on general grounds of charity and comprehension, but on account of the peculiarly important position occupied, if we mistake not, by the Methodist Church, as the great Church of the people, and as affording, in some important respects, including its flexi-

bility in regard to Church government, the best centre for Christian Union. What is meant by the allegation that Dr Thomas's doctrines are at variance with the history and theology of the Methodist Church? Does the Methodist Church, by its formularies, bind its members to a belief in the Inspiration of the Scriptures, according to the narrow construction which seems to be cherished by the Rock River Conference, or does it simply affirm that "Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation?" Does it assert that the punishment inflicted by Divine Justice for a finite fault will be infinite, or is that merely a private interpretation of Scripture impressed as a popular belief on the minds of Methodists by a pulpit rhetoric of terror? As to the "history" of the Methodist Church, it has, no doubt, run parallel to that of the other Churches. All the Churches, in the time of Wesley, adhered to forms of belief to which, since the floodgates of new knowledge, scientific, historical and critical, have been opened, no man of competent learning can adhere without doing despite to the light which is in him, and which, it is to be presumed, comes from the universal source of light. The Churches have to look in the face the question whether that which reason by conscientious effort has discovered, does or does not emanate from the Author of Truth. If it does, they have to accept it, even though it may not square with their formularies and the past history of their doctrine. If it does not, they have to show us what, if not on reason, the Evidences of Christianity rest. The Methodist Church itself is little more than a century old, and, on its first appearance, it shocked the orthodoxy of that day as much as anything propounded by Dr Thomas can shock the orthodoxy of ours. Everyone now heaps censures on the purblind prelates of a hidebound Establishment, who were unable to recognise the new spiritual birth, and whose narrowness deprived their Church of Wesley. But may not the members of the Rock River Conference be doing the same thing under different intellectual conditions and with a change of name? May not this which they are striving to crush or to cast out be another new

form of spiritual life, though dogma, not formalism, is in this case the shell through which religious progress is breaking? Nothing in history is sadder than the futile attempts made by the heirs of great Reformers to put a stop to reformation. Does the Rock River Conference think that it can draw a line beyond which thought and aspiration shall never go? Does it think that if John Wesley were alive now he would wilfully shut his eyes to the progress of knowledge, or set it down as the work of the Devil? Worship is surely as important as any but the most fundamental doctrine, and in the matter of worship the Methodist Church has recognised the fact that the austerity of her early days does not equally suit her maturity, and is making large concessions to the æsthetic cravings of the present generation. Dr. Thomas is, of course, bound by the law of charity to be considerate in propounding his opinions; if he is not, on him will rest the blame of disruption; but so long as he is, ought not his sincere reluctance to leave his spiritual home to be accepted as his warrant for remaining?\*

—Christian Unity, or, perhaps, we should rather say, the relation of the Churches to each other, has formed the subject of discussion at an Anglican Conference. Unity is not likely to find its centre in a Church which arrogates that title exclusively to itself and treats all other communions as separatist and uncovenanted "Denominations." There is no Established Church in

---

\* In the section of our last number relating to these matters, speaking of the forthcoming revision of the English translation of the Bible, we gave as instances of familiar texts which the people would in all probability miss, that of the three witnesses, in the First Epistle of John, and Job xix. 25, 26, 27, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," &c. We did not give the reason in either case, assuming that in both it was known. The first text is likely to disappear because the passage of the original is an interpolation, the second is likely to disappear because it is a mistranslation, and utterly misleading, though it is embodied in the Anglican Burial Service and there applied, in accordance with the popular interpretation, to Christ and the resurrection of the dead. We mention this because it seems somebody has fancied, or pretended to fancy, that we took the second case as well as the first to be one of interpolation. It is rather startling, we may add, to find a Minister of the Truth telling us that as the authorship of most of the Books is correctly stated in the present version, we need not be particular about the rest.

Canada, or if there is, it is the Roman Catholic Church of Quebec, which is privileged, and which is also the most ancient in the colony. But the Evangelical party in the Church of England are scarcely less tenacious of the social superiority which they derive, or fancy that they derive, from connection with the English Establishment than are the High Churchmen. Of Apostolical Succession, and the exclusive transmission of the Holy Spirit through Bishops, on the belief in which the exclusive pretensions of Anglicanism are founded, it is right to speak with respect, since their reality is maintained by good and learned men: to most of those who have looked into the historical question with open minds they appear fables. The letter of the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth, penned by Clemens Romanus, and unquestionably belonging to primitive antiquity, seems in itself conclusive against the Episcopal and in favour of the Congregational theory. It is clearly addressed by a Church to a Church, and does not even name the Bishop. Episcopacy, of the Roman Catholic or Anglican type, was, in all probability, developed out of the primitive overseerships in the latter part of the second century. If there is to be a rivalry among spiritual communities as to the comparative dignity of their origin, that origin would seem to be the highest which is the most spiritual, in which case pre-eminence certainly cannot be claimed by the Church of England, inasmuch as, historically speaking, she owes her special character to the arbitrary will of that not very spiritual personage, King Henry VIII., who not only moulded her but changed her backwards and forwards to suit the veering dictates of his policy or his caprice. Above all Churches, she has been throughout her career a pensioner and handmaid of the State. Macaulay is right in describing as her distinguishing badge the political doctrine of non-resistance to tyranny, for heresy concerning which two of her Bishops refused absolution to Monmouth, though a few years afterwards, being threatened in her possessions and privileges by the tyranny of James II., she herself cast non-resistance to the winds, and acted in alliance with the Dissenters till she had secured her own interests, when she turned round and

persecuted the Dissenters again. It would be difficult to find on the escutcheon of any other Church a stain like that which the Church of England brought upon herself by accepting the infidel and debauchee, Bolingbroke, as her leader and champion in carrying measures of political oppression against her spiritual enemies. On the high Christian excellence of many of her Prelates and clergymen, it is needless to descant, and the weak points of her history might rest in oblivion if she would abstain from denying the equal claims of other Churches. Let us once more ask, if Bishops are the divinely-appointed guardians of the truth, how we can be justified in disregarding the voice of the immense majority of them, which declares that the Church of England is heretical, schismatical, and out of the Catholic pale? The only answer, apparently, to that question is one which would make individual conscience, not Episcopal authority, the supreme rule of belief.

—To the list of books which we have had on Japan is added Miss Bird's "Unbeaten Tracks," an interesting though professedly unsystematic book, the work of a keen observer as well as of an adventurous traveller. Agnostics, and not only Agnostics, but all who study the connection between religion and moral civilization, ought to feel a special interest in Japan. That country is probably the most important experiment ever made in getting on morally, socially and politically without a religion. The Shinto, which was the old official religion, is perfectly dead, and the Buddhism which for a time prevailed among the people seems barely to retain a vestige of life. It is true that in China, also, religion has hardly any existence, except in the domestic and political worship of ancestors and the Emperor; but Chinese civilization is less vigorous and interesting than that of Japan, especially since Japan has been opened and begun to imbibe European civilization. Moreover, the educated classes in Japan are not only Agnostics, but Agnostics with their eyes open: they see that other nations have religions, and deliberately prefer to be without one; they pronounce

religion incapable of proof, superfluous, and a mere interruption of the social and industrial effort by which happiness is to be obtained. Enough for them, they say, is the present life. The most thoughtful of them, when sent abroad to study the civilization of other countries, confine themselves to science or other things that are materially useful, and if asked whether they have studied religion, reply that they had no time for anything that had not a practical bearing. Japan, in fact, is the land of Positivism, and as its people are gifted and energetic, we may form from it some estimate of what Positivism can do. The administrative system, the system of popular education, and the practical science to which Japan owes her present burst of progress, are imported from Christian countries, and their foreign character is marked by the sharp contrast between them and the native habits. Miss Bird sees the telegraph wires over her head, children returning from school with their books and slates around her, and before her men having for the whole of their raiment a sun-hat and a fan. The motive power of progress is in the Government, which is now a paternal bureaucracy, and, being smitten with the love of western civilization, is playing in Japan the part which was played in Russia by Peter the Great. The people have had no opportunity of manifesting any political virtue except filial obedience. Their submission to authority appears to be abject. They seem, however, to be very docile, and to lend themselves in an intelligent way to the execution of ordinances which are for their good. The industry is native, and it is marvellous: its source, no doubt, like that of the industry of China, is the need of subsistence pressing upon a swarming population which had no outlet in emigration, combined with the rich resources of the country; but there is also about it a pleasant appearance of delight taken by the workman in his work, that bloom of industrial happiness which is so sadly wanting in the case of the hands in our factories. Of the skill of the Japanese artists, the Kensington Museum contains specimens admirable in taste, and more than admirable in power of execution; but the art is imitative, not creative; it lacks a soul; it is

devoid of poetry, and hardly gets clear of the grotesque. Some of the old Buddhist temples, however, from the descriptions of them, must be really fine treatments of the theme of Eternal Repose. A love and a sense of beauty, decorative perhaps rather than æsthetic, are evidently the common heritage of the people of Japan, showing themselves even in the furniture and utensils of the poor; and these can hardly exist without a certain happiness of soul which again implies a considerable measure of well-being. There is much gaiety, and popular festivals are many. "Life," says Lord Elgin, "seems an affair of enjoyment in Japan." The manners of the people are singularly mild, courteous, and kindly; a proof that their state has long been industrial, not military. Their domestic affections also appear to be strong. Miss Bird is of opinion that the women are virtuous, but that there is great immorality among the men. In personal filthiness, general uncleanness, and want of decency, the inhabitants of some districts visited by Miss Bird are evidently on a level with savages. The criminal code was, like that of China, atrociously inhuman, till in this as in other departments the example of the Christian nations introduced reform. Christian missionaries are at work, with what result remains to be seen. They will have to encounter not merely the ignorant prejudices of ordinary heathenism, but a thoughtful and philosophic scepticism which is fully equipped with all the current arguments against Christianity, and which we may expect to see aided by the counter-missionary efforts of Positivists, who will hardly sit still while a Positivist nation is being seduced from the allegiance of social science and inveigled into that of theology. Mr. Akamatz, nominally a Buddhist hierarch, but really a philosopher, after speaking to Miss Bird a great deal about the demerits of Christianity, descanted on the superior influence of the philosophy of Mill, Huxley, and Spencer, which, he said, was stimulating inquiries which Christianity could not answer. He was also quite aware of the progress of scepticism in England, where, he said, belief in God and immortality was rapidly disappearing. The Japanese utterly recoil from all inquiries about the Future State, declar-

ing that they are hopeless and unpractical. On the other hand, Miss Bird's Japanese attendant, being asked by her what his feelings had been in a situation of peril from which he had just escaped, replied, " I thought I had been good to my mother and honest, and I hoped I should go to a good place." This looks like the presence, in a rudimentary form, of natural religion.

The London *Spectator* whimsically upbraids the people of the United States for not lending aid to the cause of oppressed nations. American journals naturally retort by pointing to Bulgaria, Afghanistan, the Transvaal, and other weak points in the philanthropic record of the Old Country. They say with truth that if the American Republic has not crusaded, it has assisted the oppressed of all nationalities by affording them an asylum, which, they might add, would have been altered in character and impaired in value by the maintenance of armaments, such as crusades would have entailed. They might also say that by the presence of her citizens in China and Japan, and the friendly relations into which she has entered with the Chinese and Japanese Governments, she has practically done not a little towards preserving these two important and interesting, though quaint and barbaric, nationalities from the filibuster, who, as all readers of the Jingo press of England must be well aware, had marked them for his prey. Lord Elgin, who, as Envoy to China, and as Governor-General of India, served iniquity with a heavy heart, had dark forebodings of the doom of Japan. " This," he says, after describing the pleasant aspect of Japanese life, " is what I find in Japan in the year 1858, after one hundred years' exclusion of foreign trade and foreigners. Twenty years hence, what will be the contrast?" His parting words are, " we are again plunging into the China Sea, and quitting the only place which I have left with any feeling of regret since I reached this abominable East—abominable, not so much in itself, as because it is strewed all over with the records of our violence and fraud, and disregard of right." Jingoism has had its day: a better spirit now reigns in England, and Englishmen who cherish the honour of their country as a moral power, have reason to hope that the danger of piratical



raids on Eastern nations is at an end : but that, while Jingoism was in the ascendant, Lord Elgin's presentiments were not fulfilled, Japan probably owes in some measure to her friendly connection with the United States.

Curiously enough, the *Spectator* itself, which is particularly Christian, is at the same time highly Imperialist, and has advocated conquest as an instrument of Christian civilization : it has been dubbed by an eminent thinker the organ of "filibustering Christianity:" so that the American Republic setting forth, in compliance with the *Spectator's* call, to lend its chivalrous aid to some oppressed nationality, might be encountered by the *Spectator* itself with its hymn-book in one hand and its six-shooter in the other.

Our notice of the Jew Question in Germany had passed through the press before we received the current number of the *Contemporary Review*, in which there is an article on the subject by the Author of "German Home Life." We extract a passage which shows that the German peasant may have reasons for his antipathy apart from the question of religion. We may add that exactly the same process has been going on in Roumania.

Everywhere the peasant proprietor hated the Jew. In the north and in the south, in the east as in the west, one story met the ears of those who would listen to the tale. The land had to be mortgaged to pay family claims; the bauer had recourse to the money-lender; the money-lender naturally extorted what he could; the Jew grew fat as the Gentile got lean. A few bad harvests, cattle plague, or potato disease, and the wretched peasant, clinging with the unreasoning, frantic love of a faithful animal to his habitat, had, in dumb agony, to see his farm sold up, his stock disposed of, and the acres he had toiled early and late to redeem and watered by the sweat of his stubborn brow, knocked down by the Jewish interloper to the highest bidder. By these means (even in old times) the Jew money-lender realized large profits on a small outlay, and so common a case was this that both the Prussian and Bavarian Government saw fit to pass some restrictive laws on this system of chopping up farm lands ("farm-butchery" as the peasant called it) and selling them in small allotments. In countries where the forest lands were partly royal domain, and partly the inherited property of the hereditary peasantry, the same ruthless foreclosing, the same utter ruin to the unhappy bauer, drew the attention of both the government and communal bodies to the pernicious system in vogue. The Jew of agricultural districts would know to a nicety the financial position of the farmers and peasant proprietors. He would wait and watch, and bide his time; lending his victim money in the first instance, then threatening him, again stopping the gap; until, working without capital, the bauer became a mere labourer on his own land, his master exacting work and heavy interest from him, and misfortune on misfortune culminated in total ruin.